

ALEXANDER AFANASYEV

The Syntax of Love

(PERSONALITY TYPOLOGY AND PREDICTION OF COUPLES RELATIONSHIPS)

Table of Contents:

PREDICTION

Section One: PSYCHOSOPHY

Introduction to Psychosophy.....	10
Palette of Senses.....	25
Every wise man is satisfied with simplicity.....	
I have been given a body of	sixty
The world as will and representation	93

Section Two: TYPOLOGY

Introduction to Typology	146
Tvardovsky	152
Lao.....	Tzu 158
Dumas	162
Berthier	173
Lenin	177
Ghazali	182
Plat.....o	188
Borja	191
Napoleon.....	195
Einstein	199
Andersen.....	205
Bukharin.....	208

Socrates.....	211
Pasternak	216.
Aristippus	225
Rousseau.....	232
Akhmatova	236
Goethe.....	248
Pushkin	256
Augustine.....	266
Tolstoy	272
Chekhov.....	278
Pascal.....	282
Epicurus.....	285
<i>Section Three: "THE SYNTHAXIS OF LOVE"</i>	
Introduction to the Syntax of Love.....	290
Eros	294
Philia.....	310
Agape.....	318
Afterword	332.
<i>Appendix: "INAUDIBLE"</i>	
(History of the Russian Supreme power in the light of psychosophy)	334

Dedicated to Irina

PREDICTION

"A broad man, too broad, I would narrow it down," Dostoevsky said, and he knew what he was saying. The writer himself had such a frightening breadth of nature that Dostoevsky's old friend, the critic Strakhov, was forced to confess: "I cannot consider Dostoevsky, either a good or a happy man (which, in fact, coincides). He was angry, envious, depraved, he spent his whole life in such turmoil that made him pathetic, and would have made him ridiculous, if he had not been so angry and so clever at the same time. He himself, like Rousseau, considered himself the best of men and the happiest. On the occasion of his biography I remembered all these traits vividly. In Switzerland, in my presence, he was so mean to a servant that the latter took offense and reprimanded him: "I am also a human being!" I remember how **it struck me** then **that this was said to a preacher of humanity.**

Banality to report: man is complex, contradictory. However, from the repetition of this banality does not become less obvious. Here is another characteristic sketch from nature: "Strange people surrounded Chaliapin. He could mock them enough, and from these people formed his entourage, with whom he dealt steeply: Chaliapin said - it was bad to anyone who did not agree with any of his opinions. **Denying autocracy, he himself was obsessed with autocracy.** When he had dinner at home, which happened quite rarely, his family was silent at dinner, as if filled with water in his mouth.

A paradox? The defender of the humiliated and insulted loved to humiliate, the singer of freedom turned out to be a domestic despot! But it is not enough to state the paradoxical nature of human nature, one would like to understand its nature...

* * *

There is an old sad story about an Arab Caliph. He ascended the throne as a child, ruled happily for a long time, died at a very old age, surrounded by numerous offspring; he was respected by his subjects and neighbors, loved by women, successful in wars and was immensely rich. Everyone called him "The Lucky One. But when after his death, they opened the diary, which he kept daily, and counted the number of days marked by him as happy, it turned out to be only fourteen. Only fourteen days, two weeks of happiness - for such a long and outwardly prosperous life.

A sad story. A story that may serve as a vivid illustration of a simple and obvious idea: man is unhappy, deeply and chronically unhappy. The only thing that saves a person from despair are unfulfilled hopes, ignorance of his misfortune and constant disadvantage of those around him, who are just as unhappy as he is. The absence of happiness is a norm of human life, and like any norm, even a negative one, it voluntarily or involuntarily reconciles us to the existing order of things.

If we try to name the main source of human disadvantage, I believe it would be **loneliness**. By "loneliness" in this case should be understood not only its generally accepted forms, such as the forced loneliness of Robinson Crusoe or the celibacy of 20 million adults in the former Soviet Union and every ninth resident of the United States. The faces of loneliness are manifold. A person is alone even when he is not alone, even when all outer forms of active social being seem to be observed, he is alone in the family, in the crowd, in church, in the party, in the club, at work... As they used to say in the old days, "To the lonely man there is a desert everywhere.

In turn, loneliness also has its own cause: the eternal ignorance of self and others, the lack of clear ideas about one's own inner world and the possibilities of contact with the inner worlds of others. "What are we, puppets on strings? And the puppeteer of our firmament?" - Omar Khayyam asked, and hesitated to answer that question himself. Indeed, we know the essence of our nature so poorly that we feel like helpless toys in the hands of fate, which, being blind itself, drags us blind on the bumps and holes of existence without purpose or meaning. This is why man often chooses, in fear of his own and others' blindness, the way of a lonely wanderer. In the darkness, which is empty, one is less likely to get bumps - such is the logic of the blind.

* * *

"Know thyself!" was written on the pediment of the temple of the Oracle of Delphi. And no matter how many centuries have passed, this call has not become less topical; on the contrary, the increased value of the individual has made it even more vital and significant.

Therefore, not pretending to create a comprehensive picture of human inner life, yet I will try to answer some basic questions of human psychology: Who are we in ourselves? What are the motives of our behavior and attitude to others? Where are the origins of love, love's mistakes and delusions?

In itself, the great sweep of this book might not seem excessive if it were devoted to a topic other than psychology. But when it comes to the inner life of the individual, to such a delicate matter as human relationships, any attempt to capture them in the net of theories and techniques seems doomed to failure. All this is true. But just as a person's unique skin pattern on his finger is made up of a few simple elements, so his personality is a summation of several describable mental modules. Moreover, no matter how complex and poorly grasped the system of human relationships may be, it remains a system-a system in which everything is not by chance. We do not love by chance, we do not hate by chance, we do not sympathize or remain indifferent. For all the unconsciousness of most of our mental movements, they are not without meaning. Usually uncontrolled sympathy, dislike, indifference always turn out to have a reason in the end, so it is possible and meaningful to trace what this reason is.

Man in general is a born psychologist. And not being a psychologist, he is not able to survive. It is a different matter that most of our true psychological observations remain unformulated, are based on intuition, and are rooted in the subconscious. I think that hardly anyone would dispute Labruyère who said: "In any, the smallest, most insignificant, most inconspicuous thing we do, our whole character is already reflected: a fool enters, and leaves, and sits, and rises from his seat, and is silent, and moves differently than a clever man.

A person's psychological vision becomes especially acute in an extreme situation. Solzhenitsyn's very first prison experience was in discovering this gift of clairvoyance. He said: "...the warden on duty brought my bed, and I had to arrange it silently. A boy of my age, also in the army, was helping me: his tunic and pilot's cap were hanging on the bedpost. He had asked me before the old man, not about the war, but about tobacco. But no matter how much my soul was dissolved towards my new friends, and no matter how few words were spoken in a few minutes - something alien reeked on me from this peer and veteran, and for him I closed myself off at once and forever.

(I did not yet know the word "roost", nor - that in every cell there should be one, I did not yet have time to think about and say that this man. G. Kramarenko, I don't like him, - and already a spiritual relay, a recognition relay, went off in me and closed me off to this man forever. I would not mention such a case, if it were the only one. But I soon began to experience the work of this recognition relay inside me as a permanent natural quality, with surprise, delight, and anxiety. As the years passed, I lay in the same bunks, walked in the same line, worked in the same brigades with many hundreds of people, and always this mysterious relay-recognizer, in the creation of which I had not contributed a single trait, was triggered before I remembered it, triggered at the sight of a human face, eyes, at the first sound of a voice - it opened me wide open, or only at a crack, or closed me silently. This was always so unmistakable that all the fiddling of the commissioners with the equipment of snitches began to seem koziavochny to me: for he who had undertaken to be a traitor clearly always had it in his face and in his voice, some as if deftly pretended - but unclean. And, on the contrary, the recognizer helped me to distinguish those to whom one can reveal the

innermost things, the depths and secrets for which one cuts one's head from the first moment of acquaintance. Thus I went through eight years of imprisonment, three years of exile and another six years of underground writing, no less dangerous - and all seventeen years I recklessly opened up to dozens of people - and not once did I stumble! I have not read about it anywhere, and I am writing here for lovers of psychology. It seems to me that such spiritual devices are contained in many of us, but, men of too technical and intellectual an age, we have neglected this miracle, we do not allow it to develop in us." To what Solzhenitsyn said, it remains only to add that the prison regulars possessed this kind of technique almost professionally, and one glance at the next stage was enough to point out the snitches. But even such prison regulars could hardly describe the nature of their shrewdness, for its roots were deep, at the very bottom of the subconscious.

* * *

The relationship between consciousness and subconsciousness is a special and interesting area of psychology. The Indian yogis were the first to break through the wall between the two. The great merit of the yogis is that they made the passive, subconscious control of the brain over the body active, conscious. Before the yogis, the possibilities of physiological self-control were limited to subconscious maintenance of body functions at a level set from the beginning. Yogis, having transferred self-control from subconsciousness to consciousness, got an opportunity not only to maintain the given by nature for a long time, but also to correct inborn defects of the body, to improve its functions infinitely.

The method described in this book is called psychosophy - "wisdom of the soul" (the former name "psyche-yoga" was abandoned at the insistence of students and friends, as it was not a harmonious one). The essence of psychosophy was to subordinate unconscious soul movements to conscious control, to unleash man's huge, previously undisclosed psychological potential by firm knowledge about oneself and others. There is no doubt that such a method is absolutely necessary; after all, our psyche remains under complete control of the subconscious, passive in its essence, able to respond to blows only by running away, alienation, and loneliness.

Psychosophy also has little in common with that area of human knowledge, which only by misunderstanding is called "psychology" (whatever connotation - domestic or scientific - is given to this term). The difference is that psychology is more reminiscent of surgery than yoga. Whatever way you look at it, it is based on violence over the psyche: whether it is internal self-restraint (autogenic training) or the widest range of external violence: from parental belt to psychotropic means and hypnosis. Under all conditions, such influence does not reach its goal and leads either to mental breakdown or somnambulism, or to temporary relief followed by a bitter hangover. Not without reason Sigmund Freud, who at first sight successfully treated with hypnosis, had to abandon it and enter the psychosophic path, i.e. the path of transferring unconscious psychical processes into consciousness.

The mention of Freud's name has probably already suggested to the reader that psychosophy is not something completely original and has its own prehistory. It really does. The starting point for the creation of psychosophy was the ingenious, I dare say, psychological research of the Vilnius sociologist Aušra Augustinavičiūtė. In addition, in the process of working on the theme, it became clear that psychosophy is a continuation of the centuries-old tradition of psychological developments. For example, the four-member hierarchy of functions in psychosophy can simultaneously be traced back to Aristotle's doctrine of four kinds of soul, Hippocrates' theory of four temperaments, the four-member typologies of Jung, Seago, Acoff and Emery, Pavlov's four types of higher nervous activity, William James' four forms of the self, Kretschmer's four body types, G. Murphy's four personality components. Murphy, Apel's four biorhythms, etc.

Briefly outlining the prehistory of psychosophy, we can say that it is not something absolutely original, but represents a new stage in that direction of work which relies on self-knowledge as the main tool for improving the human psyche, a new stage in that direction which seeks to transfer unconscious processes into conscious ones to give the key to activating and harmonizing the inner life of the individual.

PSYCHOSOPHY

(Section One)

Introduction to Psychosophy

Having addressed the problem of psychic typology, one involuntarily wonders whether it is necessary, and whether this problem is not far-fetched, as many things are far-fetched in modern science? I will hurry up with the answer: no, it is not far-fetched, proving it with two banal but absolutely irresistible arguments. First, as you correctly noted, we are all obviously different, and our differences are not only in gender, race, appearance, etc., but also in CHARACTER, that is, in our mental perceptions and reactions. That would be all right, but along with our sense of exceptionality, we also have a sense of our repetitiveness. There is a wonderful secret of recognition of ourselves in others, a repetition, when we find our character, our mental features in our relatives, acquaintances, literary and cinema characters (I had to hear the phrase more than once: "I am like my mother in character")... Simply speaking there is some half-paradoxical situation, when the obvious idea of our uniqueness oddly opposes to the equally obvious presence of "kindred souls" How to solve this contradiction? There is one way: accept that all our differences **are typical**, just as repetition is **typical**. From this point, it is one step to accept the necessity of a psychic **typology**. Let us take this step and ask ourselves a much more profound question: where does our unrepeatable psychic type come from, and where does its nature lie?

* * *

Early on, man became aware of himself as a multifaceted, heterogeneous creature, made up of some independent primary elements that had little dependence on one another. It all began with the epiphany of the now obvious thing: **man consists of a body and a soul**.

Further complicating this not-yet-trivial position, man divided the soul into the "soul" proper, i.e., **the emotional function**, the realm of feelings, moods, heart reactions, experiences, and the "spirit", i.e., **the volitional function**, desire, control, character, personality, innings, "I".

With the beginning of the cultural revolution, when man began to turn from a hostage of nature into its tyrant, another quite independent element of his nature emerged - "mind," "reason," "intellect," i.e., ***the logical function***, the ability to see mentally the substance of things, the connection between them and to describe them precisely.

This is how the concept of the internal architecture of man, consisting of four mental modules or functions: **EMOTION** ("soul"), **LOGIC** ("mind"), **PHYSICS** ("body") and **WILL** ("spirit") was gradually formed. Attempts have been made to further complicate the structure of the primary elements of human nature, dividing, for example, mind and intellect, but attempts of this kind should be neglected, since they have not become generally accepted and are probably a delineation of different aspects of one and the same function.

To be honest, I am not going to explain why exactly four and exactly these functions make up a person's being. Neither are references to authorities (Plato, Descartes, Goethe, Tolstoy, Hartmann, Chekhov), who brought together logic, physics, emotion, and will when they wanted to describe the fullness of human existence. Here is the mystery of nature yet to be deciphered. We, too, will operate with these four functions, speaking of man in general, of his psychic types and of his relations in pairs.

* * *

Will, Emotion, Logic, Physics is a set of functions inherent in all people. It is something that, along with anthropological features of the human species, unites us. But at the same time this set of functions is a divisive factor that gives a rather original, if not unique, face to each individual's psyche.

The point is that nature never endows the individual with functions evenly, but always makes something strong, something weak. Will, Logic, Physics, Emotion - in the psyche of an individual are not something equal, arranged horizontally, but represent a hierarchy or, to put it differently, a four-tiered order of functions, where each function, depending on its position on the rungs of the ladder, looks and acts in its own way. As nature puts these four bricks on top of each other, so will be the inner world of the individual. It is the hierarchy of functions that determines the originality of the human psyche, dividing humanity, as it is not difficult to calculate, **into twenty-four quite independent mental types**.

* * *

It is impossible to tell at once about the importance of the order of functions in a person's life; this is what we are going to talk about in the rest of the story. But to make it clear, in order to somewhat water down the dryness of the narrative, we will give two examples. One will show how the degree of reliability of perception of the world depends on the order of functions, and the other will show the sequence of inclusion of means of struggle in conflict situations.

As a first illustration, let us take a page from Leo Tolstoy's diary. It is remarkable because here the famous writer with remarkable depth not only gave a description of the action of all the functions we have mentioned before, but he himself lined them up in the hierarchy inherent in his type and lined up on the principle of the degree of credibility of the worldview. Tolstoy had the following order of functions: 1st Will, 2nd Emotion, 3rd Physics, 4th Logic.

In accordance with it, Tolstoy made the following entry in his diary: "...I know myself, by what - I am - me. This is the highest or rather, **the deepest knowledge...** (1st Will).

The first. I am sad, hurting, bored, happy. **That's for sure.** (2nd Emotion).

Second. I hear the smell of violets, see light and shadows, etc. **There may be a mistake here** (3rd Physics).

Third. I know the earth is round and spinning and there is Japan and Madagascar, etc. **All this is questionable**" (4th Logic).

An amazingly accurate description of his own psycho-type. In the first place in himself Tolstoy put his "I", i.e. the Will, and considered his knowledge of it "the deepest". On the second step he placed, endowing it with "unquestionableness", the field of emotions, experiences. As for physical sensations, they are "not infallible" for Tolstoy. And the sphere of speculative knowledge turned out to be quite "doubtful" for the writer.

The latter circumstance is particularly remarkable because Tolstoy was much engaged in philosophy, composed philosophical treatises himself, and seemed to have a great reverence for the intellect. But, as his attitude to even such simple speculative truths as the existence of Japan and Madagascar shows, the validity of intellectual information was more than questionable for him.

It may seem to some that the Tolstoyan view of logic is a kind of universal skeptical norm. But it is not. For example, for the famous philosopher Descartes, only that which is calculable was reliable, and life was identical with thinking. "I think, therefore I exist," Descartes said. Therefore, Tolstoy's attitude to logical constructions is not something natural and objective, but the essence is a reflection of Tolstoy's psychotype, or rather, any order of functions in which Logic is in fourth place.

Another example, illustrating the operation of the order of functions, will be quite worldly and will show how the sequence of means of struggle in conflict situations depends on it.

I know a boy with this order of functions: 1st Physics, 2nd Will, 3rd Logic, 4th Emotion. So, coming home one day from kindergarten and undressing, the boy dropped some candy on the floor. His older sister, who was passing by, quickly picked them up and put them in her pocket. The boy's reaction was completely consistent with his order of functions. At first, silently, without any prior negotiation, the little boy poked his fist at his sister (1st Physics). To no avail. Then the fist was followed by a volitional imperative: "Give it back!" (2nd Will). Nothing. I had to turn to logic: "This is mine!" (3rd Logic). When that didn't work either, the boy's lips twisted and he burst into tears (4th emotion). The sobs had more effect on his parents than on his sister, but anyway, the candy returned to its rightful owner.

We will limit ourselves to these two examples for now. To be honest, the last thing I wanted the reader to see in the order of functions was a primitive vertical, a kind of oak stake, on which the human psyche is placed. This phenomenon is, of course, much more complex.

* * *

The order of functions itself is very clearly divided into **the TOP** (the first two functions) and **the DOWN** (the last two). This division is remarkable because it introduces an element of antagonism into the human psyche, in which the upper strong functions are opposed to the weaker lower ones (usually the First and the Third functions are most acutely opposed).

For example, the evangelical Christ had the Will ("spirit") at the top and the Physic ("flesh") at the bottom, and in accordance with this position of functions he proclaimed in his time the famous postulate: "The Spirit gives life; the flesh does not benefit a little" (John 6:63). This phrase of Christ later became a description of the reference mental model of the whole Christian world. But no matter how hard the Church tried in many ways to make it the norm of human life, millions and millions of people with a different order of functions than Christ's continued secretly and explicitly to resist the polarization of Will and Physics, the excessive glorification of the spirit as opposed to the flesh, which for many was much more abundant than the spirit. And, I think, many people, following Victor Hugo, who did not miss a single skirt until he was 80 years old, could bitterly state

"O weak spirit of ours! You are possessed by the flesh!

You can't overcome base passions

The fall of an angel! Mud on swan wings!

The flesh is all-powerful! It overcomes all!"

Disagreement with the Christian psychological model, which affirmed the superiority of the spirit over the flesh, is inherent not only in those for whom the flesh greatly surpasses the spirit, but also in those who find the very fact of such an opposition unacceptable and strange, that is, people for whom the Will and the Physique stand side by side, in a pair, either above or below. Goethe, for example, in a letter to Klopstock, had to, contrary to the pressures of upbringing and environment, openly declare, "I am not a Christian." And this is understandable. In Goethe both functions (Will and Physique) were at the top, and therefore without terrible violence to himself to contrast the equally strong sides of his nature, spirit and flesh, he was simply not able to do so.

From this, however, it does not follow that Goethe had no bifurcation at all. No, it was simply different. With Physics at the top and Logic at the bottom, Goethe was prone to exaggerate the importance of empiricism while diminishing pure speculation. In another letter, he made another characteristic confession: "God punished Jacobi with metaphysics, but *blessed* me with *physics*, so that I could rejoice in admiring his creation. And if you say that one can only believe in God, I tell you - I **believe with** all my strength **only in what I see.**" Thus, following his order of functions. Goethe was a type of complete sensualist and a consistent enemy of rationalism, which found its fullest artistic expression in the character of Faust, a character filled with skepticism and thirst for sensual pleasures.

* * *

We all live by the principle "Strength is intelligence". That is, we justify the presence of strong upper functions to justify the presence of weak lower ones. "Zato" is a magic word that we extract into the light of God every time our failure is discovered: "I am weak and

dry, **but** strong-willed and clever," "I am weak and stupid, **but** sensitive and beautiful," etc. It is difficult even for us to imagine that life is possible without "buts," a harmonious life, without dividing one's nature into Top and Bottom.

