



# The Pole of Event: Bibikhin and Phenomenology

Vitaly Kosykhin

*Saratov State University*

## *The Pole of Event: Bibikhin and Phenomenology*

### **Abstract**

The article investigates the question of Bibikhin's position on phenomenology. Based on the existence of two different phenomenological projects—those of Husserl and Heidegger—the author identifies two poles that concentrate main phenomenological problems: the pole of event and the pole of contemplation. Their interconnectedness, though never direct, is reflected in the fact that when the one pole comes to light, the other is automatically hidden in its shadow. Vladimir Bibikhin, together with Heidegger and Wittgenstein, is considered a thinker of the pole of event. The pole of contemplation is presented by Alexey Losev, Husserl and Derrida.

### **Keywords**

Bibikhin, contemplation, essence, event, phenomenology

In his first lecture courses *Early Heidegger* and *Energy* Vladimir Bibikhin already refers to the concept of phenomenology in the context of a gripping attention, of fascination, event and action. Phenomenology here promises to be the key to discovering the mysterious world of unpredictable turns and transitions of thought, establishing itself as the only possible form of genuine philosophy. Martin Heidegger had a decisive influence on Bibikhin's perception of phenomenology, and his thinking on the themes and variations of phenomenological thought were largely behind all of this. He takes a somewhat different and cooler attitude toward Husserlian phenomenology, which he primarily regards as a kind of dry and pseudo-scientific framework that emphasizes the significance of Heidegger's breakthrough to being. This raises the question of the possible basis of such a phenomenological preference.

I will start with the assertion that there are two kinds of phenomenology, that is, two basic phenomenological traditions: those of Husserl and those of Heidegger. The dialogue and debates between them are still unfinished even to this day. Very often there is not enough attention paid to this fact. It is either believed that Heidegger's phenomenology is the continuation and development of the Husserlian project, negating it in the Hegelian sense (i.e. keeping all the most vital<sup>1</sup>) or, on the contrary, it is believed that the Heideggerian error of distorting phenomenological purity can and should be corrected only by totally and scholastically following Husserl. Further, I will prove that these are two completely different and diametrically opposite phenomenological projects. And if in the case of Heidegger's phenomenology, ways of overcoming metaphysics are discussed, from being to event, conversely, in the case of Husserl's phenomenology, it is not overcoming that should be discussed, but rather, the revival of metaphysics on the ways of searching for a new ideality of contemplation, or intuition [*Anschauung*]. When considering Husserl's notion of the life-world, it is usually forgotten that for him the life-world is, above all, the world of contemplation, so the question of what the life-world as the world of contemplation is, is not posed at all.

I propose that the terminal points of these two phenomenological paths, event and contemplation, are two opposite but essentially interrelated poles. All the main problems that phenomenological thought deals with concentrate around the pole of event and the pole of contemplation. Their interconnectedness, though never direct, becomes clear when the one pole is brought to light, and the other is automatically hidden in the shadow of the first. If the pole and the perspective of event are revealed to us, then the pole of contemplation is hidden. If we discover the pole of contemplation, the pole of event retreats into the shadows.

---

<sup>1</sup> By the way, Bibikhin himself expressed this point of view, insisting that Heidegger developed Husserl's categorical intuition (see Bibikhin 2009: 40).

I consider Vladimir Bibikhin to be the greatest thinker on the pole of event in Russian philosophy. His teacher, Alexei Losev, was the representative of another beginning or of the other pole. Two possible European thinkers on the pole of event, who preceded Vladimir Bibikhin, are Heidegger and Wittgenstein. Bibikhin says in his *Word and the Event*:

Although guessing the meaning of words remains the main occupation of ‘postmodernity,’ Heidegger and Wittgenstein, through whose works alone could now read Humboldt and Potebnya, are not yet read. The simple thought that the language is not our matter, is still rarely met with calm consent (Bibikhin 2001: 91–92).

As demonstrated below, Bibikhin’s quite unexpected convergence of Heidegger and Wittgenstein can essentially be understood only through their relationship to the pole of event. Concerning the pole of contemplation, perhaps also somewhat unexpectedly, I would consider Husserl and Derrida as its main representatives in contemporary philosophy. Actually, the difference between the two branches of phenomenology, of event and of contemplation, is in their attitudes to ideality. It’s quite enough here to imagine how the notion of ideality was treated by Husserl and by Heidegger, and once more the difference between their phenomenological projects becomes clear.

