Theses

1. **Background**: the way Aristotle is read in Russia before XIX century. During the epoch of Kievan Rus Aristotle was known in Russia from the works of the Byzantium authors. XVIIth - mid XVIIIth century theological academies and seminaries teach “scholastic” Aristotle, that is Aristotle read and understood through a prism of the medieval authors. In the middle of XVIIIth century scholasticism (and also Aristotle) is replaced by the German philosophy of Wolf and Christian Baumeister.

2. From XIXth century a new subject - Moral theology was introduced into curricula of Russian theological schools. The first Russian systems of moral theology is a bit influenced by Aristotle’s ethics. This is due to the strong influence of Protestant systems which criticize both scholasticism, and ancient philosophy underlying scholasticism.

3. By the middle of XIXth century Russian theological schools realize that it was necessary to reject western theological schemes and to create Orthodox dogmatic schemes, based on Scriptures and works of Church Fathers. Aristotle and his ethics were taken critically.

4. In the works of teachers of Moral theology of XIXth century Aristotle’s ethics is considered in a context of ethics of the antiquity and compared with the Orthodox doctrine. Examples.
5. Prof. A. Bronzov especially contributed to studies of Aristotle’s ethics, due to his basic work *Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas in relation to their doctrines on morals in the face of the Gospel*.

6. The end of the XIXth - beginning XXth century is characterized by the development of the Russian philosophical-religious thought, which is more attracted by Plato and Platonism, rather than by Aristotle (V. Solov’ëv, I.V. Kireevsky, S.N. Trubetskoj). The influence of Russian religious thought on theology.

7. **Conclusion.** Aristotelian philosophy came to Russia either through Byzantium (Greek Church Fathers and Byzantium authors) or through the West (scholasticism and medieval writers). Russian theologians considered Aristotle’s ethics in a context of moral theology (a new theological discipline) and in a context of the religious philosophy. In both cases ethics was taken in comparison, in the first case, with Christian ethics, in the second - with Plato. Plato and his school was more popular in Russia than Aristotle.

***

1. The peculiarity of Russian ethics lies in its «deep Weltanschauung awareness».

   1 A Russian thinker wishes not only to understand, what he should be, and the way it is necessary to live in this world or in the state. He wishes to understand the world and a life in order to change, to transform it and to be purified and be saved. A core of Russian philosophical thought and Russian outlook as a whole is in religious ethics. In Russian ethics there is no place for individual and individualistic interpretation of moral, it little speaks of personal values, but mostly of salvation and transformation of all cosmos and the person as its head.

   The Russian ethical thought passes without noticeable traces of both antique, and Christian authentic samples. As G. Shpet writes: Russia became Christian without «antique tradition and historical cultural succession».

---

The absence of direct antique and Christian cultural succession has played a dual role in the development and formation of Russian ethical tradition. First, it has led to its simplicity, naivety, secondly, it stimulated the development of the distinctive elements originating in features of the national character.4

The first records of Aristotle appeared in Russia the same time as first books. They were Slavic translations, and books in languages (Greek, Latin), some of them were translated into Russian.5

Undoubtedly, the inhabitants of Ancient Russia learnt about an ancient philosophy and antique philosophers after the baptism of Russia. Ancient Russia knew Aristotle basically due to the works of Byzantian authors. Reading and translating into Russian works of the Holy Fathers (particularly the book of St. John of Damaskus An Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith which was translated as far back as the pre-Mongolian period), Old Russian scholars and readers learnt the terminology (essence, hypostasis) and the basic concepts of the ancient philosophy.