Not only the psyche of an individual, but also the psyche of entire nations is divided into "upper" and "lower". The presence of typical "Englishmen", "Japanese", "Gypsies" allows us to talk about the psychotypical face of a nation, and with it the presence of an ethnic "top" and "bottom".

If we take, for example, the four familiar functions: Will, Physics, Logic, and Emotion, - and project them onto the psyche of the Russian people, having previously divided them into top and bottom, much in Russian history and culture will become clear.

Obviously, the Russian people have Emotion and Physics at the top, while Logic and Will are at the bottom. And this order of functions immediately and well explains why the historical path of Russia was so tortuous; why it is so poor in manifestations of a strong spirit and a deep mind, but so rich in artistic talents; why the national physiognomy was inherent in what Berdyaev very accurately called "eternally womanly" in the character of Russian people. When Emotion and Physics are at the top, and Logic and Will are at the bottom, the stigma of "femininity," even as applied to the nation, looks though offensive, but quite understandable and justified.

Let us remember the first peculiarity of the order of functions: the presence of **the TOP** and **BOTTOM**. And then let us remember another important feature: the division of functions into **Result** and **Process**.

What is to be understood by both? - I'll try to be brief. "Result-oriented" functions (the First and Fourth) are those for which, in expressing themselves, the result is more valuable than the process. And "processive" functions (Second and Third), gravitate toward the opposite and value the process more than the result. In schematic form, this division of functions can be depicted as follows:

1. Effective

2. Process

3. Process

4. Effective

It can also be said that productive functions, by the very principle of their action, are inwardly lonely, not inclined to search for a partner and gravitate toward a monologue when expressing themselves. Processive functions, on the contrary, are inclined to dialog, they like partnership and maximum interaction. To illustrate, here is an example. If, say, a person prefers to realize his logic function as a **result** obtained in the course of solitary office reflections, then we can say with certainty that his Logic is productive (Descartes). If, on the other hand, one finds true satisfaction only **in the process of** communicating with others, one's Logic is clearly processional (Socrates).

FIRST FUNCTION

The main sign of the First Function is its *DEFINITELY*. If we feel that nature has endowed us with something not just in abundance, but even with some excess, we can say with certainty that it is the First Function. Whatever it is: 1st Emotion, 1st Will, 1st Logic, 1st Physics.

* * *

The first function is the strongest side of our nature, so when we have first contacts with other people we quite unconsciously lay it on the table as our trump card. For example, a holder of the 1st Logic, going to a meeting with a stranger, will first (again I emphasize - quite unconsciously) think about whether her cleavage is deep enough, and then about the content of the conversation, her role in it, etc. Whereas the owner of the 1st Logic will think over the topic of the conversation first, and then she will deal with her appearance...

* * *

The first function is our main weapon in conflicts: family, industrial or otherwise.

In this connection, the most commonplace household truths take on a new and interesting perspective. For example, it is commonly believed that when a husband beats his wife and the wife cries, it means that the husband is a beast and the wife is a martyr. However, this is not true. It's just that the husband has 1st Physics and the wife has 1st Emotion, and each of them uses their strongest weapon in the conflict. There are known cases of the same kind with the opposite gender sign. Or here is another example, according to Plutarch, "Darius, the father of Xerxes, said in praise of himself that in battles and in the face of danger he became only more reasonable, "i.e. Darius had 1st Logic.

There would be no great sin in the very use of the First Function as a weapon (one has to fight with something!) if, among other things, the First Function were not too cruel in these battles. And the First is ruthless. The very productive nature of it does not tolerate compromise and requires absolute victory in the fight. The 1st Physics beats the opponent if not to death, then to a complete blackout; the 1st Will seeks undivided power, absolute leadership; the 1st Logic in discussions has only one truth - its own and, proving it, does not stop until it crushes the opponent on all counts; the 1st Emotion screams until it stuns and silences the opponent.

* * *

The first is a hammer, equally suitable for destruction and creation. However, it is a hammer with all the conveniences and inconveniences that follow from this circumstance, the hammer of a blacksmith, and not the hammer of a jeweler. The products created by him are not distinguished by fineness of finish, they are rough, simple and oriented more on reliability than on beauty.

* * *

The strongest side of one's nature is usually accorded the status of an instrument of supreme authenticity. Therefore, another angle of the First Function is superiority in terms

of the theory of cognition. On an epistemological basis, the First clearly divides humanity into four unequal parts: sensualists (1st Physics), voluntarists (1st Will), mystics (1st Emotion), and rationalists (1st Logic). Sensualists believe only experience, mystics believe only experience, voluntarists believe only personal energy, rationalists believe only logic.

The illusion of the absolute validity of the knowledge obtained with the help of the First Explains well, among other things, such an amazing phenomenon for our enlightened age as the mass fascination with magic, astrology, and similar superstitions. The mystery is solved simply: all this mass of believers in mysticism is made up of emotionalists. Therefore rationalists can continue to walk on their heads, proving the invalidity of superstition. Useless. For the 1st Emotion a black cat on the road will always be more reliable than all the arguments of reason.

* * *

The first function is the most important and most reliable tool of perception of the world around, through the prism of which one always begins to analyze the picture that opens before him. A charming anecdote from the series of anecdotes about Lieutenant Rzhevsky comes to mind in this connection: "A lieutenant and a lady are walking along a pond in which swans are swimming.

Lady (enthusiastically): "Lieutenant, wouldn't you like to be a swan?"

Lieutenant: "Naked butt? In the cold water? No, I don't think so!"

I think the reader has already guessed which is the First Function in this anecdote. Of course, it was the lady's 1st Emotion that painted the picture in front of her in emotional romantic tones, while the lieutenant's 1st Physics made the same picture purely physiological in perception.

Probably, with time, when both use other functions to analyze the environment, the positions of the characters of the anecdote will get closer: the lady will feel the discomfort of sitting in cold water, and the Lieutenant will appreciate the beauty of the landscape. But at first, their view of the world will necessarily be different and necessarily derived from the First Functions.

* * *

The first function, precisely because of its redundancy, is the main force that one feels in oneself most clearly, one hears its mighty breath within oneself. For example, once Mikhail Chekhov and Vakhtangov met, and in the course of their conversation they both, the great actor and the great director, "had to confess to each other that we are familiar with the incomprehensible power that arises in us at times. I (Chekhov) - while playing on stage, he (Vakhtangov) - in everyday life. This power gave me power over the audience, he - over the people around him.

Chekhov and Vakhtangov did not give names to the forces they felt in themselves, but now, given the special nature of the First Function, we can name them. Of course, Mikhail Chekhov had the First Emotion, and it was this that conditioned both his choice of the

acting profession and the power he had over the audience, the power of emotional dictatorship. Vakhtangov, on the other hand, had an obligatory for a great director First Will - the power to keep the actors and others around him in check.

Although man usually cherishes, cares for, and nurtures his First Function, he, and especially those around him, feel that it is unhappy and even ugly. And this feeling stems from its excessiveness. As Shakespeare wrote:

"...the sweetest honey

We are disgusted by the excess of sweetness,

He spoils his appetite with excess."

So it is with the First Function. Its excess reeks of pathology, and thus poisons man to the joy of admiring the most powerful side of his nature.

* * *

It may seem strange, but even the most fundamental religious conceptions of what God is in his being and what human immortality is all about are formed under the direct influence of the First Function.

Everyone is religious, but everyone is religious in his own way. Even the 1st Logic can be religious, but its faith has nothing to do with the mystical idolatry of popular faith. The essence of the religion of the 1st Logic is the absolutization of the mind itself.

The 1st Logic, in its usual manner of looking around and systematizing the world around it, finds it so reasonably arranged, mathematically verified, that it soon comes to the conclusion about the presence of some higher Creator, whose first and practically only property is Reason. From Anaxagoras to Einstein, any possessor of the 1st Logic, having taken the trouble to consider the problem of the origin of all things, willy-nilly comes to a self-portrait religion in which Deity, the creator and motor of the universe, is thought of exclusively as Mind (Nus in ancient Greek philosophy) and has virtually no other attributes.

In agreement with such theology the idea of human immortality is also transformed. Proceeding from its scale of values, the 1st Logic considers only mind as worthy of eternity and according to this notion models the picture of the afterlife. Constructions like Chardin-Wernadsky's "noosphere" theory, according to which a transparent shell composed of ideal, cleansed of all impurities, immortal human minds swirls over the earth, are a direct reflection of this modeling.

It remains to add to the above that the 1st Logic, in its desire to absolutize itself, is by no means alone. This is a property of the First Function in general:

The 1st Will sees in the Absolute the unconscious, the blind will (Schopenhauer, Hartmann, Kierkegaard, etc.), and awards eternity exclusively to the human "spirit," the will.

The first Physics professes outright idolatry, i.e. it deifies matter in all its forms, and immortality is imagined quite carnally, like the early Christian concept of the coming Resurrection in the flesh.

The 1st Emotion identifies Deity with the highest and brightest experience ("God is love" 1 John 4.8) and only the "soul," the heart essence within, is left to live beyond the grave.

* * *

In old age the First Function becomes even more redundant: the 1st Emotion becomes more critical, the 1st Will more tyrannical, the 1st Physics more stingy, the 1st Logic more dogmatic. And this is because the destructions of personality, produced by the inexorable passage of time, in old age force a man to consolidate even more securely in himself that which has served him as his main support before.

The First function is the pillar of the personality, the foundation upon which the bungalow of the human psyche, shaken by all the winds, rests. In this superpower and fortress of the First, however, there is a hidden and dangerous flaw. It is not flexible. That is why blows on the First are very painful and insignificant destructions of it, introduced by the fast-flowing life (say, diseases and injuries for the 1st Physics), drive a man sometimes to madness and suicide.

And human nature is apparently aware, or rather "subconscious" of the dangerous lack of flexibility in the First Function, because, despite the self-confidence of the First, it is usually in no hurry to put itself to the test in a doubtful situation, whatever we mean by test: a fight or a dispute.

Let's be completely honest: the First Function is our gift to ourselves. It is selfish, although the word "selfishness" itself is usually used only in relation to the 1st Physics. Therefore, if someone gets something from the First, firstly, it is always "from generosity", from excess of the result obtained alone, and, secondly, not due to an internal need of the First itself, but under pressure of subordinate processional functions.

In concluding this account of the First Function, it must be admitted that the First Function's selfishness, monologism, vulnerability, cruelty, and brutality make it the most significant and vivid, but not the best side of human nature.

SECOND FUNCTION

The second function is NORMATIVE. And like any norm, it is difficult to describe. A person is unlikely to find more than two words to describe his or her health, if it is normal: colors, epithets, and images are found only when there is a need to list painful conditions. So it is with the Second Function, it defies description, and like good health, one does not feel it.

If the First Function can best be compared to a hammer, then the Second Function can best be compared to a river. It is just as strong. But in addition to strength, it possesses qualities unknown to the First: breadth, richness, naturalness, and flexibility. The source of all these virtues lies in the fact that the Second's strength is paired with processionalism, i.e., it is a force charged with constant dialogue, constant interaction. Returning to the comparison between the First and the Second, if the First is our gift to ourselves, then the Second is our gift to others. Therefore, it is the Second function that is the best side of man.

Processionalism, however, is not the monopoly of the Second. The real monopoly, or its main hallmark, is action, impeccably adequate to the situation, without excess and without scarcity, the standard of behavior. I recall the story of one film director about the actress who had to shoot twenty takes in one day, and every time there were tears in her eyes exactly when it was necessary, and there were as many as necessary. Only the 2nd Emotion can do that.

The second function is extremely rich in shades and has a tremendous range. Not to go far, I will give an example of the same 2nd Emotion: one researcher calculated that Tolstoy described 85 shades of eye expression and 97 shades of smile. The ability to see and convey such richness is not mere observation-it is a special psychological disposition of the individual.

* * *

There is one more property of the Second Emotion, conditioned by the processionality: its full realization is possible only in the presence of a partner, an audience. This property is difficult to observe, but one woman with the Second Emotion confessed to me that although life circumstances forced her to do so, she - alone - did not even feel like crying.

The combination of the power and processionalism of the Second Function endows it with such an extraordinarily valuable quality as pity. Actually, pity is not the Second's monopoly, but one of the aspects of processionality. The specificity of the Second's pity is precisely that it pitied from the position of strength, confidence, and experience of the richly gifted side of human nature. Let's say there is nothing better for the sick, the disabled, the elderly than to find oneself under the care of the 2nd Physicist. The relentlessness of her compassion, the constant care, the precision, the quickness and carefulness of her movements are able to provide the utmost comfort to any infirm person.

Another characteristic of the Second Function is that it is fearless. Moreover, a person experiences a kind of pleasure, putting it to the test often in doubtful and even deliberately uncomfortable situations. And this behavior is easy to explain: the Second is not only strong, but also malleable, so blows to it do not wound, but only give direction to work on its further improvement. Thus, one of my classmates, being a holder of the 2nd Physique, was not lazy to go to the other end of the city for the sole purpose of getting into a fight. Often he drove without knowing whether he was going to be beaten or not. Of course, it was not without bruises and bruises, but the benefits became apparent over time: in time he became a dashing pilot, an Air Force colonel.

THIRD FUNCTION

"We all fail in some way," said Jules Renard, wistfully, not realizing that in doing so he was intuitively feeling out the Third Function in himself and others.

In its principles, the Third Function is almost indistinguishable from the Second Function; it is also processional. It is even, so to speak, superprocessional. However, in its external manifestations, the Third function differs strikingly from the Second. The difference is conditioned by the fact that the Third is not a strength, but a weakness, our ulcer, a sore spot of the human psyche.

In my opinion, the term "complex" introduced by the Zurich school of psychiatrists, with which attempts were made to describe the Third Function, is not very successful. Much more accurate is the term "dynamic trauma," used by the remarkable psychiatrist Charcot, who was one of the first to feel that the human psyche was inherently flawed.

Criticism of the term "complex," however, does not negate the important fact that there are very many precise features in that characterization of the Third Function that Carl Gustav Jung gave under the name of "complexes. He wrote: "...experience shows that complexes always contain something like a conflict, or at least are either the cause or the consequence. At any rate, complexes contain signs of conflict, shock, embarrassment, incompatibility. These are the so-called "painful points", in French "betes noires", the English refer to "skeletons in the cupboard", which one does not really want to remember and even less want to be reminded by others, but which often remind of themselves in the most unpleasant way. They always contain memories, desires, fears, obligations, needs, or thoughts from which there is no escape, and therefore they constantly interfere and harm us by interfering with our conscious life.

Obviously, complexes represent a kind of inferiority in the broadest sense, and I should note here that a complex or having a complex does not necessarily mean inferiority. It only means that there is something incompatible, unassimilable, perhaps even some kind of obstacle, but it is also a stimulus to great aspirations and therefore quite possibly even a new opportunity for success. Consequently, complexes are in this sense squarely the center or node of psychic life, one cannot do without them, because otherwise psychic activity would come to a fraught stagnation. But they also signify the unfulfilled in the individual, the area where something cannot be overcome or overcome; that is, without a doubt, the weak point in every sense of the word.

This character of the complex to a large extent illuminates the causes of its emergence. Obviously, it appears as the result of a collision between a requirement for adjustment and a special, unsuitable property of the individual in relation to this requirement. Thus, the complex becomes for us a diagnostically valuable symptom of individual disposition."

If we compress everything Jung said and add a little of ourselves, we can say that the essence of the Third Function is as follows: it is a function that we ourselves consider vulnerable, defective, underdeveloped, in need of constant strengthening, self-development and protection. Hence all the specific features of the Third Function.

* * *

The Third is a double. Just as the entire order of functions is divided into Top and Bottom (which has already been mentioned), so is one Third function divided and bifurcated. It combines a sense of weakness with a sense of enormous but unrealized potential. The

Third is the chained Prometheus, a titan who is made weak, defenseless, and vulnerable by psychological chains.

A friend of mine, when asked to explain what her 3rd Emotion looked like, said very accurately, "Imagine that you are pregnant and the baby is already begging to come out. But your pelvis is too narrow, and its head gets stuck when you try to give birth." Although in this case the reference was to the Third Emotion, the image of a painful labor with a baby stuck in the pelvis is the most fitting description of the Third Function in general.

* * *

Vulnerability and heightened sensitivity are the main hallmarks of the Third Function. Strikes on the Third are experienced extremely painfully, and scars from them remain practically for life.

As a rule, the period of complete defenselessness of the Third Function and particularly frequent blows to it falls on childhood. It is children who are most often beaten, humiliated, insulted, scolded. And if in childhood the Third is not protected, but, on the contrary, constantly hurt, then this circumstance refines to an extreme the already refined Third.

Fortunately, strikes on the Third Function are extremely rare, since it has a heightened sense of danger, which allows it to prevent an attack, and it is difficult to catch it unawares. For example, a person with the 3rd Physique is extremely wary of the outside world, and therefore injuries occur only in exceptional cases (of course, the words "world" and "injury" have a purely physical meaning).

Expecting a blow to the Third Function is our main nightmare: the 3rd Logic is afraid of being accused of incompetence, the 3rd Physics of being beaten, the 3rd Will of being humiliated, the 3rd Emotion of being hysterical. However, this nightmare rarely materializes, as the Third tends to hyperbolize and usually greatly exaggerates the real danger. Returning to the comparison of the Third with the chained Prometheus, I would add that her defenselessness and vulnerability make her see every crow flying by as a Zeus eagle sent to peck your liver.

* * *

However, life is life, and sometimes (to continue the metaphor) the Zeus eagle does arrive. Here we have to do something, willy-nilly. There are three ways out of a situation in which the threat of a strike against the Third is real: either the most thorough preparation in the run-up to the conflict, or transferring the struggle to another level and function, or fleeing. To illustrate this point, here is a history of the strained relationship between President Reagan and the press. With the 3rd Logic, Reagan reduced the number of press conferences to a minimum; when he could not avoid them, he agreed to talk to journalists only after long rehearsals. This is the first exit. Despite the preparation, the president did not feel very comfortable at a press conference, and therefore he often avoided the questions with the help of jokes, anecdotes, humor and cautionary tales, i.e. he tried to move the communication from the logical sphere which frightened him into the painless

emotional one. This is the second way out. And finally, escapism: Being caught off guard by journalists, Reagan simply pretended to be deaf.

* * *

The third function, more than any other, is to experience another's pain. To feel it even more acutely than the object of empathy feels it. Tolstoy, for example, did not give a damn about the work of a scientist or musician, but through the prism of his Third Physics, he could not look at every peasant working in the field without tears. Although the man himself did not necessarily experience the torments that Tolstoy attributed to him, and, in turn, could himself look with compassion of the 3rd Logic at any reading man, etc., etc.

* * *

Pity, compassion, are properties that are akin to the Third Function and the Second. However, there is a feeling, unknown to the Second, but constantly accompanying the Third, which is envy. It is identical with the feeling felt by a sick person in relation to a healthy person. It combines the desire to rise to the object of envy and at the same time to humiliate it. Here I will continue to illustrate the story of the Third Function with examples from Tolstoy's life (3rd Phys.). Here is how the director Lev Sulerzhitsky described his joint walk with Tolstoy in Moscow: "Tolstoy noticed two cuirassiers from a distance. Shining in the sun with copper armor, jingling spurs, they walked in step, as if joined together, their faces also shone with the complacency of strength and youth.

Tolstoy began to censure them: "What majestic stupidity! Totally animals, trained with a stick..."

But when the cuirassiers had drawn near him, he stopped and, seeing them off with an affectionate glance, said with admiration: "How beautiful they are! Ancient Romans, eh, Levushka? Strength, beauty, ah, my God. How good it is when a man is beautiful, how good..."

I hope the reader has paid attention to the polarity of Tolstoy's assessments when it comes to a layer of life that Tolstoy himself with his 3rd Physic was vulnerable to and which was clearly in excess (the 1st Physic) endowed with counter-cirassiers. It is typical of the Third Function.

* * *

"The fig leaf reaction" is what you might call the first reaction in a situation where the Third Function encounters the same function above.

The free, open, strong manifestation of what one has been bruised irritates one, makes one look for some justification for one's weakness, actively denies the significance and effectiveness of this layer of life, and hides behind this denial, as a shield, the feeling of one's own inferiority. This is how the fig leaf is born, with which a person usually walks all his life. The number of fig leaves corresponds to the number of the Third Functions:

they are irony for the 3rd Emotion, skepticism for the 3rd Logic, sanctimony for the 3rd Physics, foolishness and hypocrisy for the 3rd Will.