Behind the confrontation of these poles is hiding a perhaps deeper confrontation that Bibikhin refers to as the “magnetic field” of classical Platonic and Aristotelian thought. According to him, this magnet is always “ready to attract us because it is too strong of a magnet” (Bibikhin 2001: 82–83). This strong magnet manifests itself in many ways, including through the phenomenological confrontation between Husserl and Heidegger. But is it still possible to talk about the heritage of Platonism or Aristotelianism in relation to the phenomenology and philosophy dealing with problems of a different era?

Alexey Chernyakov writes in *The Ontology of Time. Being and Time in the Philosophies of Aristotle, Husserl and Heidegger* that the fourth book of *Physics* and the sixth book of *Nicomachean Ethics* take a central place in understanding Heidegger’s Aristotelianism. Moreover, he concludes that, “Corpus Aristotelicum contains vital clues on the ontological elaborations of Heidegger. I would like to say [...] that Heidegger’s philosophy can be rightly called the post-classical Aristotelianism” (Chernyakov 2001: 18). Vladimir Bibikhin said roughly the same thing during his lecture course on Heidegger:

We must go back, says Heidegger, to the critical realism of Aristotle and the Scholastics. That point does not lose sight of the modern epistemological storms, but without being knocked down, patiently goes ahead in its positive *fördernder Arbeit*, positive moving work (Bibikhin 2009: 40).

It is no wonder that through Heidegger this Aristotelianism or even “ultra Aristotelianism”, to use Sergey Horuzhy’s term, penetrates Bibikhin’s thought. Bibikhin’s interest in the Russian translations of Aristotle is particularly relevant. He references this interest in *Word and Event*, briefly looking into the Russian translation of Aristotle, with Anatoly Akhutin, and immediately admits that it must not be used. This idea was very often expressed in his lecture courses, whenever Kubitsky’s translation of *Metaphysics* came up. However, he said that other translations were of little help in understanding Aristotle’s proper text. He made one exception though: the incomplete translation of *Metaphysics* by Vasilii Rozanov, which became one of his favorite topics. Although Bibikhin generally had a lot of favorite topics, Rozanov’s translation was particularly important for him because

the main was done: Aristotelian free seeking spirit was discovered to be based on the obvious, by paying attention to the proximate. Hence, Rozanov’s attempt played an enormous role in advancing Aristotelian realism in our country. A student, a historian of thought, every thinking person would find no less than a third of *Metaphysics* to be readable. Rozanov’s intuition of Aristotle is fascinating (Bibikhin 2001: 238).

In fact, what he expresses is not so much an admiration for the beauty and accuracy of Rozanov’s translation, as it is an admiration for his focus on a specific event, where all the “attention to the nearest” relates exclusively to Heideggerian phenomenology, which is not alien to Aristotelianism.

It is important to note that for Bibikhin, Russian translations of Plato and the Platonists have much less importance and interest (as Platonism did for Heidegger):

It’s not enough that Plotinus’ *Enneads* are reproductions of Ammonius’ teachings. As a written work they do not even belong to Plotinus in the sense that Plotinus was not particularly inclined to record his lectures, he was a man of the spoken word and only began writing when his students insisted. The *Enneads* arose in the space between Plotinus and Porphyry the Syrian, his disciple, secretary, and editor. This thinker’s worth lied in the fact that he did not add anything to the accepted teachings. He promised not to innovate, but only to repeat what had already been written and said (Bibikhin 2001: 168).

The promise not to innovate is alien to the spirit of the event, alien to the attention to the proximate, and to Platonism as a whole, which clearly prefers the unity of contemplation of the ideal and the eternal that exist in the event. The event avoids ideality: “Turning up and being split—this is what is essential for the event. The event is always too new” (Bibikhin 2001: 15).

