NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY
HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

Manuscript

Tikhon G. Sheynov

Interpretation of Classical Political Thought in the Philosophy of H. Arendt and L. Strauss

Dissertation Summary

For the purpose of obtaining academic degree

Doctor of Philosophy in Philosophy

Academic supervisor:

DSc, Professor

Alexander V. Pavlov

Moscow

2025

Contents

Introduction 3

Relevance of the research 3

State of research on the topic 4

Object and subject of the research 13

Source base of the research 13

Goal and objectives of the research 14

Research methodology 15

Scientific novelty of the research 16

Theses for defence 17

Theoretical and practical significance of the research 19

Approbation of research results 19

Main content of the work 20

Conclusion 26

Introduction

Relevance of the research

One of the influential trends in modern moral, social and political philosophy is an attempt to rethink and include in the current theoretical reflection the categories of classical ethics and political thought. As a rule, interest in the classics can be explained by two interrelated reasons. On the one hand, the rapid socio-political processes associated with the transformation of forms of social life call into question the possibility of using the established in the tradition of modernity political and ethical categories to phenomena that had no historical precedents. On the other hand, the reason for the philosophical interest in classical ethical-political models is the crisis of the project of modernity, which assumed the formation of a sovereign, autonomous, rationally thinking subject and an impersonal, ethically neutral state[1].

Over the past fifty years, the narrative of criticism of modernity and a return to the classics has become central or, at least, essential to a variety of disparate ethical and political-philosophical theories[2]. In the context of modern trends towards the modernization of classical arguments and models, Hannah Arendt and Leo Strauss occupy an exceptional place. Both philosophers contributed to the revival of interest in the classics in both American and European academia of the last century. Their idea of returning to the classics combines both the recognition of the problematic nature of modern politics and philosophy, which need to be revised and overcome, and an attempt to use classical categories and ways of thinking to explain new phenomena that surpass the theoretical possibilities of the modern tradition.

Thus, the relevance of the dissertation research is determined by the following considerations:

---

[1] For more details, see, for example: Martyanov V.S. Historical Formation and Transformation of the Political Narrative of Modernity. Diss. … Doctor of Political Affairs. (5.5.1). Moscow: Institute of Physics of the Ural Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences. P. 4.

[2] See, e.g., F. Pettit, Republicanism. Theory of Freedom and State Government; preface. A.V. Pavlova. Moscow, Gaidar Institute Publ., 2016, Skinner K. Freedom before liberalism / ed. by O.V. Kharkhordin. St. Petersburg: Evrop Publishing House. University in St. Petersburg, 2006, Pocock J. Machiavelli's Moment: The Political Thought of Florence and the Atlantic Republican Tradition. Moscow: New Literary Observer, 2020, Vergara C. Systemic Corruption. Constitutional Ideas for a Non-Oligarchic Republic. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2020, McCormick J. P. Democracy, Plutocracy and the Populist Cry of Pain // Populism, Demagoguery and Rhetoric in Historical Perspective / G. Balacii and R. Goodman (eds.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2024, Kharkhordin O.V. Plebeian Republicanism: The End of Oligarchy or Aristocracy? Russian Sociological Review. 2025. Vol. 24. №1. Pp. 33-50, Foucault M. Speech and Truth. Lectures on Parrhesia (1982–1983) / transl. from French by D. Kralechkin. Moscow: Publishing House "Delo" RANEPA, 2020, Riker P. Practical reason, transl. from French by A.V. Breus // Russian Sociological Review. 2021. Vol. 20. №3. Pp. 129-148, McIntyre A. After Virtue: Studies of the Theory of Morality. Translated from English by V.V. Tselishchev. Moscow, Akademicheskiy Proekt Publ., 2000, Nussbaum M. The fragility of goodness: luck and ethics in Greek tragedy and philosophy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001, Sandel M. Democracy's Discontent: America in Search of a Public Philosophy. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1996.

1. The general interest of philosophers of recent decades in the rehabilitation of the concepts and arguments of classical philosophy to solve the problems of modern political life. As the inspirers of this intellectual movement, offering a fundamental critique of the modern project and bringing many categories of the classical back into contemporary reflection on politics, Arendt and Strauss continue to influence today's discussions about the social, political, and ethical issues of contemporary societies. It seems that a comprehensive comparative analysis of the prerequisites, strategies and consequences of Arendt's and Strauss's interpretation of classical political thought will contribute to the understanding of the current state of politics in its various, specific aspects.

2. The need to clarify the features of the Arendtian and Straussian approaches to the modernization of classical political thought, considered not separately, but in comparison, which will make it possible to determine whether the features of the philosophy of the ancients identified by Arendt and Strauss are not contradictory interpretations, but two sides of the same coin.

3. The ambiguous status that ideas based on the interpretation of the classics in the philosophy of Arendt and Strauss have in modern political and philosophical discussions. In this regard, the question remains whether the interpretations of classical political thought by Arendt and Strauss are able to provide modern philosophers not only with grounds for criticizing the status quo, but also with tools for understanding and correcting the situation.

State of research on the topic

In foreign research literature, the comparison of various aspects of Arendt's and Strauss's philosophy is the subject of several studies. In general, they can be divided into three groups. The first group consists of works devoted to the influence on thinkers of the intellectual environment in which their philosophical formation took place (namely, German philosophy at the beginning of the last century), as well as the influence of philosophers themselves on the intellectual environment in which they found themselves as a result of emigration (namely, American political science in the second half of the last century). The main reason for the interest of researchers in this topic was the general social and life circumstances that influenced the formation of the philosophical views of Arendt and Strauss and made it possible to place these views in a single research narrative, despite their substantive differences.

In 1991, the University of Colorado hosted a German-American conference to consider Arendt and Strauss in the role of German immigrants, whose philosophical and political views absorbed the experience accumulated during the years of German education and evolved as a result of interaction with American political and political-philosophical culture. Based on this

conference, a collective monograph was published[3]. Despite the fact that the title of the collection mentions the names of Arendt and Strauss together, most of the publications included in it are devoted to only one of the philosophers. and there the ideas of philosophers are not compared, but are considered in isolation from each other)[4].

Benjamin Wurgaft in his book "Thinking in Public" (2015)[5], addresses the figures of Arendt, Strauss and Levinas from a philosophical and biographical point of view, taking as a basis, on the one hand, their Jewish origin and the fact of their apprenticeship with Heidegger, and, on the other hand, the equally important problem of the relationship between philosophy and politics, embodied in the idea of a public intellectual.

The second group of studies is represented by works whose authors are aimed at comparing the philosophical ideas of Arendt and Strauss and, unlike the researchers mentioned above, focus not only on their similarities, but also on their differences. In the article "Philosopher vs. Citizen: Arendt, Strauss, and Socrates" (1998),[6] as well as in the chapter "Hannah Arendt and Leo Strauss: Citizenship vs. Philosophy" of the book "Socratic Citizenship" (2001)[7] Dana Villa examines Arendt's and Strauss's interpretations of Socrates' philosophy. Villa draws attention to the fact that Socrates adheres to an unusual position for contemporary civic culture on the relationship between intellectual and civic virtues, as a result of which he gave "individual moral conscience and intellectual honesty priority over traditional civic virtue".[8] In this context, in addition to Arendt's and Strauss's interpretations of Socratic thought, Villa explores other approaches that inherit this position, such as the theory of John Stuart Mill, Nietzsche's moral philosophy, as well as Weber's reasoning about the rationalization of politics and inflation of philosophical knowledge.

Ronald Beiner examines the possible intellectual connections between Arendt and Strauss, describing them as "uncommenced dialogue"[9]. In his opinion, allusions to Arendt's criticism of Strauss's key positions on the treatment of classical thought can be contained in various works: for example, in the Vita Activa, where Arendt criticizes political Platonism for building an erroneous hierarchy between the active and contemplative life (a hierarchy that Strauss defended), or in

[3] Kielmansegg P. G., Mewes H., Glaser-Schmidt E. (eds) Hannah Arendt and Leo Strauss: German Emigres and American Political Thought after World War II. Cambridge: German Historical Institute, 1995.
[4] Kateb G. Questionable Influence of Arendt (and Strauss) / P. G. Kielmansegg, H. Mewes, E. Glaser-Schmidt (eds) Hannah Arendt and Leo Strauss: German Emigres and American Political Thought after World War II. Cambridge: German Historical Institute, 1995. P. 29-44.
[5] Wurgaft B. Thinking in Public: Strauss, Levinas, Arendt. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015.
[6] Villa D. The Philosopher versus the Citizen: Arendt, Strauss, and Socrates // Political Theory. 1998. Vol. 26. N. 2. P. 147-172.
[7] Villa D. Socratic Citizenship. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.
[8] Ibid. P. ix.
[9] Beiner R. Hannah Arendt and Leo Strauss: Uncommenced Dialogue // Political Theory. 1990. Vol. 18. №2. P. 238-254.

lectures on Kant, where the philosopher implicitly recalls the school of Straussians when he "praises Kant for the fact that he sought to free philosophy from 'sectarianism' and limitation to 'school'".[10] Beiner believes that the image of Arendt as a philosopher who defends the authority of ancient politics at the expense of belittling philosophy is not quite adequate, suggesting that she and Strauss should be considered rather as supporters of Platonism and Kantianism on the question of the relationship between philosophy and politics. unreasonably applying the criterion of intellectual superiority to the choice of the subject of political power, as well as very naively correlating the decline of modern society with changes in the history of thought, and not in the history of politics.