However, hiding one's shame under a fig leaf is not in itself a guarantee of peace. On the contrary. The more active the denial, the more irresistible the secret desire to realize oneself in this vulnerable sphere of life. Here it is enough to remember that monk of Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra (3rd Phys.), who, saving himself from the prodigal passion, buried himself up to his neck in the ground. Thus, sometimes the struggle with the processionality of one's own Third leads almost to self-destruction.

In this regard, it becomes clear why the Third Function is not only rejected but also passionately loved. We can say that the Third Function is the main generator of love, and the choice in marriage is more often determined by it. It is not without reason that the great preacher of asceticism, Tolstoy, married a girl gifted with flesh in abundance (the 1st Function). And she could not understand for the rest of her life how the combination of the monstrous sanctimony of the "Kreutzer Sonata" with the mighty and tireless fervor of love of her husband is explained. And that is exactly how it is explained: The 3rd Physics is everything.

* * *

Marriage is not the only means by which man tries to loosen up and realize his Third Function. There are chemical means for this as well, say, alcohol. It is for the sake of the Third that we consume alcohol in companies. I emphasize - precisely in companies, because the origins of drunkenness are manifold. Alcohol, drunk in company, has that miraculous property that allows you to forget about your defect, to freely and easily implement the Third function.

Hence the amazing metamorphoses that usually happen to drunken people, metamorphoses like those that happened to the millionaire from the famous Charlie Chaplin movie. The dry, reserved man (3rd Emotion) becomes sensitive; the silent man (3rd Logic) becomes a chatterbox; the misogynist (3rd Physics) becomes a dragster; the modest man (3rd Will) becomes a snob...

The scissors in the behavior of the Third Function under the influence of alcohol sometimes take on a curious, if not tragicomic coloration. Here is a typical quote from a letter to the newspaper: "Jura was tall, strong, handsome, he constantly carried me in his arms. And everything would have been fine, if not for his strangeness. He seemed afraid to fall in love, afraid of love. True, it was worth it when he drank, and he began to say gentle words, fiercely kissing (intimacy with anyone I have never had before marriage). And in those moments, I just went crazy. I loved him so much that I was looking for a reason to drink, just so he would be mine, only mine. When he was sober, he was different, and I didn't know how to get him to relax. Obviously, the problem here was the 3rd Emotion, and here is also named the fundamental disadvantage of alcohol in terms of the realization of the Third Function: the short duration of its action. The problem returns the next day with the addition of a headache.

* * *

Like the Second Function, the Third Function likes to put itself to the test. However, there are significant differences between the self-testing of these two functions. First, the Third Function prefers to test itself under conditions that exclude direct confrontation. And second, it goes to the limit in these tests. For example, Tolstoy's sister told me how he ran for five versts behind a carriage when he was 15 years old and when the carriage stopped, the young Tolstoy breathed so much that his sister cried. Only the Third, and, in particular, the Third Physicists, can examine themselves in this way. Other Physicists would behave differently: the productive Physicists would simply not put themselves to the test (the First by virtue of self-confidence, the Fourth by indifference), the 2nd Physicist would run after the carriage, but would run only as long as it was a pleasure contest.

The ordeal described above is typical of the Third Function, and what makes it so is the Third's ignorance of the natural limit of its capabilities. Our internal picture of the state of the Third Function is a purely subjective matter. And in order to find out whether there is an "ulcer" in the Third or it only seems to us, and if there is, what its true size is, it is necessary to examine the Third and to examine it at the limit of its possibilities.

* * *

If the test for the Third Function is passed successfully, then the highest, unknown in other cases, satisfaction sets in. In general, successes, praise, and awards in the Third Function are valued like no other and are a matter of abiding pride for their owner. For example, Napoleon, having the 3rd Logic, was most proud of his membership in the National Institute (Academy of Sciences) and even signed his army orders "Bonaparte, member of the National Institute" and only after this title put all the others, for others, maybe much more weighty.

For the same reason, the Third, more than any other function, is sensitive to flattery. It is impossible to overdo it here; no matter how monstrous flattery on the Third is, deep down inside a person absolutely not believing it, still shows full readiness to drink and drink this poison, never becoming satiated and never experiencing heartburn.

FOURTH FUNCTION

It is difficult to talk about the Fourth Function in so many words. It is a "trifle," a function to which we ourselves attach little importance. This does not mean that the Fourth is obviously weak and unproductive. On the contrary, the world is full of good mathematicians with the 4th Logic and artists with the 4th Emotion. The main thing in it is again the subjective hierarchy of internal values, forcing one thing in oneself to be placed on the last fourth step. And having put, and treat accordingly.

I would like to insist on this attitude to the Fourth Function because confusion between **the quality** of functioning and **the position** of the function on the steps of the psychic hierarchy is a common mistake in psychosophy. The 4th Logic is not necessarily stupid, the 4th Emotion is not necessarily insensitive, etc. One woman with the 4th Will, when I once commented on her "weak character," contradicted me with feeling: "That's not true. I am not weak-willed. I'm just more comfortable being driven." And she was absolutely right. God forbid us, in examining low-ranking functions, to equate their position with quality. No mistake is more serious.

* * *

On the surface, the Fourth Function is hardly distinguishable from the Second. What they have in common is freedom, naturalness, and fearlessness of self-expression. For example, the 4th Logic can get into an intricate philosophical argument with ease and paradoxical thinking, without being offended, like the 2nd Logic, at the "fool" who has spoken in his heart. With the outward resemblance of action, however, there is a profound difference in motives between these two functions: 2nd Logic will not be offended by a "fool" because it will not believe it, while 4th Logic will be offended because it is deeply indifferent to assessments on this part. That's the trick.

* * *

Based on the outward similarity between the Second and Fourth functions, I see the need to list the signs by which identification of the Fourth can be considered unconditional.

The main thing is that activity according to the Fourth has no independent value; it is not an end, but a means of existence. Therefore, if, say, someone with the 4th Logic is engaged in intellectual labor, it follows only that he tries to use this function (regardless of success) as a tool with which to realize the demands of other self-valuable superior functions: ambition - by Will, material interests - by Physics, etc.

Second, the unreliability of what is mined and obtained by the Fourth; recall Tolstoy's 4th Logic, who, for all his love of philosophizing, doubted the existence of Japan and Madagascar.

Third, disconnection of the Fourth in crisis situations. The human psyche, which is generally distrustful of the Fourth as such, disconnects it during crises as a possible hindrance in choosing the right solution and shifts the internal energy to higher levels.

Next, there is mirroring. Interaction with the Fourth is always identical to the order made by the higher function of the partner. This circumstance, for example, makes the 4th Physique a good sexual partner, because, not having its own model of sexual behavior, it adequately and sensitively responds to all requests of the partner.

Finally, the Fourth Function is very dependent and easily subordinates itself to other functions higher in the hierarchy. Thus, 4th Physics painlessly becomes a concubine, 4th Emotion is easily infected with other people's moods, 4th Logic accepts any, more or less plausible concepts without any argument, 4th Will agrees in advance with decisions made for it.

* * *

A remarkable feature of the Fourth is that one learns its true power only in moments of fullness of life. Translating the term "fullness of life" into the language of psychosophy, we can say that it is a state when the first three functions are adequate to themselves, i.e. there is a good result on the First and there are processes on the Second and Third. It is at such moments that the usually dormant Fourth function acquires strength, independence and depth of sound. And vice versa, striking any of the first three functions completely shuts down the Fourth.

In short, the Fourth Function is a slave without guile, a chameleon and a dependant with great but often dormant potential.

* * *

At the end of the description of the functions I will give for clarity a diagram of their brief characteristics.

FIRST SECOND THIRD FOURTH

"hammer" "river" "ulcer" "trifle"

process result process result

excess norm deficiency scarcity

monologue dialogue dialogue monologue

hardness flexibility flexibility hardness

cruelty pity envy indifference

caution fearlessness fearlessness fearlessness

confidence confidence doubt unreliability

independence compromise compromise dependence

So we have before us a scheme. And like any scheme, it sins with straightforwardness and colorlessness. Therefore, our next task is to complicate, enliven and color the picture of the human psyche by describing Emotion, Logic, Physics and Will depending on their position on the four-step hierarchy of inner values.

EVERY WISE MAN IS SATISFIED WITH SIMPLICITY

It seems obvious: Logic, as a mental function, must be much younger than Emotion. After all, love in living beings clearly precedes thinking and is completely out of its control. Which is easily confirmed by observations on human nature, not to mention animals. That's right. But without entering into an argument about priorities, nevertheless, I will take the liberty of doubting this truth and suggesting that Logic is not inferior to Emotion in antiquity.

I proceed from the fact that life, even in its most primitive forms, is so complex and multivariant that the solution of all problems willy-nilly requires the work of the intellect. Otherwise it is impossible to survive. I will cite in this connection an observation by the remarkable biologist Konrad Lorenz. He once experimented with a species of cecchlid fish, whose interesting feature of behavior was that the male, collecting fry in the nest, "does not waste time on persuasion, but simply takes them in his spacious mouth and, swimming up to the nest, "spits them out" into the entrance hole.

One day Lorenz witnessed the following scene. Throwing a few worms at the bottom of the aquarium, he saw how the male, who had been walking around the aquarium in search

of his fry, grabbed one worm and began to chew it, but then he caught sight of a fry floating by. What happened next was this: "The male shuddered as stung, rushed after the little fish and pushed it into his already full mouth. It was an exciting moment. The fish was holding two very different things in its mouth, one of which it had to send to its stomach and the other to its nest. What would she do? I must confess that at this point I wouldn't have given two pence for the life of the tiny precious fish. But an amazing thing happened! The male stood motionless, with his mouth full, but not chewing. If I ever assumed a fish was thinking, it was at this very moment. It is quite remarkable that a fish can be found in a truly difficult situation, and in this case it behaved exactly as a human would behave if it were in its place. For a few seconds she stood motionless, as if unable to find a way out, and you could almost see how tense all her senses were. Then she resolved the contradictions in a way that cannot but cause admiration: she spit out all the contents at the bottom of the aquarium...Then the father resolutely went to the worm and unhurriedly began to eat it, all the while looking with one eye at the young, which obediently lay at the bottom. When he was done with the worm, the male took the fry and carried it home to its mother.

Several students who witnessed this scene flinched when one man started applauding."

Together with Lorentz, I applaud and rejoice for the fish, I want to note that, no matter how elementary the logical task in this case was and how painfully the fish coped with it, it involuntarily deprived the man of the halo of exclusivity due to his alleged undivided possession of such a great treasure as reason.

However, the time when man claimed intellectual primacy seems to have passed. Just as it seems that the time when superiority is seen in the weight and volume of his brain, or in the number of crinkles, has passed. According to all these parameters, man can hardly claim to be the undisputed leader of the animal world. Yes, and apparently it is not about parameters: the great scientist Louis Pasteur became a light of science with one half of his brain (the other half was atrophied), while the Florida resident, whose brain was the heaviest known, remained nameless even for the meticulous writers of the Guinness Book of World Records.

The question arises: if not the parameters of the brain and intellectual primogeniture, then what made man a "thinking reed", awarded this species the title "sapiens"? I will take the risk and give a completely heretical, based, of course, on the principles of psychosophy, explanation of the human phenomenon.

The essence of the human phenomenon is not in the presence or absence of Logic or in the quality of the tools we have for its realization, but in the position of Logic on the steps of the functional hierarchy.

It was once very aptly and expressively stated that the mind is the superfang of man. That's right. But let us remember psychosophy: man's main weapon in the struggle is the functions at the top. The 4th Logic, whatever class of beings its bearer may belong to, does not recognize thinking as a powerful weapon and even turns it off, like any Fourth function, in anticipation of conflict. That is why the intellectual barrier passes not between

humans and animals, but between those with Logic Above and those with Logic Below. There is nothing offensive here: everyone thinks, and the quality of intellectual work does not depend at all on the position of Logic on the rungs of the functional ladder. The question is only whether, for an individual's mental self-perception, Logic is supportive, self-valuable, authoritative, reliable, homogeneous or, on the contrary, secondary and ineffective.

Think of the fish in the Lorenz Aquarium. It was thinking. But its thinking was quite typical for the 4th Logic: the activation of the intellect occurred only at the moment of necessity of choice, under the pressure of external circumstances. For her, intellectual work was not self-valuable, existing as an inner need, independent of external circumstances. Clapared, the founder of zoopsychology, wrote that in animals "the intellect is turned on when instinctive or acquired automatism is unable to solve a behavioral problem. " That is, Lorenz's fish itself was not stupid, it was simply too practical and mentally lazy to become human.

The essence of the intellectual boundary that runs through the entire cosmos of living beings is that individuals with the 4th Logic perceive thinking *as a means*, whereas individuals with the Logic above perceive it *as an end*, with all the gains and losses that result from this circumstance.

Therefore, the origin of the phenomenon of man in the light of psychosophy is seen as follows: in the beginning the entire animal world, including protohumans, had the 4th Logic, but one day, due to an unclear set of circumstances (mutation, climatic changes, etc.), individual representatives of the protohuman species had their LOGIC Crawled upwards. On this day, the phenomenon of man was born. Not being smarter than his congeners, the possessor of superior Logic simply treated the very process of thinking differently, considering it to be self-valuable, supportive, killing, considered so without any evidence yet, simply by virtue of his, new for the protohuman world, order of functions.

There was a gigantic intellectual explosion, in the words of one biologist, " the unprecedented happened - man was largely out of the influence of natural selection. Incomplete, unfinished. And so remained forever... The reason the human being is out of the effect of selection is that the main condition of success is not genetically transmitted information, but extra-genetically transmitted knowledge. Survival became not those who are better equipped, but those who make better use of the acquired and with each generation growing knowledge of how to build, how to get food, how to protect themselves from disease - how to live. " But most importantly, next to pragmatic thinking came fundamental thinking, thinking that is self-valuable, which exists regardless of the impulses and circumstances of the external environment.

Modern society is only now reaching an awareness of the need to fund basic research, i.e. to satisfy, as they say, their idle curiosity at someone else's expense. But in fact, regardless of the sources of funding, basic research has existed as long as modern man has existed.

The question arises: who was Socrates, sitting on the neck of his wife Xanthippa, and in endless conversations trying to understand the essence of philosophical categories, far from everyday life? He was a typical representative of high-minded Logic: idly curious, a supporter of the self-valued game of intellectual muscle, an adherent of the theory of thinking for the sake of thinking. But no matter how angry the willing or unwilling "sponsors" of fundamental intellectualism get, in the end, their contributions are never lost; the strategic gain always rests with the representative of superior Logic. And if we now see the world as it is, with all its pluses and minuses, he alone is responsible for this; it was he who gave man power over the whole earth and perhaps prefigured its demise. But no matter how the fate of the planet develops further, the motor of the last stage of evolutionary development, the high ranking Logic, will continue to play a decisive role.

The reader is probably already dreaming of the image of man of the future, typical of some magazine illustrations: a bald body, on top of which swings a bald skull the size of a pumpkin. No, you can be calm here. I repeat, it is not about the structure of the skull and not about anthropology at all, but about the order of functions, in which Logic happens to be at the top. Therefore, no anthropological metamorphosis is foreseen. I also do not foresee a coming numerical flood of intellectuals. Since the human love program is oriented towards emotionalists, which was discussed a lot in the previous chapter, it will take at least a millennium before Logic begins to seriously compete with Emotion in the struggle for procreation.

* * *

The time has come, however, to pass from global problems to private ones and to take up the analysis of the ways in which Logic is expressed, depending on its position on the rungs of the functional hierarchy. All carriers of this function are divided into "dogmatists" (1st Logic), "rhetors" (2nd Logic), "skeptics" (3rd Logic) and "schoolboys" (4th Logic).

"Dogmatic"(1st Logic)

The title "dogmatist" in this case has a twofold meaning: that of today, in which a dogmatist is someone incapable of changing once learned truths, and in the ancient sense of the word, in which a dogmatist was understood as a thinker inclined to a monologic, affirmative form of intellectual activity, as opposed to a dialectician, who preferred a dialogic, questioning form.

In principle, both the modern and the ancient Greek meanings apply equally to the 1st Logic. Since the internal, psychological setting of Logic is reflected only in the way of thinking, but not in its quality, the "dogmatist" can turn out to be both a great sage and an impenetrable dullard. The 1st Logic is united by the results of thinking, and what the results are is a purely individual matter.

Among the external features of the 1st Logic, the most noticeable and revealing is the unambiguously affirmative form of communication. Even when the "dogmatist" seems to ask, it does not follow that he expects an answer, and the question itself is usually posed

in such a way as to contain a deliberate evaluation. For example, a question like, "Did you hear what this moron said?" - obviously does not imply an unbiased exchange of opinions. For this reason, communication with the 1st Logic can be considered rather difficult; the "dogmatist's" communication is so oppressive that the conversation is reduced to a monologue; it can be interesting, useful, brilliant or, on the contrary, tedious, aimless, wretched, but it will still be a report, speech, and not a conversation.

The monologism of the 1st Logic is insurmountable even when it tries to speak on someone else's behalf and reproduce a fundamentally alien dialogic intonation. This was the case, for example, with the great "dogmatist" Plato, who vainly imitated the style of his teacher Socrates, until nature took its course and he reduced his "Socratic dialogues" to pure monologues in the end, the title of which was already a blatant fiction of Socrates, a lover and connoisseur of communication.

Fortunately, the dogmatist is not talkative, has the ability to hear, and takes his time to speak on any of the topics offered. He allows himself to begin a monologue only under comfortable conditions, i.e., in connection with a problem in which he considers himself competent. How well-founded is such an opinion of oneself, is another question, but, most importantly, when discussing topics in which the "dogmatist" is afloat or has no information at all, he prefers to keep silent.

This, I think, is a characteristic cautiousness of the 1st Logic. It is not able to communicate outside the affirmative form, and the discovery of the failure of its First - the supporting and most powerful function - during a cavalry assault on the subject is fraught with self-destruction of the personality.

Another reason for the silence of the 1st Logic: lack of the gift and taste for discussion. In arguments with a "dogmatist," truth is not born; it is either asserted or rejected. There is no third.

He usually goes into the dispute with a billet, a cudgel of absolute truth, with which he sometimes quite effectively silences his opponent. But the 1st Logic's billet is equally strong and weak. A trifling, dislocating question, an irrelevant remark, or even a simple nonsense, takes the "dogmatist" out of the equilibrium and closes his mouth. And while he is trying to reassemble the collapsed construction of his home speculative scheme, there comes a painful silent scene, excruciating for the 1st Logic and unpleasant for the listeners.

This happened, for example, to Demosthenes. Being an orator by profession, he was a "dogmatist" by way of thinking. That is why he never, even in extreme cases, gave impromptu speeches, but always first wrote and memorized a speech at home, and only then took it to the rostrum. It would have been all right, but the violent Athenian people often interrupted the speaker by shouting, and here Demosthenes was so tetanus that he lost the gift of speech and illiterate left the rostrum, which was immediately climbed by his party-mate Demades, capable of responding more flexibly to the crowd.

The "dogmatist" in general is a stoicist, not a sprinter of the intellect. He is, as the Russians say, strong in his hindsight (the English call it humor on the stairs), so he has no taste for discussion and does not enter into it without extreme necessity. Darwin confessed: "I am not endowed with the ability to grasp on the fly or the sharpness of mind that so impresses us in gifted people, such as Huxley. Accordingly I am an unimportant critic."

The third reason for the silence of the 1st Logic: an aversion to idle chatter, hypotheses, and private opinion in general. The "dogmatist" seeks absolute truth, not opinion. Only absolute truth can be placed as a brick in the intellectual pillar that 1st Logic builds for itself. Hence the outright alienation and even dislike that the "dogmatist" feels for chatter, hypotheses and opinions. One of the scientists who knew Einstein intimately wrote: "To approach absolute truth was the most important thing for him; in this endeavor he knew no delicacy and spared not the ego of his opponents."

I will not say that the "dogmatist" himself is not the author of hypotheses. It happens and very often ridiculous hypotheses. Another thing is that he usually does not consider them as such, does not consider them to such an extent that he is not inclined to check the correctness of their life by experience. It happens not out of negligence, God forbid, but because for the 1st Logic thought is primary and self-sufficient, it is objective and does not need any crutches.

Going from conception to fact and not vice versa is the usual way of acting in the 1st Logic. It is also natural in this way of thinking that for a "dogmatist" there is no sight more grievous than that of a theory struck down by fact. Once, while talking to Huxley about the nature of the tragic, someone mentioned Spencer. "Ha!" exclaimed Huxley, "tragedy in Spenser's view is deduction deadened by fact."

