

A Consideration of Berdyaev's Theory of Personality Development

—Comparing to the Idea of Humanity Formation by Herder—

Naoki TERAOKA¹

Abstract:

This article attempts to reconstruct Berdyaev's existential philosophy, i. e. personalism as the theory of personality development, comparing to the idea of humanity formation by Herder.

The purpose of education in Japan is defined as “the full development of personality”. In the background, there is the influence of Kant's philosophy. However, Japanese today who have experienced nihilism need to consider “the full development of personality” from the standpoint of the idea after nihilism. It is the existential philosophy that is the key to overcome nihilism, and among many existential philosophers, we must pay attention to Berdyaev, who is also personalist.

In fact, there are several studies about Berdyaev's personalism from the perspective on the theory of human formation. In these studies, Berdyaev's basic ideas, “the Ego(existence)”, “personality” and “personality development”, are considered adequately, but these studies cannot make the relationship between them clear. So this article shows the relationship between them, comparing to Herder's concepts of “self”, “humanity”, and “humanity formation”.

Keyword : Berdyaev/ Herder/personality /human formation/existence

¹ / Assistant Professor, Faculty of Health and Human Development, The University of Nagano

Preface

This article attempts to reconstruct Berdyaev's existential philosophy, i. e. personalism as the theory of personality development, comparing to the idea of humanity formation by Herder.

"The full development of personality" has to be considered as the education purpose in Japan, which based on the idea after nihilism, namely "*That the highest values*", for example, of God and so on, "*devalue themselves*" (Nietzsche 1968: 9), rather than Kant's philosophy. According to Sugihara (2003: 14-17), the translation of the personality, "Jinkaku", was established and extended by Inoue Tetsujiro, who wrote *Chokugo Engi [A commentary on the Imperial Rescript on Education]* (1891), and he was one of the pioneers who established the phrase "the full development of personality"¹⁾, which was influenced by Kant's philosophy. Based on these backgrounds, Tanaka Kotaro let this concept to be the official education aim in Japan. Although the reason of human rights and the dignity of human beings was originally based on God (religion), those are found in aiming at "the full development of personality" from modern times, and the "personality" is regarded as the subject who acts moral with autonomic volition²⁾ (Hirose2014: 152-156). On the other hand, nihilism exists in both Europe and Japan (Nishitani1986: 177-181).

Humanism, especially "the third humanism" which is based on existential philosophy (Mutai2002: 9-10), is considered as "philosophy which aims at reconstructing human beings from nihilism" (Miki1967: 167). The existence indicates "the way of the subjective being of each individual" (Mutai2002: 296) and "the subjective and individual being" (Mutai2002: 299). Mutai (2002: 296-299) gives it a certain evaluation that the attitude of existentialism, which thinks of human's "limit situation" (Jaspers), for example "solitude" and so on, as "her or his own problem subjectively and seriously, though extremely abstract" (Mutai2002: 296-298). On the other hand, "many existentialists consider human existence without respect of social conditions" (Mutai2002: 297). Therefore, the true existential attitude which confronts "the social conditions and the human alienation through it" is important (Mutai 2002: 298).

Berdyaev, one of the greatest existential philosophers, has developed his own

existential philosophy, i. e. personalism, keeping surmounting nihilism in mind. What is noticeable is that he attempts to get over Kant's formalistic personalism, even influenced by it (Berdyaev1950: 37 and 93-98, Berdyaev1938: 123). He insists that the objectified world, society, is established in the process of modernization and in the society "the Ego" as existence becomes solitary. In order to surmount the solitude (nihilism), it is important to develop personality as existence, he also mentions. In fact, there are several studies about this viewpoint in nation and overseas. For example, Tanikawa (1970, 1971) considers Berdyaev's understanding of "the Ego" and personality adequately, even failure to make sure their "development". Köpcke-Duttler (1982) examines the Berdyaev's theory and connects to another basic idea "creation", but he cannot make the relationship between existence ("the Ego") and personality clear. Dancák (2012) researches the Berdyaev's theory based on his basic ideas, "personality", "transcendence", "freedom", "creation", "God-man (Theandric)", but he cannot clearly refer to the relationship between existence and personality, either. So this article shows the relationship between "the Ego" (existence), "personality" and "personality development", comparing to Herder's concepts of "self", "humanity" and "humanity formation" because their ideas have many similarities what will be examined in the next sections.

Berdyaev's existential philosophy, especially of history and religion, attempts to accept and overcome that of Herder, which is based on his idea of humanity formation³⁾. Surely, he, as well as Kant, is a thinker before nihilism, but in one of Berdyaev's main work, *The Meaning of History* (1923), he refers to Herder. "[H]e [Herder] was the last real humanist. [...] In Herder's humanism man was still associated with the Deity. His humanism was religious, but his religion was humanist" (Berdyaev1962: 132). However, in the modernization, nihilism spread out, as a result, humanism became "his[man's] self-affirmation and the denial of anything superhuman" (Berdyaev1962: 142) and "[t]he intermediate reign of the humanities of which Herder spoke comes to an end" (Berdyaev1962: 146). Nevertheless, Berdyaev (1962: 157) insists that history goes from antihumanism to "the New Middle Ages", in which "he[man] submits himself to a supernatural principle which becomes the content of his life".