In her book "The Crisis of German Historicism: The Early Political Thought of H. Arendt and L. Strauss" (2015), Leesy Keedus[11] addresses the origins of philosophers' ideas about the crisis of contemporary politics and analyzes their early texts written during Weimar Germany (in the case of Strauss) or in the early years of emigration (in the case of Arendt). Keedus's article "Liberalism and the Question of the 'Proud'" (2012)[12], on the basis of which the fourth chapter of her book was created, is devoted to a comparison of Arendt's and Strauss's interpretations of Hobbes's Leviathan. The researcher focuses on Hobbes's analysis of affects (mainly the fear of violent death and vanity), which both Arendt and Strauss consider an important stage in the formation of modern political thought. Of particular interest for this thesis is the research premise, the development of which is aimed at Keedus's comparative analysis. It lies in the fact that both Arendt and Strauss saw Hobbes as a "paradigmatic liberal", and therefore an examination of their interpretations of Leviathan will allow us to understand how thinkers saw the consequences of the expansion of liberalism as the dominant political doctrine of modernity.

Finally, the third group includes those foreign studies in which Arendt and Strauss are not directly compared, but in which aspects of their interpretations of the classics are considered important for the dissertation. A review of Strauss's writings on classical political philosophy is presented in the thematic collection of Brill published under the editorship of Timothy Burns (2015)[13]. Studies of more global themes of Strauss's philosophy, such as the crisis of modernity, "theological-political issue", criticism of liberal democracy and the social sciences, are collected in the Cambridge Collection edited by Steven Smith (2009).[14] Strauss's interpretation of Xenophon

[10] Ibid., p. 238.
[11] Keedus L. The crisis of German historicism: the early political thought of Hannah Arendt and Leo Strauss. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
[12] Keedus L. Liberalism and the Question of "The Proud": Hannah Arendt and Leo Strauss as Readers of Hobbes // of the History of Ideas. 2012. Vol. 73. N. 2. pp. 319-341.
[13] Brill's Companion to Leo Strauss' Writings on Classical Political Thought / ed. by T. Burns. Leiden, Boston: Brill Academic Publishers, 2015.
[14] The Cambridge Companion to Leo Strauss / ed. by S. Smith. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

is devoted to an article by Eric Buzzetti[15], as well as texts by Alexandre Kojève[16] and Eric Fegelin[17][18][19], Christopher Baldwin[20] and Ari Linden[21]. Strauss's interpretation of Plato's philosophy is the subject of articles by Linda Rabier[22], Stephen Smith[23], Christina Basili[24], George Klosko[25], Alan Bloom[26], Mark Lutz[27] and Constantine Constantinou[28].

Special mention should be made of the reviews of Strauss's biography, as well as the main stages and themes of his work. These include biographies by Carlo Altini[29], Daniel Tanguay[30] and Neil Robertson[31]. The intellectual dialogue between Strauss and Carl Schmitt, which played an important role in the formation of his interest in the classics, is devoted to the works of Heinrich Meier[32] and Robert Hawes[33]. Meyer focuses on the problem of the conflict between philosophy and religion, which dominated Strauss's early work and continued to influence his subsequent studies of classical thought[34]. Other historical and philosophical analyses of Strauss's work are undertaken in the book "Leo Strauss between Weimar and America" by Adi Armon (2019),[35] as

[15] Buzzetti E. A Guide to the Study of Leo Strauss' On Tyranny / Brill's Companion to Leo Strauss' Writings on Classical Political Thought. Leiden, Boston: Brill Academic Publishers, 2015. P. 227-257.
[16] Kojève A. Tyranny and Wisdom // Strauss L. O tyrannii [On Tyranny]. Translated from English and Ancient Greek. A.A. Rossius, transl. from French. A.M. Rutkevich. St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg Publishing House. University. Pp. 221-274.
[17] Fegelin E. "On Tyranny" by Leo Strauss. K. Kolkunova, nauch. Ed. by A.V. Pavlov // Sociological Review. 2011. T. 10. №3. Pp. 125-130.
[18] Sharpe M. Publicizing the Essentially Private: Leo Strauss's Platonic Aristophanes // Symposium. 2014. Vol. 18. N 2. P. 3-32.
[19] Menon M. A Lesson in Politics: Some Remarks on Leo Strauss' Socrates and Aristophanes // Philosophical readings. 2017. Vol. 9. N 1. P. 6-11.
[20] Baldwin C. Learning to Love Aristophanes: Reading Aristophanes with Strauss / Brill's Companion to Leo Strauss' Writings on Classical Political Thought / ed. by Timothy W. Burns. Leiden, Boston: Brill Academic Publishers, 2015. P. 169-189.
[21] Linden A. Thinking through "The Clouds": Comedy in Hegel and Strauss. The German Quarterly. 2017. Vol. 90. N 4. P. 423-438.
[22] Rabieh L. Leo Strauss on the Politics of Plato's Republic / Brill's Companion to Leo Strauss' Writings on Classical Political Thought. Leiden, Boston: Brill Academic Publishers, 2015. P. 323-343.
[23] Smith S. Leo Strauss's Platonic Liberalism // Political Theory. 2000. Vol. 28. N. 6. P. 787-809.
[24] Basili C. The Limits of the City: Leo Strauss's Hermeneutics and Plato's Republic // Comparative and Continental Philosophy. 2020. Vol. 12. N. 3. P. 197-210.
[25] Klosko G. The "Straussian" Interpretation of Plato's "Republic" // History of Political Thought. 1986. Vol. 7. N 2. P. 275-293.
[26] Bloom A. Interpretive Essay / the Republic of Plato: second edition. New York: Basic Books, 1991. P. 307-436.
[27] Lutz M. The Argument and the Action of Plato's Laws / Brill's Companion to Leo Strauss' Writings on Classical Political Thought. Leiden, Boston: Brill Academic Publishers, 2015. P. 424-440.
[28] Konstantinou K. Leo Strauss' "The Argument and the Action of Plato's Laws" // Dianoesis. 2022. Vol. 12. N 12. P. 307-319.
[29] Altini C. Philosophy as Stranger Wisdom: A Leo Strauss Intellectual Biography. New York: Suny Press, 2022.
[30] Tanguay D. Leo Strauss: an Intellectual Biography. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2007.
[31] Robertson N. Leo Strauss: an Introduction. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2021.
[32] Meier, H. Carl Schmitt, Leo Strauss, and "The Concept of the Political." On the Dialogue of the Absent / transl. from German by Y.Y. Korintsa. Moscow: Publishing group "Skimen", 2012.
[33] Hawes R. (Abuse). Leo Strauss and His Role in Schmitt's Resuscitation by the German Right: The Case of Heinrich Mayer / transl. from English by A. Pisarev // Logos. 2012. № 5. Pp. 68-86.
[34] Meier H. Leo Strauss and the Theologico-political Problem / transl. from Germ. from M. Brainhard. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
[35] Armon A. Leo Strauss Between Weimar and America. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019.

well as in the collection “Reorientation: Leo Strauss in the 1930s” edited by Martin Yaffe and Richard Ruderman[36].

In the studies of Arendt's work, the theme of the classics is also represented by a variety of studies. Reconstruction of Arendt's views on the crisis of modern political thought, as well as the main provisions of its political ontology, is undertaken in Bhiku Pareha's book Hannah Arendt and the Search for a New Political Philosophy (1981)[37] and in Dana Villa's book Politics, Philosophy, Terror (1999)[38]. Tama Weisman's Hannah Arendt and Karl Marx: On Totalitarianism and the Tradition of Western Political Thought (2014)[39] is devoted to a historical and philosophical review of an important episode in Arendt's early work, the interpretation of Marx's philosophy as the last representative of political Platonism in European philosophy. An important character in Arendt's interpretation of classical thought is Socrates. Arendt's interpretation of the figure of Socrates and Plato's response to Socrates' ideas about philosophy and politics are discussed in the publications of Dana Villa[40] and Margaret Canovan[41], and the conclusions that emerge from this analysis about the political significance of civil friendship (φιλία) are conceptualized in John Nixon's book[42]. An overview of the key themes of Arendt's philosophy, including the important problems of the Roman experience of the political, natality, freedom, power and subjectivity, is contained in a collective monograph published by the University of Cambridge (2000)[43] and the Bloomsbury Companion, edited by Yasemin Sari and Peter Gratton (2021).[44]

Elisabeth Young-Bruel's book “Hannah Arendt: For the Love of the World” (1982), the biographical work of Samantha Rose Hill (2021[45]), and Willa's book on the relationship and intellectual dialogue between Arendt and Heidegger[46] should be mentioned as sources for the dissertation-relevant circumstances of Arendt's personal and intellectual biography.