The "dogmatist" in his trust in thought (or rather, not in thought, but in the First Function, the function of the highest certainty) happens to go so far that those around him begin to classify this infatuation with speculation as insanity. Obsession with an idea, confidence in its super-value, reliance on logic to the detriment of fact and experience has its own special name in psychiatry - "paranoia". And it happens that such a diagnosis is given to the 1st Logic. However, as in the case of manic-depressive psychosis in the 1st Emotion, paranoia is not a mental illness in the proper sense of the word, it is just an extreme expression of the 1st Logic, which is naturally overly trusting of speculative schemes. And if we classify paranoia as an illness, it is not a mental illness, but a psychotypical one, i.e., conditioned by the individual's mental type.

However, the clinical title "paranoid" of the 1st Logic is given rather seldom, more often we are talking about a borderline condition characterized usually by epithets like: "mentor", "doctrinaire", "scientific donkey". Indeed, however unfortunate it is to admit, the 1st Logic, with its superpower giving man support and protection, at the same time deprives his brain of flexibility and ability to grow, generates herds of scientific asses.

The reaction, which the 1st Logic reacts to any obvious stupidity, nonsense, illogic, gibberish, which other Logics usually perceive quite indulgently, is also very similar to

madness. Knowingly nonsense, that is, direct mockery of the best, most important side of the psyche "dogmatist" almost immediately knock him out of the rut, driving him to madness, to hysteria. Paustovsky described in his memoirs one of his gymnasium teachers, who pathologically hated gibberish. The young fools in gymnasium soon recognized this weakness of his and, yelling some deliberate stupidity at the beginning of the lesson, just knocked out the teacher, immediately brought to the hysterical seizure and insanity.

* * *

The 1st Logic's thinking may not be the best in the world, but it is certainly the most HONEST. This is because there is nothing above Logic here, and no other function twists its arms to please itself, or presses from above, dictating the direction and way of thinking. The lower functions of the "dogmatist" can only ask, not demand from Logic something for themselves, something working for self-interest according to Physics, for sensitivity according to Emotion, for vanity according to Will - and only. Therefore, the 1st Logic, more than any other, is honest and pure in its reasoning, and the rigor of its intellectual constructions can be quite relied upon.

The ability to immerse oneself in thought to the point of total disconnection from the outside world is noticed in a "dogmatist" already in childhood. Extreme and, even more importantly, lonely brooding characterizes such a child. He can be alone for hours, preoccupied with his thoughts, not reacting to what is going on around him. Sometimes a thought grabs him at the most inopportune moment, for example, at a meal, and grabs him so strongly that the child "dogmatist's" look turns to stone, and the spoon hangs in the air for a long time, not carried to the mouth.

The tendency to somnambulistic immersion in thought in the 1st Logic is well illustrated by episodes from Einstein's life. It is said that one day Einstein was seen wheeling a baby carriage down the street; suddenly he stopped at the most inappropriate place, from the point of view of traffic rules, and, taking paper and pencil from his pocket, began to take hurried notes. Only when he was finished with his notes did Einstein continue driving. Or another case. Wishing to celebrate the scientist's birthday more extravagantly, friends invited Einstein to a restaurant and, among other things, ordered a rare delicacy - Russian caviar. When the caviar was brought, Einstein was just "talking about Newton's law of inertia and its possible physical explanation. He sent the caviar into his mouth and continued to comment on the law of inertia. When the caviar was eaten and the speaker stopped to put an invisible point, his interlocutors asked him if he knew what he had eaten. "No, why?" - "It was caviar!" - "How, was it really caviar?" - Einstein exclaimed sadly..."

The memory of the 1st Logic is also notable for its peculiarity. It holds ideas, theories, concepts well, but is rather weak on facts, names, dates, numbers. When Einstein was asked a simple question about the speed of sound, he replied: "I don't know it by heart. Why burden your memory with what you can find in any reference book." Einstein's explanation is only half true; the root of this kind of forgetfulness is in the efficiency of "dogmatist" thinking. He is not interested in disparate out-of-system factual material,

because it cannot be used to build that complete intellectual construction on which 1st Logic tries to rely. According to the "dogmatist," facts are sand, a worthless building material in and of themselves; only the visible addition of the cement of thought, which can turn the sand grains of facts into the concrete from which alone can form the true and unshakable pillar of personality, makes them valuable.

For the same reason, the "dogmatist" is usually not curious and often not even well-read. In general, if the circle of his professional interests is far from the intellectual sphere, with its baggage "dogmatist" almost does not stand out from the crowd, and does not seek to do so. His end game is system analysis, not information storage. Niels Bohr, for example, none of his colleagues considered him to be seriously erudite, but no one denied his great talent for structuring disparate, at first glance randomly caught in the field of view, facts. Bohr himself said: "You know, I'm an amateur. When others begin to exorbitantly complicate the apparatus of theory, I cease to understand anything... I can only think with a pinch of salt.

A "dogmatist" is a philosopher, a philosopher even when his occupation is formally far from philosophy. For example, Einstein and Bohr are considered to be physicists, but in fact they were natural philosophers and were much closer to Democritus than to Rutherford. The philosophical leanings of the "dogmatist" can be explained by the fact that the thinking of the 1st Logic is strategic from the beginning and gravitates toward the creation of closed universal systems. It is an unattainable, but constant goal of the "dogmatist" to link all things in the world with thought. As another famous physicist, Hevesi, wrote: "The thinking mind does not feel happy until it manages to link together the disparate facts it observes. This 'intellectual unhappiness' is what drives us most to think - to do science."

* * *

The conceit of the "dogmatist" as to the capacity of his mind extends far and wide. George Eliot once asked Spencer why he had no forehead wrinkles when he worked so hard. "It's probably because I'm never puzzled," the famous scientist replied. "Dogmatist" self-confident to the point that, perhaps, only he leaves indifferent to the general enthusiasm for crossword puzzles, logic tests and the like means of intellectual self-control. And in vain. This self-confidence sometimes serves the 1st Logic badly, because when a person's fate depends on test results (employment, admission to an educational institution, etc.), the 1st Logic does not always get high scores. And it's not just because the "dogmatist's" mind is undeveloped and stiff. The very assumption that the power of mind given by nature is not only plentiful, but even abundant, can be challenged seems so ridiculous to a "dogmatist" that he sometimes considers straining his hemispheres simply unnecessary. Hence the often more than modest results of intellectual testing of the 1st Logic.

* * *

About Style. In its pursuit of brevity, the 1st Logic is very similar to the 1st Emotion. Like the "romantic," the "dogmatist" is brief in his self-expression and seeks to present to

human judgment only the result of his solitary reflections, the "raisin" of thought, excluding everything that has preceded it, that is, the process of rational inquiry. For example, Einstein wrote his famous theory of relativity in three pages, and spent eighteen pages on his thesis, without even providing a list of references.

The lapidary expressions of the 1st Logic is rarely for her benefit and almost always to her detriment. Sometimes one can directly associate with it some irreplaceable, tragic losses. For example, Heraclitus - the greatest and deepest philosopher of antiquity - was already nicknamed "Dark" during his lifetime, and only a few brilliant quotations from his entire philosophical heritage have reached our days. Such is the bitter toll of the 1st Logic for the high concentration of its emphatically productive style.

The handwriting of the "dogmatist" is very recognizable. It is ugly, difficult to read, and by its principles is close to stenography (I think the inventor of stenography had the 1st Logic). The main formal attributes of "dogmatic" handwriting are as follows: one chooses the simplest and the fastest variant of lettering, also the links between letters are short, direct and maximally adapted to shorthand. In short, the handwriting of the 1st Logic is extremely rational and neglects clarity and aesthetics for the sake of speed and simplicity.

"Ritor" (2nd Logic).

To say that the "rhetorician" is a great lover of conversation is to say nothing. Communication is the air and bread of the 2nd Logic. The size of this need can be seen on the example of Fidel Castro, for whom it costs nothing to give a 15-hour interview. However, apparently, this is not the limit - Castro himself confessed that he met people even more talkative than him.

Moreover, this talkativeness of the "rhetorician" exists as if by itself, as a passion, as a disease, outside of personal and public interests. And sometimes in spite of them.

Abandoning the affairs of the vast empire, all day long Emperor Tiberius wandered through the schools of grammarians, asking wild, from the point of view of his social position, questions: "Who was Hecuba's mother? What was Achilles' name among the girls? What songs did the sirens sing?" No better than Tiberius sometimes wasted precious government time Stalin. He loved, for example, calling on the carpet some literary roach, for hours to devote criticism of the novel paralyzed from fear roach, comparing some of the great writers with others, comparing the different manners of writing, etc.

These curiosities could be considered a mere bliss of adored tyrants, except for the fact that both Tiberius and Stalin had the 2nd Logic. This circumstance puts everything in its place. Being carriers of a psychotype in which Logic is the Second Function, i.e. not only a powerful function but also a processional one, both tyrants, contrary to their own and state interests, simply could not go against their nature and threw everything they could get their hands on, up to near-literary gossip, into the insatiable womb of the 2nd Logic processionalism.

To pay tribute, the "rhetorician" would be utterly unbearable if his wordiness often did not reach the heights of the true art of communication. The secret of this art is in the ability and desire not just to speak out, but, above all, to involve the interlocutor in the conversation, to make an intellectual feast together.

The techniques by which such involvement in a conversation is achieved are simple and fail-safe. First, unlike a "dogmatist," a "rhetorician" never begins a conversation with a statement, but always with a question. He begins with a question even when the subject is known to him thoroughly. One of the owners of a powerful 2nd Logic, which is only switched off at night, once explained to me: "If I ask you a question, it doesn't mean that I don't know the answer. It just makes me more comfortable to talk to you."

The second way: pretend to be a fool and begin communication with a phrase like the famous Socratic: "I only know that I know nothing. It is hard to imagine who would refuse to swallow such a bait - an opportunity to teach a fool. And then it was a matter of technique: one word at a time, the conversation began to roll, and lo and behold - for an interesting conversation and the day passed.

It does not follow from this that only direct, open, equal dialogue conditions the full realization of the 2nd Logic. It is enough to have an echo. Especially in a situation when she is compelled by the force of circumstances to a monologue. Take, for instance, a speech from a rostrum. In this case, it seems that the speaker is condemned to a monologue, which means that the 2nd Logic is deliberately put in an uncomfortable position for her. This, however, is only an appearance. There is still communication; there is contact, only not on the linguistic but on the energetic level. This is how writer Garcia Marquez describes the rally version of Fidel Castro's 2nd Logic: "In the first minutes his voice is barely audible and intermittent. It is as if the speaker is moving blindly in a fog, using every flash of light to grope the terrain heel by heel, stumbles, but gets up and... completely overwhelms the audience. From that moment on, there is an electric circuit between him and the audience, which excites both sides, turning them into a kind of dialectical accomplices, and in this unbearable tension his ecstasy."

* * *

Another admirable and precious quality inherent in all "rhetors" without exception is a healthy cynicism. The 2nd Logic believes in neither God, nor devil, nor party programs, nor scientific doctrines - nothing. Everything axiomatic, dogmatic, falling into the millstones of the "rhetorical" brain's hemispheres, quickly loses its absoluteness and becomes a simple object of intellectual manipulation. For the "rhetorician" there are no prohibitions, no frameworks, no rules holding back the free play of thought. Everything is subject to the judgment of the 2nd Logic, but this judgment is merciful and rarely gives a final verdict (except for sheer stupidity). The verdict is the result, the end of the process, which the 2nd Logic cherishes so dearly. This is why the cynicism of her statements is devoid of aggressive, categorical notes; it is the cynicism of a nonpartisan, free-thinking person.

The "rhetorician" also has little regard for his own statements, which are not even statements, but only hypotheses, convenient for the moment. To refute today what was said yesterday is the normal state of a "rhetorician. We don't have to go far to find an example: Lenin. During his life he said so much to the contrary that Leninists still cannot decide which of his statements should be considered directive. A great polemicist, Lenin managed every time to make an extremely convincing point that directly contradicted the one he had recently defended with equal brilliance. In general, the ability of the 2nd Logic to shed its dilapidated intellectual skin with the ease of a snake is an enormous gift that makes an invincible polemicist, a Proteus of thought, multi-faced and elusive, out of a "rhetorician.

It is impossible not to admire the breadth of interests of the 2nd Logic. It is interested in almost everything that happens in the world, from global problems to the smallest ones. The memory of the "rhetorician", which is bulky and well holds universal concepts and insignificant facts, like a stingy store room, keeps everything that comes in its way, matches its interests as well. And there is a reason for this omnivorousness of the memory of the 2nd Logic. God only knows what can begin a conversation dear to the heart of "rhetorician", what will serve as a starting point: a trifle or a super-idea. The main thing is to participate, and full participation requires a voluminous memory devoid of conceit.

However, unlike the "dogmatist", the 2nd Logic is not at all embarrassed by the complete absence of information, when it fearlessly enters a conversation. It is true, it enters without the risk of being punished, because it is protected by the flexibility and freedom of mind, which are dear regardless of the degree of awareness of the interlocutors, as well as by the inevitably questionable form of entering the conversation.

The 2nd Logic is also unrivaled as a commentator, an interpreter of other people's ideas. To illustrate this point, one can describe Mikhail Bakunin, a young man who was fascinated by Hegelian dialectics at the time: "Bakunin had a great ability to develop the most abstract concepts with a clarity that made them accessible to everyone, without losing any of their idealistic depth... Bakunin could talk for hours, argue tirelessly from evening to morning, without losing any dialectical thread of conversation or the passionate force of conviction. And he was always ready to explain, to explain, to repeat without the slightest dogmatism."

As much as the "rhetorician" loves joint intellectual feasts, at the same time he is flawless in the art of rebuking, shutting up his opponent. Let me give examples from the life of tyrants we already know. About Stalin, they said that when Orjenikidze, learning about the search, carried out in his apartment NKVD, called his despot, and expressed his indignation, he heard in response: they say that the NKVD - an organization that can search and Stalin. Silent scene. One day a delegation of Trojans came to Emperor Tiberius and, with great delay, offered their condolences on the death of their son. Tiberius' reaction was instantaneous, he responded by expressing his condolences to them on the death of the best of the Trojans, Hector. A silent scene.

Regardless of the speed and accuracy of the 2nd Logic's witticisms, it should be noted as a general characteristic feature - a great speed of the processes going on in her brain. Necessary information is instantly extracted from the recesses of memory, it is instantly and semi-verbally assimilated, variants are calculated and hypotheses are born. There is an impression that the impulse runs faster along the neurons of the "rhetorician" than in other people. Watching the work of the 2nd Logic closely, you involuntarily feel like an arithmometer standing next to a computer.

Perhaps the only disadvantage of the 2nd Logic, which is an extension of its advantages, is that the thinking of the "rhetorician" gravitates toward tactics rather than strategy. The 2nd Logic does not aspire to something long-term, large-scale, finished; it is more interested in a momentary, close-to-the-point intellectual game. This peculiarity of the 2nd logic was very well described by the example of Lenin, by the SR Viktor Chernov: "Above all, he is a master swordsman, while a swordsman needs very little foresight and no complicated ideas at all. In fact, he does not need to think too much: he must concentrate on his opponent's every movement and control his own reactions with the speed of innate instinct in order to respond without the slightest hesitation to his enemy's every move."

Lenin's intellect was sharp but not broad, resourceful but not creative. A master of evaluating any political situation, he instantly mastered it, quickly assessed all its new twists and turns, and displayed remarkable political acumen. This perfect and quick-witted political acumen stands in stark contrast to the utterly unfounded and fantastic nature of all the historical forecasts he made for any length of time - any program that encompassed something more than today and tomorrow."

As a tactician rather than a strategist of thought, the "rhetorician" does not seek the ultimate truth, after which, of course, his quick, agile mind should simply fall away. One confession of Lessing is characteristic in this sense. He wrote: "The value of man is determined not by the possession of truth, real or imaginary, but by the honest labor used to reach the truth.... If God, concluding in his right hand the truth and in his left hand the eternal pursuit of the truth, but with the fact that I will go astray without end, said to me, "Choose!" I would humbly cling to His left hand, saying, "Father, give! The pure truth - it is for You alone."

* * *

"Rhetor" is not a big fan of putting his views in writing. And that's understandable. His passion is live communication, not a battle with a dead sheet of paper. He leaves it to others to take notes for themselves, as Socrates did when he agreed to Plato's writing. But what disgusts the 2nd Logic even more from office work is the impossibility of limiting himself to some framework, of finding the beginning and the end of thought. Thinking for the "rhetorician" is first of all a process, a movement, a flow, and the attempt to tear something out of it is no more fruitful than the attempt to cut a piece of the river. Therefore, if he sits down at the table, he does so with great reluctance, for any particular reason, and

his manuscript looks like something without beginning and end, a fragment of a boundless, endless opus.

The only time 2nd Logic willingly turns to paper is during times of forced loneliness. It is when she is condemned to silence that she turns to such a surrogate as paper, and usually keeps a diary. But he who thinks that it is a diary in the ordinary sense of the word, as a secret attorney of innermost thoughts, is greatly mistaken. It is nothing of the sort. It is a ship's journal of thought, expressly intended for outsiders to read. An acquaintance of mine, after long absences, would not just give, but force his wife to read his journal-journal.

Another notable and amusing character trait of the 2nd Logic is her passion for making notes in books, especially library books. Reading with a pencil, she lavishes the pages with dashes, exclamation and question marks, "nb", etc. Usually the phenomenon of a passion for scribbling in books can be explained in two ways: either by a lack of culture, or by a desire to more firmly imprint the most important places in the memory. But in reality, the origins of this passion are different. Scribbling in books is a typical form of communication for the 2nd Logic, a message to all future anonymous book owners, an attempt to exchange opinions by correspondence.

"Skeptic" (3rd Logic)

Once again I will express heresy, but I will still say: skepticism is not philosophy at all, but psychology. The title "skeptic" deserves any holder of the 3rd Logic, regardless of the level of education and degree of philosophical training. It would be enough to deny the efficacy and necessity of the rational beginning in a human being to be in the camp of skeptics.

However, the 3rd Logic would not be the Third Function if it were not internally bifurcated and, along with the fierce denial of reason, secretly worshipped it. The poet Alexander Blok almost cried out in his letters: "I know love, I know that 'reason' will not do, I don't want it, I throw it away, throw dirt on it, trample it underfoot," - but in one questionnaire he admitted: "My favorite quality is reason."

Typical of the Third Function, love-hate in the 3rd Logic is original only in that it addresses human mental activity.

* * *

An ordinary, everyday "skeptic" is a silent person, very cautious in his assumptions and conclusions, who treats all kinds of categorical judgments with distaste and irony. Moreover, silence as a form of existence predominates. One female Logic 3 owner, who was married to a Logic 4 owner, once complained to me, "I know I'm smarter than he is, but I want to open my mouth but I can't. Something gets in the way." Indeed, the "skeptic" is almost always condemned to silence, although it weighs on him more than on anyone else. However, it is worth it for the "skeptic" to open his mouth from time to time, as he immediately hears from outside: "Shut up, you'll pass for smart," and he goes numb, catching air with his mouth.

The only way for the 3rd Logic to protect itself from such traumas is to turn logic off from direct contact altogether. This is very much unwanted deep down and impossible in the conditions of modern society. Therefore, the "skeptic" has no choice but to limit himself or herself to minimal self-defense: fleeing from the most acute questions, discussions, disputes, and, most importantly, preventing attempts to use logic in conflict situations. Phrases like, "Let's not discuss!" "Stop talking!" - with which the 3rd Logic usually begins a conflict, pursue precisely this goal. Such demands are rarely heard by the grumpy opponents of the "skeptic," but he cannot avoid trying to protect himself from being hit where it hurts, so throughout the conflict he tries to take the fight to other functional levels, or, at the worst, to pretend to be deaf.

Having an almost panic-stricken fear of an acute, venturesome argument, the "skeptic", at the same time, appreciates unhurried, benevolent, free conversation, in which there are no winners and losers and, therefore, no division into smarts and fools (3rd Logic is most afraid of getting into the latter). It values, even to put it bluntly, idle chatter, in which the process is much more valuable than the result.

It is here that we discover that the supposed silent man is in fact monstrously verbose, that there is no greater joy for him than to murmur and murmur quietly, almost in a whisper, going over, like beads of rosary beads, topic by topic.

The third Logic especially succeeds in two themes. The first is the classic skeptical one: about the inconsistency of reason (the work of Sextus Empiricus "Against the Logicians" can be considered as a benchmark in this field). Perhaps, and without competing with Sextus Empiricus, every "skeptic" contributes in this direction, very ingeniously, and most importantly, logically proving the uselessness of logic. Although even the ancient opponents of the first skeptics pointed out that it is not very correct to fight by reasoning against reasoning. But that is the two-faced dodginess of the 3rd Logic: to deny intelligence in such a way that everyone can say, "How clever is he!"