The theology of Kievan Rus is first of all, characterized, by the lack of classical learning in Russia, an ignorance of Russian theologians of Plato and Aristotle's philosophy.6 Antique wisdom was accessible to the Old Russian reader in the form of a few sayings as a part of collections, for example Пчела which means Bee (Μέλισσα) - the Byzantian anthology of moral manuals. Bible sayings prevail alongside with words of the Holy Fathers, plus quotations of Philo, Plato, Aristotle and some Greek poets. «The latter were the main source from which ancient Russia learnt classical culture».7 «These limited, often apocryphal fragments, could not give any representation about methods and main ideas of classical philosophy. Without knowledge of its conceptual instrument the major works of Greek patristic would remain unintelligible for a Russian reader of that time».8

4 See: Назаров В. Н. Россия. P. 773-774.
8 Подскальский Г. Христианство и богословская литература в Киевской Руси (988-1237 гг.). Изд. 2. – СПб., Византийороссика, 1996. P. 434.
In the Ancient Russian literature every educated person was called a "philosopher". Very often they had nothing to do with philosophy as an academic discipline. In XIIth century Metropolitan Kliment of Smolensk was called a "philosopher" about whom the chronicler wrote: «Such a philosopher had not risen in Russia yet». Researchers say, that Kliment read Homer, Plato and Aristotle - certainly, in Greek, because they were not translated into Slavic at that time. Moreover, Kliment’s opponents nicknamed him a “philosopher” who knew Greek classics and accused him of pagan secularism.

In XV - XVIth centuries the attitude to philosophy among the Old Russian scholars was generally negative for two reasons. First, in the works of this time a contrast is often underlined between the true philosophy (Christianity) and philosophy as it is. According to Maximus the Greek (apprx. 1470-1555) wisdom of pagan philosophers is imaginary; it is not “wisdom”, but “art” or “sophistication”. Secondly, the ancient philosophy caused aversion because of Catholics who were taken as opponents of the Orthodoxy were active adherents of Aristotelianism. Maximus the Greek is characterized by a acute negation of western scholasticism. He is an open admirer of Plato as «the highest of the external philosophers», but «Aristotelian art» was for him a synonym of a heresy. Maximus's religious style is typically Byzantium.

Similarly critical relation to a pagan wisdom we can see in the theological and spiritual writings of that time, for example of John of Vishensk and Isaja of Kopinsk.

The attitude to the ancient philosophers in Russia changes only by the end of XVIth century From «wise men» they turn to «spontaneous Christians». If before this time Aristotle’s writings were known to very
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9 Федотов Г. П. Собрание сочинений в 12-ти тт. Т. 10. Р. 68.
12 Епископия на римлян // Попов А. Историко-литературный обзор древнерусских полемических сочинений против латинян (XI-XV вв.). М., 1875. Р. 234.
13 Послание Максимово ответное к королю о вере. Р. 215.
14 Флоровский Г., прот. cit. P. 23.
15 See: Ibid. P. 37.
narrow circle of readers in Russia, since XVIth century his Latin translations appear in Russia on a large scale, and are in demand among Russian theologians. In XVIIth century many images of antique philosophers appear on the wall paintings in churches. Aristotle’s works were in libraries of tsars and boyars, statesmen and clergymen.

It is possible to assume, that first translations of Aristotle into Russian were made not from the original (the Greek language), but from Latin and Polish translations, and more often than not they were not translations of Aristotle’s works, but renderings of his writings with comments. The first translation from Greek was published only in 1757.

Till XVIIth century Aristotle’s philosophy in Russia was known fragmentary. References to antique philosophers are met in popular collections of sayings (florilegii), in philosophical “encyclopedias”, in the certain translated works. There were many pseudo-Aristotle works, the most important of which was Secret of secrets or Gate of Aristotle, known in Russia since XV century, since the time of Ivan the Terrible.

From XVIIth century Western, “scholastic” Aristotle was accepted as a canon in Kievo-Mogiljanskaja College (a major theological Russian school of that time) (founded in 1632). The whole plan of education was copied from the Jesuits, and textbooks were based on Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas. Throughout XVIIth century the managements in the form of explanations to Aristotle’s transpositions are written here, and in the beginning of XVIIIth century the treatises on philosophy of peripatetic are already produced.

