

EUROPEAN YEARBOOK OF THE
HISTORY OF PSYCHOLOGY
SOURCES, THEORIES, AND MODELS

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Mauro ANTONELLI
University of Milano-Bicocca, Italy

CO-EDITOR

Horst GUNDLACH
Heidelberg, Germany

EDITORIAL BOARD

Christian ALLESCH (University of Salzburg, Austria)
Saulo de Freitas ARAUJO (Federal University of Juiz de Fora, Brazil)
David B. BAKER (University of Akron, USA)
Adrian C. BROCK (Bolton, United Kingdom)
Jacqueline CARROY (Centre Alexandre Koyré, Paris, France)
Renato FOSCHI (Sapienza University of Rome, Italy)
Gordana JOVANOVIĆ (University of Belgrade, Serbia)
Enrique LAFUENTE (National Distance Education University, Madrid, Spain)
Ramón LEÓN (Ricardo Palma University, Lima, Perú)
Luciano MECACCI (Florence, Italy)
Annette MÜLBERGER (University of Groningen, The Netherlands)
Serge NICOLAS (Université Paris Descartes, France)
Petteri PIETIKÄINEN (University of Helsinki, Finland)
Csaba PLÉH (Central European University, Budapest, Hungary)
David K. ROBINSON (Truman State University, USA)
Henning SCHMIDGEN (Bauhaus-Universität Weimar, Germany)
Armin STOCK (University of Würzburg, Germany)
Karl Halvor TEIGEN (University of Oslo, Norway)
Jacob VAN BELZEN (University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands)
Robert H. WOZNIAK (Bryn Mawr College, USA)
Ekaterina ZAVERSHNEVA (Moscow, Russia)
Włodek ZEIDLER (University of Finance and Management, Warsaw, Poland)

ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Elena CANADELLI, Dario DE SANTIS, Aurelio MOLARO, Roberta PASSIONE,
Daniele ZAVAGNO (coordination), Paola ZOCCHI
Department of Psychology – University of Milano-Bicocca, Italy



EUROPEAN YEARBOOK OF THE
HISTORY OF PSYCHOLOGY
SOURCES, THEORIES, AND MODELS

7
2021



BREPOLS

© 2021, Brepols Publishers n.v., Turnhout, Belgium.

All rights reserved.
No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted,
in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical,
photocopying, recording, or otherwise
without the prior permission of the publisher.



D/2021/0095/333
ISSN 2295-5267

E-ISSN 2507-0304

ISBN 978-2-503-59210-7

DOI 10.1484/J.EYHP.5.126802

Printed in the EU on acid-free paper.

CONTENTS

Mauro ANTONELLI <i>Editorial</i>	7
ORIGINAL ESSAYS	
Josef HLADE & Rudolf MEER <i>Alois Riehl and the History of Psychology: The 1913 Declaration of the Philosophers</i>	11
Vincenzo FANO <i>Meinong Epistemologist of Measurement</i>	41
Yunus Anil YILMAZ <i>Freud and Claus: Biological Roots of Psychoanalysis</i>	77
SHORT PAPERS	
Marco INNAMORATI, Renato FOSCHI & Andrea ROMANO <i>The Pope and the Unconscious: Pius XII's Speech on Psycho- therapy in 1953 and Its Interpretation by Agostino Gemelli</i>	109
INTERVIEWS	
Luciano MECACCI <i>Interview with Tatyana V. Akhutina</i>	133
DOCUMENTS AND ARCHIVAL MATERIAL	
Mauro ANTONELLI <i>Vittorio Benussi on Saliency and Inadequate Perception</i>	157

CONTENTS

DISCUSSIONS

Some Trends in History of Russian Psychology

David K. ROBINSON

Introduction 201

David K. ROBINSON

North American "Understanding" of History of Psychology in the Soviet Union 205

Irina Anatolyevna MIRONENKO

A Forgotten Name in the History of Russian Psychology: Mikhail Ivanovich Vladislavlev 225

Natalia Anatolyevna LOGINOVA

The St Petersburg School of Psychology from the 1950s to the 1970s 241

Maria Vladimirovna OSORINA & Marina Olegovna AVANESYAN

Lev Vekker and His Unified Theory of Mental Processes 265

Olga Arkadyevna ARTEMEVA

History of Russian/Soviet Psychology (1900–1950) as Self-Organization of the Collective Subject 283



MAURO ANTONELLI

EDITORIAL

After the challenging pandemic year 2020, which prevented its conclusion, EYHP can finally publish the announced large Discussion section about new historiographical trends in the history of Russian / Soviet psychology, both from “abroad” and from “within”. Special thanks go to the section editor David K. Robinson, who, despite being hospitalized by the epidemic disease, resumed the forcedly interrupted work and completed it during his convalescence.