Another topic or, better to say, sphere, in which the 3rd Logic breathes easily, is the border between knowledge and ignorance, that shaky strip where there are no dogmas yet, everything is just facts and facts, hypotheses and opinions. This is where the talent of the 3rd Logic, a great master of multi-variantism, exquisite paradoxes, speculative lace weaving and absurdity of any situation, unfolds in full force. I suppose the question, "How many angels can sit on the end of a needle?" - was invented by the 3rd Logic.

Complexity of thought in general is internally closer to the 3rd Logic than simplicity. This circumstance is interesting because in philosophy there is a principle called "Occam's razor," according to which, of the two options for solving a problem: complex and simple, it is necessary to cut off the complex option as the most unproductive and cumbersome. So, the usual opposition between the First and the Third functions finds its embodiment here as well. The 1st Logic certainly accepts "Occam's razor", the 3rd Logic does not accept it at all and prefers the complex solution to the simple one.

Much more caution than in the analysis of hypotheses and opinions is exercised by the 3rd Logic in the analysis of dogmas. Unlike the 2nd Logic, which is fearless enough to test even commonplace truths, the 3rd Logic does not feel as strong for open rebellion against them; its rebellion is hidden; it is a painful, painful, gradual, in the words of the great "skeptic" Kant, shaking off its "dogmatic sleep".

* * *

In describing Churchill's 3rd Logic, Lloyd George wrote: "Churchill's mind was a powerful mechanism. But in the construction of that mechanism, or perhaps in the materials of which it was composed, there was some incomprehensible defect that prevented it from always working properly. The critics could not say what it was. When the mechanism malfunctioned, its very power led to disaster, not only for itself, but also for the people with whom it worked. That is why the latter felt nervous about working with him.

In their opinion, there was some fatal flaw in the metal from which it was cast. This weakness was put forward by Churchill's critics to justify their refusal to use his great powers at the moment. They did not see him as a positive quantity to be used in the hour of danger, but as an additional danger to be guarded against.

Unfortunately, Lloyd George merely points out some flaw in Churchill's logic, but is apparently unable to articulate what it is. My attempts to question the holders of the 3rd Logic on this point were also not very fruitful. The answers were brief, and it was evident that the main difficulty for them was forming priorities, systematic thinking ("thoughts spread like crayfish"). *Thinking 3rd Logic is a kind of labyrinth in which all paths are equally acceptable and there is no way out.*

A special topic: the relationship between thinking proper and speech. The key here can be found in the phrase of one owner of the 3rd Logic: "I cannot think and speak at the same time. An admirably accurate admission. 1st Logic thinks first, then speaks, 2nd Logic is able to do both at the same time. The 3rd Logic also aspires to the simultaneity of thinking and speaking, but practice shows that for it such a situation is an ideal, not reality. Gaps are constantly forming between the intellectual product and its realization, which have to be filled with all kinds of garbage in order to hide the defect. This is why one of the characteristic features of the 3rd Logic is the abundance of all kinds of trash words in speech, interjections, mooing and similar attempts to win time for reflection, while observing the appearance of continuity in the flow of speech. Boris Yeltsin's parodic "You see! Boris Yeltsin is an extremely vivid example of this kind of subterfuge.

I suspect that for a considerable part of the holders of the 3rd Logic the problem is not so much in haphazard thinking and related doubts regarding mental abilities, as in stiffness and underdevelopment of the speech apparatus. Therefore, in the development of speech, starting from infancy, I see the main solution to the problem of "skepticism. Otherwise, the consequences can be most unfortunate. For example, Alexander Blok nearly died of hunger during the Civil War, because a ration was given to writers for lectures, and he was incapable of lecturing due to his innate "skepticism. Blok told his colleagues: "I envy you all: you can talk and read somewhere. But I can't. I can only read from what is written."

An idea of the feelings experienced by the 3rd Logic when she finds herself in the department is given by excerpts from one letter to a psychiatrist: "I teach in a technical university...For the sixth month now I have been giving a course of lectures in my specialty... "Reading" is a misnomer. Not reading, but torturing and tormenting listeners... I go out to my students like a statue of a commander. Everything is wonderful and amazing: my tongue cannot move, my spine is stiff, I carry the weight of an Egyptian pyramid on my shoulders, but my brain, what's in my brain, I can't even understand. Smoke screen. I forget half the material, no notes help.

Another source of intellectual failure for the "skeptic" is the very order of functions that put Logic down. Correctness of thinking is especially difficult for the 3rd Logic, because the stronger functions standing above it simply break its apparatus under themselves. The powerful, irrepressible "I want!" 1st Will easily turns into a clownish "I think!" 3rd Logic, and there's nothing you can do about it.

Lermontov wrote: "I like to doubt everything: this disposition does not interfere with the decisiveness of my character. What the combination of "skepticism" and decisiveness of character leads to can be seen in the examples of two famous "skeptics" such as Napoleon and Hitler. They mocked common sense, not because they thought little and poorly, but because by the 1st Will they believed too much in themselves and in their right to rule the world to heed the reasonable babble of the 3rd Logic. Their Will, which is much higher than Logic, simply excluded from the circle of mulled over topics and facts such as it found sensitive for itself, and thus deliberately stupefied the work done by the strong mind of nature. In essence, the violence done to the 3rd Logic by the higher Will is what is commonly called "feminine logic," i.e., as one wit has defined it, it is "the unconscious conviction that objectivity can be overcome by one desire." The efficacy and infallibility of mental work depends not only and so much on the ability to think long and connectedly, but also on how honestly we think. Dishonesty is stupid, stupidity is dishonest--this is what all moral and intellectual evaluation should look at.

* * *

If the "skeptic" turns to politics, the first thing that characterizes him is a steadily strained relationship with the press. In democratic systems, the "skeptic" politician usually flees from the press, as President Reagan did. Under totalitarian regimes, the skeptic ruler fights it off with repression. Napoleon, for example, shut down 160 French newspapers in one day, put a heavy hand of censorship on the remaining ones, and claimed that a different newspaper was worth a thousand bayonets. In this statement of the great commander, as in a drop of water, is reflected the respect and the fear that the 3rd Logic constantly feels before the word that is difficult for it.

* * *

A few observations on the not-so-significant but characteristic features of the 3rd Logic.

First. She is the main consumer of crossword puzzles, logic problems, and tests. All this intellectual production is an ideal testing ground, on which the 3rd Logic can check herself without interference and risk of serious injuries, find out how objective her inner feeling of her mental inferiority is. Although, in my opinion, crossword puzzles and tests are not capable of giving a true picture of the state of the logical apparatus. However, as a

psychotherapeutic tool they are absolutely necessary, inspiring and comforting a large army of "skeptics".

Second. The 3rd Logic, even without being emotional (i.e. with the 4th Emotion), is still prone to mysticism. The mechanism of this tendency is quite transparent. Congenital skepticism, which makes the 3rd Logic dislike rationality in search of something alternative and positive, automatically pushes the 3rd Logic into the camp of mysticism. However, usually the "skeptical" mysticism of the 4th Emotion is not deep and is limited to a tendency to superstition, as such famous "skeptics" as Reagan and Yeltsin have openly admitted.

Third. If the 3rd Logic works in the artistic sphere, she is closer to such trends as expressionism, dadaism, surrealism, etc. The secret of this sympathy is just as simple: the "skeptic" cannot but be close to artistic movements that emphasize the irrational, aesthetic concepts that oppose the unconscious to the conscious, placing the latter much lower than the former.

"Schoolboy" (4th Logic).

I'm afraid that the reader has an impression beforehand, voluntarily or involuntarily, of the 4th Logic as a deliberately mentally helpless and backward function. Therefore I'll emphasize once again that it is not so. The essence of problems of the 4th Logic consists not in the low quality of its functioning, but in the fact that an individual gives Logic the last place in his inner hierarchy of values. Let us read into such lines:

"It wasn't hard for me to wean myself off feasts,

Where the idle mind glitters while the heart slumbers."

Who is the author of these lines, where Emotion ("heart") is unambiguously preferred to Logic ("mind")? The author is a great clever, unsurpassed polemicist, according to the evidence of his contemporaries - Alexander Pushkin, whose 1st Emotion was really combined with the 4th Logic, which is clearly reflected in the above lines.

In Pushkin's example, it is easy to see one of the specific traits of the 4th Logic: the combination of quality work of the logical apparatus with complete insanity. Pushkin was a brilliant polemicist, losing at cards to anyone who could hold them. There is nothing paradoxical here. His polemical gift was revealed in a serene atmosphere of a friendly circle. Whereas a big card game itself led to discomfort, tense situation, when, according to the laws of the Fourth functions, Pushkin's Fourth Logic was switched off, and all inner energy was concentrated in Emotion - the function which was the first in his inner hierarchy. And I think it's easy to predict the result of a card game based on emotions beforehand. And so, depending on the situation, any "schoolboy" smart and stupid in one person lives.

The Russian Tsar Nicholas II was not denied his intelligence by those who knew him well. But. Pobedonostsev considered him intolerant of "general questions" capable of assessing

the "value of a fact in isolation, without relation to the rest, without any connection to the totality of other facts, events, currents, phenomena. The king himself said, "that he agonizes hard, choosing from all he has heard the right", "that he has to strain his mind", and "he thinks that this effort mind, if it could pass in the horse (when he sits on it), it would be very troubled. That's just the way it is. The 4th Logic finds it difficult to do independent mental work, to engage the intellect at all without an immediate and obvious need to do so. The "schoolboy's" brain is pragmatic, does not like to look far ahead and quickly goes mouldy without any stimulus from outside.

And so, in appearance, the 4th Logic is almost indistinguishable from the 2nd. It is also intellectually non-partisan; it easily assimilates, accepts, reproduces, develops any views: dogmatic, dialectical, skeptical... The 4th Logic is as free and fearless in its premises and conclusions as the 2nd. And let's give credit, omnivorousness combined with fearlessness is a major and very weighty trump card in the hands of the "schoolboy".

Two things allow us to quickly distinguish the 4th Logic from the 2nd Logic. First, the ideology of the "schoolboy" is completely detached from his life, and he is in no way inclined to follow what he himself postulates. Of one such holder of the 4th Logic, Tolstoy wrote: "Sviyazhsky was one of those, always surprising for Levin, people whose reasoning, very consistent, though never independent, goes by itself, while life, extremely definite and firm in its direction, goes by itself, completely independent, almost always contrary to reasoning.

The second sign of the 4th Logic is innate skepticism. However, let us not confuse it with the active skepticism of the 3rd Logic. "Schoolboy" skepticism is toothless; Pasternak's remark that to engage in intellectual activity all your life is like eating mustard all your life is the edge beyond which a "schoolboy" rarely crosses in his critique of rationalism. The skepticism of the 4th Logic is not a vigorous denial of the efficacy of the intellectual element in man, but a simple indifference to it. And this is the great difference between the skepticism of the 3rd and the skepticism of the 4th Logic. Because the indifference of the 4th Logic, which was colored by skepticism a while ago, may be colored by dogma tomorrow, and the day after by something else. Because of its indifference to intellectual questions, 4th Logic is easily seized, but the mistake will be made by one who thinks he has seized it forever. No - until a subsequent interlocutor. Of one such "schoolboys" Labruyere wrote: "He appropriates another's mind with such naturalness that he himself is the first to be deceived, sincerely believing as if he were expressing his own judgment or explaining his own thought, although in fact he is merely an echo of the one he has just parted with." Chekhov wrote very self-critically about the same: "I do not have a political, religious or philosophical worldview; I change it every month...".

In a word, the "schoolboy" is energetic only in need, idly curious, internally completely uninhibited, an intellectual chameleon. And here are all his pluses and minuses.

As a consolation to the "schoolboy," it must be added that he is a champion. He outnumbers all other Logics among the population of the earth. There is no country or

nation where a Logic above the "schoolboy's" one would dominate. Purely hypothetically, we may assume that in Greece in the Y-IYth century B.C. and in Germany in the YIIItth and XIXth centuries, at the height of their philosophies and sciences, the 4th Logic was slightly displaced. But at other times and in other spaces, the dominance of the 4th Logic was and is undivided.

I HAVE BEEN GIVEN A BODY...

About the role of Physics in human life, it seems hardly necessary to speak about it. Its importance is obvious. And it is too outwardly visible to assume there is a subtext hidden from view. It's all true. But the most remarkable and worthy of special attention, from the point of view of psychosophy, is that the position of Physics on the steps of the functional hierarchy, determines much more than just the state of the organism and its energy. On the contrary, it turns out that the place of Physics in the order of the functions of the individual affects such far from physiology areas as law, economics, aesthetics, the coloring of worldview and worldview, and many other things.

We would like to warn you in advance that everything said about the appearance of different Physicists does not represent universal characteristics, but is a description **by preference, i.e.** it hardly gives more than 70% of hits. There are many reasons for this inaccuracy. For example, when talking about overweight 1st Physicist, we should not forget that overweight can give the lower Physicist a widespread thyroid disease. And most importantly, a person can borrow *the appearance* from one parent and *the psychology* from another. And their more than likely mismatch, is capable of misleading anyone engaged in psychosophy. In short, everything said below about the appearance of different Physicists and types is quite relative.

However, you can't tell everything at once, so after dividing the owners of Physics into "owners" (1st Physics), "hard workers" (2nd Physics), "underdogs" (3rd Physics) and "slackers" (4th Physics), let's see what makes each of them great.

"The Owner" (1st Phys.)

In the crowd, the "proprietor" is visible from afar, he is the brightest and most conspicuous figure. The "proprietor" is distinguished first of all by his power and abundance of forms, his height, and the richness of his facial sculpture. Usually he is handsome, but even if he is not, the "proprietor" is said to be "many" (it is not without reason that Kretschmer called him an "athlete" in his typology).

The mighty build of the "proprietor" is not the law; I have come across rather small individuals among them. But still, tall, burly people prevail among the 1st Physicists. And this is no accident. If the reader remembers, one of the main attributes of the First Function is redundancy, so it is natural that the 1st Physicist should have redundant flesh.

However, this excess does not become obvious, visible right away. Externally, a "possessive" child does not differ from his peers. Usually he is thin, built, with long legs. The first external signs of 1st Physique begins to show with the beginning of puberty:

shoulders and hips are expanding, buttocks are becoming flat, facial features are getting bigger and juicier, lips take an unusually sexy bowed, kissing shape.

By the end of the process of puberty, the rapid flowering of the 1st Physique reaches its climax. Girls, with a thin waist, acquire steep, ace worm-shaped hips, lush shoulders, and mighty firm breasts. Young men are made broad-boned, shouldered, muscular, and hairy. There is still little fat on the body of the "proprietor," the skin is clean and brightly pigmented, as they say, "blood with milk." A thick, lush cap of hair enhances the attractiveness of the image.

Unfortunately, the riotous beauty of the 1st Physique does not last long: in women until the first birth, in men until the age of thirty. After this threshold there is a sharp metamorphosis, which for the first time visibly shows the excessiveness of the flesh of the "proprietor". Overnight the weight increases by 20-30%, the waist disappears, the belly bulges, the body begins to overgrow with fat.

At first the increased fullness does not embarrass the 1st Physicist much, and even on the contrary, with its appearance it becomes as if adequate to itself, because the former purely psychological feeling of the excessiveness of its bodily beginning finds its direct physical expression. The "proprietor" begins to worry only when his weight exceeds a certain "excessive norm" which he himself has set. But a belated fight against obesity rarely yields a positive result; laziness and the habit of abundant food do their work, deforming the appearance of the 1st Physicist further and further.

The early and booming 1st Physique in general tends to blossom just as early and just as booming. The body is quickly covered with folds, the breasts and buttocks sag. The skin loses its brightness and then darkens. The eyes become a little rolled up. The kissing roll on the upper lip disappears, and the lower lip begins to sag and turn outward in the corners of the mouth. The hair turns gray early, and in men, often worse, a rapidly expanding bald spot is revealed.

Earlier than others, the 1st Physicist is hit by menopause and impotence. Suddenly there are diseases, first of all attacking joints and cardiovascular system. The source of these diseases is programmed in the very nature and psychology of the 1st Physique: overweight, passion for comfort, excess, laziness. Death of the "proprietor" is more often all taken as a result of lesions of the cardiovascular system.

That, in brief, is the external, corporeal history of the 1st Phys.

If it is not always possible to speak about the power and abundance of bodily forms as applied to the 1st Physique as a universal beginning, the peculiarities of its plastics are truly universal. "The "proprietor", if he is in no hurry, acts, speaking in Russian, "like a sheep," and in Indian, "with the gait of an elephant. The 1st Physicist, with her shoulders straightened, her belly protruding, her socks open and her feet slightly shuffling, moves along the street with the lazy grace of the 1st Physicist. In fact, she is not so much moving as she is flowing from one beautiful pose to another. In general, statics is somewhere

inwardly closer to the "proprietor" than dynamics. He can stay in the same pose for hours without experiencing any noticeable discomfort.

* * *

Since ancient times, since the statues of Phidias and Praxiteles, the 1st Physique has established itself as the standard of human beauty in both form and proportion. I will not judge how objective such a standard really is, but I will only note that the 1st Physics attracted the artist's attention back at the moment when he first picked up a brush and clay, and the earliest human images that have come down to us from primitive times show, as a rule, the familiar excessive, appetizing forms of the "possessor".

The ancient artists, who may not have had too refined, but in their own way healthy taste, cannot be denied a certain logic when they chose the 1st Physics as their model. The eye, seeing only the external, physical side of an object, involuntarily seeks that which most fully expresses this object and, preferably, with excess. And the appearance of the 1st Physics meets these requirements in the best way, showing the external side of the human being in excess. Here, I believe, is the main reason for its noticeable influence on the formation of the anthropological aesthetic ideal.

Now artistic taste has changed, become subtler, and images of the nude 1st Physique have moved into such less prestigious spheres as kitsch and pornography. However, the number of their connoisseurs, recruited primarily from among the "proprietors" themselves, has not diminished. Rarely, even a deep, old man with the 1st Physics does not have somewhere stashed a card of a naked maiden with an immense butt and watermelon breasts. And that's understandable. Looking at such a card, the "proprietor" is not so much seduced as identified by seeing on it a young kindred being, both in body and spirit.

Of course, the interest in appearance begins in the 1st Physicist with himself and accompanies him throughout his life, until the grave. Knowing what constitutes the most spectacular side of his nature, the "proprietor" deals with his appearance with full dedication until the end of his days: exposing everything that can be exposed (sometimes reaching into exhibitionism in this striving), emphasizing by covering clothes what cannot be exposed, abusing the brightest colors of makeup and the most tart perfumes. And let us not be too harsh on the 1st Physique for this - the unconscious demonstration of the redundancy of the First Function is peculiar to everyone - the only difference is what it is.

Taking care of one's appearance, at the same time, does not prevent the "proprietor" from being very untidy and neglecting hygiene, especially in everyday life. And such bifurcation is quite understandable, because care about one's body in the 1st Physicist neighbors with absolute confidence in self-sufficiency and extreme goodness of her physical beginning, which does not require any embellishments in the home environment. "And so - good!" - the 1st Physicist lazily thinks, when it comes to soap and a comb, and, wrapped in a greasy robe, settles down on the chronically untidy bed.

* * *

Another reason that attracts both the artist and us mere mortals to the 1st Physics has a speculative nature and turns out to be a pure delusion. The fact is that the mighty loins of

men with the 1st Physics, steep hips and full breasts of women are associated by an outside observer with the ability to abundant fertility (a thing that has not lost its significance to this day). This, however, is a mistake. No, men who are "possessive" have no trouble making babies, and women who are "possessive" endure childbirth more easily than anyone else. It is not a matter of physiology, but in the absence of an internal psychological attitude to abundant fecundity in the 1st Physicist. The "proprietor" has a poorly developed love of children, and, if it is his will, he can manage with one child.

This paradox is explained by the effectiveness of the 1st Physics. Seeking more for the result than for the process, the "proprietor" subordinates his reproduction to this principle: one child is already a result, a result which once and for all certifies the fullness of the 1st Physics in terms of reproduction. And to replicate the same result, in fact, adding nothing to the previous one, is there any reason? Such or almost such a scheme scrolls in the subconsciousness of the 1st Physicist when the question of the second child arises.