The scholarship of Kiev was the first open meeting with the West. As Fr G. Florovsky says, it was «a delivery in a captivity». «The imitative and provincial scholasticism» is formed as «school theology», theologia scolastica, as a result of which, the experience comes off the thought. «It was pseudo-morphosis of the religious consciousness, pseudo-morphosis of the orthodox thought». The orthodox theology is at this time only on a way to its unique identity.
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20 Михайлов П. Б. Аристотель в России // Православная энциклопедия. Т. 3. Р. 257.
21 Флоровский Г., прот. сиб. Р. 56.
22 lvi.
Aristotle gets into the same time from the East to Moscow. In the end of XVIth century the Lihudys Brothers in Moscow Slavic-Greek-Latin Academy teach some disciplines on Aristotle. Textbooks and guidebooks are also published here, treatises are written and various courses under Aristotle’s texts are taught. But at the beginning of XVIIIth century Moscow also switches to scholastic Aristotle, though as it happened not for long. Being disappointed in lifeless scholastic schemes, and inspired by ancient philosophy, the philosophical education in Russia takes a new path: from Aristotle to Wolf’s ethics, which emphasizes naturalness of ethical standards as coming from the life structure. In it Russia follows the Western way. The numerous textbooks, based on Aristotle, are replaced by Wolfian philosophy rendered by Christian Baumeister, whose textbook becomes obligatory and standard. For a long time Aristotle is superseded from the centre of academic consciousness of Russia to periphery. In its theology Russia moves from Catholic paradigm to Protestant. Latin-protestant scholasticism dominates.

At last, in 30th of XIXth century there is a next change of paradigms when Wolf is replaced by the ethics of German classical philosophy, first of all I. Kant and F. Schelling. But as neither of them made educational program on ethics, that subject gradually disappears from the system of university philosophy and remains only within the framework of the academic theological education as «moral theology».

2. In some way the «moral theology» had the advantage in Russian education over philosophical ethics. It was taught from the middle of XVIth century not only in seminaries and theological Academies, but also in some periods - even at universities. At the same time, the «moral theology» did not become a true theological discipline in Russia and didn’t reach the level of «theological ethics», that is philosophically and theologically proved and systematically expressed concept of morals.

Up to XVIIIth century the Christian moral is limited to ascetic and hagiographical materials (works of ascetics and Church Fathers, collections of instructive reading). Only since the middle of XIXth century there are first regular attempts to write down the orthodox moral theology which,
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23 *Baumeisteri Elementa philosophiae*. M., 1777. «Нравоучительная философия, содержащая естественное право, этику, политику, экономию и другие вещи, для знания нужные и полезные» (1788).
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at the same time, is a copy of Catholic or Protestant systems of theological ethics. By the beginning of 1890s it was found necessary to create the orthodox system of moral theology detached from inadequate scholastic theology. But it only led the whole theology to be transformed in «moral monism» (as Metropolitan Antony Khраповитский) said when dogmatic themes were turned to moral experience, and dogmatic theology itself was dissolved in moral theology.

Thereby, moral theology turned again to ethics, and Russian religious-philosophical thought of XXth century is occupied by a search of “philosophical-theological synthesis” of morals. Since this moment moral theology steps back into the sidelines giving way to philosophers.

Moral theology was always thought as closely connected with dogmatic theology. Initially it was understood as a certain integral Christian doctrine (a vivid example of this approach is the Orthodox catechisms which consist of two parts - dogma (dogmatic theology) and a moral (theological ethics). Later under the Western influence these two disciplines stand apart and develop independently.

Moral theology in Russia has not been developed. As Prof. N. Glubokovsky writes: «In spite of much diverse and in detailed works in this area the course is not systematic». Courses of the Roman Catholic Church with their detailed rubricating influenced by scholasticism, were an example of these courses.