The event is not something that exists in the Platonian “always,” it is suddenly granted or given (Heideggerian *es gibt*), given that the reality of things arise through the event. The reality of the external world is also an event. The event is historical: it entails, like the tail of a comet, a history that it also creates itself. Plato is not thinker of history, but his heritage, albeit in a modified form, according to Bibikhin, continues to resist the event:

The main thing that happens in the modernity, dissemination of technical civilization is the continuation of the kingdom of the inverted Platonic idea. The given state of things is not enough to be accepted, it is necessary that they have been so positioned or otherwise introduced into the system of representation and welfare (Bibikhin 2001: 16).

Bibikhin’s confrontation with Platonism continues until his final lecture that he carried out on November 2, 2004 at the Institute of Philosophy. Describing the late Platonic thought in *The Republic*, he said that it was saturated with the spirit of *paideia*, preparing a human for the correctness of view, for an arrangement in the space of truth. Plato cannot let humankind fall into the abyss where the war for being is going on. This is not surprising, since Plato is a thinker of the other pole: not of the event, but of the contemplation. In *Word and Event* Bibikhin states:

We do not see Plato becoming outdated as fast as his interpretation does. On the contrary, while the event is happening, Plato grows. It does not make much sense to say that it could have happened differently, this is granted. And yet is there not something horrible about the fact that we continually use Plato’s goods, since he has influenced us all, but still do not try to read him as clearly as possible? (Bibikhin 2001: 17).

Here the expression “on the contrary” makes a contrast between Plato and the event. Reading Plato “to all possible clarity” should not mislead us because is still “useless to go with the texts of Plato in hand trying to prove that they are misunderstood, since our understanding is never conclusive” (Bibikhin 2001: 17).

Such is our understanding of the pole of event: not only is our reading of Plato never final, but so is our understanding of any philosophical text and of philosophy in general. The event is always new, and always unpredictable. And in the perspective of the pole of event Plato will always be read in a new way. Readers must constantly open themselves to a new Aristotle. Alexei Losev perceived Plato and Aristotle quite differently. He was inclined toward the pole of contemplation. This, of course, is not the case when a positive or negative assessment of a certain way of interpretation can be made. And looking closely at Bibikhin’s philosophy and the philosophy of Losev, it cannot be said which is better or worse, they

are simply different. They are simply two different poles, and each of them has their own advantages and disadvantages, their own breakthroughs, failures and critical turns of thought.<sup>2</sup> The pole of event and the pole of contemplation both cast a different light on philosophy, each of them that open a new view on philosophy's specific landscapes and horizons.

Vladimir Bibikhin's last work, *Heidegger: from 'Being and Time' to 'Beiträge,'* clearly highlights the pole of event in Heidegger's thought and as well as in Bibikhin's.

In 1989, Gesamtausgabe Volume 65 Series III Unpublished works (1936–1938), 521 pages, was suddenly published. This book was immediately considered to be Heidegger's second major work. Now it has been translated into Russian and is awaiting publication. It is called *Beiträge zur Philosophie (Vom Ereignis)* (Bibikhin 2005: 114).

Following François Fédier, Bibikhin prefers to translate this title as a *Contribution to Philosophy from Ereignis*, leaving the last word, because of its ambiguity, untranslated. He spoke about this work earlier in his course on Heidegger, calling it the second major product of the Heideggerian heritage. He even considered it to be the most important work of Heidegger, because of the challenge it presents for thought.

His emphasis on the book's sudden appearance directly associates us with the context of the event, *Ereignis*. Bibikhin refers to Heidegger's note, *Letter on "Humanism,"* where Heidegger said that, since 1936, his thought had been driven by that word. Vladimir Bibikhin emphasizes that the simple translation of the word *Ereignis* as event is not enough, because we need to see also the movement, the lightning flash, an epiphany—those extra shades of meaning, which at one time were proposed by Jean Beaufret. Bibikhin adds additional meanings of *Ereignis*, introduced by the French translator François Fédier: *avenance*, which tried to fuse in this concept the meanings of event (*événement*) with the beginning of a new era, the coming of the Messiah (*avènement*) and the appropriateness of what is happening (*avenant*). However Bibikhin gave many more explanations of *Ereignis*, although Bibikhin's main translation of *Ereignis* is event. For Bibikhin, the thought that is not only found in *Ereignis*, but originates in *Ereignis*, is important in and of itself.