First of all, Berdyaev's understanding of "the Ego" becomes clear by comparing to Herder's concept of "self".

1. Berdyaev's Understanding of "the Ego"—Comparing to Herder's Concept of "Self"

For Berdyaev (1938: 65), "the Ego" is "primary and primitive". Besides, it "belongs to the sphere of existence" (Ibid.). "The primitive Ego is rooted in existence" (Ibid.). "The Ego" as existence "dwell[s] within himself, in his own authentic world", rather than is "at the mercy of the social and biological world" (Berdyaev1938: 44). In other words, it is "concrete universality", not "the general and the objective processes of the external world" (Ibid.).

As the background, there are "two types of knowledge" (Berdyaev1938: 48). One is "rational and objective knowledge which is confined within the frontiers of reason and apprehends only the general" (Berdyaev1938: 49). The other is "the knowledge immanent in Being and in existence through which reason is enabled to apprehend the irrational and the individual after transcending the general" (Ibid.). The viewpoint of the former one is "of society, of communication between men by means of the objective and the general" (Ibid.). The other one is "of community, of existential communion and of penetration into the heart of the individual" (Ibid.). That is why the latter one is called "participation" (Ibid.), more precisely, "participating in Being and existence" (Berdyaev1938: 55).

Berdyaev (1938: 37) insists that "effective knowledge involves familiarity, or, in other terms, a subjective approach, an identification of oneself with the subjective existence", i. e. the knowledge as participation. Also the two aspects are included in existence as personality, that is rational aspect and irrational one (Berdyaev1938: 124-125). In the objectified society, the irrational aspect of existence, "an obscure irrational substratum"⁴⁾ (Berdyaev1938: 43) is rationalized. It is through admitting "the limitation of reason when confronted with irrational Being" and "its paradoxical and contradictory nature" (Berdyaev 1938: 48) that "transcendence" as knowledge is achieved.

[K]nowledge is immanent in Being; but what really takes place within Being is

a *transcendence* and, in the process, a penetration into the vast depths beyond any given Being. The function of knowledge is not to reflect, but to create. Beyond any given stratum of Being there lies a still deeper stratum; and transcendence is the only means of attaining this deeper stratum of Being. (Berdyaev1938: 43)

[I]f this knowledge is understood as Being, as a function within and by means of Being, as a transcendence of Being operative in the heart of Being, then the knowing subject must necessarily be existential, and his knowledge must be immersed in the mystery of existence, in the depth of Being, rather than be a reflection of Objective Being. (Ibid.)

In short, “[t]he Ego’s reality lies in its endeavor to transcend itself” (Berdyaev 1938: 68), so “[t]he participation of the knowing subject in existence is anterior to his knowledge. My existential experience is anterior to my knowledge. For that reason, knowledge is resemblance” (Berdyaev1938: 43).

Especially, we must pay attention to freedom and creative power (activity) of which transcendence consists.

These[[T]he religious sources and foundations of philosophical theory [knowledge]] are contained in the theandric idea, in the idea of the reciprocal action of the divine and human natures, of the freedom and creative power inherent in both these natures. (Berdyaev1938: 29)

It is obvious that “[k]nowledge is essentially active because man is active” (Berdyaev1938: 33). Corresponding to “two types of knowledge”, “[t]he activity of the knowing subject manifests itself in two ways”, “by objectification” and “by means of Existential philosophy” (Berdyaev1938: 52-53), on the other word, “existential communion” or “participation”. Especially, “participation” indicates not only “the revelation of human existence” but also “through it, that of divine world” (Berdyaev1938: 53). Therefore, in the quotation shown above, freedom and creative power (activity) are considered as “the idea of the reciprocal action

of the divine and human natures". "God is an agent only when He is a subject, a spiritual essence revealed by the subject" (Ibid.). "[M]eaning is revealed, the meaning of human existence and of the universe as part of the Divine Being" (Ibid.). Such participation brings us "the existing reality, which whereby assumes a greater significance" (Berdyayev1938: 52). Through this "probing the meaning of existence", "[t]he creative nature of intellectual activity [knowledge]" is displayed (Berdyayev 1938: 53). "The process of intellection [knowledge] discovers the meaning, the cosmos, underlying the meaningless and chaotic universe" (Berdyayev1938: 52). That is why knowledge is called not merely activity but also creative power.

In addition, the creative power in knowledge is based on freedom. Berdyayev (1938: 55) points out that freedom, i. e. "the creative reaction of the subject's illumined freedom to Being", "originates in the irrational abyss prior to any Being". On the other hand, Logos, namely "the reflection of Being in the subject in the form of speculative knowledge", "is divinely inspired" (Ibid.). According to his explanation, the world is created by God, even "incomplete and requires man's active collaboration" (Berdyayev1938: 33). Thus "[h]is creative freedom should extend to all spheres and it should pursue its creative work in the sphere of knowledge itself" (Ibid.). That is why knowledge is "not merely reflection, but also creative transfiguration" (Ibid.). Moreover, Berdyayev (1938: 56) points out "the primacy of freedom over Being". "The basis of knowledge is irrational because it is derived from pre-ontic freedom" (Berdyayev1938: 55). Based on the pre-ontic freedom, the irrational aspect is included in existence as personality.