It is not without the effect of mental attitudes, either, when a male "possessor" suddenly discovers that he is impotent. In general, early impotence of the 1st Physique has two reasons: one is psychophysiological and the other is purely psychological. The first reason is that the tendency to excess and comfort in the 1st Physicist early begins to age the cardiovascular system. The heart fills up with fat, the walls of blood vessels grow up with salts and toxins. And as the man's potency entirely depends on the work of cardiovascular system, its premature withering by the 1st Physicist is easy to predict. In my opinion, only therapeutic fasting can save the situation, but it is this type of treatment that the "proprietor" accepts least of all, the very thought of temporary food refusal throws him into shock.

Besides, impotence, if it occurs after the age of forty, does not embarrass the 1st Physicist much. And here the second is a psychological reason. Appreciating in sex not so much the process as the result, he treats the problem of potency accordingly. As long as his organism and experience allow him to raise the sexual bar higher and higher, the "proprietor" is the most reckless of lovers. But after the peak is passed, and the bar itself, without demand, begins to slide down, sex loses its sporting charm for the "proprietor," and after that the interest disappears as such. The time of the highest results is over, so is it worth trying any further? - ponders the 1st Physicist and thus involuntarily speeds up the process of shutting down his peristalsis. As the Hamburg sexopathologist Friedrich Koch wrote: "Whoever perceives sex as a 'sport of the highest achievements' also falls into decline sooner."

The result is also the reason for some other specific features of the intimate life of the 1st Physicist. I think it is superfluous to say that her sex is powerful and plentiful. However, it is necessary to warn that it is contraindicated for partners with processional Physicists. Because "proprietary" sex is crude, mechanistic, economical, businesslike, monotonous, aimed at achieving the result (orgasm) as soon as possible, and almost indifferent to what precedes or follows this climax of pleasure. By analogy with the activity of any First Function, there is egoism, athleticism, a spirit of violence and competition (it is not without reason that the emperor Domitian called sex "bed wrestling").

The love action of the 1st Physicist is always monologic. Even when the partner manages to convince the "proprietor" to think not only about his own pleasure, but to somehow respond to the requests of the opposite party, he remains faithful to the monologue form of intimacy. The difference is that to the formula "I take," "I give," is added, but the dominant "I" remains unchanged; eroticism is not conceivable for the 1st Physique in such categories as "we," "dialogue," and "co-creation.

Roughness, as already mentioned, is also an indispensable companion of the First Function and, consequently, of the First Physique. In the latter it is expressed in low receptivity, thick-skinnedness of sense organs (hearing, touch, smell, etc.) The "proprietor" is a sensory behemoth. And this circumstance also affects intimacy in its own way. First, the surface of the body of the 1st Physique is poor in both area and number of erogenous zones, which, of course, does not add excitement either to the "proprietor" or to his partners, and breeds laziness, sleepiness, and coldness in love.

Second, women with the 1st Physique, especially childless women, often do not know what an orgasm is. And, apparently, the majority of women who, according to sexology, suffer from anorgasmia are "possessive" women. The reason given above is the thick-skinnedness of the 1st Phys.

The situation is not hopeless, though, I think. Sophia Andreyevna Tolstaya, for example, judging by her diaries, began to experience orgasm only when she was over thirty. And not her husband, I am sure, was the cause, although Tolstoy on the fervor of love, few could match. Most likely, Tolstoy was driven to orgasm by frequent childbirth and breastfeeding, which eventually thinned her bodily perception enough to achieve an extreme contraction of the so-called "orgastic cuff," which, according to doctors, causes orgasm in women.

Third, thick-skinnedness relieves the "proprietor" of physiological jealousy. The key word here is "physiological" because, contrary to popular belief, jealousy is a complex, multi-faceted feeling, and cheating is not always perceived as a blow to physics, and may, depending on the psychotype, not be perceived as a blow at all. So, due to thick-skinnedness, the "proprietor" is not physiologically jealous, the knowledge that someone else enjoys the caresses of his permanent partner does not lead to physiological rejection, a sense of squeamishness, a feeling of inability to continue intimacy. In the case of adultery, if anything the "proprietor" is concerned about in terms of physics, it is the issue of sexual superiority over his rival and the right of superiority in possession, i.e. he is ready to put up with someone else running along his intimate path, as long as he runs behind him.

To tell the truth, the "proprietor" himself cannot be classed as a model of fidelity either. However, it would not be very correct, due to the specific attitude to cheating, to attribute some natural amorality to the 1st Physicist. The nature of "possessive" sexuality is such that he cheats as if he were not cheating. It is possible to cheat in a well-established dialogue; as for the intimate monologue of the 1st Physique, it knowingly excludes dialogue and, therefore, cheating. The sex of the "proprietor" is not a matter of two, but of

him alone, so no matter how many partners there are, the main thing is that there is no cheating on oneself, the beloved.

* * *

Sensory behemothness greatly affects the tastes of the 1st Physicist. Tastes, it is said, are not debatable, often and correctly said, but argued incessantly at the same time. By and large, however, there are really three basic kinds of taste, really almost irreconcilable, the differences between which are due to the position of the Physicist on the first three rungs of the functional hierarchy. Therefore, the further reference to the bad taste of the 1st Physique should not be taken literally. It is simply not she, but the two Physicists below her, who act as trendsetters today. Here is the main source of both subjectivism of evaluations in general, and the division into bad and good taste, in particular.

As for the tastes of the 1st Physicist, due to her sensory thick-skinnedness, she likes bright, striking colors, but is poor at distinguishing halftones and shades. Has a predilection for coarse, heavy, spicy food. Not good with the 1st Physicist's hearing. I will not say that a bear necessarily stepped on her ear, but she clearly gives preference to the loudest and simplest sound. She is attracted to tart, nasal smells, because the 1st Physicist simply does not feel any other, more subtle ones.

A predilection for a certain kind of clothing makes the figure of the "proprietor" noticeable from afar. He likes expensive, catchy fabrics and furs, a puffy silhouette that emphasizes his already powerful forms. He knows no measure for the trimmings of a dress, whether it is really expensive or frivolous: a brooch as big as his fist, a chain or a ring as thick as a finger... To summarize, we can say that the style of the 1st Physicist's clothes is close (no offense, please) to the style of the Mafiosi, as they are usually portrayed in the world's movies.

Admittedly, the taste of the "proprietor" is crude. But the matter is not hopeless. Serious lessons can develop and refine the taste of the "proprietor. There are many opera singers with the first physics who have sharpened their hearing by long studies (Chaliapin), many artists with the first physics perfectly distinguish shades of colors (Michelangelo), Dumas father, despite his first physics, was recognized by connoisseurs of cooking as the most refined gourmand. So, although the problem of the "proprietor's bad taste" is indeed not far-fetched, it is solvable, one only needs to make an effort.

* * *

It is possible to guess in a child "the proprietor" quite early. If in kindergarten or at the yard sandpit a child whose neighbor stole a toy, silently, without any prior negotiation, punches the offender in the ear, then parents can be congratulated: their child has the 1st Physics.

The explanation of the mechanism of this prediction is very simple. The first function in conflicts is the main and first exposed weapon. Therefore, naturally, the first impulse of the "proprietor" in the event of a clash is to try to influence events by force. Especially

often children resort to them, since they, not yet aware of the social taboo against violence, do not consider it necessary to restrain their first and quite natural impulse.

With time upbringing usually subdues such impulses, and the child with the 1st Physique more often just compensates them by imitating an attack or only clenching his fists. The latter option as a reflex is kept by the "proprietor" until the end of days.

The attitude toward violence as a litmus test for determining the position of Physics on the rungs of the functional hierarchy is only good for a child's time. Later it becomes the object of close attention of such a no-nonsense sphere as criminal law, under whose protection is precisely the physical layer of life.

Therefore, I don't want to scare anyone: neither the "owner" himself, nor those around him, but the owner of the 1st Physics is one of the most criminogenic category of citizens. This does not mean that the other Physicists are obviously clean before the law, and the "proprietor" has been in jail since the cradle. Not at all. Much in the fate of the "proprietor" depends on the order of the other functions, the upbringing, the effectiveness of law enforcement, the economic model of society and much more. Still, the thesis of increased criminogenicity of the 1st Physics remains in force. Because only in her, when a problem arises, unconscious impulse instantly provokes temptation to solve it through illegal actions. And not always external and internal brakes are strong enough to overcome such temptation.

The impulsive propensity for violence is well illustrated by one harmless example from the lives of both Dumas. One day, as Dumas father was sitting at work, little Dumas son unwittingly interrupted her with his loud crying; Dumas father's reaction was quite in the spirit of the 1st Physique - he silently took his son by the scruff of the neck and threw him on the bed. Of course, this action of the writer was not subject to trial, but it is a good illustration of the thesis about the impulsive tendency of the 1st Physique to violence. The impulsiveness of this propensity is indicated by an even less beautiful episode in the life of Alexander I. One contemporary of the tsar described the parade of the Guards after his return from the campaign: "At last the emperor appeared, leading the Guards division, on a glorious red horse, with naked sword, which he was about to put down before the empress... We admired him. But at that very minute a man ran across the street almost in front of his horse. The emperor gave the spurs to his horse and rushed at the fleeing man with his bare sword. The police took the man in their sticks. We could not believe our own eyes and turned away, ashamed of the king we loved. I involuntarily recalled the cat converted to beauty, which, however, could not see a mouse without rushing at it."

The cruelty and selfishness of the First Function has already been mentioned before. Both of these qualities, needless to say, are fully intrinsic to the 1st Function. It is easier for her to kill, rape, rob, and steal than for anyone else. But "easier," of course, does not mean to commit such a thing. The vast majority of "proprietors" are law-abiding and are not a danger to others. Moreover, we want to bow low and sincerely sympathize with the law-abiding "proprietors" for their almost daily feat of overcoming themselves, for the chronic

violence against the most powerful side of their nature. Agree, without much hope of success to insist, persuade, ask, where everything seems to be simple, easy and quickly solved by a single blow of the fist - is not it torture?

* * *

The "proprietor" is the first victim of all kinds of financial scams, lotteries, gambling, etc. He is a monstrously gambler, and the prospect of instant, effortless enrichment has an almost magical power over him. The "proprietor's" temptation to pump up his pocket muscles prevails over all the arguments of reason, which is understandable, since his Physics, by definition, dominates Logic, as well as all other functions. Of course, depending on the degree of trust in Logic, the "proprietor's" involvement in financial mirage projects is different. But, if at the 1st Physics Logic is the 4th, then the example of Balzac, who all his life rushed through with fantastic projects of instant monstrous enrichment, will prove to be not yet the most curiosity.

While he does not usually take the pains and troubles of others to heart, the "proprietor" is more acutely affected by his own property and physical losses than anyone else. Even minor blows to Physics, the pillar of his personality, are often perceived by him as almost the death of the universe. I think that mass suicides during stock market crashes are committed for the most part by the 1st Physicist. In any case, other Physicists are less serious about money.

What to say about stock market crashes? Even a slight cold smears the "proprietor" on the wall, sometimes driving him to hysterics. From the outside and in the opinion of other Physicists, such a heightened reaction to a simple ailment is a theater, a game, a provocation in order to cause pity. But in reality it is not. The discovery of a weakness, a defect in the strongest and best side of one's nature is a tragedy for anyone. In the case of the "proprietor," this side is Physics, and so natural are his excessive, to the outside eye, worries about minor ailments.

Here again, I would like to express my most sincere and warmest sympathy to the "proprietor. After all, it is Physics, like no other function, that is subject to the blows of the fast-flowing time. There are no options. Years can add intelligence, keep intact the strength of mind and freshness of feelings, but there is no case when they have added or saved someone's youth, beauty, strength, health. Therefore, the tragic evolution of the "proprietor," associated with the destruction of his support, from an optimist and merry man to an irritable, gloomy, apocalyptically looking at the world, is almost inevitable. Chekhov's example here is quite illustrative. Under the weight of aging and the growing tuberculosis process, he quickly worked his way up from the splashing, cheerful Antosha Chekhonte to the classical singer of twilight and melancholy; without the brake of the 3rd Emotion, which prevented Chekhov from freely crying out the terror that filled him, Chekhov's plays would be comparable in tone to the darkest Shakespearian tragedies.

* * *

Physics 1 is, to put it mildly, somewhat stingy. I cannot judge how far her stinginess can go in each individual case. There is no norm here, the range is enormous: from hardly noticeable prudence to truly pathological greed. In any case, any "proprietor" is a complete materialist, knowing better than anyone his benefits and the value of money. President Reagan's famous phrase about the free school lunch program—"there is no such thing as free lunch"—expresses perfectly the sober, purely pragmatic view of the problem of material mutual aid that is characteristic of the 1st Physics.

Although the "proprietor" is stingy, he is not the kind of person who is willing to work endlessly to replenish his coffers. The personal economic credo of the 1st Physicist can be formulated as follows: the main goal is to reach 120-130% of the level of well-being of the social group to which one belongs. That is, the 1st Physicist wants to live a little better than others, and the percentage of property excess should correspond to the percentage of self-perception of one's physical excess. But then, stop. Having achieved an external result adequate to the inner feeling, the 1st Physics thereby quenches its thirst for money and willingly switches its time and energy to processional functions, so that the "proprietor", being neither ascetic nor altruistic, at the same time has not infinite but rather clearly defined limits of material needs.

I will allow myself, in this connection, a little advice to parents of children with the 1st Physique. If you want to see your child harmoniously developed, try to make it feel somewhat more well-off than its peers. A child does not need much, and the effect of such feeding can be huge. A well-fed child, having received adequate property results, more quickly and willingly switch to studies in non-material spheres. On children, I think, at all should not save. And in the case of the 1st Physics such economy is simply dangerous, the material hunger will completely stifle in the child all other needs and, not exclude, will lead to offenses.

A splendid example of an early solution to the problems of raising the 1st Physique is Goethe's childhood. The poet was well aware of his dependence on the level of wealth and once half-jokingly remarked that if he had been born in England, he would not have been born without an annual income of 6,000 pounds. Although Goethe himself could not complain - he was born into one of the richest families of Frankfurt. But the luck of Goethe was not in this, but that his parents did not spare money on him. Feeling wealthy enough, the boy turned to mastering all kinds of book wisdom, including those related to the painful for him Logic, with time he markedly excelled in them and became not just a great German poet, scientist, administrator, but, above all, the standard of a harmonious personality.

A strict individualist in everyday life, the "proprietor" remains so in his attitude to the economic model of society. In the usual terms of political economy, the "proprietor" is a born "liberal. He is an unquestioning supporter of private property, and a small fan of encouraging all kinds of social programs. When General Pinochet chose as his motto "Chile is a country of owners, not proletarians," he was expressing not so much the economic views instilled in him, as his personal sense of what was right with the economy. And it was these feelings that were successfully projected onto the economic mechanism of the country during Pinochet's reign.

Even when the 1st Physicist becomes at the helm of a state with a system that deliberately does not allow private initiative and "social injustice," it remains itself. The difference is that in this case the concern for the poor turns into pure demagogic, and the encouragement of private initiative is replaced by a more than lenient attitude to theft (Brezhnev).

If we are talking about the political face of the 1st Physicist, it is necessary to say that the "proprietor" is also a born "hawk", which becomes quite understandable if we take into account his psychophysical properties. Only for the "proprietor" it is natural to give preference to force methods over all others in solving arising political problems. And, in addition, only the 1st Physics entirely identifies the power of a country with the volume of its military muscles, pumped up as much as possible with excess.

In light of this, I think the reader will understand the programmed nature of the absentee militaristic duel between Reagan and Brezhnev. Since both politicians had 1st Physics, the arms race during their reign was fatally predetermined.

When Reagan was succeeded as president by Bush, in the absence of formal change (Reagan was succeeded by a fellow president and vice-president), there was a radical shift in priorities. Bush, with his 1st Logic, identified the power of the state no longer with the amount of weapons, but with the level of education, and made appropriate corrections in government programs. So, in politics, too, while the other components are identical, the difference in the order of the functions of its figures will inevitably predetermine the change of means and reference points.

* * *

"The "proprietor" is the kind of person who, as Goethe said in the mouth of Faust, "only takes things seriously. Therefore, one more noticeable mark of the 1st Physique from childhood is an unaccountable, but obvious craving for handicrafts, for subject pursuits. The child-"proprietor" seeks to try everything, to pass through their hands different, primarily domestic, crafts. Easily grasping the essence of the case, he quickly confident movements early enough to begin to reproduce even a relatively complex operation. In short, the 1st Physicist from childhood has no fear or problems related to crafts and mechanics.

At the same time, the "proprietor" cannot be called a "workaholic", a gambling worker who feels pleasure from work as such, regardless of the result. The processiveness of labor contradicts the 1st Physicist - she is economical, calculating and does not hurry to work too hard for vague goals or inadequate rewards.

A small but expressive feature of the production psychology of the 1st Physicist can be considered the fact that she is not opposed to the conveyor belt. She copes with work on the conveyor belt without internal opposition and tension: it gives a quick visible result, so necessary for the 1st Physicist, and the monotony of labor is not a burden for her - as long as she gets paid (another result).

* * *

Naturally, sport is among the main activities and interests of the 1st Physics. After all, it is sport, as it seems, that realizes the physical beginning in its purest form. And he in whom it is strong, cannot but try to test himself in this field.

However, the "proprietor" accepts the sport not unconditionally, and not entirely, but under his, a certain position of Physics, angle of view, with certain sympathies and preferences. Internally, the closest thing to the 1st Physique is bodybuilding. The obvious orientation of body-building on the dispute - who will show more abundance and relief of flesh - is extremely appealing to the experiencing the same mental sensations of the "proprietor".

The 1st Physicist also likes sports martial arts, in which she is attracted to the characteristic for martial arts bias not so much on the process of struggle, but on the result so dear to his heart. The "proprietor" is somewhat less sympathetic to collective games and does not find any place in them comfortable. In fact, he feels at ease only in the first line of attack, because in the collective game the place of the attacker is the only one where the "proprietor's" passion for effectiveness can be quite satisfied.

Although it seems that sport is specifically designed for the 1st Physics, it does not always succeed on this path. And there are good internal reasons for that. First, the "proprietor" has a rather poorly developed reaction, and it seems that the impulse runs somewhat slower along the muscles of the 1st Physicist than it does in other Physicists. Therefore, no matter how attractive, say, fencing or table tennis are for the "proprietor", he cannot expect much success here.

Second, the failures in the sport of 1st Physics are due to the tardiness and short-termism of what I for myself call "dynamic prediction. In short, dynamic prediction is the prediction of the consequences of a particular movement in a particular environment and under certain rules.

To make it clear, I will give you an example of the movement of a person in a street crowd. Once in it, a person, judging from the outside, moves freely and thoughtlessly, but in reality this is not so. All the way from the starting point to the end point, the pedestrian, in order not to collide with others and at the same time not to turn his movement into endless wandering, is engaged in unconscious prediction of the optimal route, where, besides his own data, the dimensions, speed and direction of movement of others are considered, as well as unwritten, but existing for pedestrians in any country rule of the preferential side of movement. In a word, several hypothetical maps of a situation for a step, for two, for three ahead are constantly formed in human subconsciousness taking into account all conditions. Thus, even such a simple action as movement in a crowd is controlled by an internal computer engaged in dynamic prediction, and, judging by collisions and hiccups occurring in this situation, prediction of this computer, depending on the position of Physics on the steps of functional hierarchy, may be different and quite far from the ideal.

As for the dependence of the dynamic prediction on the order of functions, I will try to explain its mechanism on another example, which can become a good household test in Physics on occasion. We are talking about such a simple action as pouring liquid into a vessel. So, the 3rd Physique usually under-pours because her prediction, out of caution and insecurity, is ahead of the action. The 2nd Physics, by the custom of the Second Functions, is normative, its prediction is adequate to the action, so the level of liquid it pours in always corresponds to the limiting risk. The 1st Physics, on the other hand, often overflows, since its prediction is careless and lags behind the action.

Now that the meaning of "dynamic forecasting" is clear to the reader, it is easy to guess why a late and short-term forecast has a negative impact on the sporting career of the "proprietor": interception play, anticipation, and accurate passing are more difficult for him than for anyone else.

However, the consequences of dynamic prediction errors in the 1st Physicist are much more serious than simple failures in sports. The fact is that the sensory behemoth of the "proprietor" from the beginning is not conducive to an objective perception of the external environment, including the dangers associated with it. And its combination with delayed dynamic prognosis, in general, makes the 1st Physicist a permanent patient of hospitals and trauma centers. It is as if by fate itself is destined to receive and inflict trauma.