One of the first attempts to teach moral theology were lectures of Fr Jacob Voskresensky Morals for noble girls (1813). As the sources used by the author used Wolf’s writings (rather popular at that time), and also B. Winkler’s work who tries to combine elements of Aristotle ethics with the Ten Commandments (following Melanchton), Aristotle is used here mediately and his own system of ethics is not considered at all.

In 1870 Prof. P. Linitsky of Kiev Theological Academy in the academic periodicals started publishing the detailed work on Moral and religious con-

---


cepts of ancient Greek philosophers. Five parts of this work were published, but then for the unknown reasons, publishing was stopped, not having reached the analysis of Aristotle’s philosophy, terminated at Plato’s views.

In the beginning of 1840s historian of philosophy and professor of theology and ecclesiastical law in Kazan Theological Academy Archimandrite Gabriel (Voznesensky) (1795-1868), wrote a textbook on philosophy in six parts (The History of philosophy) for students of Kazan University. In the first part, where the Ancient Greek philosophy is considered, he gives little attention to Aristotle (pp. 132-146), giving only the most general information about his life, and also touched upon his gnoseology, logic, physics, the doctrine of soul. He gives one page only to his moral views (pp. 142-143), saying about the highest good and virtue as perfection of reason - contemplative and practical. The author takes a little prejudiced attitude to Aristotle. At the end of the section on the Greek philosopher he writes, that Aristotle «can be accused of: 1) the obvious desire to humiliate philosophers, preceding him. 2) The extreme darkness and dryness of a style. 3) The excessive claim on systematic connection. 4) The abusing of technical expressions, divisions and differentiations».

Another author of the same time - Markellin Olesnitsky (1848-1905), professor of the Kiev ecclesiastical Academy on chair of moral theology, and then - psychology in his course of lectures on moral theology (Moral theology or the Christian doctrine on morals [1892]) mentions Aristotle only twice. First time - considering a question: «Is it possible to study the virtue?». He writes, that Socrates considered it possible and mixed virtue with knowledge, but Aristotle «has fairly objected to him, that besides knowledge in virtue there is also exercise and habit», and Markellin Olesnitsky agrees with him. In his other works on ethical issues, the author never writes about Aristotle. In his two-volume book The History of Morals and moral doctrines (1882-1886) he does not examine the doctrine of Ancient Greece (probably, he had no time to do it). If the first volume is devoted to the introduction to ethics, where the author studies history and genesis of morals, and also ethics in a life of gentiles, the second volume is on the ethics of eastern people - the Chinese, Indians, Semites, Egyptians and Persians. Also he never mentions Aristotle’s name in his thesis for a doc-
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29 Гавриил, архим. История философии. Часть 1. – Казань, 1839. Р. 146.
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tor’s degree From the system of a Christian moral (1896) which was criticized and undergone severe censorship reductions because of its allegedly dependence on Protestant doctrines, and he had to resign. Apparently, this “dislike” to Aristotle is explained by the fact that the author is attracted by Protestant systems of moral theology which take a scholastic heritage of Catholic Church critically and also to the sources of scholasticism - to the heritage of ancient Greece.

Orest Novitsky (1806-1884), the professor of philosophy of the Kiev Theological Academy considers philosophy from the point of view of Fichte and Kant. In his book The Gradual development of ancient philosophical doctrines in connection with the of pagan beliefs (1-4 parts. 1860-1861) he examines heritage of Ancient Greece, Aristotle’s philosophy in particular. Only ten pages is on Aristotle’s ethics: he examines such themes as free will, virtues, the good, dividing virtue into intellectual and moral, the doctrine on happiness as the highest good. N. Chernyshevsky in his review on this book, reproaches Novitsky, that, «following scholastic errors, who mixed Aristotle’s philosophy with truths of Christian religion, following the example of the transcendental philosophers, who combined religion with science, like them he eclipsed in himself true concepts of both: he understands neither doctrines of Church Fathers, nor the spirit of worldly learning. This blackout came from his wish to be an expert in two subjects, each of them is great enough to remain not fully comprehended. To study one of them the person gives all his strength and all his life, all life, but Orest Novitsky had neither time, nor strength to study thoroughly either religion, or worldly learning». In fact, on some pages on Ancient Greece, the reader has an impression, that the author writes about views of German philosophers, such as Kant, Fichte, but not Plato or Aristotle.