Nevertheless, since Berdyayev (1938: 79), referring to Martin Buber's *Ich und Du* (1922), emphasizes "the Ego has no real existence outside of its relationship with the Other Self or the Thou", his existential philosophy is not solipsism. Therefore, "the Thou" or "the Other Self" is the precondition of "the Ego". Besides, "we assume that the We, as well as the Thou and the It, are immediate data" (Berdyayev1938: 80).

The objectified We [...] has also another aspect, that of community and communion with other people, a communion wherein each person is not an It but a Thou. [...] [T]here exists another kind of communion between human consciousnesses, based upon their participation in the We [...]. The We is a qualitative content immanent in the Ego, for every Ego is invariably related not only to the Thou but also to multiple mankind. (Ibid.)

Of course, “the We” and “the Thou” can be objectified as “the It”. However, for Berdyaev, the objectification needs to be overcome. Instead, he thinks “community and communion with other people” is important because transcendence as knowledge means “participation”, “penetration of primary reality” (Berdyaev1938: 82). “*Communion implies reciprocity* [...]”. In a state of communion both the Ego and the Thou are active [...]” (Berdyaev1938: 83). Since “the Thou” is also the other “Ego”, what on “the Ego” are similar with “the Thou”, such as reciprocal activity and creativity. Furthermore, this reciprocal creativity between “the Ego” and “the Thou”, i. e. “[t]he communion of the Ego and the Thou gives rise to the We” (Berdyaev1938: 139). “[T]he Ego also postulates the We, in whose depths the communion of the Ego and the Thou is achieved” (Berdyaev1938: 140). Therefore “[c]ommunion involves participation, reciprocal participation, interpenetration”, and “the Ego’s union with the Thou”, namely “[t]he interpenetration of the Ego and the Thou is consummated in God” (Berdyaev1938: 141).

Importantly, Herder’s “self” (cf. Terakawa2014: 40-43) and Berdyaev’s “the Ego” are alike. According to Herder (1990: 829), human beings need to “forget the narrow I” for “self”. “Forget *thine I*; but never lose *thy self*, which is the greatest gift the rich God gives us from His heart” (Herder1990: 830). Herder explains that “thine self is what the Thou thyself creates from all and what exists in the present moment, moreover, thy Creator as well as thy Creature” (Ibid.). That is why Herder (1990: 831) regards human self as “the image and likeness of God”. Berdyaev shares theandric idea with Herder. “As a spiritual Savior of mankind, he [Christ] wants to create God-man” (Herder1989: 709). The following sections will reveal this point in more detail. Besides, “what live in the other

heart is our purest and most meaningful *self*” (Herder 1990: 832). In addition, as well as Berdyaev, existence is important for Herder. “Every living being enjoys its existence [...]. Its purpose is intrinsic to itself. [...] This simple, deep-rooted feeling of existence, this something *sui generis* is happiness” (Herder1969: 308). It is true that Herder is a thinker before existentialism, but he seeks philosophy of history, which ““puts all together and describes the concrete, different, individual realization of human existence” (Pannenberg1962: 96).

Both Berdyaev and Herder involve with “monad”. Berdyaev (1938: 140) involves it from existential philosophy, and contrasting “the windowless monad” (Leibnitz), “the monad may be more or less hermetic; it may be closed to some objects and open to others. We must understand this dynamically”. Herder emphasizes “self” as “the monad with window” (cf. Terakawa2020: 65-68). “Pure simple unity must already *relate each other in accordance with its essence*, even God brings nothing into it. Otherwise, every monad itself is a world and cannot communicate with the other monad” (Herder1987: 49).

Moreover, Berdyaev, who attaches importance to Freedom, evaluates Herder’s concept of Freedom. “For him[Herder], man was the first being to realize his freedom and to stand upright. Man was a king in his freedom” (Berdyaev1962: 132, cf. Herder1969: 255-267). As well, in the idea of humanity formation by Herder (1989: 184), it is the knowledge that “gives human beings his own feeling of existence”. This point will be explained in the third section.

We are going to examine Berdyaev’s understanding of “personality”, which has a close relationship to “existence” as “the Ego”, comparing to Herder’s concept of “humanity” in the next section. “Existential philosophy is a Personalist philosophy; the human personality is the real subject of knowledge” (Berdyaev 1938: 51). “Existential philosophy alone is able to propound the problem of personality” (Berdyaev1938: 133).

2. Berdyaev’s Understanding of “Personality”—Comparing to Herder’s Concept of “Humanity”

While the existence as “the Ego” is “primary and undifferentiated”, moreover, “is postulated *ab initio*”, “the personality is propounded” (Berdyaev1938: 121).

Therefore, the existence as “the Ego” is “to realize its personality” (Ibid.).

In addition, “the personality, like God, is extra-natural” (Berdyaev1938: 122). In other words, the personality belongs to “a spiritual category” instead of “a natural biological category” and “it is the spirit manifesting itself in nature” (Berdyaev1938: 121).

In contrast, the personality shows some relationships to nature (cosmos).

It[the personality] is sensitive to all the currents of social and cosmic life and open to a variety of experience, but it takes care not to lose its identity in society or in the cosmos. Personalism is opposed to either social or cosmic pantheism. The human personality has nevertheless a material content and foundation (Berdyaev1938: 122).