When analyzing the Russian studies of the legacy of Arendt and Strauss, it is necessary to highlight three features. First, there are practically no works devoted to the comparison of their

[36] Reorientation: Leo Strauss in the 1930s / ed. by Martin D. Yaffe, Richard S. Ruderman. New York: Palgrave Machmillan, 2014.
[37] Parekh B. Hannah Arendt and the Search for a New Political Philosophy. London: The Macmillan Press, 1981.
[38] Villa D. Politics, philosophy, terror: essays on the thought of Hannah Arendt. Princeton. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1999.
[39] Weisman T. Hannah Arendt and Karl Marx: On Totalitarianism and the Tradition of Western Political Thought. Plymouth: Lexington Books, 2014.
[40] Villa D. Arendt and Socrates // International Journal of Philosophy. 1999. Vol. 53. N. 208 (2). P. 241-257.
[41] Canovan M. Socrates or Heidegger? Hannah Arendt's Reflections on Philosophy and Politics // Social Research. 1990. Vol. 57. N. 1. P. 135-165.
[42] Nixon J. Hannah Arendt and the Politics of Friendship. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015.
[43] The Cambridge Companion to Hannah Arendt / ed. by D. Villa. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
[44] The Bloomsbury Companion to Arendt / ed. by Y. Sari, P. Gratton. Bloomsbury Publishing, 2021.
[45] Rose Hill S. Hannah Arendt. London: Reaction Books, 2021.
[46] Villa D. Arendt and Heidegger: The Fate of the Political. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1996.

philosophies. The exception is texts in which philosophers are placed in a broad theoretical narrative. As examples, A.A. Gloukhov's book “The Overlap of the Wave” (2014)[47], where Arendt and Strauss are depicted as representatives of the post-Nietzschean tradition of comprehension and overcoming political Platonism and are included on a par with Heidegger, Deleuze, Derrida and Foucault, as well as the work of A.V. Pavlov, devoted to the history of American political science and theory[48], where Arendt, Strauss and other political thinkers (Neumann, Popper, Berlin, Marcuse, etc.) are European emigrants who brought elements to American political science of the 1950s and 1960s anti-positivist philosophy. In both cases, the task of direct comparison of the philosophies of Arendt and Strauss is not posed, and the problematization of their relationship to classical political thought is limited or absent. For example, Gloukhov analyzes Strauss's philosophy only on the basis of the lecture "The Problem of Socrates". Pavlov, referring to researchers of American political science, focuses on the avoidance of academic dialogue with each other and the focus on revising the history of political thought, which is common to the philosophy of Arendt, Strauss and their European contemporaries, which distinguished them from their American positivist colleagues and from the theorists who followed them in the 1970s[49].

Secondly, in the studies devoted to the philosophy of Arendt and Strauss separately, there is a noticeable bias towards Arendt studies. Since the 1990s, in parallel with the translations of Arendt's key texts, there has been an increased interest in the analysis of various aspects of her political philosophy: the theory of action, moral philosophy, the concepts of totalitarianism and revolution, the categories of judgment, violence and power, etc. In recent years, the philosopher's correspondence with Karl Jaspers (2021)[50] has been translated and the book “On Violence” (2021)[51] with a detailed commentary by M. Yampolsky and the book “What is Politics?” (2025)[52] containing fragments of her handwritten works were published.[53]. Texts have also been published that focus primarily on Arendt's face-to-face dialogue with philosophers whose ideas are in tune

[47] Glukhov A.A. Overlap of the Wave: Plato's Political Logic and the Post-Nietzschean Overcoming of Platonism. Moscow: Izd. Higher School of Economics, 2014.
[48] Pavlov A.V. Civil War in Political Theory // Political Theory in the XX Century: Collection of Articles. Moscow: Publishing House "Territory of the Future", 2008. Pp. 7-40.
[49] In a similar context, the figures of Arendt and Strauss are considered by the researcher in the article devoted to the consideration of Eric Fegelin's work "The New Science of Politics: An Introduction" — see: Pavlov A.V. Seventy-Year "The New Science of Politics" // Sociological Review. 2021. T. 20. № 1. Pp. 244-261.
[50] Arendt H., Jaspers K. Letters, 1926–1969. Moscow: Gaidar Institute Publishing House, 2021.
[51] Arendt H. O nasilii [On Violence]. Moscow, Novoe izdatelstvo Publ., 2021. The second and third parts of the work "On Violence" were published in 2005 in the anthology "Morality in Politics" edited by B.G. Kapustin — see: Morality in Politics. Reader / transl. from French, English, German, Spanish, Czech. Compiled. and general Ed. B.G. Kapustina. Moscow: Universitet Book House, 2003. Pp. 312-377.
[52] Arendt H. What is Politics? Translated from German by D. Kuznitsyn. St. Petersburg: Vladimir Dal, 2025.
[53] Arendt's early wartime publications, her dissertation on the concept of love in the philosophy of Aurelius Augustine, as well as some articles and lectures of the American period in which she addresses the philosophy of Marx and Hobbes, remain untranslated and important for this dissertation.

with her own. In her dissertation (2019), M.A. Sidorova reconstructs the theory of action of Arendt and Ricoeur, showing the influence of its political philosophy on the evolution of the hermeneutic theory of the French thinker[54]. O.A. Koval correlates Arendt's ideas about the destruction of the public sphere with the existential philosophy of A. Camus[55]. In co-authorship with E.B. Kryukova, Koval also refers to the reception of Walter Benjamin's philosophy in Arendt's[56] work. Finally, D.E. Gasparyan conducts a comparative analysis of the philosophy of Arendt and M.K. Mamardashvili from the point of view of questions about the nature of thinking and morality[57].

The legacy of the Russian "Straussiana" today is much more modest. Since the end of the last century, Russian-language editions of several major works by Strauss have been published: "On Tyranny" with a commentary by Alexandre Kojève and a subsequent response by Strauss[58], "Natural Law and History"[59], a collection of articles and lectures "Introduction to Political Philosophy",[60] as well as the books "Notes on the Work of Lucretius"[61] (2019) and "The City and Man"[62] (2021) with historical and philosophical commentaries by A.N. Mishurin[63] and A.V. Pavlov,[64] respectively. Of the translated articles, of particular importance, in our opinion, are "Persecution and the Art of Writing"[65], "On the Critique of Carl Schmitt's 'Concept of the Political'" with Strauss's letters to Schmitt[66], a translated commentary by H. Meier[67] and

[54] Sidorova M.A. Ponyatie dejstvie v filosofii H. Arendt i P. Ricoeur: sopravitel'nyi analiz [The concept of action in the philosophy of H. Arendt and P. Ricoeur: comparative analysis]. Diss. … Cand. Filos. Sciences. Moscow: National Research University Higher School of Economics.
[55] Koval O.A. Krizis obshchestvennosti i perspektivy ego preodoleniia [The crisis of the community and the prospects for overcoming it]. Lessons of Arendt and Camus. 2023. T. 34. № 6. Pp. 161-177.
[56] Koval O.A., Kryukova E.B. After Benjamin: Hannah Arendt's Poetic Thinking. Journal of the Higher School of Economics. 2024. T. 8. № 1. Pp. 99–116.
[57] Gasparyan D.E. On the Way to Moral Action: The Political Dimension of a Person in H. Arendt and M. Mamardashvili. 2019. № 6. Pp. 62–75.
[58] Strauss L. O tyranii [On Tyranny]. Translated from English and Ancient Greek. A.A. Rossius, transl. from French. A.M. Rutkevich. St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg Publishing House. University, 2006.
[59] Strauss L. Natural Law and History / transl. from English by E. Adler, B. Putko. Moscow: Aquarius Publishers, 2007.
[60] Strauss L. Introduction to Political Philosophy. Moscow, Logos Publ., Praksis Publ., 2000.
[61] Strauss L. Notes on the Work of Lucretius / transl. from English by A.N. Mishurin. Moscow, OntoPrint Publ., 2019.
[62] Strauss L. Gorod i chelovek [The City and the Man]. St. Petersburg: "Vladimir Dal", 2021.
[63] Mishurin A.N. Leo Strauss. The Last Partisan // Strauss L. Notes on the Work of Lucretius / transl. from English by A.M. Mishurin. Moscow: OntoPrint. 2019. P. 153-206.
[64] Pavlov A.V. Virtue and the Ancient Polis: The Place of the Book "The City and the Man" in the Corpus of Leo Strauss's Works. 2022. T. 21. №1. Pp. 264–283.
[65] Strauss L. Persecution and the Art of Writing / transl. from English by E. Kukhar, ed. by A.V. Pavlov // Sociological Review. 2012. T. 11. № 3. Pp. 12-25.
[66] Strauss L. Three Letters to Karl Schmitt / Mayer H. Karl Schmitt, Leo Strauss and the "Concept of the Political". On the Dialogue of the Absent / transl. from German by Y.Y. Korintsa. Moscow: Publishing group "Skimen", 2012. Pp. 147-154.
[67] Mayer, H. Carl Schmitt, Leo Strauss, and "The Concept of the Political." On the Dialogue of the Absent / transl. from German by Y.Y. Korintsa. Moscow: Publishing group "Skimen", 2012.

subsequent reviews by A.V. Mikhailovsky[68] and T.A. Dmitriev[69], as well as the articles “The Spirit of Sparta and the Taste of Xenophon”[70], “Xenophon's Anabasis”[71] (2021), “Remarks on the Gods in the Work of Thucydides”[72] (2019), “A Note on the Plan Beyond Good and Evil”[73] (2020), and “The Crisis of Our Time and the Crisis of Political Philosophy”[74] (2025).