The topic of the history of Russian / Soviet psychology, anticipated in the last volume by an extensive essay on the famous Resolution of July 4, 1936 by the Central Committee of the All-Russian Communist Party against pedology, is completed in this volume by an interview with Tatyana V. Akhutina, one of the most important pupils of Aleksandr R. Luriya, author of contributions to the study of the brain mechanisms of language, language disorders resulting from brain injuries, and language rehabilitation programs.

The *Essays* and *Short papers* are devoted to some critical chapters in the history of German-speaking psychology. The article by Josef Hlade and Rudolf Meer analyses the role of Alois Riehl as one of the six initiators of the “Declaration Against the Occupation of Philosophical Chairs with Representatives of Experimental Psychology” of 1913, against the backdrop of the heterogeneous relationship between German neo-Kantianism and psychology. Vincenzo Fano’s article deals with epistemological questions linked to the psychological aspects of measurement, i.e., on the reliability of the perceptual impressions involved in

any measurement, almost forgotten and insufficiently considered by contemporary theories of measurement. This issue was raised in 1860 by Gustav Theodor Fechner in his *Elemente der Psychophysik* and developed by Alexius Meinong in an almost forgotten but theoretically stimulating paper, here presented in significant historical and epistemological detail. Yunus Anil Yilmaz focuses on the biological, especially evolutionary inspiration of Freudian psychoanalysis and on how Freud's interest in Darwin was evoked by his biology professor Carl Claus during his study of medicine in Vienna. Yilmaz employs a sociological approach to understand the biological components of Freud's theory. Marco Innamorati, Renato Foschi, and Andrea Romano analyse Pius XII's Speech on Psychotherapy of 1953, which exerted a profound influence on the attitude of the Catholic world towards this issue. While the impression made by this speech outside Italy was one of greater openness toward psychoanalysis, its reception in Italy was different, due to the authoritative interpretation of Pius XII's speech by Agostino Gemelli, which directly influenced the Italian Catholic world.

The section *Documents and archival material* presents two essentially theoretical pieces of Vittorio Benussi's which illuminate essential aspects of his theory of perception, inspired by the sophisticated views of his teacher Alexius Meinong and the Graz School. They also clarify Benussi's complex relationship with theory and, more specifically, his position with regard to the antagonistic approaches of the Berlin School of Gestalt psychology.

My thanks go, as usual, to all those who have actively supported EYHP's scientific and publishing project, ensuring the growth of the Journal.



IRINA ANATOLYEVNA MIRONENKO

St Petersburg State University, Russia

A FORGOTTEN NAME IN THE HISTORY OF RUSSIAN PSYCHOLOGY: MIKHAIL IVANOVICH VLADISLAVLEV

Abstract

M. I. Valdislavlev was professor of philosophy at St Petersburg Imperial University who taught and wrote about psychology for three decades until his death in 1900; some of his students later developed the new psychology in Russia, before and after the Revolution. He had training in German philosophy, but many of the introspective investigations that he published also resonated with moral and ethical teachings of Russian Orthodoxy, reflecting his early training in the religious academy. Valdislavlev's primary methods were introspection and linguistic analysis, and he carried out elaborate investigations of the will and the imagination. By 1924 the new Soviet government favored objective, experimental approaches and virtually proscribed "spiritual" psychology, leaving some questions open: did the teaching of Vladislavlev disappear, or was it absorbed into other trends in Soviet psychology? Are introspective approaches still relevant for psychological research today?

Keywords

M. I. Vladislavlev, Russian philosophy,
St Petersburg Imperial University, Introspective psychology, Will

Author Information

IRINA ANATOLYEVNA MIRONENKO is doctor of psychological science and professor at St Petersburg State University. She has many publications (in Russian and in English) on history of psychology and theoretical psychology, also on understanding Russian psychology in

international context, for example, her book: *Rossiyskaya psikhologia v prostranstve mirovoy nauki* (Russian psychology in the context of international science) (2015).

