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ABSTRACT
The article is primarily concerned with the problem of estrangement of a human being, raised in a number of works of M.Heidegger, a philosopher of the 20th century. Belonging to a "cybersociety", a person alienates from his Sein (essential Being), ceases being "the co-reflection of a Whole". In his later works "Country Path Conversations", "Creative Landscape: Why Do We Stay in the Province?" Heidegger formulates his own philosophy of "a country path", which guides a person to preserve his essential Being. The image of Goethe's Faust had been regarded in the scope of Heidegger’s philosophical concept of returning to oneself, which is viewed as a conceptualization of a person’s essential Being. The paper also outlines the distinct correlation of Heidegger's philosophy of "a country path" with philosophical ideas of L.N.Tolstoy, expressed in his novel "Anna Karenina". A life path of Konstantin Levin can be regarded as a Russian approach to a philosophy of "a country path".
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INTRODUCTION
The issues of a human being, his “essential source” and his destiny occupied the mind of a great German philosopher of the XX century Martin Heidegger (1889-1976) in the course of his creative career. From the whole range of issues, the philosopher was dealing with in his lifetime, the main emphasis of this article will be put on the problem of the estrangement of a civilized person from his essential Being. The dilemma considered here is regarded in the context of Heideggerian notions and had been touched upon before in our earlier discussions “Ontological essence of Vyacheslav Ivanov’s symbolic hermeneutics in the context of Martin Heidegger’s philosophy” [1], “Symbolic Interpretation of the Image of Goethe’s Faust in the Context of Heidegger’s Notions "The Earth" and "The Sky"” [2]. Thus the image of Goethe’s Faust had been regarded in the scope of Heidegger’s philosophical concept of returning to oneself, which can be interpreted as a conceptualization of a person’s essential Being.

MATERIALS AND METHODS
In a number of his works Heidegger emphasizes the fatality of metaphysical way of thinking, which is specific for the Western culture. According to M.Heidegger, the key to the conservation of cultures, their advance towards each other is not to lose touch with the “essential source”.

The interpretation of the “essential source” can be traced in Heidegger’s works “The Origin of the Work of Art” (1936) [3] and “A Dialogue on Language between the Japanese and an Inquirer” (1953-1954) [4]. The latter work, which supports our hypothesis, emphasizes not just dialogical correlations between the
German and the Japanese languages and cultures, but much more: it reveals the “essential source” of the Eastern and the Western languages. According to M. Heidegger, in the process of translation he had the feeling of “wandering from one linguistic creature to another, accompanied by the glimmering light” what made him feel that the essential Being of the roots of different languages must have been identical [4, 286]. Thus M. Heidegger regards a language as “the house of Being”. It was that apprehension of the essential Being that entitled him to discover the common unity in presumably genetically varied linguistic structures. According to M. Heidegger, this unity constitutes the essential base of any language. A thought, in which a philosopher of the XX century is in our opinion unanimous with the philosophy of Hegel and Goethe, is vital for our comprehension of the Universe, the East and the West as a Whole.

The above mentioned idea is supported by the Russian orientalist T.P. Grigoryeva: “Heidegger has mastered the language of east and West, he is a messenger of their adhesion - of two halves of the Unity” [5, 272]. The point of his creative career can be traced in the concept of the East and the West in every phenomenon, although the metaphysical way of thinking has separated them and opposed to each other.

According to M. Heidegger, the initial conception of the essential Being dates back to the Middle Ages, when a system was impossible as a type of reflection. Citing M. Heidegger, “analogy is the crystallization of the understanding of being in medieval life and it gave to the medieval agent a sense of their metaphysical place in the order of things” [6, 157]. The philosopher reflects upon the result of the metaphysical type of thinking: “the power of system, not only in reflection, starts empowering in the world perceived as a picture” [6, 157]. By the “world picture” Heidegger means the world itself as Being in general. Heidegger regards a picture not as an imprint, but refers us to the idea of Being positioned ahead of us, perceived from our point of view. Thus a world picture is subjective, the essential being becomes itself only “being positioned by a human being” [6, 157].

Thus Heidegger refers to a world picture not as a view of the world of a person, but to the world itself, comprehended as a picture.

A modern Russian philosopher M.A. Mamonova in her book “West and East. Traditions and innovations of rational thinking” [7] expresses the idea that a rational Western type of thinking alienates a person from the penetration in the essential “view of the world” and leads an artist to a perception of the world as an image, constructed by an observer, a cognoscitive personality. A Western picture of the world is represented by an image-constructing individual.