Also, “since it[the personality] is the image and likeness of God, it is intimately related to Him. It postulates the supra-personal: [...]. [...] [I]t is the manifestation of an existential purpose” (Ibid.). This assertion tells the meaning of “the theandric idea” clearly as “the idea of the reciprocal action of the divine and human natures” (Berdyaev1938: 29). In more detail, since the personality is “the image and likeness of God”, the existence as “the Ego” relate to God. That is why “the theandric idea” appeared. Based on this idea, the insistence that “*meaning* is revealed, the meaning of human existence and of the universe as part of the Divine Being” (Berdyaev1938: 53) can be regarded as “the development of the personality” (Berdyaev1938: 126), which has “its supreme value” (Berdyaev1938: 134, 136). In the next section, we will consider it further.

On the other hand, the personality includes “a mystery based on the co-existence of contraries” (Berdyaev1938: 123).

It[the personality] is a unity in the midst of plurality, and can thus comprehend the universe. [...] *[T]he personality is the incarnated antinomy of the individual and the social, of form and matter, of the infinite and the finite, of freedom and destiny.* For this reason, the personality cannot be a complete whole; [...] it fashions and creates itself, it is dynamic. It is essentially the union

of the finite and the infinite. (Berdyayev1938: 132)

[A]ll these[idealist and realist ethics] should co-exist, just as the human and the supra-human, the real and the ideal, co-exist in the personality itself. To be in love with another's personality is to perceive the identity and unity underlying its perpetual change and division [...]. (Berdyayev1938: 147)

Since "the co-existence of contraries" appears in the personality, it is "a whole" (Berdyayev 1938: 123) and "has a universal content" (Berdyayev1938: 132), "not anything partial or particular" (Berdyayev1938: 131). The human personality represents "the intersection point of several worlds" and "belongs only partially to any society, State, confession, or even the universe", i.e. the personality "exists on several planes" (Berdyayev1938: 132). This is because God, of which the human personality is the image, is *coincidentia oppositorum*⁵⁾ (Berdyayev 1938: 88).

It is sure that the personality "has a universal content", but "[t]he Being of the personality is distinct and original, and has no affinity to any other Being" (Berdyayev1938: 128). "Monism in any form is incompatible with personalism. The very idea of the personality implies a dualism" (Berdyayev1938: 127). Hence Berdyayev looks upon "[t]he very idea of the personality" as "the coexistence of contraries", not as the complete unification. Though the existence as "the Ego" also "postulates the existence of others, of the Thou and the We" (Berdyayev1938: 131), it is not unified with them. Similarly, the personality is not integrated with cosmos or God. As mentioned, the personality "belongs only partially to [...] the universe", and it is "the image" of God, not God Himself. That is why Berdyayev's understanding of "the Ego" and the personality is different from that of romanticism. "[T]he inherent subjectivism of the romantics makes them[the Ego] identify man with nature [...]. The romantic Ego [...] had sought to identify itself with the cosmos" (Berdyayev1938: 74). Romanticism is also "an event of great importance in the emancipation of the Ego from the tyranny of the objective and social world" (Ibid.). Nevertheless, "[t]he romantic Ego tends to lose its consistency, to disintegrate in cosmic infinity" (Berdyayev1938: 74-75). Thus "it[the Romantic movement] failed [...] to make it conscious of the need to

forge a personality for itself" (Berdyaev1938: 74).

In addition, "[t]he personality may also be defined as a complex unity, made up of the spirit, the soul, and the body" (Berdyaev1938: 122). Particularly, we need to notice that "[t]he body is an integral part of the personality" (Ibid.). It is not the abstract human image but "man as a concrete being, as a personality" which exists "here and now", namely the existence for which Existential philosophy aims (Berdyaev1938: 20). "Human existence acquires significance only when all human slavery is suppressed, or when the personality is freed from the dominance of the world, of the State, of the nation, or of abstract thought and ideas; when it is immediately subordinated to a living God" (Berdyaev1938: 135). Therefore the existence and the personality has the body, "a concrete form" (Berdyaev1938: 123).

The following part is the examination of the connection between Berdyaev's understanding of "personality" and Herder's concept of "humanity". For Herder (1969: 280, cf. Terakawa2016: 56-65), human beings and humanity have a close connection with nature and God, i. e. they are "connecting link of two worlds" or "the middle ring between two adjoining systems of Creation".

We aware of, within the destiny of individual created, a *ruling similarity of leading form*, which, alternating in an uncountable way, becomes to more human's figure through these chains of being. [...] Similarly, we also see that the *power and impulse become to that of human beings*. [...] [F]inally, all of them are united, and they become *humanity, freedom, and the ability of reason* of human beings. (Herder1989: 166)

For man has no nobler word for his destiny than that which expresses the essence of himself as a human being, and which thus reflects the image of the Creator of our earth. (Herder1969: 267)

"*Godlike Humanity*" (Herder (1989): 188) is the keyword to understand the reason why Berdyaev (1962: 132) insists "[i]n Herder's humanism man was still associated with the Deity. His humanism was religious, but his religion was

humanist". Furthermore, if "the Ego" as existence realizes its personality, it is also the existence. As well as Berdyaev (1938: 44), Herder (2002a: 1138) considers humanity as "the humanity [...] of concrete human existences", not as "abstract humanity". He expresses the realization of humanity in concrete human existences through the metaphor of Proteus.