Address for Correspondence

Irina Anatolyevna Mironenko, Faculty of Psychology,
St Petersburg State University, 7/9 Universitetskaya nab.,
St Petersburg, 199034, Russian Federation.
Email: mironenko.irina1@gmail.com



One of the more interesting introspectionist psychologists in late-nineteenth-century Russia was Mikhail Ivanovich Vladislavlev (1840–1890), professor of philosophy at St Petersburg Imperial University (now St Petersburg State University). His books are mostly represented by single copies on the old-book shelves of central libraries and do not attract much attention from readers. For a long time, the main historical analysis of his work was a brief mention in a broad history by Budilova (1960), in the framework of the debate between “materialism and idealism” in Russian psychology before the Revolution. One small monograph about Vladislavlev (Bolshakova, 1997) was published in 500 copies at a provincial university over twenty years ago and is difficult to find. Nonetheless, Vladislavlev was a prominent philosopher of his time who published some serious work on psychology.

Son of a village priest, Vladislavlev graduated from seminary and was enrolled in the St Petersburg Theological Academy. He did not graduate from the academy to follow a religious profession; instead, he competed at the university for a grant to study in Germany, and he succeeded in receiving it. With this step he was following an important Russian academic trend, as will be discussed below. In 1867 Vladislavlev began teaching philosophy at St Petersburg Imperial University, as professor of philosophy from 1869; he was dean of the historical-philosophical faculty 1885–1887, and finally served as rector of the university 1887–1890. In addition to his translation of Kant’s *Critique of Pure Reason* (1867) and some books on logic and on history of philosophy, he left behind several large volumes (1866, 1879, 1881b) that develop his conception of psychology. In those decades he taught and likely influenced many people who later became leaders in Russian psychology and philosophy: Aleksandr Ivanovich Vvedensky (1856–1925), N. Ya. Grot, N. N. Lange, and others.

In the nineteenth and early twentieth century, Russian psychology, like most other disciplines, was an integral, well-established part of international scholarship. Russian psychologists communicated freely with their foreign colleagues and took part in the European development of psychology. Most of the leading Russian intellectuals of this generation had advanced education

in Europe, and this was certainly true of those who contributed to the development of Russian psychology. Most prominent in the Russian psychological tradition was Ivan Mikhailovich Sechenov (1829–1905), a physiologist who studied engineering in St Petersburg and then graduated medical school in Moscow. He spent three and a half years (1856–1860), studying physiology, chemistry, and physics with luminaries of the German universities: in Berlin (Johannes Müller, Emil du Bois-Reymond, Heinrich Magnus), Heidelberg (Hermann Helmholtz, Robert Bunsen), Leipzig (Felix Hoppe-Seyler), and Vienna (Carl Ludwig). He spent another year (1862–1863) in the Paris laboratory of Claude Bernard, where he began his important research on nerve inhibition. Sechenov's work was influential both in Europe and in Russia, and Pavlov called him the father of Russian physiology and scientific psychology.

Vladimir Mikhailovich Bekhterev (1857–1927) is another prominent example of a Russian scientist who was educated abroad. He graduated from the Military Medical Academy in St Petersburg in 1873 and studied in St Petersburg Medico-Surgical Academy; later he was awarded an eighteen-month travel scholarship to study and conduct research in Germany and in Paris (1884–1885). During this trip he worked with and learned from a variety of notable contributors to psychology and psychiatry, such as Wilhelm Wundt, Paul Flechsig, Theodor Meynert, Carl Westphal, Emil du Bois-Reymond, and Jean Martin Charcot.

A generation later, Aleksander Fyodorovich Lazursky (1874–1917) graduated from the Military Medical Academy in St Petersburg in 1897 and then had two years of study abroad in Germany, where he carried out research in Wilhelm Wundt's Institute for Experimental Psychology in Leipzig and in the laboratory of experimental psychology that the psychiatrist Emil Kraepelin installed in his clinic in Heidelberg; he also attended lectures by Carl Stumpf in Berlin. Although Lazursky died rather young, his ideas about psychological observation ("natural experimentation") continued to be very influential in Bekhterev's circle in St Petersburg (called Leningrad 1924–1991).

Sergei Leonidovich Rubinstein (1889–1960) was educated in Western Europe during the final years of Imperial Russia.