One gets the impression that the "proprietor's" dynamic prediction mechanism is not to say that it tends to be wrong, but that it is just mostly in a disconnected state. I happened to observe such a scene. A good acquaintance of mine with the 1st Physics once took it upon himself to pull a piece of rebar from a pile of construction debris for his household needs. The rebar did not yield, my acquaintance, irritated, increased his efforts and, watching him, the more I, a bystander, was imbued with the expectation of disaster. My friend was pulling without looking back and obviously without thinking about where his elbow would be if the armature suddenly gave way, i.e. there was no dynamic forecast at all. Of course, it ended the way it was supposed to end: the rebar suddenly gave way, and my elbow crashed into the stacked masonry behind.

If we multiply all these frightening circumstances by the quite natural passion for acquiring all kinds of unsafe mechanisms and machines (cars, for example), then the suicidal and traumatic background in which the life of the 1st Physicist takes place will appear even more clearly.

"Laborer" (2nd Phys.)

Let's start with the appearance of the "toiler. In childhood, a child with the 2nd Physique hardly stands out externally from his or her peers. The only rather firm hallmark of the "toiler" during this period is the round, moon-like shape of the face. God knows how it happened and what science has to say about it, but the 2nd Physicist is predominantly "brachycephalic" (short-headed), while the other Physicists are predominantly "dolichocephalic" (long-headed). So, the round, wide face of the 2nd Physicist is recognizable from afar and at any age.

The onset of puberty adds little to the appearance of the "toiler. Girls grow small, firm, milk-rich breasts. The buttocks increase in volume very much (the impression is that at puberty the process of growth and distribution of pelvic muscle mass of the 1st and 2nd Physicists is one-sided and multidirectional: the 1st Physicist has flat buttocks, the 2nd Physicist has growing buttocks while keeping the thighs narrow).

Women before childbirth, men up to the age of thirty, usually retain their thinness and slimness. The more striking is the metamorphosis that happens to the 2nd Physique after that: the waist disappears, and the straight line formed from the hips to the shoulders gives the short, as it turns out, torso an almost square shape; the ankle disappears, and the leg becomes more grounded and firm. The hand is made short-fingered, being a combination of a wide square palm with short, plump, quick fingers.

The circle is the form that dominates the appearance of the 2nd Physicist. And it is the form of the circle that Tolstoy used when describing Platon Karataev: "...Platon's whole figure...was round, his head was perfectly round, his back, chest, shoulders, even his arms, which he carried as if always about to embrace something, were round; his pleasant smile and large brown gentle eyes were round".

After the age of thirty, the "toiler" unknowingly shortens, or maybe begins to look shorter, his neck and legs. His whole silhouette seems to shrink and become denser, giving a strong, healthy, grounded and compact appearance (it is not without reason that Krechmer in his classification called the 2nd Physique "picnic" - "dense").

The evolution of the appearance of the 2nd Physique can be clearly traced in the evolution of the appearance of Napoleon: in his youth, he even openly boasted of his slimness and thinness; what he eventually turned out to be is seen in the portraits of Napoleon of the imperial period. How the female version of the 2nd Physique looks after childbirth can be imagined by looking at the nude images of Rubens's second wife, Helena Frohmen, Venus Callipigi, Mayol's "Pomona".

In general, the appearance of the 2nd Physique can be described as follows: her face is neither too ugly nor too beautiful. A simple, wide, round face with a small, short, usually straight nose. Height is more often below average, tall people are rare. Hair is not particularly textured or thick, and early baldness occurs in men. The figure is corpulent, broad-chested, and lean. The proportions are dominated by the orientation to be broad, square, collected, stable, therefore, if we proceed from the established canons of beauty (about the origin of which we spoke in the section devoted to the 1st Physics), the proportions of the "worker" cannot be called beautiful. Although this circumstance does not bother men at all and does not bother women with the 2nd Physique at all.

I would like to add, in the form described above, the 2nd Physique after thirty years is as if preserved and survives unchanged until death. A small abdomen may still grow, but there is no serious, up to flabby obesity. The "toiler" does not like to be overweight, and the dynamic lifestyle he usually leads is not conducive to that.

Although, as said, the looks of the 2nd Physicist are never too pretty, a caveat is necessary, she may not be very attractive in statics, but she is unusually good in dynamics.

The impeccable cleanliness, economy, speed and precision of movements inherent in the "worker" are aesthetic in themselves. I can't help but think of my karate teacher in this regard. Looking at his short legs, it was hard to believe that they could even rise above a rather noticeable belly. That's why I was shocked to see his slow, clean, flawless leg movements that were as difficult, as high and beautiful as the ballet ones, as if they had been taken off with a rapide.

Age has little effect on the plasticity of the "toiler". Bitter, describing the aged Mark Twain, said: "His dry folded bones move carefully, each of them feeling its old age... He seems very old, but it is clear that he plays the role of an old man, for often his movements and gestures are so strong, deft and so graceful, that for a moment you forget his gray head.

2nd Physics lives by movement, so simplicity, normativity, and beauty are as natural to it as breathing in water is natural to fish.

2nd Physics knows a lot about love, too. Without guaranteeing anything in advance in each individual case, I can state with full responsibility that the "worker" is the best lover in the world, if we have in mind the purely physical meaning of this word. Characteristics typical of the Second Function as such: strength, variety, processiveness, dialogue, flexibility - can be transferred entirely to the sex of the 2nd Physique. In love the "worker" is indefatigable, confident in himself and in his right for leadership in this sphere, multifaceted, non-standard, resourceful, natural, tolerant, benevolent, responsive, cherishes all stages of sexual intercourse without exception, from the very beginning to the very end.

A lot contributes to the passionate nature of the "toiler" and the abundance of erogenous zones located (in contrast to the 1st Physique) on the back as well. But most of all, I do not know why, the ears of the "worker" are erogenous. In the light of this feature, Napoleon's habit of rubbing the ears of his subordinates as a sign of highest affection becomes understandable. He caressed as he wished to be caressed.

Among the many love virtues of the "toiler" must be included the fact that his sex is long-lived. The 2nd Physicist is not inclined to delay the time of his first sexual intercourse and with pleasure indulges in this occupation throughout his life, up to the last allowed by the aging of the organism.

The attitude of the 2nd Physicist to sex itself can also be called normative. It is equally alien to the sporting fever of the 1st Physicist, the timidity and sanctimony of the 3rd Physicist, the indifference of the 4th Physicist in this sphere. "Workaholic" recognizes sex as a necessary pleasant duty, which can be talked about without rapture or cursing, in simple, calm, free language.

The attitude of the "worker" to nudity is similarly calm. He is a born nudist - a person who accepts nudity as a non-negotiable given, who appreciates it at least for the fact that it is natural, who does not see in nudity anything super-seductive or super-repulsive.

In general, the hallmark of the 2nd Physique is the Rabelaisian simplicity, love and naturalness of the attitude to everything that concerns physiology. For her, there is no high and low in physiology, nothing worthy of concealment, nothing shameful - everything is still wonderful, everything is still beautiful and can be a source of inspiration. In this connection I will not deny myself the pleasure of quoting a long but perfectly charming quote from Zinovius Zinik's novel "The Russophobe and the Fungophile," describing with rare relish the defecation process of a Russian emigrant who had come to England:

" He rose, stretched with a crunch, sighed sweetly, and yawned, listening to his stomach rumbling and an owl's whooping in unison. To achieve final harmony, he needed to relieve himself on the inside as well. He moved to the bushes at the edge of the clearing, unbuckled his pants, pulled them down, and stood for a minute, his pants down to his knees, scratching his belly - exposing it to the cool breeze of the night air, as only a man convinced that no one else existed on this earth, in this clearing, among these bushes and trees, except him. He took his time and squatted down. A huge ass... with its matte glow, its unseen whiteness in the black frame of the night foliage, was like a full moon, out of a featherbed of thundering clouds. The moonlight played on his white buttocks, and it was unclear what was illuminating the shimmering light of this clearing - the Russian ass or the English moon?...he relieved himself noisily and heartily, he grunted, pushed and groaned blissfully, materializing the connection of his soul - aka stomach - with the roots and the soil through his anus. Sitting with a plantain leaf in his hands at the ready, with each grunt he felt more and more strongly how the blissful emptiness inside him balanced with the primordial emptiness of this night glade..." Is it worth explaining after this quote where the author stands on Physics?

The "worker's" perception of physical existence primarily as a process leads to the fact that he is not only sexual but also child-loving. Not thoughtlessly, though, but quite calculatedly. He loves children, loves to make them, to nurture them, to feed them, to clothe them, to make their clothes, etc. Therefore, no matter how the other functions of the "worker" are correlated, no matter what relations are formed in the family, there is no reason to worry about the life and physical health of children born to the 2nd Physicist.

* * *

The "worker" is a creature in the physical sense who is extremely contactive. He loves to touch, stroke, take care of people and objects, which he considers his own, related, close, not changing his need for contact even when it is necessary to take out pots or squeeze out pus.

And at the same time for the 2nd Physicist there is a boundary beyond which there are people and objects, for her absolutely untouchable, to which she has a feeling of disgust a priori and so strong that it looks at times simply anecdotal. About Dostoevsky, who had, strange as it may seem, a 2nd Physicist, his wife told the following story. One day they went to a Berlin restaurant, sat down under a tree and ordered a beer. Suddenly a twig "fell from the tree into Dostoevsky's mug, and with it a huge black beetle. My husband was squeamish and didn't want to drink from the mug with the beetle, but gave it to the porter, ordering him to bring another one. When he left, my husband wished he had thought of demanding a new mug first, but now perhaps the porter would just take the beetle and branch out and bring the same mug back. When the kellner came, Fyodor Mikhailovich asked him: "What, did you pour out that mug?" - "How I poured it out, I drank it!" - he

replied, and you could be sure by his satisfied look that he hadn't missed a chance to have another beer."

This episode with Dostoevsky, in addition to being a vivid illustration of the thesis of the emphasized purity of the 2nd Physicist, is a clear example of the mismatch between the psychological attitudes of different Physicists. Unlike Dostoevsky, the keller most likely had a 1st Physicist (she is not very squeamish by her thick skin), and this circumstance determined the difference in the behavior of the keller and his famous client.

The "toiler's" passion for cleanliness looks almost manic in the eyes of other Physicists, and it is the easiest way to recognize the 2nd Physicist. One only has to enter a house which is shining with cleanliness and order and in which she certainly lives.

The "hard worker" is fast, agile, fidgety. His energy and stamina are amazing. There is no worse punishment for the 2nd Physicist than forced idleness. Severe surgeries and heart attacks are not able to stiffen the "worker" - barely coming to his senses, he begins to feel the need for action, motor itch, which quickly leads to escape from the hospital bed.

The 2nd Physicist is the only true "workaholic. Labor is necessary and dear to her in itself, often regardless of the size of the payoff. Moreover, we should pay special attention to the fact that her "workaholism" is not conditioned by one physical sphere. No. The 2nd Physicist is a "workaholic" in general, of the widest profile. Whatever the order of the other functions of the "worker", he is ready to work tirelessly in any place, wherever his lot takes him: in artistic, intellectual, managerial spheres - all the same.

The "worker" can work on an assembly line, though not without violence to his burdensome monotony of nature. It is much more effective to use the 2nd Physique on a variety of collective work. Such qualities of the Second Function as strength, processiveness, dialogue, flexibility are embodied in the type of the ideal master in production in the 2nd Physicist. There is such a master, and not one, in any production. He is greedy to work, shrewd, ready to set an example of labor enthusiasm, to enthuse the indecisive and make the careless work, to replace the tired, to train a beginner, the first to master a new operation, to take control when abnormal situations arise.

Unfortunately, there was a place on earth where the greed for labor of the 2nd Physicist turned out to be a tragedy for her - it was the Stalinist camps. This was because his confidence in the absolute value of labor, his habit of action, and his fearlessness in the waste of his strength forced him to engage in hard work without guile, from the first to the last day, with full dedication, the payment for which was a swift and painful death. The "toiler," incapable of simulation and sabotage, simply burned out like a candle in less than a year from starvation and overstretch. Peace be upon him, who died more ridiculously and tragically than the others, who died out of an inability to curb the better side of his nature.

The special talent of the 2nd Physicist is to make, as we say, "a candy out of shit". The 2nd Physics is economical, nothing is lost in its economy and at the same time nothing lies dead weight, any even strongly worn out thing finds its use with time, often quite far from the original one. When turning shit into candy the "worker" has a special type of

thinking, the mechanism of which I will not explain, I only know that no one is able to comprehend so deeply and comprehensively the world of things and to transform it as deeply and comprehensively as the 2nd Physics. Cocteau wrote of Picasso: ". He collects whatever he can get his hands on. He is a genius junk man. As soon as he comes out of the house, he picks up everything and brings it to his workshop, where every thing begins to serve him elevated to a new, high rank. And it's not just the hands that pick up the unusual object. The eye also chooses every little thing. If you look closely at his paintings...objects obey Picasso like animals to Orpheus. He takes them wherever he wants, into a realm he undividedly rules, establishing his own laws. But these objects always remain recognizable, for Picasso is always faithful to the idea contained in them."

Without excessive excitement, but with full seriousness, Physics 2 takes the world of things. It is native to her, an element as dear to her as air is to a bird. Dostoevsky's wife recalled: "... Two or three days we went with her husband to buy for me the top things for the summer, and I marveled at Fyodor Mikhailovich, as he did not get bored to choose, consider matter from their quality, pattern and style bought things. Everything he chose for me was of good quality, simple and elegant, and I subsequently quite trusted his taste."

2nd Physic knows the value of money, is able and loves to earn it. As in labor in general, in his financial activity the "toiler" knows no edge and is inwardly ready for endless hoarding. However, he is neither Shylock nor Hobsek to pine over gold. The mercantilism of the 2nd Physique is not so much productive as processional, which is why her self-interest does not reach a pathological, tragic overstrain, but has a character of healthy enthusiasm, even if in a rather specific sphere of activity.

Financial collapse, of course, is not painless for the 2nd Physicist. But it is not fatal for her, it does not knock the "worker" out of the saddle. The collapse worsens the conditions of the acquisitive process, but it does not cancel the process itself, which means that life continues.

In terms of sympathies for political-economic models, the "worker" is best classified as a "social-democrat. Of all types of property, he prefers collective property, but does not exclude others. He takes property inequality for granted, but believes that all citizens who are able to do so should pay a tax that ensures a tolerable existence for the poor. At the same time, according to the "worker", this tax should not be a trough for the idlers and should not be excessive, depriving the poor and the rich of the incentive to work. In short, both in the family and in society, he is a sober, calculating altruist who does not forget himself or others.

* * *

The "Worker" is the world's best fighter. The very bodily architecture of the 2nd Physique with its short dense legs, low center of gravity, wide square body gives a special power and stability to the figure of the "Worker". But the main, fighting dignity of the 2nd Physique lies not in its anthropology, but in its psychology - in its absolutely unpretentious fearlessness. The Second Physique enters into battle without thinking twice, without

calculating the consequences beforehand, and fights to the last man, sparing neither himself nor his opponent. Napoleon's famous phrase: "We must go into battle, and then we will see! - perfectly reflects the reckless behavior of the 2nd Physique in battle, and those marks from the many wounds found on the emperor's body after his death testify that his pugnacity was not realized in absentia, only in the cabinet plans of campaigns, but was personal, quite bodily in nature.

Speaking about the courage of the 2nd Physique, one cannot but say that it is not always for the benefit of the "toiler" and in this case can be considered a virtue only conditionally. The fact is that the 2nd Physique is born fearless; there is no merit to it here. And the source of this fearlessness is in the psychological attitude to the strength and flexibility of the physical. The "worker" can afford fearlessness because he feels his body is something like a rubber truncheon - an effective, reliable, non-deformable weapon.

If we are talking about the pugnacity of the 2nd Physicists, then the question about the criminogenic nature of this category of citizens arises by itself. What can I say? Of course, you can't call this "hard worker" an angel. But without taking the liberty to answer for each individual case, I can responsibly declare that by nature he is law-abiding. And not out of fear. It is simply that he feels his physical self sufficiently broad and richly endowed to earn his livelihood by honest work, without the risk of coming into conflict with the law.

Self-interested violence is in general internally alien to the "worker". Therefore, even when he, due to circumstances, takes the path of violence, the "social democrat" in him does not die, the "worker" is simply transformed into a "Robin Hood" - a social democrat with a criminal bias, and thus as if reconciled with himself.

I have no criminal statistics, but looking at 2nd Physics through the prism of psychosophy, you feel that of all types of criminal activity she is closest to theft with the use of technical means. In such thefts there is an element of youthfulness, a competitive spirit, and room for loving, understanding hands. Accordingly, among organized crime, the "hard worker" feels better in the role of technical director, who provides the material part of operations (cars, weapons, communications, locks, etc.).

While I was sitting there describing the peculiarities of the criminogenesis of the 2nd Physics, the newspaper came. In it is a recent criminal story that demonstrates how comical the "Robinhood" of 2nd Physics can sometimes be. Here is the full story: "A funny thing happened in Gastonia, North Carolina. A thief broke into an apartment. To begin with, he cleaned the dishes, the kitchen floor, and the bathtub for some reason, and then fled, taking with him a stereo and some small things. "It's nice to get the apartment cleaned up," says victim Stephanie Pitts, "but where's the stuff?"

The "hard worker" is always inwardly divided. Circumstances force him to do evil, while his soul yearns for good deeds. Hence such paradoxes as combining theft with washing dishes at the victim's place.

About Taste. Probably many will disagree with me, but the taste of the "worker" is standard. To characterize it in one word, I think it is best to call the taste of the 2nd Physique "Japanese" (the Japanese have the 2nd Physique prevailing). The hallmark of Japanese taste is the priority of naturalness over all other properties of an object. Whether it is design or cooking, everywhere the Japanese try to avoid violence over the material, attempts to pass one off as the other. On the contrary, the Japanese aesthetic credo requires not to conceal but to emphasize and highlight the natural properties of the material during processing. This credo can also be seen in Japanese cuisine, which is close to raw food in its principles, in architecture and ceramics, where the traces of processing are specially preserved on the form, and, of course, in such a specific form of artless art as ikebana.

Of course, only in Japan was the taste of the 2nd Physique able to develop and become the norm. Any "worker" living in another country must in one way or another adapt his taste to local temporal and national norms. But within the limits within which aesthetics is always allowed to fluctuate, the 2nd Physique demonstrates all the same inherent craving for naturalness, the naturalness of color, sound, smell...

"The Unsavory"(3rd Phys.)

Usually the 3rd Physicist is born thin, thin-skinned, and dies the same way.

Those stages of life that leave a noticeable trace on the Physicists above have little effect on the appearance of the "under-trophy". Even puberty, which usually quickly and noticeably changes a child's appearance, in Physique 3, firstly, begins with a delay, and, secondly, proceeds sluggishly and ineffectively, although in the end all signs of it are evident.

The average "underachiever" is a pale, thin, slouchy person with long thin limbs and neck ("asthenic" according to Kretschmer). Skin is poorly pigmented, and in general the skin is not good, because, due to hypersensitivity, it reacts too violently with rashes, pimples, boils, blisters, etc. to environmental influences. The physique of the 3rd Physique is proportionate, and can often claim the highest marks. However, here's the odd thing, her facial features are just as often lacking in proportion. Strong facial asymmetry is not uncommon. Especially often let down the nose, which is too wide, then too long: the noses of Tolstoy and Paganini - not the limit in this respect. The belief in the unattractiveness of one's appearance (not always groundless), with public demonstrations of total indifference to the problem, is in fact crucial for the "prude", being her idea of a fix, a stumbling block. Tolstoy, who provides the richest material for his description of The Third Physique, formulated this state of himself as follows: "...I was bashful by nature, but my bashfulness was further increased by my conviction of my ugliness. And I am convinced that nothing has such a striking influence on a man's direction as his appearance, and not so much the appearance itself as the conviction of its attractiveness or unattractiveness."

The "Undertaker's" plastique is dynamic, and in this, he is similar to the "Worker. However, there are significant differences: the movements of the 3rd Physique do not have

that certainty, precision and purity. There is a certain vanity, excessive energy and cautiousness of movements inherent in the plastique of the "undertrophy".

Like Physics 2, Physics 3 is fidgety, maybe even unnecessarily fidgety. Therefore, it is sometimes amusing and instructive to watch the crowd at bus stops. If we have to wait long enough, the crowd itself imperceptibly stratifies into two parts: static and dynamic. The scene looks like this: productive Physicists (1 and 4) stand motionless, without changing their postures, and processional Physicists (2 and 3) wander around these statues in a Brownian fashion. The skinny, slouching, nosy people, the 3rd Physicists, are especially restless among the latter.