At the same time, Strauss's most important texts remain little known to the Russian-speaking reader. We are talking about the books “Thoughts on Machiavelli”,[75] “The Political Philosophy of Thomas Hobbes: Its Basis and Genesis”[76], “Philosophy and Law: A Contribution to the Understanding of Maimonides and His Predecessors”[77] and “Spinoza's Critique of Religion”,[78] “Socrates and Aristophanes”[79] and “Argument and Action in Plato's Laws”[80]. Despite the fact that reference to these works is necessary for a holistic understanding of the essence and evolution of Strauss's political-philosophical, historical-philosophical, and cultural-philosophical ideas, they are presented in Russian studies in a generally modest and indirect way, for example, in the form of a mention of “Thoughts on Machiavelli” in S.E. Lyubimov's study of modern interpretations of Machiavelli[81]. Important exceptions are the appeal to Strauss's ideas about Hobbes in the series of articles “The Relevance of Hobbes's Philosophy” by A.F. Filippov (2008),[82] as well as A.N. Mishurin's dissertation “Knowledge and Power in the Political Philosophy of Leo Strauss” (2014)[83] (the only Russian-language dissertation devoted to Strauss at

[68] Mikhailovsky A.V. Political Philosophy vs. Political Theology: On the Book of Heinrich Mayer / Mayer H. Karl Schmitt, Leo Strauss and the "Concept of the Political". On the Dialogue of the Absent / transl. from German by Y.Y. Korintsa. Moscow: Publishing group "Skimen", 2012. Pp. 169-191.
[69] Dmitriev T.A. Dispute about the foundations of the political: Leo Strauss versus Karl Schmitt. 2012. T. 11. № 3. Pp. 26-40.
[70] Strauss L. Dukh Sparta i vkus Ksenofonta [The spirit of Sparta and the taste of Ksenophon]. Philosophical Journal. 2022. № 38. Pp. 137-166.
[71] Strauss L. "Anabasis" by Xenophon / transl. from English by A.N. Mishurin // Vox. Philosophical Journal. 2021. № 32. Pp. 51-82.
[72] Strauss L. General Remarks on the Gods in the Work of Thucydides / transl. from English by A.N. Mishurin // Vox. Philosophical Journal. 2019. № 26. Pp. 98-114.
[73] Strauss L. A note on the plan "On the other side of good and evil" / transl. from English by A.N. Mishurin // Vox. Philosophical Journal. 2020. № 28. Pp. 44-62.
[74] Strauss L. Krizis nashego vremeni i krizis politicheskoi filosofii [The Crisis of Our Time and the Crisis of Political Philosophy]. Philosophical Journal. 2025. № 48. Pp. 173-200.
[75] Strauss L. Thoughts on Machiavelli. Illinois: The Free Press, 1958.
[76] Strauss L. The Political Philosophy of Hobbes: its Basis and its Genesis. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1952.
[77] Strauss L. Philosophy and law: Contributions to the Understanding of Maimonides and his Predecessors. New York: State University of New York Press, 1995.
[78] Strauss L. Spinoza's Critique of Religion. New York: Schoken books, 1965.
[79] Strauss L. Socrates and Aristophanes. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1996.
[80] Strauss L. The Argument and the Action of Plato's Laws. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1998.
[81] Lyubimov S.E. Religioznoe uchenie Niccolò Machiavelli v sovremennykh interpretatsiyah: sravnitel'nyi analiz [The religious doctrine of Niccolò Machiavelli in modern interpretations: comparative analysis]. 2018. №5. Pp. 200-208.
[82] Filippov A.F. Actuality of Hobbes' Philosophy. Article One // Sociological Review. 2009. T. 8. № 3. Pp. 102–112; Filippov A.F. Actuality of Hobbes' Philosophy. Article Two // Sociological Review. 2009. T. 8. № 3. Pp. 113-122.
[83] Mishurin A.N. Znanie i vlast' v politicheskoi filosofii Leo Strauss [Knowledge and power in the political philosophy of Leo Strauss]. Diss. … Cand. Filos. (23.00.01). Moscow: Institute of Physics of the Russian Academy of Sciences.

the moment), in which the content of books on Machiavelli, Spinoza and Maimonides is reconstructed and built into the problems of the relationship between knowledge and power in Strauss's philosophy.

Thirdly, it is necessary to note several Russian studies of the philosophy of Arendt and Strauss, which are close to the context of the thesis's problems. These will include works devoted to the interpretations of classical political thought by Arendt and Strauss. In addition to the above-mentioned texts by Glukhov and Mishurin, we note the publication by M.A. Sidorova devoted to the role of the Socratic daimon in Arendt's theory of thought and action, where the author pays attention to Arendt's late works on Socrates[84]. The article by A.G. Zhavoronkov is devoted to Arendt's lecture "Philosophy and Politics"[85]. Here, the author draws attention to the philological inaccuracies and free assumptions that Arendt makes when referring to Plato's dialogues. I.V. Dudenkova traces the origin of the concept of "natality" in Arendt's philosophy, analyzing her dissertation on Aurelius Augustine, revealing the ambivalent meaning of human "birth" and comparing this problem with the study of biopolitics[86]. Especially important is Dudenkova's thesis that in Arendt's work a consistent logical transition from natality to free action (and therefore to politics) becomes possible only if the fact of human birth is theologically rooted. Strauss's project of returning to the classics, such as the prerequisites for its emergence, the German research tradition on the basis of which it developed, as well as the American intellectual culture in which Strauss found himself after emigrating and to which his criticism was directed[87]. Finally, S.A. Akaev examines Strauss's views on the methodology of the history of philosophy in the lens of the modern theory of intellectual virtues[88]. Following I. Ward, the author identifies three key intellectual virtues of the historian of political thought, stemming from the principles of Straussian hermeneutics: modesty, impartiality, and prudence.

Thus, the analysis of the literature directly or indirectly touching upon the problems of the dissertation testifies to the interest of foreign researchers in comparing the views of Arendt and Strauss. In the analysis of the similarities and differences of these views, their historical-philosophical or biographical component prevails, which is studied with the aim of historical and

[84] Sidorova M.A. Daimonion as a metaphor of the acting and thinking Who in the philosophy of H. Arendt. 2015. № 12. Pp. 166-174.
[85] Zhavoronkov A.G. Philosopher and the State: Hannah Arendt on the Philosophy of Socrates. Russian Sociological Review. 2017. Vol. 16. № 3. Pp. 303-318.
[86] Dudenkova I.V. Beginning, Birth, Action: Augustine and the Political Thought of Hannah Arendt. Russian Sociological Review. 2015. Vol. 14. №1. Pp. 105–119.
[87] Dmitriev T.A. Classics and History of Political Philosophy: The Case of Leo Strauss // Classics and Classics in Social and Humanitarian Knowledge. Moscow, Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie Publ., 2009. Pp. 155–180.
[88] Akaev S.A. Intellectual Virtues of the Historian of Political Philosophy: Leo Strauss's Approach. 2022. № 81. Pp. 117–130.

philosophical contextualization of the views of philosophers on the problem of modernity. In the works devoted to the content of Arendt's and Strauss's interpretations of classical political thought, we can talk about the fragmentary nature of the material chosen by researchers, on the basis of which the comparison is made. As a result, the volume of this material does not exhaust the total volume of studies in which Arendt and Strauss reflect on the features of classical political thought separately. The reason for this approach, in our opinion, is the methodological premise, according to which the points of contact between the philosophies of Arendt and Strauss are found in specific historical and philosophical subjects, the interpretation of which is found in both philosophers (namely, the philosophy of Plato and Socrates, as well as Hobbes's Leviathan). As a result, works in which Arendt explores classical subjects not touched upon by Strauss, as well as works in which Strauss comments on authors that are not addressed by Arendt, are not considered by researchers as material for comparing their interpretations of the classics. For example, in studies devoted to the comparative analysis of the ideas of Arendt and Strauss, we do not find reference to Strauss's analysis of Xenophon's dialogue Hiero or the comedies of Aristophanes, nor to Arendt's reflections on the pre-philosophical understanding of law among the ancient Greeks, or to the Roman experience of freedom conceptualized in Augustine.

The dissertation will offer an alternative research optics, in which the comparative analysis of Arendt's and Strauss's interpretations of classical political thought will be based not on common authors, in whom they both have an interest, but on a common philosophical narrative, which can be traced in their writings on the classics and is built around common categories that describe the fundamental features of political and philosophical life. It seems that this step will make it possible not only to make the comparative analysis of Arendt's and Strauss's approaches to the classics more thorough, but also to move to the plane of modern application of those ideas that Arendt and Strauss considered the most essential for classical thinking.