Graduating from secondary school in Odessa with a gold medal (first in his class) in 1908, he had all his higher education in Germany – at Marburg University, where he studied with Neo-Kantian philosophers Hermann Cohen and Paul Natorp. There, in 1914, he defended his Ph.D. dissertation in philosophy, “On the Problem of Method”. When the Great War began and he suddenly found himself in enemy territory, Rubinstein went back to Russia. A German philosopher by training, Rubinstein’s work eventually moved in a rather different direction: in the mid-1930s he established himself as the leading theoretician of Soviet Marxist psychology.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, Russian psychology was characterized by several different trends, reflecting the various directions that were studied abroad and continued at home. Chronologically, and to use a term that was current then, the first approach was spiritual, that is to say moral and religious. This type of psychology flourished in university departments of history, philosophy, and philology, as well as in the academies and seminaries of the Russian Orthodox Church. Prominent representatives of this approach were Lev Mikhailovich Lopatin (1855–1920), Nikolai Aleksandrovich Berdyaev (1874–1948), Boris Petrovich Vysheslavtsev (1877–1954), Semen Liudvigovich Frank (1877–1950), Lev Platonovich Karsavin (1882–1952), and Ivan Aleksandrovich Ilyin (1883–1954). In a variety of ways, influenced by Christian teachings, these philosophers explored questions such as freedom of the will, moral sensibility, and human existence (Abul’khanova-Slavskaya, 1997, pp. 36–48).

A second trend among Russian psychologists was based on modern European traditions, particularly the works of main-line psychologists such as Wundt, who developed an approach to psychology that employed quantitative and experimental methods. Nikolai Yakovlevich Grot (1852–1899) and Georgy Ivanovich Chelpanov (1862–1936) were prominent representatives of this line of Russian psychology. With his background in German philosophy Vladislavlev generally belonged to this trend, though he departed from it in some important respects, especially as he reflected some themes of Orthodox religion.

The third trend in pre-revolutionary Russian psychology included those who followed Sechenov and shared his concept

of objective, experimental research in psychology – a scientific approach that eschewed metaphysical theories. Russian physiologists – particularly Sechenov, Aleksei Alekseyevich Ukhtomsky (1875–1942), and Ivan Petrovich Pavlov (1849–1936) – were most important in establishing this trend. Sechenov, who emphasized objective research on mental phenomena, is generally considered the founder of this trend. He taught that the objective factors that cause psychic acts should be discovered and analyzed – in particular, that mental phenomena originate in physiological acts. Pavlov’s classical conditioning was developed within this framework. Bekhterev, Sergei Sergeievich Korsakov (1854–1900), Ivan Alekseyevich Sikorsky (1842–1919), and Nikolai Nikolaevich Lange (1858–1921) were among the Russian psychologists and psychiatrists who adhered to this line of psychological thought, which commanded considerable authority both inside and outside of Russia. For example, the leaders of American behaviorism recognized the works of Pavlov and his theory of conditional reflexes as a basis for their own approach to psychological science (Watson, 1916; Murphy & Kovach, 1972; Wertheimer, 2012).

The experimental trend was pronounced in Russia even before the Revolution of 1917, although it was also often opposed. In 1879, Wundt founded the world’s first laboratory dedicated to experimental psychology in Germany, and in 1885, a psychological laboratory was already founded in Russia, by Bekhterev at Kazan University before he came back to St Petersburg. A prominent Russian scientific journal *Vestnik Znaniya* (Bulletin of knowledge) regularly published reviews and short writings by the leaders of the new experimental psychology: among them Wundt, “Natural History and Psychology” (1907); Wilhelm Jerusalem, “Handbook of Psychology” (1907), James Mark Baldwin, “Psychology and its Methods” (1908); Théodule-Armand Ribot, “Experimental Method in Psychology” (1911); as well as writings by Russian researchers. Thanks to private funding and official recognition, large research centers for psychology were opened in late imperial Russia: the Psychoneurological Institute in St Petersburg (1907), led by Bekhterev, and the Institute of Psychology in Moscow (1912), led by Chelpanov.