Is not the good on the earth *strewn about*? Because one form of humanity and one region of the earth could not grasp it, it got distributed into a thousand forms, it roams forth – an eternal Proteus! —through all parts of the world and all centuries. (Herder2002b: 298)

Besides, Herder's concept of "self" is different from the so-called romantic Ego, which "had sought to identify itself with the cosmos" (Berdyaev1938: 74). This is because, as well as Berdyaev (1938: 123), "the co-existence of contraries" remains in Herder's "self" (cf. Terakawa2018b) instead of realizing complete unification with nature, others and God, even it seems "to lose its consistency, to disintegrate in cosmic infinity" (Berdyaev1938: 75).

Next, we attempt to consider Berdyaev's theory of "personality development", comparing to the idea of "humanity formation" by Herder.

3. Berdyaev's Theory of "Personality Development"—Comparing to the Idea of "Humanity Formation" by Herder

"Solitude(Isolation)" is the key to understand Berdyaev's theory of personality development deeply. From the middle of the 20th, technology is regarded as "an extreme form of the materialization of human existence" (Berdyaev 1938: 141). "The Ego" and its personality are precipitated in that objectified world (Ibid.), i. e. society, the nation and the State. Everything is objectified in societies. "The Ego" can lead communication with the objects in societies, but the communication is not the true relationship because "[t]he Ego remains isolated as long as it can only communicate with the object" (Berdyaev 1938: 83). Nevertheless, for Berdyaev, solitude "gives birth to the personality's growing consciousness of itself" (Berdyaev1938: 68), and "can only be vanquished by the communion of

personalities, of the Ego and the Thou, in the innermost depths of the We” (Berdyaev 1938: 83). In other words, solitude in the society is considered as “a qualitative content acquired by the personality in the process of self-realization” (Berdyaev 1938: 137), and “can only be overcome on the existential plane by the confrontation of the Ego with another Ego, with the Thou, with the subject” and with God (Berdyaev 1938: 70). Through the surmounting solitude, “[i]t [the Ego] must find a way of escape from the objective world in which there is no communion or community” (Berdyaev 1938: 70-71).

Surmounting solitude is also the cause of “man’s liberation from his natural state of servitude” (Berdyaev 1938: 150). In more detail, the personality-realization “is accompanied by his emancipation from all servitude”, for example, of nature, the state, the nation, class, technology and organized society (Ibid.). Moreover, “[t]here is, however, a servitude from which no Utopia or social organization can liberate him—and that is the ultimate power of death” (Ibid.). In this sense, “Self-realization is a process of permanent auto-creation, an elaboration of the new man at the expense of the old” (Ibid.). While “the old” means the servile and objectified man, the “new man” is “the fulfilment of that eternal content”, i. e. “the process of realizing the divine image and likeness in man” (Ibid.). Though “the Ego” is confronted with the object “to precipitate the Ego into an objective world”, it “must, indeed, fulfil itself in the objective world as well, if all the aspects of the personality (including knowledge) are to be completely developed” (Ibid.).

Importantly, “Knowledge” is the way to overcome solitude. “Knowledge based on communion” is “a longing for the Other Self, for others” (Berdyaev 1938: 72), i. e. for “entering into communion with the Thou” (Berdyaev 1938: 87). In other words, the solution to “the problem of communication between one Ego or personality and another” lies “in love, in erotic and friendly love” (Berdyaev 1938: 84). “The personality and love are intimately related, for *love transforms the Ego into a personality*. Only love can effect that complete fusion with another being which transcends solitude. The pursuit of knowledge cannot achieve this unless it be inspired by love” (Berdyaev 1938: 89). “The Ego is only an embryonic personality; to become one in reality, it must commune with the Thou and the We. It is this communion of personalities longing to be reflected in one another

which confirms the personality” (Berdyayev1938: 84-85). So we can consider surmounting solitude through knowledge and love, i. e. transcendence as the process of human (personality) formation, that is “participating in Being and existence” (Berdyayev1938: 55).

A real communion, a real triumph over solitude, can only occur when the Ego identifies itself with the Thou, as in the case of love and friendship. [...] [W]hen the union of the Ego with the Thou is also a communion, its [knowledge’s] universal results acquire a greater validity precisely because they are based upon the individual, the singular and the personal. The true affirmation of individuality is to be found in what is universal and concrete rather than in what is general and abstract. (Berdyayev1938: 87)

We must pay attention to the Berdyayev’s insistence that “[i]t would be a mistake to confound the personal mode of apprehension with egocentricity” (Berdyayev1938: 21) when he mentions the above. The egocentricity is “a form of perpetual self-imprisonment leading eventually to insanity” and “the Original Sin” (Ibid.). On the other hand, the personality is “the reflection of the divine image and likeness, and, as such, it is the true path leading to God” (Ibid.). “The passage from the human Ego to the divine world, which constitutes man’s final triumph over the sin of egocentricity, may take place in communion with others, but not by their means” (Berdyayev1938: 32). In short, “[t]he free development of the personality precludes self-interest, and must be based entirely on its aspiration to commune with the Thou and the We” (Berdyayev1938: 126). Thus “egocentrism” is, like solitude, “fatal to the development of the personality; it is the greatest obstacle in the way of its realization” (Ibid.), and “*Knowledge attained is a symbol of victory over egocentricity*” (Berdyayev1938: 32).