According to A.V. Smirnov, a researcher of Western and Eastern mysticism, the start of the subjectification process formation of a human being in Europe as the result of analytical type of thinking is associated with the name of N. Kusansky [8]. On the contrary in his monograph “The Great Shaykh of Sufism (a Sample of Paradigmatic Analysis of Ibn 'Arabi's Philosophy)” A.V. Smirnov displays a medieval interpretation of a human being in microcosm as absolute: the universe is inside the personality, not outside, a human being is seen as “all-subject” [9].

RESULTS

The point of many postulates of M. Heidegger is that the philosopher of the XX century represents a medieval eastern type of mentality in his interpretation of the world image with its essential source. This type predetermined the next stage, the Renaissance, and due to it its art preserved and multiplied the ancient samples of penetration in the world of nature and the unity with it.

The logic of our interpretation of M. Heidegger’s works leads to the hypothesis that it is the philosopher’s inclination to the medieval eastern type of thinking with the world image and its essential source, being formed in its frames, which can be interpreted by a human being only in the ‘all-subject’ position. This type of mentality explains the attitude of a thinker to a process of human subjectification, reaching the extremes in the cultures of the last centenaries. Heidegger is highly focused on this process, in which a
human being is the base and measure of all beings, when every ‘self’ is seen as such a base and is opposed to Sein, the world and nature.

The philosophical approach of late M. Heidegger, defined by M. M. Mikhailov as “a philosophy of a country path” [10] in the foreground reveals the fact that the age of industrialization breaks the harmony between the human being and the world, a person ceases being “connected to the Whole”.

In his work “The origin of the Work of Art” the philosopher is concerned with the state of art in the frames of industrial society in the world, becoming cybernetic. According to M. Heidegger, “a modern person does non part with his subjectivity <…> , on the contrary the industrial society represents the self-consciousness to its extremes”, in other words the subjectivity” [11, 287].

Having evolved as a philosopher in the age of industrialization, Heidegger points out the significance of the “step back”. At the same time he is puzzled about the direction; “Where back. Back to that start, designated for us in the goddess Athens’s name. But it does not symbolize the revival of the ancient Greek world” [11, 290].

M. Heidegger’s “step back” in the conditions of the industrial society is presented in two of his works "Country Path Conversations" [11] and "Creative Landscape: Why Do We Stay in the Province?" (From “The Selected works of different years (1933-1970)” [12]. The titles themselves provide us the hint to the question about the meaning of the term “a step back”. “A step back” denotes a step to the province, to the natural lifestyle. The province as a life experience contributed to the development of his philosophy of a country path.

The symbolic images of an oak and a country path ("Country Path Conversations" [11]) denote that a person being a part of the whole is primarily connected with the earth and the sky. Thus, an oak as a symbol of life in the world is constantly “telling” a country path, destined to be a person’s life path, that “to grow means to bloom towards the sky and at the same time to be deeply rooted in the darkness of the earth; what he meant was that an innate talented person is born in conditions of being really ready to follow the will of the sky and be guarded by the earth” [11, 239].

Analyzing the second Heidegger’s work mentioned above ("Creative Landscape: Why Do We Stay in the Province?" [12]) the linguist’s attention is drawn to the philosopher’s skill to outline ontological reflections alternated with fiction descriptions. A view of a guest and a traveler is drawn to Heidegger’s poetic description of a landscape, while for a narrator of this story these meadows and pasture-land, the forest with its “tall dark, old fir-trees” is the world of his existence, the world which allows his philosophy to thrive: “When in the dark winter night the blizzard rages with all its ferocity around the hut, veiling all neighborhood, hiding everything, it is time for philosophy to celebrate” [12, 218].

Heidegger concludes his reflections in the following way: "And this philosophical work does not take place as the third-party class eccentric, entrenched in his corner. Its exact position is among peasant labor "that carries and directs" the labour of the philosopher [12, p. 219], they are the original source of philosophy of a country path.

DISCUSSION
We consider the Russian variant of a philosophy of a country path to have been outlined long before M. Heidegger, by L. N. Tolstoy in his novel “Anna Karenina” [13]. According to many biographers and researchers of Tolstoy’s creative way, his life philosophy, being genetically connected with the wisdom of Russian patriarchal lifestyle, is represented by his character, Konstantin Levin.

It is widely known that the novel by L. N. Tolstoy “Anna Karenina” in the time of its creation was regarded as a challenge to Europeanizing Russian society with its new attitude to the issues of marriage and family. L. N. Tolstoy was deeply concerned with these issues, which were the impetus for writing this piece.
According to a great Russian writer, the age of mechanization detrimentally influenced the essential source of the human “self”. This thought, symbolically expressed in a railway, was the implied point of the novel. The railway in the interpretation of Tolstoy reminds the Wormwood star – the sign of tragedy.