After the victory of Bolsheviks in the Russian Revolution 1917, the situation in Russia changed radically. The new government tried to control all spheres of social life, including science. What Petrovsky (2000) calls the period of the “political history” of Russian psychology began. The destiny of the three pre-revolutionary trends in psychology quickly changed, as the new state struck a death blow against “spiritual” psychology. By the early 1920s the situation in Soviet Russia stabilized as political opposition was crushed, and the Bolsheviks began to “put things in order”, enforcing ideological unanimity in the scientific and cultural life of the country. The dialectical materialism of Marx, Engels, and Lenin was declared to be the foundation for Soviet philosophy and science. “Idealism” was effectively suppressed. In August 1922, many scholars who championed religious themes in psychology were exiled, among them Berdyaev, Vysheslavtsev, Frank, Karsavin, and Ilyin. The idealistic, spiritual trend in psychology thus ended abruptly in Soviet Russia.

Along the road toward the violent conversion of Russian psychology into a mono-theoretical-methodological science, the next step was the abolition of the moderate European empirical trend, resulting from “the discussions” of 1923 and 1924. Chelpanov had been trying to support a diversity of approaches to psychology in the Moscow Institute, but his assistant, Konstantin Nikolayevich Kornilov (1879–1957), was a champion of Marxism. Kornilov attacked his chief in print and then replaced him as head of the Institute, marking the end of non-Marxist psychology in Soviet Russia. Soviet psychology had to be recast within the framework of a single methodology based on the philosophy of dialectical materialism, though this task was by no means a simple one that could be accomplished quickly. In any case, those who belonged to other two trends in Russian psychology were no longer relevant, perhaps not even remembered. This seems to have been the case for Vladislavlev, whose work was no longer cited even at the university where he had served as rector. What legacy might he have left behind anyway in the minds of his students, despite the later developments? It is worthwhile considering how Vladislavlev’s ideas developed before trying to answer this question.

While in Germany during the academic year 1862–1863, Vladislavlev studied at the universities of Jena and Göttingen, where he attended lectures by Kuno Fischer, Rudolf Hermann Lotze, and other prominent German philosophers. When he came back to Russia, Vladislavlev was considered a specialist of German philosophy, especially of Immanuel Kant and Jakob Friedrich Fries, who developed and systematized Kant's psychological ideas. He began lecturing at St Petersburg Imperial University, first as a docent and soon as professor of philosophy. Inspired by his German teachers Vladislavlev read deeply on psychology and wrote three bulky volumes (1866; 1879; 1881b), in which he explored the history of psychology from antiquity to his own time, outlined his own conception of the discipline of psychology, and presented a detailed examination of the structure of mental processes.

His rather original approach to introspection involved elaborate methods of questioning and methods of language analysis. He viewed psychology as a system of knowledge (*nauka*, often too simply translated as “science”) that should contain a classification and a description of mental phenomena, as well as an explanation of the patterns of their occurrence and the courses of their development. The most important goal of psychology, he argued, is the disclosure of the meaning and significance of psychic life and its individual manifestations, the interpretation of mental actions. In this sense, Vladislavlev considered psychology to be a philosophical “science”. From his point of view, psychology as the study of mental life occupies a central place in his system of metaphysics and philosophy.

Vladislavlev asserted that introspection is the main method for understanding psychic life: “We comprehend mental life of other people and animals only through self-observation [...] Information about the qualitative side of a mental phenomenon is given only by self-observation” (Vladislavlev, 1881b, v. 1, p. 8). However, direct self-observation can distort the actual course of the mental process. Therefore, he advised the use of indirect observation, by means of remembrance. Vladislavlev believed that a person, even without special efforts, possesses substantial knowledge of his own spiritual life, and this knowledge can be obtained through interviews. Vladislavlev recom-

mended that only educated people should be involved in such work, people who are able to understand the meaning of the research being conducted and who are serious about it. His recommendation was to ask only a few questions and to formulate them as precisely as possible.

Experimental method in psychological research was growing in popularity at that time in Germany and elsewhere, but Vladislavlev was evidently skeptical about it, pointing out limitations in its application. One fundamental limitation on experimental research is the possible methodological danger it presents – experimental procedures can disturb normal mental functions of the subject. He also pointed out that the experimental method is limited due to the impossibility of arbitrarily invoking any particular psychological phenomenon, as well as the impossibility of an isolated study of any process that normally appears as a part of an integral mental activity.

More fruitful methods of psychological research, Vladislavlev suggested, would involve analysis of works of art and analysis of language. Works of art provide “a second world of psychological facts, comprehended by the imagination” (1881b, v. 1, p. 19). However, he believed that art’s best use would be as raw material for the psychologist’s analysis – for example, to illustrate theories or research findings.