Another cause which develops the personality is God. We need to notice that Berdyayev distinguishes God from “religion” and “church”. Surely, religion means “*bond*” (Berdyayev1938: 60) or “relationship” (Berdyayev1938: 91), but they indicate “social organization” or “communication” (Berdyayev1938: 60), i. e. it is objectified (socialized). “[H]istorical religion cannot escape its social and objective

ties. [...] The Church is social and objective" (Berdyaev1938: 47-48). So "[w]hen religion becomes a mere social and objective manifestation, the sense of solitude fails to be ontologically transcended" (Berdyaev1938: 91). Rather, surmounting solitude, namely transcendence, "are only manifest in God" and in religion as "Revelation, the voice and incarnation of God", in other words, "[t]ranscendence can only take place if the relationship between the Ego and the divine world is rooted in the inner life, in the Church-community as opposed to the Church-society" (Ibid.). "This free inner subordination to God, Who is never synonymous with the 'general', is the only condition which enables the human personality to determine from within its relations to the supra-personal values [...]" (Berdyaev1938: 135). In this sense, the process of the personality development is not only "humanization" but also the process that "created Being is transcended and made divine" (Berdyaev1938: 55-56). "[T]o treat of man is also to treat of God. [...] At the present time, it is imperative to understand once more that the rediscovery of man will also be the rediscovery of God" (Berdyaev1938: 152).

Moreover, "[t]he intimate communion of one Ego with another [...] is common to the animal, vegetable and mineral worlds" (Berdyaev1938: 84). "This relationship reconciles man with objective, alien nature, and thus transforms the object into the subject, into a familiar and friendly relationship" (Ibid.). That is why "[o]riginally there was no line of demarcation between the Ego and the 'totality'" (Berdyaev1938: 66) and "solitude can only be transcended on the spiritual plane, only in mystic experience, wherein all things participate in the Ego and the Ego participates in all things" (Berdyaev1938: 92).

However, it must be noticed that the love as transcendence through which personalities are developed is "dualistic because it supposes two personalities in place of an undifferentiated identity" (Berdyaev 1938: 147). "When man becomes aware of himself as a person and aspires to realize his personality, he has to admit firstly his inability to continue his hermetic existence and, secondly, the great difficulties assailing him in his attempt to escape from his seclusion and to identify himself with the Other Self and with the other Ego"(Berdyaev1938: 70). So Berdyaev (1938: 75) insists that solitude can only be surmounted when "the Ego" "confirm[s] itself as a personality capable of preserving its identity while in

the process of transcending itself". Now, it is reminded us that the idea of personality presupposes dualism as "the co-existence of contraries", not monism as the complete unification (Berdyayev1938: 123, 127). That is to say, in personality development, "the Ego" aims for expanding "only in relation to another personality" (Berdyayev1938: 147), not for complete unification with "Thou". "It [the Ego] longs to find another Ego, a friend, who would identify himself with it and thus confirm it, who would admire it, listen to it; in a word, reflect it. Therein lies the deep significance of love" (Berdyayev1938: 71).

In addition, "the Ego must, indeed, fulfil itself in the objective world as well, if all the aspects of the personality (including knowledge) are to be completely developed; but its objective development can never, and in no sense, be definitive" (Berdyayev1938: 150). So "[t]he complete realization of the personality can only take place on an extra-natural plane – on a plane of spiritual freedom, of communion and of love" (Ibid.). Nevertheless, human personalities have no choice but to seek "to realize himself in history" and "[h]is life and his creative acts are restricted to the framework of history. Within this framework he is forced to give an objective form to his creative imagination" (Berdyayev1938: 150-151). History is "his [personality's] appointed path, his destiny" (Berdyayev1938: 151). In culture, as well as history, human personalities have to accept his destiny. "The task of creating culture devolves on man by virtue of his historical existence. [...] [I]n the elaboration of cultural values he helps to fulfil himself as a creative being [...] but it also gives an objective form to his creative acts" (Ibid.). So Berdyayev encourages human personalities to "face this tragic conflict, this insoluble antinomy" and to "assume full responsibility for it" (Ibid.). "There is no alternative but to shoulder the burden of history and culture, the burden of the terrifying, distressing and degraded world" (Ibid.). "In our time speculative thought tends to be more pessimistic, but at the same time it is more sensitive to the evils and sufferings of the world. It is an active and creative pessimism" (Berdyayev1938: 152). Namely, the stages of personality development is "firstly, the undifferentiated unity of the Ego with the universe; secondly, the dualist opposition of the Ego and the non-Ego; thirdly and finally, a union which preserves plurality in a transfigured form" (Berdyayev1938: 66). Human existence

in “the dualist opposition of the Ego and the non-Ego”, i. e. in our time, cannot return to “the undifferentiated unity of the Ego with the universe”. Therefore human existence aims for “a union which preserves plurality in a transfigured form”, i. e. communion of personalities or “the We”.

In this way, Berdyaev's theory of personality development is connected with his philosophy of history. As Berdyaev (1962: 132) himself mentioned, Herder also thinks of his own theory of humanity formation based on his own philosophy of history (cf. Terakawa2015: 42-43).