Object and subject of the research

The object of the research is political and philosophical ideas touching upon the problem of return to classical political thinking, the crisis state of modern societies, as well as the modern rethinking of ideas, categories and problems of classical political philosophy.

The subject of the research is the application of political and philosophical ideas of Hannah Arendt and Leo Strauss, devoted to the need to return to classical political thinking, in contemporary political-philosophical discussions.

Source base of the research

The source base of the research includes the works of Arendt and Strauss, which meet the criteria specified in the object of research. In Arendt's case, these texts include the books “The Origins of Totalitarianism” (1951), “Human Condition” (1958), “The Life of the Mind” (1977-1978), “On Violence” (1970), “On Revolution” (1963), the collections of articles “Between the Past and the Future”, “Responsibility and Judgment”, lectures “Philosophy and Politics” (1954), “Karl Marx and the Tradition of Western Political Thought” (1953), “The Great Tradition” (1953), “The Revision of the Tradition by Montesquieu”, the dissertation “The Concept of Love in Aurelius Augustine” (1929), as well as texts from the early period of Arendt's work, reflecting the prerequisites of her interest in classical philosophy and politics.

In Strauss's work, the above criteria are met by articles and reviews of the 1920s and 1930s devoted to the issues of Jewish emancipation and Judaica, the article “Remarks on Carl Schmitt's ‘Concept of the Political’” (1932), the books “Spinoza's Critique of Religion” (1930), “Philosophy and Law” (1935), “Hobbes's Political Philosophy” (1936), “Thoughts on Machiavelli” (1958), “On Tyranny” (1948), “The City and Man” (1964), “Socrates and Aristophanes” (1966), “Argument and Action in Plato's ‘Laws’” (1975). articles “Persecution and the Art of Writing” (1952), “Epilogue” (1962), “Three Waves of Modernity” (1960), “On the Intention of Rousseau” (1947), “What is Political Philosophy?” (1957), “Jerusalem and Athens” (1966), “Reason and Revelation” (1948), “Progress or Return? The Contemporary Crisis of Western Civilization” (1952), “The Crisis of Our Time and the Crisis of Political Philosophy” (1963), as well as lectures “The Problem of Socrates” (1970), “Natural Law and History” (1953) and “On Plato's ‘Symposium’” (1959).

Goal and objectives of the research

The goal of the study is to theoretically reconstruct and compare the interpretations of classical political thought in the philosophy of Hannah Arendt and Leo Strauss in order to determine their significance in modern political and philosophical discussions.

To achieve this goal, the following **objectives**:

1. On the basis of historical-decorative and critical analysis, to reconstruct the role of the problems of the crisis of modernity in Leo Strauss's appeal to classical political thought.

2. On the basis of conceptual and critical analysis, to determine the content of the basic concepts used by Strauss to describe the nature of classical political thought, as well as the vulnerabilities in the philosopher's approach to the work of classical authors.

3. On the basis of historical-descriptive and critical analysis, to formulate the meaning of the problem of the crisis of modernity in Hannah Arendt's appeal to classical political thought.

4. On the basis of conceptual and critical analysis, to formulate the content of the basic concepts used by Arendt as determining the nature of classical political thought, as well as the vulnerabilities in the philosopher's approach to the heritage of classical thinkers.

5. On the basis of a comparative analysis of Arendt's and Strauss's interpretations of the problems of the crisis of modernity, as well as the concepts used by philosophers to describe the nature of classical thinking, to determine the general conceptual basis of Arendt's and Strauss's interpretations of classical political thought and to propose the application of these interpretations in modern political and philosophical discussions.

Research methodology

The methods of the study are as follows:

1. The historical-descriptive method, which makes it possible to analyze the prerequisites and content of the ideas of Arendt and Strauss about the crisis of modernity and the return to classical political thinking, as well as to determine the features of philosophers' interpretations of the political and philosophical ideas of the classics. This method is most popular in the first and second chapters of the work, which describe the approaches of Arendt and Strauss to the interpretation of specific works of classical philosophers, historians and poets.

2. The method of conceptual analysis, which is necessary to identify the key categories, arguments and ways of thought that are the results of Arendt's and Strauss's interpretations of classical political philosophy. This method is used in the first and second chapters, the tasks of which are to discover the conceptual features of classical philosophy and politics, which Arendt and Strauss considered to be decisive and in need of modern rethinking. This method also makes it possible to formulate and explain the concepts that determine the features of Arendt's and Strauss's approaches to the problem of the conflict between truth and politics.

3. The method of comparative analysis, which is necessary to determine the similarities and differences in Arendt's and Strauss's comprehensions of the problem of the crisis of modernity, as well as the common and distinctive characteristics of Arendt's and Strauss's interpretations of classical political thought. This method is used in each of the chapters of the dissertation. From the historical and philosophical point of view, this method will make it possible to detect differences in the characteristics of classical political thinking and experience, which Arendt and Strauss consider to be the most important for understanding the crisis state of modern societies.

Comparative analysis is necessary for a correct understanding of the common problems that both philosophers find in the ideas of the classics, as well as the reasons why the solutions to these problems are different for philosophers.

4. The method of critical analysis, the appeal to which is due to the complexity, inaccuracies and internal inconsistency of the philosophical arguments of Arendt and Strauss. In the first chapter, this method will be applied in section 1.1, where an attempt is made to explain Strauss's contradictory explanation of the metaphor of the "second cave". In the second chapter, criticism is required to explain the contradictory nature of Arendt's categories of power, violence and freedom in their relation to the political sphere. The method of immanent criticism is also used in paragraphs 1.3 and 2.3, which are devoted to the vulnerabilities of Arendt's and Strauss's approaches to the problem of the conflict between truth and politics in classical thought.

Scientific novelty of the research

1. The thesis provides a comparative analysis of Arendt's and Strauss's approaches to the problem of the crisis of modernity, the philosophers' justifications for the return to classical political thought, as well as their interpretations of key aspects of political thinking and the experience of the classics. The non-intersecting plots of classical political thought, which interested Arendt and Strauss separately, but allow us to determine the specifics of the approaches of each of the philosophers to solving a common problem, are analyzed.

2. The study shows that the problem of the "tyranny of truth", explicitly developed by Arendt within the framework of the interpretation of Socratic and Platonic thought, is also present in other theoretical contexts to which the philosopher turns throughout his work. Three philosophical narratives were identified, within the framework of which Arendt describes the essence of the problem of the tyranny of truth and offers her own way to overcome it, drawing theoretical resources from various philosophical sources: the philosophy of Augustine, the dialogical technique of Socrates, and the theory of judgment based on Kant's third critics.

3. The paper identifies and describes the vulnerabilities of Arendt's and Strauss's approaches to overcoming the conflict between truth and politics as the main problem of classical political thought. In relation to Arendt's approach, the problem of normative indifference is described and revealed, expressed in the insensitivity of a political subject to normative attitudes lying outside the political community. In relation to the Strauss approach, the problem of political passivity is revealed, expressed in the rejection of epistemological autonomy to the political sphere.

4. The study proves the possibility and necessity of considering the results of Arendt's and Strauss's interpretations of classical political thought not as opposite ways of understanding the authors of the past, but as complementary elements of a holistic view of the ethos of a political subject.

5. The thesis reveals the theoretical significance of Arendt's and Strauss's interpretations of classical political thought in modern political and philosophical discussions. Having analyzed the political and philosophical debates about post-truth as a new destructive phenomenon of the modern public sphere, we have shown that the virtues derived from Arendt's and Strauss's interpretations of classical political thought make it possible to see the shortcomings of existing arguments in favor of combating post-truth, as well as to more accurately and productively comprehend nature and practical ways to overcome it.

Theses for defence

1. The main problem of classical political thought, which allows us to consider it as a preferred alternative to the project of modernity, in the view of Arendt and Strauss, is the problem of the conflict between truth and politics. Arendt and Strauss's appeal to the political thinking of the classics does not allow us to find a visible, institutional alternative to modern politics, but opens up the prospect of renewing a fundamental question that has been forgotten as a result of the formation of the political philosophy of modernity: the question of the possibility of politics as an epistemologically autonomous sphere of experience.

2. Modesty, understood by Strauss as one of the key virtues of the classical author, has a political meaning and can be used as a means of preserving political life from the destructive influence of truth. Strauss explains the need for Modesty by the fact that philosophical reason in its classical sense recognizes the natural limitations imposed on its cognitive abilities. Since philosophy and politics, as the ultimate modes of human life, are always in a state of mutual threat, Modesty also becomes a virtue that allows classical authors to remain faithful to truth as the object of their theoretical claims, and at the same time to protect the polis from the danger of thoughtless use of this truth for practical purposes.

3. The result of Arendt's interpretation of the conflict between truth and politics is the definition of concern for peace as a virtue of the political subject, necessary to maintain the public sphere as an epistemologically independent space of free self-expression, the rationality of which is asserted within the community, not outside it. Based on the analysis of the philosophical narratives constructed by Arendt, which allow us to formulate the problem of the tyrannical influence of truth on the sphere of politics, we can conclude that the virtue of caring for peace is

described by three interrelated categories, the practical implementation of which contributes to the overcoming of the tyranny of truth by the political subject. The first category, the starting position, describes the state in which the subject is aware of the threat to his political existence emanating from the order of truth that orders human actions. The second category, communicative practice, describes the ability of a political subject to discover the source of epistemological legitimacy of political life not in the sphere of philosophical truth transcendent to the community, but in the community itself. The third category, the communicative space, describes the condition of the general disposition of community members to the correct, non-devaluing perception of communicative practice.