Vladislavlev found language to be the richest source of psychological knowledge. He suggested a variety of methods for psychological research on language. First, he focused on an analysis of the lexicon, the words a language uses to characterize mental phenomena. Words contain common knowledge about the categories and qualities of psychological phenomena, knowledge that can substantially aid our understanding of psychology. To mine these linguistic sources for psychological knowledge, Vladislavlev recommended a comparative analysis of these concepts in various languages as well as a comparative analysis of the use of these concepts throughout history. He also paid considerable attention to the study of the syntactic structure of speech, believing that syntax reveals subtle dynamics of mental processes.

Vladislavlev’s most complete conception of psychology was outlined in two large volumes (more than 1000 pages alto-

gether) entitled *Psikhologiya: issledovaniya osnovnykh yavleniy dushevnoy zhizni* (Psychology: An investigation of the basic phenomena of psychic life) (1881b). This work focused on volitional phenomena, the will, in ways rarely addressed by psychologists, even at that time. Vladislavlev regarded the will as the ultimate source of all the activities of the individual; it determines the structure and function of all psychic processes. He proposed a multilevel classification of volitional phenomena and comprehensive analyses of each level and type. Of special interest is the way he addressed the problem of freedom of the will, based on his original philosophical anthropology, which in many ways was close to the ideas of the Russian Orthodox philosophers of his time.

Vladislavlev's view on human essence and existence, his "anthropology", is the key to understanding his reasoning about human psychology. It is the basis of his ideas on psychological function and structure. He assumed that the human is the creation of the Supreme Being and is part of the created universe, which is based on certain principles of harmony. Every person is inscribed in the universal "hierarchy" – humans are above animals, and above them are other forms of life unknown to them. He insisted that there is no reason to deny the existence of the latter just because we do not know about them; for example, ants do not suspect the existence of people, because they do not possess the abilities necessary for such cognition.

The mainstream of twentieth-century thought is based on an implicit philosophy of humanity that is rooted in Western culture, individualistic in its essence. A good example of this line of thinking is the Theory of Basic Human Values, developed by the social psychologist Shalom H. Schwartz (1992). Vladislavlev built on a quite different model, more typical of the Russian philosophy of his time. In his view a human being is always regarded as part of something more important than himself or herself. Every human being is a part of the universe, a part of the universal hierarchy. Human beings exist in the universe, where the coordinate space is given by the categories of Good and Evil, which can never be fully understood or explicated by the human mind and can only be conceived by means of an a priori "moral feeling", somewhat like the "categorical imperative" of Kant.

These moral “spatial coordinates” are more important than any particular individual, than his or her loved ones, indeed more important than humanity as a whole. The meaning and logic of a human life can only be understood and judged in relation to the universe. Human life is not enough to provide for the “meaning” of human existence, and the meaning of human life and human aspirations cannot be conceived within the limits of any one human life. There are “instinctual drives of the human soul”, the ultimate goals of which lie beyond our consciousness and beyond the limits of individual human existence. The human soul strives for knowledge, goodness, and beauty; however, in earthly existence absolute knowledge, beauty, and good are unattainable. “Obeying these drives, we go along the line, which terminates outside the scope of our existence”. (Vladislavlev, 1881b, vol. 2, p. 337)

Vladislavlev’s understanding of the freedom of the will must be viewed in this context: not as freedom from external compulsion, but as freedom of the human personality from his or her own individual passions. Vladislavlev states that a human is not free to change his or her nature, since he or she was created thus by the Supreme Being. However, a person has free will, which manifests itself in actions. The Creator is also limited in His freedom, in one sense: having created a person, He does not have power over that person’s actions thereafter. For their actions, people themselves are responsible.

A human, a priori and by nature, is endowed with the “instinctive drives of the human soul” (Vladislavlev, 1881b, vol. 2, p. 450): 1) the desire for life, and 2) moral principles and aspirations. The psyche is a means for realizing these drives, which are subsequently differentiated into an extensive system. These drives determine general psychic structure and functions. The leading role is that of the Will, the generator of all psychic activity. Vladislavlev’s concept of the Will is somewhat different from that used by most psychologists during the second half of the twentieth century – for them will is related to motivational conflicts and to the suppression and abrogation of disapproved motives. For Vladislavlev human nature is viewed as normally being in harmony with the world and with itself. Thus, the Will is equated with the positive, driving forces of human nature.