Event immerses us not into the past, but to the coming thought. "The past does not mean anything, the beginning is everything," says Hei-

---

<sup>2</sup> To compare with Bibikhin: "There can be no such thing as the victory of right or wrong interpretation of Heidegger. A philosopher is not for to enter our picture of the history of philosophy. He is to show us where our pictures, our dreams are, and where the lost is, what our dreams are about" (Bibikhin 2001: 19).

degger in his winter semester lecture course in 1937–1938 *Basic Questions of Philosophy*, bearing in mind that the unsaid, not recorded in the classical beginning of thought, and primarily, meaningful Greeks' unthinking in their word "aletheia", is more important than the well-known and recorded, putting the task to comprehend what had not been done. In *Being and Time* the philosophic school was keenly felt and assumed; in *Beiträge* it becomes worse than the problem, a dead end. Heidegger comes on an unexplored way (Bibikhin 2005: 115).

Their relationship to the role and significance of the philosophical method is another essential distinction between Husserl's and Heidegger's phenomenology. For Husserl, philosophy begins, as it does for Descartes, with acquiring the method, whereas for Heidegger, philosophy begins only after parting with the method, which is when

concepts are displayed (flash) as an all-defining event, Ereignis, increase its growth, for its essential novelty Ereignis eliminates the system where it could be included. Everything is ruled by an unconditional first beginning. Philosophy itself is now changed, for it does not move in the network of coordinates, but melts all the coordinates into the system (Bibikhin 2005: 119).

Philosophy at the pole of event is always different, a movement that melts its network of contemplative theoretical coordinates, but the movement is not a chaotic one, and it is simply subjected to another logic. That is, to the logic of action, praxis, and energy.

In *Word and Event* Bibikhin gives a very accurate and essential definition of philosophy at the pole of event: "philosophy is not an intellectual exercise" (Bibikhin 2001: 19). Indeed, we cannot intellectually predict an event, it does not move along a path of reason. The event leads, creates, organizes, and one cannot say in advance where it will go. That is why the method and the event are absolutely incompatible.

However, I argue that philosophy is not only an intellectual activity at the pole of event, but that it is also an intellectual activity at the pole of contemplation. When one philosophical beginning is affirmed, the other one is shadowed. Hiding in the shadows, and the instance of contemplation disappearing, are both characteristic of Heidegger's and Bibikhin's thought on the event. Not only theirs, because this thought has its own history, which is oriented not on the intellectual metaphysics of Aristotle, which is relevant to this thought only when talking about praxis, energy and the present moment of time (i.e., just about the "metaphysics of presence," in terms of Jacques Derrida), but on pre-Socratic thinking. Bibikhin pays particular attention to Heraclitus, who discovered that the logos can be unintelligent. Therefore, none of our interpretations, according to Bibikhin, could reinterpret Plato properly. That is what Neoplatonists and

Losev did with eidetic (intellectual intuition), as Plato did himself. Here there are two consciously contrasting eide: the intellectual and unintellectual.

In *Word and Event*, Bibikhin states that,

event awoke us only to be enmeshed in dreams. The event of all events, the very existence of the world and of humankind, happened before we could observe it. We see that it already occurred. And now it is not all that important, whether we decide that God created everything, or that it all appeared by chance, or that we ourselves created it all in a dream. All of these interpretations are based only on the traces of the event itself (Bibikhin 2001: 19).

It should also be noted that the dreams start only after being woken up by the event. The fact is that the event cancels out the coordinates of the world that can be computed, and that can basically be put in order, including the coordinates of metaphysics.

The event creates disorder. And this disorder is not chaotic, but is its own kind of mode of relating to thought. Because our thoughts should not necessarily be ordered, and we do not just exist in an ordered mode of thinking. We also exist in a world of our own mental disorder. Therefore philosophy is an existential way to survive in the disorder, and to adapt to it. Husserl's method aims to attach thoughts to order somehow, and in doing so, put them in order. Heidegger's and Bibikhin's approaches are somewhat different. We must learn to think and learn to think differently, says Heidegger. This is similar to finding one's self in the woods of Bibikhin or on the lost paths of Heidegger, on a road, which suddenly appears from nowhere and, of course, leads nowhere. Here traveling this road (or philosophizing) becomes the aim itself.