4. Arendt's and Strauss's approaches to understanding the conflict between truth and politics have vulnerabilities due to the point of view chosen by each of the philosophers, from which the possibilities of overcoming this conflict are assessed. Arendt looks at the conflict between philosophy and politics from the point of view of politics, as a result of which her approach traces normative indifference, i.e., the lack of justifications for correlating the political will of the subject with any principles that lie beyond the interests of the community's self-preservation. Strauss looks at the conflict between philosophy and politics from the point of view of philosophy, as a result of which his approach is marked by political passivity, i.e., the lack of justifications for endowing political life with the status of an intrinsically valuable sphere of human experience. These vulnerabilities compensate for each other, as a result of which the virtues of Modesty and concern for peace derived from these approaches can be considered within the framework of a holistic view of the ethos of the political subject.

5. The results of Arendt's and Strauss's interpretations of classical political thought can contribute to contemporary discussions about post-truth and contribute to a clearer understanding of the nature and ways of overcoming this phenomenon. The interpretation of post-truth as a phenomenon alien to politics, which is common among researchers, to be eliminated through the ordering of the public sphere in accordance with the standards of expertise and scientific truth, simplifies the understanding of the nature of post-truth and harms political life. Turning to Arendt's reflections on the tyranny of truth, the essence of political lies and the virtue of caring for the world allows us to expand our understanding of post-truth and comprehend it as an essential feature of political life, which is more natural in relation to it than the truth itself. Turning to Strauss's idea of reconciliation with the truth and the virtue of Modesty, in turn, makes it possible to maintain a responsible attitude to the truth and the desire to search for it, preventing its undue intrusion into the sphere of politics.

Theoretical and practical significance of the research

Theoretical significance of the research is determined by the contribution to modern discussions about the possibility of applying the ideas of classical political thought to describe, explain and solve topical problems of political philosophy. Although researchers of post-truth as a pernicious phenomenon of the modern public sphere are already turning to Arendt's philosophy as a productive theoretical resource, combining her approach to the conflict between truth and politics with Straussian ideas allows us to expand our understanding of the nature of contemporary political lies, to comprehend the vulnerabilities of the application of the Arendtian approach per se, and to open up opportunities for productive complementarity of their philosophical ideas. In addition, since the thesis presents a holistic and original comparison of Arendt's and Strauss's approaches to classical political-philosophical ideas, its results allow us to take a fresh look at the common and different aspects of their interpretations of the classics. The identification of two complementary virtues of the political subject in Arendt and Strauss allows us to abandon the popular idea of philosophers as radical apologists for the ahistorical rehabilitation of classical politics and classical philosophy and to see their approaches to classical political thought not only in comparison, but also in a productive bundle. Finally, since the important works of Arendt and Strauss have been studied relatively little within the framework of the Russian academy, this dissertation will serve as a contribution to the study of the legacy of Arendt and Strauss in a new, little-studied aspect.

Practical significance of the research is that its materials and conclusions can be used in the compilation of lectures and seminars on the history of political philosophy of the 20th and 21st centuries and special courses on the reception of the ethical and political thought of antiquity in modern philosophy, as well as in the compilation of textbooks and the writing of scientific publications devoted to the comprehension of modern problems of ethics and political philosophy.

Approbation of research results

The results of the research were approved at the following scientific conferences:

1. XV International Conference of the School of Philosophy and Cultural Studies of the Faculty of Humanities of the Higher School of Economics “Culture in the Era of Digitalization” (Moscow, HSE, 2024). Lecture: Arendt and Dostoevsky: the Political Meaning of Love.

2. The First Interdisciplinary Scientific Conference of Young Scientists “Religious Thought in Philosophical and Theological Research: History and Prospects” (Moscow, CMI, 2023). Report: Athens and Jerusalem by Leo Strauss and Lev Shestov.

3. XIV International Conference of the School of Philosophy and Cultural Studies of the Higher School of Economics “The World/Worlds of the Future” (Moscow, HSE, 2023). Lecture: The Tyranny of Truth and Its Enemies.

4. XIII International Conference of the School of Philosophy and Cultural Studies of the Higher School of Economics “Subject and Responsibility: Nature, Society, Culture” (Moscow, HSE, 2022). Lecture: Responsibility and Tradition: The “Socratic Subject” as the Author of a Moral Statement in the Philosophy of H. Arendt.

Also, the results of the dissertation research are reflected in the following scientific publications:

1. Sheynov T. G. Post-truth as immoderate speech: philosophical approaches of H. Arendt and L. Strauss in modern discussions about truth and politics. Russian Sociological review. 2025. T. 24. № 2. P. 31-57. (List B).

2. Sheynov T. G. “Athens and Jerusalem” by Leo Strauss and Lev Shestov. Voprosy Filosofii. 2024. № 4. Pp. 126–136. (List B).

3. Sheynov T. G. Philosophical categories of antiquity in discussions about the rehabilitation of politics: the anthropological meaning of civil friendship. Chelovek. 2023. Vol. 34. № 6. Pp. 48–64. (List D).

Main content of the work

The dissertation research consists of an introduction, three chapters, a conclusion and a list of references. The first and second chapters of the dissertation are devoted to the analysis of the interpretation of classical political thought in the philosophy of Leo Strauss and Hannah Arendt, respectively, the third chapter carries out a comparative analysis of the considered interpretations, based on the results of the previous chapters, and also considers the prospect of applying the philosophical ideas of Arendt and Strauss in modern political and philosophical discussions. The results of the study are set out in the Conclusion.

The first chapter of the dissertation research (“Interpretation of Classical Political Thought in Strauss's Philosophy”) consists of two paragraphs. In **paragraph 1.1.** (“The Crisis of Modernity as the Subject of Strauss's Philosophy”) examines the content of Strauss's interpretation of classical political thought in the context of the problematic crisis of modernity as a historical and philosophical context, which motivated him to modernize classical concepts and arguments. The main purpose of the paragraph is to clarify what, according to Strauss, are the fundamental characteristics of classical political thinking in contrast to modern and what events in the history

of ideas or political history became decisive in the process of the formation of the modern project and the overcoming of the classics.

In **paragraph 1.1.1.** (“Philosophy and History: The ‘Second Cave’ of Historical Consciousness”) examines Strauss's comprehension of the metaphor of the “Second Cave”, which describes the formation of the “historical consciousness” of modernity in its difference from the classical ideas of history.

In **paragraph 1.1.2.** (“Philosophy and Science: The Moral Basis of Political Knowledge”) describes the features of Strauss's comprehension of the features of classical and modern ideas about the relationship between philosophy and science, the key concept for the description of which is the concept of “moral basis”.

In **paragraph 1.1.3.** (“Philosophy and Religion: ‘Jerusalem and Athens’ as a Metaphor of Western Culture”) Strauss's interpretation of classical and modern forms of religious criticism is considered, which for the philosopher is an expression of the correlation between philosophical reason and religious faith characteristic of a particular era in the history of thought.

In **paragraph 1.2.** (“The Political Meaning of Modesty in Strauss's Philosophy”) on the basis of the historical and philosophical analysis of Strauss's appeal to classical political thought, the concepts used by the philosopher to describe the essential characteristics of classical political thought were identified, and a critical analysis of Strauss's approach to the heritage of the classics was carried out. It was established that the key concept that determines the nature of classical political thinking, in contrast to modern one, is Modesty as a virtue of the classical philosopher, poet and historian. Strauss's interpretation of the heritage of three classical authors — Plato, Xenophon and Aristophanes — is considered, as a result of which it is determined how in each case the philosopher sees the political meaning of the virtue of Modesty in the classics.

In **paragraph 1.2.1.** (“The Divine Law of the Citizen and the Wise”) the concept of the “divine law” (θεός νόμος), used by Strauss as a conceptual basis for describing the relationship between philosophical and political life, is considered. It is established that, arising on the basis of political life, philosophy poses a threat to it, but also finds itself in a vulnerable position, in connection with which the philosophical way of life inevitably acquires a political character, and the virtue of Modesty inherent in philosophical life, presumably acquires political meaning.

In **paragraph 1.2.2.** (“Plato's Modesty: The Union of Socrates and Thrasymachus as a Remedy for Political Utopianism”) Strauss's reflections on Plato's dialogues “Republic”, “Symposium” and “Laws” are analyzed, within the framework of which the philosopher discovers

the political meaning of the virtue of Modesty in the relationship between Socrates and Thrasymachus, Aristophanes' speech from the dialogue "Banquet", as well as the instructions of the Athenian sage from the dialogue “Laws”.