Following his basic desires and inclinations, a person strives to strengthen his being, to expand his scope and means, and also to make his life significant and beautiful.

Vladislavlev distinguished several categories of phenomena of the Will (mostly “drives” or “attraction”, *vlechenie*):

1. attraction to favorable conditions for all kinds of activities and aversion to unfavorable conditions;
2. attraction to rapprochement with other living beings and aversion to conflicting conditions;
3. attraction to a more valuable life, to high moral forces, and to the exaltation of one’s existence;
4. the drive to continue life, striving for greater activity and freedom, for a significant life, for solid goals and strong abilities; and
5. the drive to realize moral values, to do good.

Vladislavlev offered some discussion of unconscious phenomena in the human psyche, decades earlier than Sigmund Freud did. Unlike Freud, however, Vladislavlev considered the unconscious as entirely good. The human is entirely good by his nature, endowed with moral instinct. If a man turns to evil, it is the result of mistakes, departures from the moral instinct. Life is not easy. Human beings can become confused or entangled in their individual desires. On such occasions a false entity emerges, something like Mr Hyde’s personality coming out of Dr Jekyll, which turns out to be a great misfortune for Dr Jekyll.

Aside from some unconscious phenomena, the Will launches and directs all other psychic processes. Thus, desire precedes emotional experience: if there was no desire to live, then death would not be frightening. The Will launches and directs cognitive processes also. The two highest cognitive abilities are reflection and imagination.

In contemporary psychology, there is hardly any place for imagination; as soon as we begin talking about creative intelligence, there seems to be no need for imagination as a separate process, so most cognitive psychologists today simply ignore imagination in their theories. In Vladislavlev’s theory, however, imagination has a critical place in the structure of psychological

processes: the intelligence is divided into two processes – reflection and imagination – which always work together. They both perform the same functions: they combine scattered impressions into holistic images; they make images of objects into abstract concepts; they perform analysis, equation, and differentiation of things. Although they work together to perform these functions, the purposes and means of reflection and imagination are distinct.

Reflection follows the rules of logic. Thus, it recognizes objects as similar in those cases where the signs of similarity prevail over the signs of difference, after performing the analysis of the signs. Imagination does not do such preliminary work; it directly reveals similarities in things, based on particular, often random, signs. We can say that the imagination creates a similarity between objects, finding similarity in the animate and the inanimate, transforming the abstract into the concrete, etc. Unlike reflection, which is aimed at cognizing the world as it is, imagination is not bound by the laws of logic and remains free.

Like reflection, imagination is generated entirely by phenomena of the Will, by human beings' wants and aspirations. It serves to satisfy two basic desires: (1) the desire to repose on "small impressions", jokes, or fun – things that do not require great exertion and provide needed rest to psychological life; and (2) the desire for a valuable and substantial existence. Through the imagination the soul aspires to the universe of ideals. Imagination creates the universe of ideals, moral and aesthetic, by which we are guided in life and by which we adorn our lives.

Thus, the world of art, created by the imagination, originated from the need of the soul to be assured of some place where it can find repose and experience enjoyment. But art also has another important and serious goal that puts it above science: in art, life, and religion, imagination creates for us a world of ideals, helping us to strive for these ideals, things that in reality are never fully attainable, but are still necessary for humans. This is the most important function of the imagination; in fact, it is the function of creativity.

There are individual and age differences in imagination. Children tend to have vivid imaginations; the slightest excuse causes a child's imagination to race. Imagination in old people

is sluggish, by contrast; mature judgment and reasoned decisions are partly based on the weakening of imagination in old age. There are also individual differences in the energy levels of imagination. People with exceedingly high imaginative energy become bright artistic types if they turn to art; however, they can also become liars and swindlers.

Another feature is the fertility of imagination. Fertile imagination is endowed with inexhaustible resources to create new images and their combinations. A fertile imagination, if it is directed towards science or art, can yield abundant fruits. Imagination directed toward evil becomes a source of mischief, dubious entertainment, and harmful projects. The meager imagination is not rich in forces for new constructions; it is dry, devoid of brightness and clarity. Vladislavlev also distinguished between imagination that is either original or imitative, either sublime or low. The type of intelligence where reflection and imagination work together is a gift of nature, but to become mature, intelligence always needs nurturing, provided by culture, by art, and by science.