Being is coming to existence in the event, and it effectively realizes itself and acts. Here the phenomenology of the event of Heidegger and Bibikhin reveals its connection with Mikhail Bakhtin's philosophy of the act. In his analysis of Bakhtin's thought, Bibikhin primarily draws attention to the unity of his and Heidegger's thought. A little earlier he introduces the position that both philosophers say and think the same thing, but not in the sense that they repeat each other. And for Bibikhin, Bakhtin's "act" and Heidegger's "event" acquire coincidental configuration. Although, according to Bibikhin, the way of the thinking act was not passed by Bakhtin until its end, this did not prevent it from analysis. However, taking into account the specificity of the event, where any road does not lead to an end, there is nothing surprising about this. Bibikhin argues that,

Bakhtin introduces to Berdyaev's style an edgy border between the living and unique event, which is the act of accomplishing of being, and the flat



space of objectified culture. Communication between the world of life and the world of culture is one-sided: the event of being is a creative act (Bibikhin 2001:96).

Indeed, any creative act takes place only when it is a unique event. Once we repeat the creative act, then we have either plagiarism or copying, or we do something other than this act. Therefore, in this context, Bibikhin says that the oneness of unique experience, uniqueness of the event, and the act, do not require an additional foundation, they simply exist in their entirety:

...the act is complete by itself and does not necessarily need a manifestation. 'Everything, even the thought and feeling is my act.' The act includes self-sacrificial denial, and allowing self to be inactive. Bakhtin's act is far more than the subject's behavior. When there is the act, strict necessity no longer essentially remains in its subject (Bibikhin 2001: 96).

This is very similar to Heidegger's position that the source of the event can only be the event itself. As Heidegger himself says,

what Appropriation yields through Saying is never the effect of a cause, or the consequence of an antecedent. The yielding owning, the Appropriation, confers more than any effectuation, making, or founding. What is yielding is Appropriation itself—and nothing else [...]. There is nothing else from which the Appropriation itself could be derived, even less in whose terms it could be explained (Heidegger 1992: 127).

In late Heideggerian ontology nothing at all precedes the event, as it provides the basis for everything around itself.<sup>3</sup>

So the act is not the subject, it is even beyond the subject. The act does not belong to the subject; rather a person is the act themselves.

It is not me who is preparing and making the act, but the act as the initial event gives being to me. Life is a "responsible acting" [...]. The subject and consciousness are shadows that the act as the event casts aside (but can it cast?), as the act of belonging to the place of any meaning, i.e., to the world in its history (Bibikhin 2001: 95–96).

This suggests a very interesting parallel to Marx's thought expressed in *Theses on Feuerbach*. He writes about the new philosophy that pushes the practical revolutionary event of changing the world, in contrast to the old philosophy, which just explained it. After all, for Marx, as for Hei-

---

<sup>3</sup> Compare to Bibikhin: "The light of the event brings out the truth of things, not their private, but the first and hence the last meaning" (Bibikhin 2001: 97).

degger and Bibikhin, philosophy is not an intellectual exercise. Marx is a thinker on the pole of event; in this sense, though taking into account Bibikhin's ambiguous attitude towards Marxism, he is much closer to Marx than to contemplative phenomenology.

Event is the disclosure of what comes to being. Any disclosure primarily appears in the world as light. It is no accident that Bakhtin understands the event as illumination [...]. Realizing himself in the event that seized him, the man "clearly sees these individual and only people whom he loves, and the sky and the earth and the trees [...] and time (Bibikhin 2001: 96–97).

If one uses the Heideggerian language of hyphens and condensations, the event is what we see as being accomplished now. But, it must be remembered that this is only a view of the one pole, where the event is something that happens to us. The pole of contemplation, on the other hand, is what does not happen to us. It is what we have lost or what we have never had. Plato is not interested in what we see or in what is revealed to us but in what we do not see or in what is hidden from us. Moreover, the most interesting can begin only when everything disappears from view. Only then can the invisible be seen. For example, Plato's ideal forms, his ideas, and his metaphysics as a whole, are naturally "overcome" by the limitation of the horizon of the immediate here-being or the here-event.