30 See: Кудрявцев П. П. Профессор Маркеллин Алексеевич Олесницкий. К., 1905.
Also Prof. A. Bronzov later did not compliment the work in question, saying, that from those places of this book which mentions Aristotle’s ethical principles, it is absolutely impossible to take out any clear understanding about them. But, anyhow, Bronzov continues, it is our first work on this theme.34

Fr I.L. Janyshev in his fundamental work The Orthodox-Christian doctrine on Morals for the first time made an attempt to explain the concept of morals in general and to show characteristics of Christian moral. From antique authors Janyshev gives ideas of Plato, Aristippus, stoics, Epicurus, and other ancient authors.35 Aristotle’s ethical views are examined in detail in a section on «human virtues from the philosophical point of view» (pp. 167-198). The author, though briefly, gives a correct assessment and an exact analysis of the doctrine of Aristotle, sometimes comparing some of his points with the Christian doctrine.

4. In 1832-1847 the writings of St. Jerome of Stridon were translated in Russian, which were published in 14 volumes in Kiev Theological Academy at the end of XIXth century. These texts tell a Russian reader about Aristotle’s ethics. Ethics of St. Jerome is not independent: after Aristotle he defines virtue, as «the middle, a measure», also he writes about «four main virtues» also taken from ancient philosophy, without any correlation with Christian virtues. Martin Luther accused him of it, saying, that he speaks only about fasting, food, virginity, but learns not on either belief, or hope, or love, or the deeds of faith.36

In 1878 John Stuart Blackie’s book Four phases of morals: Socrates, Aristotle, Christianity, utilitarianism (М, 1878; М, 1899) was translated into Russian. If the personality of Socrates here is examined by the author I detail, we can’t say it about the chapter on Aristotle which is rather superficial and does not achieve its goal.37 As Prof. A. Bronzov says, «this book

36 See: Бронзов А. А. Нравственное богословие в России в течение XIX столетия. С.т. Р. 141.
37 See: Бронзов А. А. Аристотель и Фома Аквинат в отношении к их учению о нравственности. С.т. Р. 58-59; Бронзов А. А. Нравственное богословие в России в течение XIX столетия. С.т. Р. 313.
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cannot be called academic [...]]. The author’s attempt to take Aristotle’s ethical views critically is not completed, because, but for few, in itself sometimes true to a certain extent, but not proved academically, sketchy remarks, it is impossible to find anything more in Bleckie’s research. In other words this composition is nothing else but “excessive literary worthless stuff”.

At last, in 1884 the main work of Aristotle on ethics was translated - *Nicomachean Ethics* (1884).

XIXth century in Russia is a century of a preponderance of German philosophy and pietism. Fr G. Florovsky wrote: «The German idealism itself was, to a great extent, only a recurrence of pre-Christian Hellenism. Those, who do not wish to remain with the Church Fathers, who are afraid of falling behind in “patristic scholasticism”, in a vain diligence, on the same level with the century, to break in somewhere “forward”, they are thrown back, and found themselves with Plato and Aristotle, with Plotinus and Philo, - that is, anyway, before Christ [...] A belated and vain return from Jerusalem to Athens...».

I.V. Popov (1867-1938), Prof. of Moscow Theological Academy, canonized by the Russian Orthodox Church as the new martyr, in his dissertation for Master of Theology *Natural moral law*, devotes one chapter to the *Basic Ideal of morals*, where he also examines Aristotle’s views of on this issue. In his opinion, Aristotle’s moral ideals are considerably below ideals of Plato, and the ideal of morals for the former was friendship (*filia*) to which Popov devotes a few pages of his study. The book itself is on the criticism of ethics of utilitarianism and of modern German philosophy (Schopenhauer, Kant, Herbart), therefore ancient philosophy is referred to as a minor source.