In **paragraph 1.2.3.** (“Xenophon's Modesty: ‘Hiero’ as an Guidance in Political Virtue”) Strauss's interpretation of the dialogue “Hiero” by Xenophon is considered, and within the framework of which the political meaning of Modesty is found in Simonides' “Tyrannical Teaching”, clothed by Xenophon in the form of a message hidden in the form of a dialogue, addressed to a limited audience of virtuous “friends of philosophy”.

In **paragraph 1.2.4.** (“Aristophanes' Modesty: Poetic Politics as a Method of Humanization of the City”) analyzes Strauss's study of Aristophanes' comedies, in which the philosopher discovers the political meaning of the virtue of Modesty in the dramatic representation of philosophical and political ways of life in their comic form in order to emphasize their mutual threat and the danger of their absolutization.

In **paragraph 1.2.5.** (“A Critical Analysis of Strauss's Political Epistemology”) on the basis of the analysis of Strauss's interpretation of the works of classical authors, an attempt is made to identify the vulnerabilities of the philosopher's approach to the relationship between philosophical and political life. It was established that the method of solving the problem of the mutual threat of philosophy and politics proposed by Strauss does not imply overcoming one side of the opposition to the other, but requires the preservation of philosophy and politics as independent ways of life, recognition of the insurmountability of their opposition and the desire to ensure their safe coexistence. At the same time, a significant drawback of Strauss's theory is political passivity, i.e., the philosopher's lack of grounds for recognizing politics as not just an independent, but also an intrinsically valuable sphere of human experience. This is because, despite the recognition of the danger that philosophy poses to politics, this danger should be avoided, not because politics is of independent value from philosophy, but only because the danger of philosophy is the cause of its vulnerability to the city.

The second chapter of the dissertation research (“Interpretation of Classical Political Thought in Arendt's Philosophy”) consists of two paragraphs. **Paragraph 2.1.** (“The Crisis of Modernity as a Subject of Arendt's Philosophy”) is devoted to the reconstruction of Arendt's ideas about the need to turn to classical political thinking in the context of the problems of the crisis of modernity. The purpose of the chapter is to find common theoretical motives in Arendt's explanation of the features of classical and modern political thought, which make it possible to

determine the causes of the crisis of modernity and the features of classical experience and thinking that represent a preferred alternative to modernity.

In **paragraph 2.1.1.** (“The Emergence and Decline of the Classical Experience of Power”) Arendt's comprehension of the phenomenon of power in its classical and modern versions, as well as the categories of legality and form of government accompanying it, is analyzed. It is established that within the framework of classical political experience, power was a pure possibility, a potential that a political community possesses in the presence of the experience of a joint enterprise between its participants, carried out through word or deed and expressing urgent collective experiences (passion for competition, will to act or love of communication). The formation of modernity is conditioned by the “objectification” of power and law, that is, the removal of these categories from the boundaries of political life and the assignment to them of the status of external regulators of human relations.

In **paragraph 2.1.2.** (“The (non)Political Meaning of Violence: Classics and Modernity”) examines Arendt's interpretation of the classical and modern understanding of the phenomenon of violence and its relation to the political sphere, as well as reveals three different understandings of the phenomenon of violence characteristic of Arendt's philosophical reasoning: violence as any activity, the sphere of manifestation of which is the treatment of man with nature, violence as the practice of domination that destroys political relations, and violence in its constitutive sense as the essence of any political action.

In **paragraph 2.1.3.** (“Images of Freedom in Classical and Modern Perspectives”) Arendt's comprehension of the phenomenon of freedom in its classical and modern forms, as well as the categories of equality, lawlessness, institution and performance accompanying this phenomenon, is analyzed. It is established that, by analogy with power, classical freedom completely coincided with politics and represented the state that a political subject experiences when performing an act or showing his self in a persuasive speech. Freedom, as well as the equality it defined, did not constitute the subject of politics, but, like law and violence, formed its boundary, on the outer side of which were the hardships of maintaining life that had already been overcome by a person who had entered the political sphere. The movements of thought that conditioned modernity made freedom not the essence but the concern of politics, through the transfer of this phenomenon to the sphere of man's inner life, that is, the property of the sovereign will.

In **paragraph 2.2.** (“Practices of Care for the World as a Condition for Overcoming the Tyranny of Truth”) on the basis of the historical and philosophical analysis, the concepts used by Arendt to describe the nature of classical political thought were identified and the application of

these concepts was considered on the example of Arendt's appeal to classical works, as well as works containing elements of classical thinking. It is established that the key problem of classical political thinking, which lies at the heart of Arendt's theory political and in need of re-actualization in the conditions of the crisis of modernity, Arendt designates with the term “tyranny of truth”. Its meaning lies in the fact that philosophical truth contributes to the devaluation of the general world as a space for the political self-expression of its participants, prescribing to it the ontological status of the sphere of “prejudices” to be eliminated in the light of a consistent explanation of political life as a functional element of the order of truth.

In **paragraph 2.2.1.** (“The Tyranny of Truth and the Virtue of Phronesis: The Problem of the Autonomy of Political Experience”) analyzes Arendt's interpretation of the Aristotelian category of phronesis, formulated by the philosopher as a result of rethinking Heidegger's fundamental ontology, as well as the content of Arendt's concepts of the tyranny of truth and care for the world, used to describe the relationship between truth and politics as key characteristic of classical thinking.

In **paragraph 2.2.2.** (“Practices of Care for the World in the Theology of Aurelius Augustine: Love and Memory of God”) considers Arendt's interpretation of the philosophy and theology of Aurelius Augustine as containing the problematic tyranny of truth. It is established that in search of a solution to the conflict between truth and politics found in Augustine's reasoning, Arendt emphasizes the importance of two Augustinian categories, each of which performs its own “political” function: non-instrumental love of neighbor (caritas), the political potential of which is manifested in the possibility of seeing the members of the Christian community as an intrinsically valuable object of selfless love, and the memory of God as an act of thought that legitimizes love for one's neighbor as a non-instrumental attitude.

In **paragraph 2.2.3.** (“Practices of Caring for the World in Socrates' Dialogical Method: Maieutics and Friendship”) analyzes Arendt's comprehension of the problems of the tyranny of truth on the example of her interpretation of the features of Socrates' dialogical method. It is revealed that the categories of Socrates' philosophy, which serve as a means of overcoming the conflict between philosophical truth and the world of human opinions, are maieutics — a trial of the interlocutor for the truthfulness and consistency of his unique opinion, which is an integral part of the equal dialogue between citizens, as well as friendship – an attitude that equalizes the participants in the philosophical dialogue as equal actors involved in a common political space and having freedom of expression in its unique opinion.

In **paragraph 2.2.4.** (“Practices of Caring for Peace in Kant's Philosophy: Judgment and Responsibility”) examines the application of the categories and arguments identified by Arendt within the framework of classical political thought in the modern political and philosophical context on the example of Arendt's analysis of Kant's “third critics”. It is established that the categories that characterize the position of the modern political subject and allow him to overcome the classical contradiction between truth and politics are judgment – cognitive ability correlation of a particular event with a set of imaginary positions of community members that form the sphere of common sense, as well as political responsibility — a collective affect that takes the subject out of the sphere of individual morality and binds him to the general world as an object of voluntary care.

In **paragraph 2.2.5.** (“A Critical Analysis of Arendt's Political Epistemology”) on the basis of the analysis of the concepts used by Arendt to characterize classical political thought, a critical analysis of the philosopher's approach to the problem of the conflict between truth and politics as a key problem of classical thinking is proposed. It is shown that in search of ways to overcome the tyrannical effect of truth and substantiate the epistemological autonomy of politics, Arendt does not abandon rationality as a regulatory principle political life, but places the source of this rationality in the community itself. As a result, for Arendt, the problem of the epistemological autonomy of politics turns into the problem of the political legitimation of truth. At the same time, the ineradicable flaw of Arendt's theory of the political is normative indifference, i.e., the subject's insensitivity to prescriptive principles that lie outside the space of political communication. The reason for this indifference is the need for a continuously reproduced experience of novelty, which rejects all normative prescriptions as manifestations of the tyranny of truth alien to politics.

The third chapter of the dissertation research is devoted to a comparative analysis of the interpretations of Arendt and Strauss of classical political thought, as well as to the determination of the possibilities of presenting these interpretations as complementary and forming a holistic view of the ethos of the political subject, applicable in modern political and philosophical discussions. The chapter consists of three paragraphs.

In **paragraph 3.1.** (“The Crisis of Modernity in the Philosophy of Arendt and Strauss”) a comparative analysis of Arendt's and Strauss's interpretations of the problem of the crisis of modernity as a prerequisite for a return to the classics is carried out, as a result of which similarities and differences in the explanations by philosophers of the key characteristics of classical political thinking in contrast to the modern, historical and historical-philosophical boundaries of the classics, as well as the reasons why the classical political-philosophical attitudes gave way to modern ones.

In **paragraph 3.2.** ("The Conflict of Truth and Politics in the Views of Arendt and Strauss") a comparative analysis of Arendt's and Strauss's approaches to the conflict between truth and politics as a key problem of classical political thinking, identified as a result of the analysis of the concepts used by each of them, is determined. The basis is made up of the two virtues of the political subject – Modesty and care for the world – which determine the possibility of maintaining an honest and responsible attitude to the truth and at the same time striving to protect the political space from its tyrannical influence.