In order for the "event of the world" to exist, it should come true. By no extraordinary effort of active will could I create and "confirm my own indispensable involvement in being" without the world of event (Bibikhin 2001: 98).

Examining Bibikhin's course and then his book, *The Language of Philosophy*, his dispute with Husserl's phenomenology resurfaces. He argues that perception reaches people before they have developed the skills of consciousness.

We do not have time to notice that the event of the world precedes the sensations [...]. Perception is not something that is created by our life experiences. It is given to us otherwise. We gained perception, before we developed the skills of consciousness. Husserl defines perception as what we later identify by categorical intuition (Bibikhin 2007: 82–83).

Bibikhin states that things are going before contemplation, before categorical thinking, and that the event of the world touches a person not through the mind, and not through the contemplation, but through the event.

In the event of things as a pure message for the first time makes itself known, realizes itself and begins his story a human being. It makes sense because prior to any formation, the consciousness already has the event of the world incorporated. The event of the world directly touches a man and completely captures him. He can only secondarily fence it from the world, reflecting it through consciousness (Bibikhin 2007: 83).

However, the relationship between the event and the contemplation can be imagined in a less equivocal manner, since there is a reverse perspective, the perspective of contemplation, or intuition. Contemplation is only secondary at the pole of event, not so much because things outside of the contemplation are primary (a view that Kant attributed to former metaphysics), but because the event is always taking place for the first time. Because the contemplation inevitably comes after the event, it is secondary. Contemplation isolates us from the world and, as a result, does not seize our immediate being.

In *Science and Reflection* written in 1953, Martin Heidegger focused on the meaning of the word “theory.” Although the literal translation of the Greek word is “contemplation,” Heidegger tends to show that in the depth of this theory, contemplation overshadows the event. To do this, he points out that the Latin translation of the Greek “theory” as “contemplation” is inadequate, because it creates a new semantic field in which all that was eventual and significant in the original Greek word, had been lost. *Contemplari* means something restricted, limited, and dedicated to a particular area. But it is impossible to restrict the event. From the standpoint of the phenomenology of Heidegger, *medieval vita contemplativa*, contemplative life is not the same as the Greek *bios theoretikos*.

However, it is possible to contrast the Husserlian position with the thought of Heidegger. According Husserl, the notion of a crisis of thought is associated with the infinity of meanings (Husserl 1970: 53). Specifically, since theory as *contemplatio* meant a restricted space, such a theory held its borders from the endless sprawl of thought in the face of the new infinity of thinkable objects.

It is no coincidence that the critics of metaphysics from Fichte and Hegel to Heidegger, insist on its limitations (and again, Kantian critique of metaphysics is the exception here) by investing in this concept the connotation of insufficiency and incompleteness. Otherwise Husserl, for whom the introduction to the scientific world, beginning with Copernicus and Galileo, the principle of infinity became the basis of the future destruction of semantic space of metaphysics as a theory—*contemplatio* in European thinking.

Consequentially, philosophy and the sciences became the infinite multiplication of the number of theories. Events began to multiply themselves, eventually leading to a senseless world, and therefore to the existential senselessness of scientific work that no longer explores the space

of a holistic theory (that is already absent), but only some aspects and problems in the space of the science of eventuality.

And Husserl therefore raises the question of the life-world (*Lebenswelt*) as well as the question of the contemplative world. In his late theory, contemplation is intended to put an end to the event, since in relation to event, contemplation is the opposite pole. This does not mean that the event must disappear; it will be overshadowed by contemplation, as the Greek natural philosophy had been hidden in the shadows of Plato's and Aristotle's thought, up to its second reacquisition in the inverted historicism of Nietzschean and Heideggerian thought.

Here it seems quite appropriate to pose a question about the possible nature of the events in the ideal space of Plato, or, to imagine the events in the world of the pure forms or intellects of Aristotle. What events could happen in the intelligent world of Aristotle, of course, if we read him through the prism of Maimonides and Averroes, or Siger of Brabant, and not through the prism of the later nominalist criticism? Or at least through the lens of Dante, who wrote his Aristotelian *Convivio* (*The Banquet*)? This is a different Aristotle, and Dante not purposefully states that that the interpretation of Aristotle that emerged after conviction of Averroists, (who tried to save the space of Aristotelian contemplation) leads nowhere. Later in the debate about hierarchical relation between *potentia ordinata* and *potentia absoluta* Nominalists would come to an exclusively eventual interpretation of the world created only by unrestricted divine will.