We can speak [...] of an education of mankind. Every individual only becomes man by means of education, and the whole species lives solely as this chain of individuals. [...] It is in the light of such considerations that I feel justified in speaking of an education of mankind and of a philosophy of the history of man. Their essential characteristic is the continuous interaction of individuals. This process alone makes man a human being in the proper sense of the world. (Herder1969: 312-313)

That is to say, “our existence aims to form *humanity*” in history (Herder1989: 187). In other words, to “forget the narrow Ego” (Herder1990: 829) and to realize his “self” as the image of God in human existence. Moreover, Herder also distinguishes “[t]he *religion of Christ*” from Historical Christianity and church.

It[history] is immediately degraded to a chronicle of bishop, church and monk because historians write it for churches and even for the Order, monastery and sect instead of the dignified of mankind, world and nation. Since people habituated themselves to sermon and must believe all what bishop tells, the whole world becomes to where people believe Christianity or follow the herd of Christian blindly in historian's eyes. (Herder1989: 717-718)

The purer a *religion* was, the more it was compelled to and was determined to advance humanity, the essence of what it means to be human. [...] *The religion of Christ*, which was represented by Himself, taught by Him and practiced by

Him, was this *humanity*. It was nothing but this [...]. (Herder1997: 103)

Furthermore, knowledge(cognition) is the key for the theory of humanity formation by Herder (cf. Terakawa2018a), as well as Berdyaev. “Where the Load’s spirit is, there is freedom. The deeper, purer, and diviner our cognition is, then the purer, diviner, and more universal our efficacy is too, hence the freer our freedom” (Herder2002b: 216). “Humanity is the noble measure according to which we cognize and act” (Herder 2002b: 213-214). Another point is that Herder also relates knowledge(cognition) to love. “To love the grater Creator in oneself, to love one’s way into others, and then to follow this sure pull – that is moral feeling, that is conscience” (Herder2002b: 214).

Conclusion

Berdyaev insists “the Ego” is to realize, and further to develop its personality, in other words, communion of personalities or “the We” through knowledge and love as transcendence, which is similar with that in Herder’s theory. The following points will be examined in the future.

Firstly, in order to complete the understanding of human formation, it is important to look upon to the relationship between nature and human personality explained by Teilhard de Chardin, who is also one of the greatest personalists, and read more about his theory of personalism. Berdyaev’s personalism and philosophy of history is based on existential philosophy. Thus while Berdyaev inherits the ontological and theological aspects of Herder mainly, that of Chardin is similar with the cosmogonical and theologonical viewpoints. So genealogy of the theory of human formation is more clarified when Chardin’s personalism is considered additionally.

Secondly, it has to be considered how Berdyaev’s theory of personality development connect with the other basic ideas, for instance, “freedom”, “creativity”, “transcendence” etc. This article emphasizes the relation among “the Ego”, “personality” and “personality development”, but the connection with the other concepts is not clarified enough. Then Mounier, who is influenced by Berdyaev (Chiba1983: 72-73, 78-85, Berdyaev1950: 264, 273-275) and develops his

own personalism, helps us to understand the connection with those other concepts more obviously.

Note

- 1) In more detail: cf. Inoue (2001) and Sako (1995).
- 2) Aptly, Sugihara (2003: 22-23) points the same content out.
- 3) These points will be considered in future research.
- 4) The expression of "obscure irrational substratum" and "the irrational abyss" (Berdyaev1938: 55) is influenced by Böhme's concept of "Ungrund". Berdyaev is influenced by the German mystic, Eckhart, Böhme, Cusanus and so on (Berdyaev 1950: 83, 99 and 179, Berdyaev1938: 55 and 88), with who the theory of human formation originates (Gadamer1960: 7, cf. Schaarschmidt1965).
- 5) Cf. Cusanus's *De docta ignorantia* (1440). Also, Herder regards "coincidentia oppositorum" as principle of human formation. Cf. Terakawa (2018b).

Reference

- Berdyaev, Nikolas (1938): *Solitude and Society*, trans. by George Reavey, London
- Berdyaev, Nicolas (1950): *Dream and Reality. An Essay in Autobiography*, trans. by Katharine Lampert, London
- Berdyaev, Nicolas (1962): *The Meaning of History*, trans. by George Reavey, Cleveland
- Chiba Taiji (1983): Emmanuel Mounier no Jinkakushugi wo megutte [Personalism of Emmanuel Mounier], in: *The Annual Reports of the Faculty of Education, Tohoku University*, vol.31, pp.71-85
- Chiba Taiji (1984): Jinkaku to Tashasei no Mondai [The Problem of Personality and the Otherness], in: *The Annual Reports of the Faculty of Education, Tohoku University*, vol.32, pp.1-19
- Dancák, Pavol (2012): Educational context of Berdyaev's personalism, in: *E-Theologos*, vol.3, no.1, pp.17-27.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg (1960): *Wahrheit und Methode. Grundzüge einer philosophischen Hermeneutik*, Tübingen
- Herder, Johann Gottfried (1969): *J. G. Herder on Social and Political Culture*, trans., ed. and with an intro. by F. M. Barnard, Cambridge
- Herder, Johann Gottfried (1987): *Herder und die Anthropologie der Aufklärung*, in: *Johann Gottfried Herder Werke*, vol.2, ed. by Wolfgang Pross, München
- Herder, Johann Gottfried (1989): *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit*, in: *Johann Gottfried Herder Werke in zehn Bänden*, vol.6, ed. by Martin Bollacher, Frankfurt a. M.
- Herder, Johann Gottfried (1990): *Volkslieder, Übertragungen, Dichtungen*, in: *Johann Gottfried Herder Werke in zehn Bänden*, vol.3, ed. by Ulrich Gaier, Frankfurt a. M.
- Herder, Johann Gottfried (1994): *Schriften zu Philosophie, Literatur, Kunst und Altertum. 1774-1787*, in: *Johann Gottfried Herder Werke in zehn Bänden*, vol.4, ed. by Jürgen Brummack and Martin