Also Fr Paul Florensky (1882-1937) touches upon Aristotle’s ethics superficially. He calls Aristotle as «the most sober-minded from philosophers», «the father of modern learning», and refers to him basically on issues of logic, metaphysics and terminology. Ethics are mentioned by him only in his book *The Pillar and ground of Truth*, where Father Paul devotes
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38 Бронзов А. А. Сопоставление между собою нравственных воззрений Аристотеля и Фомы Аквинского. с. 43.
39 Флоровский Г., прот. Пути русского богословия. с. 511.
40 Попов И. В. Естественный нравственный закон. – Сергиеев Посад, 1897. Рр. 415-417.
the whole chapter to friendship. Only here and anywhere more he refers to *Nicomachean ethics* of Aristotle.

5. As we can see, Aristotle was given little attention by the academic professors and theologians of the Russian Orthodox Church in XIX century. There were afraid to come back to Aristotle, taking him as obsolete. Having deserted scholastic theology, also they had to reject Aristotle, who was at the root of this method. Many Russian philosophers and theologians take Aristotle as a predecessor of Hegel, as he who proved the unconditional and absolute rights and prerogatives of reason beyond any religious frameworks.

But despite this visible dislike of Aristotle, it is necessary to give the only exception. It is Prof. A. Bronzov (1858-1936/37) of St. Petersburg Theological Academy with his dissertation for Master of Theology *Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas in relation to their doctrines on morals in the face of the Gospel* (1885)\(^{41}\) in which has shown a genetic relation of Thomas Aquinas system with Aristotle’s doctrine and their basic difference as Aristotle’s ethics contradicts moral principles of the Gospel.\(^{42}\)

This work is practically ignored by the majority of scholars. At the same time, it is the first work on the issue in question not only in Russia, but also in the West. Moreover, up to date it is the only Russian work on ethics of Thomas Aquinas.

According to the author, the basic point of ethics of Aristotle and Thomas is the concept of the highest good, the way to which is through the virtues. Despite the genetic relation between the these two thinkers, there are also important differences in their ethics. The main is on the relation of divine grace to the freedom of men.

This work consists of three basic parts. In a rather extensive introduction the author and meticulously analyzes resources and foreign and Russian literature on this problem. From the sources on moral philosophy of Aristotle the author takes only *Nicomachean ethics*, believing two other treatises (*Great Ethics* and *Eudemian Ethics*) to be pseudo-Aristotle and false (and in his work he does not consider these books). Those works, which included these at that time doubtful treatises, he accuses as non-
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\(^{41}\) See: Бронзов А. А. Нравственное богословие в России в течение XIX столетия. cit. P. 275.

critical. Among the studies on Aristotle, Prof. Bronzov analyzes articles and books published mainly during XIXth century, underlying either any points of moral philosophy of Aristotle, or the whole moral outlook of the Ancient Greek philosopher. The author shows, that until now there was no academic comparison of views of Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas, therefore his study is relevant and of novelty.

The first part of this work is on Aristotle’s doctrine on morals. In his preliminary remarks the author analyzes the “method” of Aristotelian approach, which he used to at disclose his ideas on morals, that is the ethics is based on “psychological” principles exclusively, thus ignoring completely “religious” ones. Then the author turns to Aristotle’s doctrine on morals which he subdivides into two basic sections: the doctrine on «the highest good», and the doctrine on «the virtue». The last section says about virtue as habit and the midpoint between two extremes, about two types of virtue and, at last, he examines in detail certain 13 moral and 5 intellectual virtues. At last, in the last section of the first part the author examines the views of his predecessors and followers of Aristotle in ethics. From the former he speaks of Indian philosophy of Gothama, Socrates and Plato. From the latter of peripatetic philosophy (Theophrastus, Eudemus of Rhodes, to whom he attributes the book *Eudemian Ethics*), stoics, Cicero, Epicururus, academic skepticism and, at last, Christian authors up to the time of Reformation.