But let's get back to Husserl's interpretation of the life-world as the world of contemplation, and to the universal problem of his later phenomenology. How can the life-world and the contemplation that Husserl discusses be combined? The life-world is, in its nature, contemplation. It does not require scientific experimental evidence, because truth is accomplished in it.

This position of Husserl is very close to the Neo-platonic understanding of the role of contemplation. As well as for Plotinus, another thinker of the pole of contemplation, the life of the mind itself is, at every level, not an event, but rather, contemplation. This life arises from the contemplation and abides in it; it creates within the contemplation all the multiple of living forms through the power of contemplation. The philosophy of Plotinus is the exact the opposite of Bakhtin's philosophy of the act. According to Plotinus, "In the same way, human beings, when weak on the side of contemplation, find in action their trace of vision and of reason" (Plotinus 1992: 242). The world of contemplation in Platonism is an ideal intellectual space. "But this would be to see it from without, one thing seeing another; the true way is to become Intellectual-Principle and be, our very selves, what we are to see" (Plotinus 1992: 573). This is possible not through the event or the act, but through the contemplation.

Though all the differences of philosophical approaches of Plotinus and of Husserl to the role and the nature of contemplation, we can state

between them a certain commonality: the contemplation is ideal and as such is associated with the sphere of meaning.

It is in the relation to the ideality is rooted in the main difference between the two kinds of phenomenology, Husserlian and Heideggerian. The transcendental phenomenology of Husserl is both a philosophical critique of the “degenerate” forms of the previous metaphysics, which lost their essence, i.e. the ideality of contemplation, and a new project of restoring the lost forms of this ideality. Heidegger, on the contrary, in his Dasein analytics, seeks to go beyond the ideal and contemplative essence of metaphysics, no matter whether is it *theoria* or *contemplatio* that is subjected, according to Heidegger, to be overcome. The proximity to Heidegger’ pole explains the outwardly paradoxical aphorism of Bibikhin that philosophy is not an intellectual exercise. Incidentally, the criticism of Heidegger’s metaphysics of presence, which takes place in Derrida’s deconstruction, is an attempt to continue the metaphysical intentions of Husserlian phenomenology as it is connected with a particular ideality of meanings in the deconstruction. The same relation to ideality can be seen in the fundamental contradiction of the philosophical positions of Bibikhin and Losev.

And if Plotinus’ words “become the contemplation” can serve as the imperative for philosophy on the one phenomenological pole, the imperative of the other pole may be “become the event”. I suppose that Vladimir Bibikhin has become just such an event in contemporary philosophy, a unique, all-inclusive, and attractive event.

## Bibliography

- Bibikhin, Vladimir (2001). *Slovo i sobytiye*. [Word and event]. Moscow: Editorial URSS.
- Bibikhin, Vladimir (2005). “Heidegger ot ‘Bytiya i vremeni’ k ‘Beiträge’ ” [Heidegger: from ‘Being and Time’ to ‘Beiträge’]. *Voprosy Filosofii* 4: 114–129.
- Bibikhin, Vladimir (2007). *Yazik filosofii* [Language of philosophy]. St. Petersburg: Nauka.
- Bibikhin, Vladimir (2009). *Ranniy Haidegger. Materialy k seminaru* [Early Heidegger. Materials for a Seminar]. Moscow: Institut filosofii, teologiyi i istorii Svyatogo Fomy.
- Chernyakov, Alexei (2001). *Ontologiya vremeni. Bytiyo i vremya v filosofii Aristotelya, Guserlyya i Haideggera*. [The Ontology of Time. Being and Time in the philosophy of Aristotle, Husserl and Heidegger]. St. Petersburg: Vysshaya religioznaya i filosofskaya shkola.
- Heidegger, Martin (1982). *On the Way to Language*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Husserl, Edmund (1970). *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology. An Introduction to Phenomenological Philosophy*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press
- Plotinus (1992). *The Enneads*. New York: Larson Publications.