- Bollacher, Frankfurt a. M.
- Herder, Johann Gottfried (1997): *On World History: An Anthology*, ed. by Han Adler and Ernest A. Menze, trans. by Ernest A. Menze with Michael Palma, New York
- Herder, Johann Gottfried (2002a): *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit*, in: *Johann Gottfried Herder Werke*, vol.3/1, ed. by Wolfgang Pross, München
- Herder, Johann Gottfried (2002b): *Philosophical Writings*, trans. and ed. by Michael N. Forster, Cambridge
- Hirose Yuichi (2014): Kyoiku no Mokuteki ni kansuru Ichikousatsu [A Explanation of the Education Purpose], In: *Bulletin of Teaching Profession Graduate School Joetsu University of Education*, vol.1, pp.149-158
- Inoue Kyoko (2001), *Individual Dignity in Modern Japanese Thought: The Evolution of the Concept of Jinkaku in Moral & Educational Discourse*, Michigan
- Köpcke-Duttler, Arnold (1982): *Nikolai Berdiajew's Weg einer schöpferischen Bildung*, Frankfurt a. M.
- Miki Kiyoshi (1967): *The Complete Works of Miki Kiyoshi*, vol.5, Iwanami Shoten
- Mutai Risaku (2002): *The Collected Works of Mutai Risaku*, vol.6, Kobushi Shobo
- Nietzsche, Friedrich (1968): *The Will to Power*, a new trans. by Walter Kaufmann and R. J. Hollingdale, ed. with com. by Walter Kaufmann, New York
- Nishitani Keiji (1986): *The Collected Works of Nishitani Keiji*, vol.8, Sobunsha
- Pannenberg, Wolfhart (1962): *Was ist der Mensch?: Die Anthropologie der Gegenwart im Lichte der Theologie*, Göttingen
- Sako Jyunichiro (1995), *Kindainihonshisoshi ni okeru Jinkakukannen no Seiritsu [The Establishment of "Jinkaku" in Thought of Modern Japan]*, chobunsha
- Schaarschmidt, Ilse (1965) Der Bedeutungswandel der Begriffe „Bildung“ und „bilden“ in der Literaturepoche von Gottsched bis Herder, in: *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Bildungsbegriffs. Kleine Pädagogische Texte. Bd. 33*, ed. by Wolfgang Klafki, Weinheim/Bergstr., pp.24-87
- Sugihara Seishirou (2003): *Kyoikukihonho no Seiritsu: "Jinkaku no Kansei" wo megutte [The Establishment of the Basic Act on Education: On "the Full Development of Personality"]*, revised ed., Bunka Shobo Hakubunsha
- Tanikawa Morimasa (1970): Berdyaev no Jinkakushugi ni okeru Sanitsusei no Imi [The Meaning of Trinity on Berdyaev's Personalism], In: *Academic Bulletin of the Faculty of Letters, Kyoto Prefectural University*, vol.22, pp.20-33
- Tanikawa Morimasa (1971): Berdyaev no Ningengaku ni okeru Shakaitekiijitsuzon to Rekishitekiijitsuzon: Jinkakusyugikyokugaku no Kiban wo motomete [Social Existence and Historical Existence on Berdyaev's Anthropology: Seeking the Basis of Personalistic Pedagogy], In: *Academic Bulletin of the Faculty of Letters, Kyoto Prefectural University*, vol.23, pp.82-94
- Terakawa Naoki (2014): Über den Selbstbildungsgedanken bei Herder: im Hinblick auf seine Sprach- und Religionsphilosophie, In: *Proteus: Natur und Bildung*, Heft 16, pp.25-44
- Terakawa Naoki (2015): Ningenkeiseiron no Kaika: Herder no Ningenseikeiseishisou [The Flowering of the Theory of Human Formation: The Idea of Humanity Formation by Herder], In:

Kyoikutekishikou no Ayumi. [The Genealogy of Education Thinking], ed. by Sasada Hiromichi, Nakanishiya Shuppan, pp.37-52

Terakawa Naoki (2016): Eine Betrachtung über Herders Gedanken zur Humanität im Zusammenhang mit seiner Weltsicht und seinem Menschenbild, In: *Herder-Studien*, Bd. 21, pp. 37-69

Terakawa Naoki (2018a): Significance of Analogical Cognition in Herder's Theory of Human Formation: The Dynamic Relationship between Self-formation and Welt-formation, In: *Studies in the Philosophy of Education*, No.118, pp.38-55

Terakawa Naoki (2018b) Die »coincidentia oppositorum« als Prinzip der Bildung bei Herder, In: *Proteus: Natur und Bildung*, Heft 18, pp.89-104

Terakawa Naoki (2020): Humanität und Individualität: um Herder's Bildungslehre, In: *Proteus: Natur und Bildung*, Heft 19, pp.59-75

Acknowledgement

This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 20K02478, 19K14100.