Because of the radical “experimental” shift in Russian psychology a century ago, Vladislavlev’s name is hardly known to psychologists today, even in the university where he worked, but his writings now deserve new consideration. Some of the broad, anthropological aspects of his view of psychological science may have survived in other forms into the Soviet period, for example. Research in psychology today develops in the context of a new global modernity, which calls for renovation of the general domain of psychology, new objects of research, and changes in methodology and in diversification. Psychology has even begun to investigate subjective phenomena once again. The work of introspectionists of the late nineteenth century should find their proper place in the history of psychology; their ideas might even contribute to its contemporary development.



Acknowledgment

This research was supported by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research (Project No. 20–013–00260).

References

- Abul'khanova-Slavskaya, K. A., et al. (1997). *Psikhologicheskaya nauka v Rossii XX stoletiya. Problemy teorii i istorii*. [Psychological science in Russia during the twentieth century: Problems of theory and history]. (A. V. Brushlinsky, Ed.). Moscow: Institute of Psychology, Russian Academy of Sciences.
- Bolshakova, V. V. (1997). *Ocherki istorii russkoy psikhologii (XIX – nachalo XX vv): Ch. 2, Russkiy volyutarizm: M. I. Vladislavlev* [Essays on the history of Russian psychology of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Part 2: Russian voluntarism: M. I. Vladislavlev]. Nizhny Novgorod: VVAGS.
- Budilova, E. A. (1960). *Bor'ba materializma i idealizma v Russkoy psikhologicheskoy nauke. Vtoraya polovina XIX – nachalo XX v.* [The struggle between materialism and idealism in Russian psychological science, second half of the nineteenth century to the beginning of the twentieth century]. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.
- Kant, I. (1867). *Kritika chistogo rasuma* [Critique of pure reason] (M. I. Vladislavlev, Trans). St Petersburg: N. Tiblena (N. Neklyudova).
- Murphy, G., & Kovach, J. K. (1972). *Historical Introduction to Modern Psychology*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Petrovsky, A. V. (2000). *Psikhologiya v Rossia v XX stoletii* [Psychology in Russia during the twentieth century]. Moscow: URAO Publishers.
- Schwarz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 25, 1–65.
- Vladislavlev, M. I. (1866). *Sovremennye napravleniya v nauke o dushe* [Modern trends in the science of the soul]. St Petersburg: N. Tiblen and Co. (N. Neklyudova).
- Vladislavlev, M. I. (1868). *Filosofiya Plotina, osnovatelya Novoplatonovskoy shkoly* [The philosophy of Plotinus, founder of the Neoplatonic school]. St Petersburg: V. Golovin.
- Vladislavlev, M. I. (1879). *Leksii po psikhologii* [Lectures on psychology]. St Petersburg: Pazovskogo.
- Vladislavlev, M. I. (1881a). *Logika: Obozrenie induktivnykh i deduktivnykh priemov myshleniya i istorich. ocherki: logiki Aristotelya skholarstich. dialektiki, logiki formal'noy i induktivnoy* [Logic: Review of inductive and deductive thinking techniques and his-

- torical essays on the logic of Aristotle, scholastic dialectics, and formal and inductive logic]. St Petersburg: V. Bezobrazov.
- Vladislavlev, M. I. (1881b). *Psikhologiya: issledovaniya osnovnykh yavleniy dushevnoy zhizni* [Psychology: An investigation of the main phenomena of psychic life]. 2 vols St Petersburg: V. Bezobrazov.
- Vladislavlev, M. I. (1885a). *Istoriya khristianskoy filosofii. Lektsii* [History of Christian philosophy: Lectures]. St Petersburg: Grobovoy.
- Vladislavlev, M. I. (1885b). *Lektsii po istorii filosofii*. [Lectures on the history of philosophy]. St Petersburg: Grobovoy.
- Vladislavlev, M. I. (1887). *Lektsii po logike* [Lectures on logic]. St Petersburg: Mikhailov.
- Watson, J. B. (1916). The place of the conditioned reflex in psychology. *Psychological Review*, 23, 89–116.
- Wertheimer, M. (2012). *A brief history of psychology*, 5th ed. New York: Psychology Press.