The second part of the work is on the doctrine of morals of Thomas Aquinas which is written on the same pattern, as the first one. The most important and independent part is the third on *Comparison Aristotle’s and Thomas Aquinas moral views*. First the author compares them according to their content (where they agree and disagree with each other), then from «their internal justifiability» (and also similarities and distinctions). At last, the last section is on the comparison of moral views of Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas with the Gospel principles. And at last, he gives his conclusions.

6. In XIXth century Russian religious philosophy, referring to the antiquity, turns in favor of Plato. Ivan Kireevsky\(^43\) in his work *On the character of education in Europe and its influence on the education in Russia*...
Eugeny Shilov

(1852) suggests two types of learning - Western and Eastern. The source of the first one is Aristotle with his reasonableness rooted in the earthly world. A source for the second one is Plato, directed to the higher spheres and overcoming everything worldly. «Greek Christian thinkers obviously preferred Aristotle to Plato... Because the very way of thinking of Plato is more integral in its intellectual movements, more warmth and harmony in speculative activity of reason». The same preference is seen in the works of philosophers of the end XIXth - early XXth centuries: S. Trubetskoj and Vladimir Solov'ëv, the latter even undertakes a grand project on translating the works of Plato provided by his detailed comments.

At the beginning of the XXth century the attitude of the clergy and theologians to Aristotle was ambivalent. Some of them see Aristotle as “an ascetic of virtue”, alongside with Socrates and Plato. Usually they are those authors who refer to representatives of the ancient philosophy as bright images for preaching, sometimes not going deeply in their philosophy. Such an attitude we can see at St. John of Kronshtadt.

In the Academic circles by the beginning of XXth century a totally different attitude to the ancient philosophy is developed. For example, Metropolitan Antony (Khrapovitsky) opposes the transformations of theology into scholasticism. He writes, that modern theological ethics is extremely lifeless, because it is based not on Scriptures and the Holy Tradition, but on the systems «necrotic scholasticism», on the systems, constructed «out of the true Church, that is on Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas, Luther and Kant, only partly decorated according to the Orthodox pattern».

45 Творения Платона. 1899-1903.
7. In conclusion:

a) Throughout all the history of Russian theological thought the knowledge of Aristotelian ethics was superficial and non-deep. He was addressed either from the point of view of the history of philosophy while studying metaphysical systems of Ancient Greece, or of moral theology where Aristotle's position was often represented as one of ethical systems of pre-Christian ethics.

b) It is possible to say that among antique philosophers, Aristotle has never been singled out. Their favorite was Plato, with his poetic language, with his warmth and sincerity, so dear to a Russian reader. In contrast to him Aristotle seemed different: dry, lapidary language, clearness of wording, sharpness of his terminology. This image would become even more dry and lifeless due to scholasticism which would give Russia her Aristotle.

c) The attitude to Aristotle basically depends on the attitude of the author to the West: to the Catholic West, to the Protestant West or to the philosophical West. During different periods of Russian history either party dominated. Aristotle's philosophy reaches the greatest aversion when theologians or philosophers try to overcome the previous, western educational frameworks and to create something originally Russian, free from any influence.

d) The only basic exception is the dissertation of prof. A. Bronzov on the comparison of ethics of Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas. Up till now this work is insufficiently studied and awaits for its researcher. Probably the author undertakes this topic to show complete otherness and distinction of these two approaches in the doctrine on morals: antique and Christian.

e) By the beginning of the XXth century Russian philosophy turns to antique heritage, choosing Plato, and the academic theology continues to get rid of philosophical roots from its theological systems, trying to build them on biblical and patristic principles. In both cases Aristotle remains irrelevant.