In **paragraph 3.3.** ("Philosophical Approaches of Arendt and Strauss in Contemporary Discussions of Truth and Politics") offers a theoretical outline of the concept of the ethos of the political subject, based on the interpretations of Arendt and Strauss of classical political thought and represented by the virtues of Modesty and care for the world, as well as illustrates its importance for solving modern political problems. The sphere of experience in which this concept is applied, the key characteristic of the classical thinking, which distinguishes it from modern thinking and needs to be rethought and re-actualized within the framework of the proposed concept, as well as the key virtues of a political subject, which can be identified on the basis of the proposed concept. The applicability of the ethos of the political subject is demonstrated by the example of discussions about post-truth as a destructive phenomenon of the modern public sphere, the debates on overcoming which correspond to the general context of the problem of the conflict between truth and politics.

Conclusion

The dissertation conducts a study of the interpretations of classical political thought by Hannah Arendt and Leo Strauss — philosophers who in many ways stand at the origins of the modern tradition of comprehending contemporary politics by means of pre-modern thought — and also determines the necessity of considering these interpretations in comparison and the possibility of applying their results as a tool for understanding and solving contemporary problems of political reality. We turned to the approaches of Arendt and Strauss to the political-philosophical classics in the historical-philosophical context of the crisis of modernity — a problem that determined the formation of the philosophical interests and goals of each of them. The divergence noted by Ronald Beiner between the "prejudices" that motivated Arendt and Strauss to interpret classical thought, where the former considered thinking from the point of view of historical experience, and the latter considered historical experience as a consequence of transformations in thinking, turned out to be justified, but only partially. Arendt and Strauss indeed considered the crisis of modernity from two opposite sides and discussed it in different languages, yet the subject of their consideration and discussion turned out to be common. An analysis of the main motives of the Arendtian and

Straussian interpretations of the classics in their distinction from modernity showed that the "pragmaticism" of Arendt as opposed to the "idealism" of Strauss is an inadequate conclusion from a comparative analysis of their approaches. Each of the philosophers in their own way discovers in classical thought and experience a common problem, the solution of which cannot be guaranteed by the soothing pathos of modernity, and the maintenance of the appearance of which is the duty of a thinking person in the classical understanding. The **main results** of the conducted research can be considered as:

1. Determining the historical-philosophical prerequisites, content, and key characteristics of the interpretation of classical political thought by H. Arendt and L. Strauss based on an analysis of the philosophers' approaches to the problematic of the crisis of modernity.

2. Identifying the common philosophical problem that emerges as a result of Arendt's and Strauss's interpretation of classical political thought and describing the strategies for resolving this problem by each of the philosophers.

3. Determining the similarities, differences, and vulnerable points in the approaches of Arendt and Strauss to resolving the key problem of classical political thought.

4. Identifying the common result of Arendt's and Strauss's interpretation of classical political thought and substantiating the possibility of its application in contemporary political-philosophical debates.

5. Describing the relevant political-philosophical problematic, in relation to which the interpretation of classical political thought by Arendt and Strauss can serve as a prospective solution, and explaining the essence of this solution.

6. Identifying prospects for further research of the results of Arendt's and Strauss's interpretation of classical political thought in the context of contemporary problems of political reality.

The **general conclusions** of the conducted research are following:

1. The essence of the problem uniting the approaches of Arendt and Strauss to classical thought lies in the conflict between truth and politics, the classical expression of which is the confrontation between the philosophical and political ways of life. For each of the philosophers, the conflict between truth and politics presupposes a certain "commitment" of the political subject to one side of the conflict — to politics in the case of Arendt and to philosophy in the case of Strauss. Proceeding from this, in their readings of classical authors each of the philosophers depicted the dramatic development of a subject who found himself in a situation threatening his political or

philosophical existence and found salvation in certain cognitive or communicative practices aimed at the correct handling of truth.

2. Based on an analysis of Arendt's interpretation of Augustine's theology, Socrates' method, as well as the categories of responsibility and judgment, it can be concluded that the Arendtian subject is aimed at permanent resistance to the tyranny of truth, and the chance to overcome the conflict between truth and politics can be found only in a situation of a miraculous transformation of his epistemological horizon.

3. Based on Strauss's interpretation of Plato's “Republic” and “Laws”, Xenophon's “Hiero”, and Aristophanes' comedies, it can be concluded that the Straussian subject is aimed at reconciling truth and politics. This goal is served by modesty, which, being a virtue of the philosopher who observes the natural limitations of reason, at the same time possesses political meaning, expressed in the mutual preservation of the philosophical and political ways of life inviolate through the correct public utterance of truth.

4. Considering the content of Arendt's and Strauss's approaches to the conflict between truth and politics allows for conclusions about their similarities and vulnerabilities. Thus, the vulnerability of the Arendtian approach turned out to be normative indifference — the insensitivity of the political subject, preoccupied with resisting the tyranny of truth and maintaining the integrity of the common world as an epistemologically autonomous sphere of life, to any normative and universal prescriptions that regulate the community from the outside: the good, justice, morality, etc. The vulnerability of Strauss's “philosophically committed” approach turned out to be political passivity — the insensitivity of the moderate subject to politics as a source of meaning for human existence independent of philosophy, as a result of which philosophical modesty, while acquiring political potential, does not use it to a proper extent. A key similarity between the approaches of Arendt and Strauss, in turn, was the recognition of the impossibility of politics in its highest, classical sense: in Arendt's case — due to the necessity of a miracle as a condition for overcoming the tyrannical order of truth, and in Strauss's case — due to the tragic mismatch between reality and the philosophical standards of the “city in speech”.

5. The interpretations of classical political thought by Arendt and Strauss are incapable of providing either alternative to contemporary institutional models of political life or practical tools for improving contemporary political regimes. Their value lies in the possibility of formulating the virtues that a political subject must possess, who accepts the impossibility of political life in its classical sense, but at the same time is aware of the ethical necessity of preserving correct relations between truth and politics. These virtues turn out to be modesty and care for the world.

6. The result of Arendt's and Strauss's interpretation of classical political thought is the ethos of the political subject, which, in our opinion, is precisely what can become a contribution to solving contemporary problems of political reality. A description of the general characteristics of this ethos allows us to conclude that the sphere of experience in which it can find application is the public handling of truth by a person, realized in self-destructive collective practices. The key feature of classical political thinking to which this ethos responds is the impossibility of politics, expressed in the "doom" of collective practices to constant decline, and the "metavirtues" of the political subject, which allow maintaining these practices in integrity while remaining faithful to truth, are modesty and care for the world.

7. Turning to contemporary debates dedicated to the phenomenon of post-truth and considering research approaches to understanding its origins and dangers allows us to conclude that there are two positions concerning ways to overcome post-truth: the "position of truth", based on the idea that post-truth should be combated by regulating the public sphere with standards of objectivity and rationality, and a more compromise position, according to which the destruction of post-truth by truth will lead to the destruction of politics itself. In the opposition of these positions lies the contemporary expression of the conflict between truth and politics, within which the subject finds himself before an insoluble choice between the tyrannical ordering of the public sphere by truth and the disregard for truth in the arbitrariness of political lies. The solution to this dilemma is precisely the ethos of the political subject, based on the "metavirtues" of care for the world and modesty, where the former allows the subject to comprehend the inadmissibility of overcoming political lies from the position of truth, and the latter — to reveal the true danger of post-truth and learn to correctly handle truth and morality in political communication.

8. Although one of the main goals of the research was to prove the practical applicability of the Arendtian and Straussian readings of classical political thought, the main emphasis in it was rather on clarifying and comparing the theoretical foundations and key problems of these readings. Their application to solving contemporary political-philosophical problems can be considered only a sketch of a more specialized, interdisciplinary, and substantiated with broad empirical material study, which would serve as a continuation of the problems and ideas outlined in the dissertation. The methodological basis of this study could include methods of empirical sociology, social and moral psychology, moral epistemology, and other disciplines touching on the problem of the functioning of the contemporary public sphere. The questions that this study could answer, and which were not the subject of this dissertation, would be: what specific political, cultural, and social phenomena (besides the problem of post-truth) are subject to comprehension and correction using the ethos of the political subject identified by us; what specific communicative and

institutional practices, behavioral scenarios, and political decisions can serve as a target model for following the virtues of modesty and care for the world; and what cases from contemporary political life demonstrate the effectiveness of the ethos of the political subject developed by us in the form of an outline.

Thus, the interpretations of classical political thought by Arendt and Strauss do not limit our knowledge and actions to abstract and socially irrelevant patterns of a forgotten antiquity, but, on the contrary, open possibilities for the most diverse forms of political self-expression and responsible search for truth, inspired by the hope of saving[89] the common world — a place guaranteed by nothing, invisible, but the only possible one in which a person can feel at home.

[89] Dmitriev T.A. «The Freedom to Be Free»: Hannah Arendt on «Salvation» of the World of Politics // Russian Sociological Review. 2024. Vol. 23. No. 4. P. 249-258.