It well-known that a Russian psychological novel represented in the masterpieces of L.N.Tolstoy and F.M.Dostoyevsky provided us with the samples of fiction philosophy and served as the philosophical base of the first generation of Russian professional philosophers (L.Shestov, V.Rosanov, N.berdiaev) etc. Touching upon ontological philosophy of late M.Heidegger it is essential to emphasize his outstanding fiction style that is being highlighted by all the researchers of his creative career. All stated above allows us to pose the problem of philosophical interpretation of the novel “Anna Karenina” by L.N.Tolstoy in its interconnection with late Heidegger’s ontological philosophy (it was the period mentioned above when the philosopher was concerned with the social issues in the époque of mechanization).

Just as M.Heidegger, Konstantin Levin finds his life philosophy in natural, down to earth interests, being penetrated in peasant labour, which connects a person with his roots – the earth and reveals the sky to him, raising his soul.

A philosophy of Levin’s life as a Russian variant of “country path” was not developed immediately. It took Levin enormous efforts to reveal the truth of life, his own essential Being. He is subdued to many hardships and primarily by the monde.

L.N.Tolstoy describes Levin’s life after his marriage in a following way: “Now, involuntarily it seemed, he cut more and more deeply into the soil like a plough, so that he could not be drawn out without turning aside the furrow” [13, 1701]. And further: “To live the same family life as his father and forefathers…” [13, 1702]. Tolstoy and Heidegger both interpret the earth as Sein, essential Being of a human “self”. This being is revealed in a person the moment he “cuts more and more deeply into the soil”, it happens “involuntarily”. By this term Tolstoy means that a person is inclined to discover his essential Being not in the outside world, it is in his nature, his roots, in the earth, where he was born and where he lives; it is in everything that a person does unconsciously day by day. This idea is emphasized by Tolstoy in the words of Levin, that all his life, filled with everything, that was meaningful for his “father and forefathers” “had no meaning at all for him, when he began to think” (our italics – A.S.). Without thinking “besides knowing thoroughly what he had to do, Levin knew in just the same way HOW he had to do it all, and what was more important than the rest” [13, 1703]. Living according to the rules of the earth and the sky, one does not need any evaluations, e.g. “Whether he were acting rightly or wrongly he did not know, and far from trying to prove that he was, nowadays he avoided all thought or talk about it” [13, 1704].

As soon as a person regards himself as a thinking individual, capable to analyze, the harmony of the universe is ruined in his view of the world, the oneness of his inner world starts its destruction. Tolstoy emphasizes this idea, characterizing his Levin in a following way: “Reasoning had brought him to doubt, and prevented him from seeing what he ought to do and what he ought not. When he did not think, but simply lived, he was continually aware of the presence of an infallible judge in his soul, determining which of two possible courses of action was the better and which was the worse, and as soon as he did not act rightly, he was at once aware of it” [13, 1705].

The author, evaluating Levin’s thoughts and actions concerning the sense of life, summarizes: “that he had been living rightly, but thinking wrong” [13,1716]. Similar to Heidegger, Tolstoy knows by his intuition of a sophist writer that the essential being of a person, his soul values are rooted in his terrestrial life. Levin, the character of L.N.Tolstoy, finds the answer to the question, which tortures him, concerning the sense of life, that the following idea could not satisfy his queries. “The answer has been given me by life itself, in my knowledge of what is right and what is wrong” [13,1717]. And eventually L.N.Tolstoy, similar to M.Heidegger later, denies the role of reason in the revelation of a person’s soul. The inner monologue of Levin exemplifies this point: But who discovered it? Not reason. Reason discovered the
struggle for existence, and the law that requires us to oppress all who hinder the satisfaction of our desires. That is the deduction of reason. But loving one’s neighbor reason could never discover, because it’s irrational.” [13, 1718].

CONCLUSION

To summarize, the formation of the negative attitude to the industrialization era started in the XIX century in Russian literature represented by L.N.Tolstoy, in the XX century by Martin Heidegger, who was concerned with ontological issues the whole life, in particular with the issues of essential Being. A number of his works, especially of the later period, raises the problems of the industrial or as he called it “the cybernetic” society.

Both M.Heidegger and L.N.Tolstoy were regarding the issues of the inner world of a human being in conditions of the so-called “technical progress” of the society, allowing us to carry out the comparative analysis of the selected works of the two titans of philosophy of the mankind.
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