In spite of the fact that the "underdog" has a rather sickly appearance, his body is not as fragile as it seems. The joints and the cardiovascular system are well maintained until old age, which is facilitated by thinness, mobility and moderation in eating. The situation is somewhat worse with the respiratory and gastrointestinal systems - they give the 3rd Physicist a lot of trouble during life and often lead to death.

Although usually the "prude" shows a feigned indifference to his physical condition, it has over him an enormous, incomparable power. Tolstoy confessed: "If I have an unhealthy stomach, I find dog feces everywhere on the road during my walk, so that they even disturb my walk, but if, on the contrary, I am healthy, I see clouds, woods, beautiful places. Isn't that a strange statement for a preacher of the theory of the superiority of the spirit over the flesh?

Without admitting it to herself, the 3rd Physicist is very mistrustful and listens to the workings of her own body with constant attention. But here we shouldn't confuse the 3rd Physique's hypersensitivity with the 1st Physique's episodic hypersensitivity, which prefers radical medical remedies. Mistrustfulness of the 3rd Physique is a chronic (processional) phenomenon, in which preference is given to prevention, hardening and strengthening of the organism.

I am sure that the main inventors and consumers of yoga, raw food dieting, morgation, therapeutic fasting, all kinds of gymnastics, etc. are precisely the "undertruths". It is necessary to have such an undertrust in one's body, combined with the deepest care for it, in order, like yogis, to listen to its work for years, to duplicate unconscious control of the body by conscious control, to find time and desire with the help of poses, diets and breathing exercises to improve its functions.

However, the hypersensitivity of the 3rd Physicist does not serve her alone, but often makes a great contribution to the health of society. Fear of oneself and habit of listening to one's own body, due to the processional nature of the 3rd Physicist, usually turn on others and give the world implacable fighters for purity of nature, active propagators of healthy lifestyle and first-class doctors.

If in childhood the 3rd Physicist is accompanied by beatings, illness, hunger, this often so refines it, initially refined, that the physical sensitivity of the "underdog" at all goes beyond

the limits of the generally accessible and commonly understood. Simply put, one becomes a psychic - initiated into the mysteries of the body by a higher initiation for man.

"I feel people somehow, physically," Tolstoy said. He said, hardly guessing that the oversensitivity of Tolstoy's 3rd Physics is one of the two most important components of his genius. The capacity for sensory empathy, even in absentia, even still only predictable, is the secret of Tolstoy's work. Reading the description in Anna Karenina of the scene when, after Karenin's visit, Anna feels the touch of his lips on her hand like a burn, you realize: not Anna, but Tolstoy himself, who had entered her shell, put his hand up for a kiss and felt the searing touch with his hypersensitive skin.

The sensitivity of Tolstoy's 3rd Physics is not the limit. Sometimes the empathy of the "underdog" reaches such a degree that he is not just acutely sympathetic to what the other is experiencing, but can directly experience the same thing. In science, this phenomenon is called "stigma. Francis of Aziz, whose hands and feet opened wounds when contemplating the image of the crucified Christ, is the most famous example of a stigmatic.

The compassion of the "underbelly" for people of physical labor is boundless. Sometimes it takes such hypertrophied forms that it is simply anecdotal. For example, about the famous French playwright Rostand told the following story: "Rostand had his own coachman, who drove only him. Rostand felt awfully sorry for him. When he had dinner after the theater, he could not without shuddering to think that the coachman freezes on the rump, getting wet in the rain far after midnight. This thought poisoned all his pleasure. So he ordered the coachman to bring him a glass of grog and tell him to go home, that the master would hire a fiaker.

One night the coachman barged into the cafe and told "monsieur" that he was leaving. Angry that he wasn't being taken seriously."

It is easy to guess the 3rd Physicist: from infancy she absolutely, to the point of cramping, cannot stand tickling and carries her hatred for it through her entire life. This is the sign that gave the 3rd Physicist the title of an "untouchable".

The origin of this heightened sensitivity is in the primal sense of the over-guardedness of the 3rd Physics. And through the prism of this supervulnerability all behavioral, legal, economic, aesthetic and other aspects of the life of the "underdog" can be clearly and easily read.

* * *

The vulnerability of the 3rd Physique is especially evident in the intimate sphere. All life appears to the "untouchable" as a path blocked by a giant barrier - a bed, the safe crawling over which constitutes the honey and meaning of life. It might seem that I exaggerate a little, but here are Tolstoy's own words, uttered with complete seriousness: "Man experiences earthquakes, epidemics, the horrors of disease and all kinds of torment of the soul, but for all times the most painful tragedy for him was, is and will be - the tragedy of

the bedroom. Here Tolstoy quite unreasonably and understandably turned his own problem into a universal one.

Timidly and belatedly, in comparison with the others, the 3rd Physique begins her sex life. And almost regardless of how it unfolds, the usual bifurcation in the sex of the "undertrope" for the Third Physique also has the misfortune of being present. Once a lady acquaintance of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, describing his Third Function, said well that he was a "platonic and immodest admirer." I would characterize the bifurcation of the 3rd Physique more lapidary and harsher—"a hypersexual prude.

On the one hand, the vulnerability of the 3rd Physique makes its possessor prude: deny the importance of eroticism, portray it as something not worthy of attention, impure. On the other hand, the same vulnerability of the 3rd Physics requires putting into sex the maximum of one's strength and soul, in order to heal a constantly aching wound in this way. This is how the biprostatic "underbelly" exists, causing bewilderment and censure from her sexual partners. S.A. Tolstaya, looking at her husband, all at once cheerful and ladylike after a night spent together, venomously remarked: "If those who read 'Kreutzer Sonata' with reverence, looked for a moment in the love life, which lives Levochka, and at one which he is cheerful and kind - how they would topple their deity, from the pedestal on which he had been placed.

The plagues of the 3rd Phys. can be so deep that the natural cessation of sexual activity is perceived as liberation from slavery. This is what the playwright Euripides called his impotence, for which he was honored by Christian apologists with the title of "proto-Christian. In the example of Euripides, among other things, one can clearly see another sign of the severely bruised 3rd Physique - a pathological hatred of creatures of the opposite sex. None other than Euripides was the first to propose in the drama "Ion" to reproduce unisex, by budding, without women, and all the subsequent "prudes" who theorized on this subject were only epigones of Euripides. And companions in misfortune.

The timid suitor, the timid object of courting, the "prude" prefers not to take the initiative in love affairs - it is more convenient for him not so much to lead as to be led. However, if the partner is assertive and delicate enough, and it comes to the sin, he is pleasantly surprised and rewarded by the discovery in the "prude" inspired, voluptuous and sophisticated lover. Firstly, the heightened sensory sensitivity turns the body of the 3rd Physique into one solid erogenous zone; the back of the "undertrope" is especially erogenous because, being the most defenseless part of the body, it is attuned to the perception of the environment in an ultra-sharp manner. Secondly, for the same reason the 3rd Physique is sensitive to another's body, delicate, tender, sensitive to the partner's requests and possibilities. Finally, the specificity of sexual psychology of the "prude" requires putting another's pleasure above one's own, moreover, to see the sufficient and full realization of one's sexuality exactly in the visual manifestations of experiences experienced by the partner. So, if it is ever allowed to talk about sexual altruism, it is the first quality that should be attributed to the "undertrope.

I would like to draw your attention once again: all the above-mentioned pleasures can be obtained from the 3rd Physics only if maximum delicacy is observed. In sexology, for example, there is a well-known case of a man who became impotent on his wedding night. And he was brought to it by quite innocent behavior of the bride, she just lay on her back and spread her legs, such "rudeness" so impressed the groom that he immediately lost his manhood forever.

However, predicting in advance where the sexuality of the Third Physique would stumble is hopeless. For example, Jean-Jacques Rousseau fled the embrace of a seductive young Venetian, discovering that she had nipples of different shapes and thinking on this basis that she was "some monster, rejected by nature, people and love." Or here are more excerpts from women's letters to the psychiatrist: "I have never been married, have never had any relations with men, I despise men... Men did not hurt me, did not do anything nasty to me. When I was a child, at the age of twelve, I was walking down the street behind respectable men and I heard them talking about married life and what it was all about. I haven't been able to see them since..." "It happened in sixth grade. Some fool of eighteen years old came up under my skirt. Then in eighth grade something like that happened again in the stairwell. To be fair, it was no big deal. But from that moment on, I was terrified... I'm afraid to get acquainted, I'm afraid to even know people. Don't get me wrong, I don't think "all men are scoundrels". But it will remain ... "

The 3rd Physicist is the only Physicist who is jealous of physiological jealousy. For her sexual intercourse is such a delicate, intimate, even sacred thing, that intrusion of strangers into this sphere is perceived as desecration of a sacred thing, after which physical rejection comes, carnal squeamishness and the possibility of continuing previous sexual life becomes, at any rate, rather problematic. If, over time, the "prude" forgives the infidelity, she never forgets it.

I want to warn you: it is very difficult to deceive the 3rd Physicist by leaving her in the dark about outside adventures. Firstly, because she is constantly on the alert, waiting and afraid of treachery. And secondly, she has an absolute ear for the subtlest vibrations of the human body.

Just as the Third Physicist's view of sexuality is not devoid of sanctimony, her perception of nudity suffers from a certain flaw. This is why the most consistent opponents of nudism and pornography are usually recruited from the ranks of the "prudes."

I will allow myself in this connection a small interesting observation about the 3rd Physicist. An early and very characteristic sign of her is the habit of turning away from the TV screen when love scenes, even a simple kiss, are shown. There is no reason to attribute this reaction to upbringing, since it manifests itself in very early childhood. We are left to speak of a certain "inborn moral feeling," a certain "innate bashfulness. However, even this explanation is valid only insofar as it concerns the obvious innateness of the reaction. In fact, the child turns away from the image of the kiss, not because of natural bashfulness, but because of innate "viciousness," because he has the 3rd Phys. And this

means that the child is heightened sensuality and his physical perception is so heightened that he not only sees the kiss on the screen, but he also tastes it on his lips. And this involuntary invasion of someone else's kiss with his lips makes the child turn away from the screen.

Another reason for the "prude's" aversion to everything that relates to the intimate sphere, to nudism and pornography, I think, is the fear of the power that nudity has over him. Once in the presence of Tolstoy, displeasure was expressed at the fact that the sculptor Paolo Trubetskoy goes with his wife naked on the river to bathe. And Tolstoy, being unable to directly condemn his friend, made a characteristic confession: "I always had this feeling of shame, and, for example, the sight of a woman with naked breasts has always been repulsive to me, even in my youth. Then there was another feeling, but it was still embarrassing..."

What's disgusting about a woman's breasts? Right, it wasn't innate bashfulness that made Tolstoy turn away from them. But because of his natural fornication. The sight of a naked breast was too intoxicating for him, too attractive, drove him to a frightening self-forgetfulness. It was not shame, but fear of the magical power of nudity over himself that Tolstoy felt, and it was this that made him avert his eyes.

Tolstoy not without reason loved to retell a dream, allegedly seen once by an acquaintance landowner. He dreamed the following: he is on a narrow path through the bushes, guided by two towering in front of the hill. Suddenly, the landowner stumbles, gets his foot in the mire and begins to sink. When, waist-deep in the mire, he looks up at the two hills in front of him, he sees the head of a gigantic woman rising from behind them... Horror grips the landowner as he realizes where he is sinking... And here comes the awakening. Tolstoy not in vain loved to retell this, most likely, his own dream. Tolstoy felt at the sight of a woman's body in the position of this anonymous landlord, and the fear of plunging into a woman's womb with his head, to the complete loss of his "I", forced him to avert his eyes from the nudity.

Fear is a dominant, though possibly hidden, feature of the 3rd Physique's eroticism. It fears creatures of the opposite sex, it fears rejection of intimacy, and it seeks the most non-traumatic ways of realizing its sexuality. Let's open "Father Sergius" in this regard. If the reader remembers, the core of the story is the attitude of the monk, Father Sergius, toward two women. One, a secular, beautiful, smashing lady, tries to seduce the monk, and to overcome the temptation, he chops off his finger. Another - just a feeble-minded merchant's daughter, barely presented to Father Sergius, is so seductive that he immediately breaks his vow of chastity with her. Tolstoy was asked: why did Father Sergius "break" with the foolish girl, resisting the onslaught of a secular lioness? Tolstoy was unable or unwilling to give a clear answer to this question. So I will take the liberty of resolving this long-standing perplexity myself.

Father Sergius did not give in to temptation the first time because he was afraid. He was afraid that this secular, beautiful woman would lure him in, but at the last moment she

would refuse him, push him away, laugh in his face, and reproach him by reminding him of his monastic vow. The fear of sexual trauma was so great in Father Sergius that he preferred to cut off his own finger rather than undergo such an ordeal. The story of the foolish girl is a different matter. She, already by virtue of her morbid condition, guaranteed Fr. Sergius full sexual comfort, and lo and behold, the sinning was not slow.

The example from "Father Sergius" is not, of course, evidence that the 3rd Physics is only preoccupied with hunting down the mentally handicapped; it is merely an illustration of the thesis of the preference that the "untouchable" has for non-traumatic ways of realizing her sexuality. There are other ways that can be called "perversions," "inversions," or "unconventional modes of love" (whatever one likes) that have one thing in common: minimal traumatism. These are onanism, same-sex love, bestiality and fetishism. We can probably add to this list something else in the same vein, the main thing is that all these ways of love are psychologically comfortable and thus especially valuable for the 3rd Physics.

As far as "perversions" are concerned, it is necessary to add that not only the 3rd Physics is prone to them, but to a greater or lesser extent all Physicists. Another thing is that for each of them in this case there is a significant difference in motives. Whereas the 3rd Physique falls into the camp of "sexual minorities" out of fear, the 1st Physique falls into it out of omnivorousness, the 2nd Physique falls into it out of curiosity and love of diversity, the 4th Physique falls into it out of indifference. So the very position of Physique on the steps of the functional hierarchy is no guarantee of "health" or "disorder" of the sexual sphere.

Talking about comfortable for the 3rd Physique sex, it is impossible to bypass the simplest and most convenient type of realization of sexual need. Marriage. So, the "undertrope" is a creature of the highest degree of marriage. Explaining the advantage of marriage, Tolstoy, from the pole of 3rd Physique and through the mouth of one of his heroes, noted that "marriage, besides the pleasantness of the home, eliminating the impropriety of sexual life, gave the possibility of a moral life. "Of course, Tolstoy was a bit overreaching in declaring marriage a condition for a moral life, etc. Nevertheless, with various reservations, the value of marriage for sexual life must be recognized, and that is that it makes legitimate sexual intercourse, the thing that the 3rd Physique most needs, the thing that surrounds her sex with maximum comfort.

The advantages are many. First, the voluntary or involuntary presence of strangers during legal intercourse puts strangers at a definite disadvantage and automatically closes their mouths, no matter what they may have witnessed. Secondly, marriage, although not a guarantee, still puts certain obstacles in the way of venereal diseases, and this is very important. Suffice it to recall the example of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, who paid for one night with a prostitute, among other things, by spending two months painfully examining himself for the first signs of a bad disease.

Finally, marriage again does not guarantee, but puts barriers to cheating and having other people's children, which is especially important for men with the 3rd Physic. Everyone is jealous, even insects are jealous, what to say about people. But the jealousy of men - "prudes", if it is possible to put it that way, is more jealous than jealousy of any other man, because they are afraid not simply to lose power over a creature, which they consider as their own, are afraid not simply to have another's posterity, which any man is afraid of, the fear of 3rd Physics is immeasurably increased by threat that infidelity will confirm carefully hidden, but constantly felt diagnosis of defects of his physical beginning. It is therefore natural that, in search of additional levels of protection, the "untouchable" rushes into marriage in an attempt to cover his wounded body by law.

* * *

The chadolove of the 3rd Physicist is boundless and sometimes takes excessive, ugly forms, the "undertrope", seeing in procreation not just a value, but an absolute value, independent of time, space and circumstances, is not just prolific, but prolific in an uncalculated, thoughtless way. Although it can be understood, fecundity is both physiological and psychological need of the 3rd Physics. Through reproduction, its processionality and dialogivity are realized, but most importantly, it is a certification of the wholesomeness of what seems incomplete and defective from birth.

To the flip side of such a welcomed phenomenon as the child-love of the Third Physicist, it is necessary to include the excessively dense guardianship which she usually establishes over her children. Feeling herself a creature vulnerable and little adapted to life, the "prude" does not always transfer this feeling to her offspring and tries to create for him not too useful for an independent life, hothouse conditions of existence. In a word, if there is her will, the 3rd Physique gives numerous, but little adapted to the harsh conditions of life offspring.

* * *

"The prude is a very unimportant fighter, worse than anyone. The fact is that he is, quite frankly, a coward. How much the 3rd Physicist's cowardice is noticeable to outsiders depends on many conditions, but the fact that she is less willing than anyone else to put her already born body to the test of force is certain.

Out of fear, the 3rd Physique can be too cruel in a fight (if it cannot be avoided). Fear of getting hurt stifles pity and sense of proportion, so when it comes to fighting, exceeding self-defense is a common phenomenon for the 3rd Physique.

However, the "prude" has to fight very rarely. Hand-to-hand violence both in everyday life and in politics is the least acceptable and the most unpromising way of solving problems for him. If, as it was said, the 1st Physicist is a born "hawk", then the 3rd Physicist is a born "dove". Pacifism is in her blood. Therefore, it makes no sense to look for a founder of pacifism. Clearly, neither Tolstoy, nor Gandhi, nor even Christ were the originators of pacifism; their unanimity on the issue of violence is the unanimity of a

certain class of people united by the 3rd Physics. The "non-pacifist" is most afraid of physical force, and therefore least inclined to resort to it himself.

Let me say right off the bat: God forbid that the pacifism of the 3rd Physicists in both everyday life and politics is the norm, the model for dealing with controversial issues. Absolutely not. Well, precisely dosed violence is an argument as good as any, especially in relation to people who are not squeamish about hand-to-hand violence themselves.

Pacifism is the social expression of personal cowardice. Therefore, whatever lofty words and authoritative quotations cowardice and pacifism may be laden with, they are a flaw, not an ornament, of the 3rd Physics, especially men.

Let me give one piece of good advice to parents of boys with the 3rd Physique: send them to the Kyokashinkai karate school. (Mas Oyama). I myself devoted several years to this most aggressive, militant style of karate and know firsthand how beneficial its effect on the 3rd Physique is. After all, it is not the pain itself, but an exaggerated idea of pain that is truly painful for the 3rd Physique. That is why when a "prude" takes karate, during sport fights he will become sure that his body is not as flimsy as it seemed and is able to "hold a punch", that his own fist also weighs something, reality and the idea of pain will become adequate to each other. And the adequacy of real and perceived pain is the fighting norm that, at once, relieves the 3rd Physicist of two of society's most intolerable vices: cowardice and its derivative, cruelty.

In sports the Third Physicist is cautious and at the same time gambling, filled with outward contempt and secret envy - in a word, shows the usual for the Third Functions double-handedness. Tolstoy - a consistent opponent of any physicality with a passion for physical education, and after leaving the village, frightened the peasants, hanging upside down on the bar for a long time, for which he was awarded from them the nickname "strange gentleman.

* * *

In light of what has been said about the 3rd Physicist, it is not difficult to guess that she is unusually law-abiding. Her natural pity, her selflessness, her aversion to violence, and her fear of violence in return practically guarantee a negligible percentage of "unsubjects" in the overall criminal statistics.

The only crime that a "prude" relatively often decides to commit, which, by the way, is due to the same 3rd Physics, is a crime of jealousy. It has already been said before that the 3rd Physique is the only Physique suffering from physiological jealousy. What anguish the jealous "under-touch" experiences and how it feels to avenge his real or imagined honor is conveyed with incredible power and precision in Tolstoy's "Kreutzer Sonata," read it.

Without dwelling further on the details of the criminogenesis of the Third Physique, I will note a detail just as accurately captured in "Kreutzer Sonata" and which is also relevant to the chronicle of the incidents. The fact is that the "untouchable" quite often has thoughts

of suicide. This idea can even become obsessive, manic, but only in exceptional cases is implemented by the "prude" in life. Recall, Tolstoy's hero, killing his wife out of jealousy, decides to commit suicide, and then this happens to him: "Yes, now I must also kill myself," I said to myself. But I said it, and I knew that I would not kill myself. However, I got up and picked up my revolver. But the strange thing was, I remember how many times before I had been close to suicide. Now there was no way I could not only kill myself, but even think about it.

Tolstoy does not say why the hero often thought of suicide and why, even after killing his wife, he did not kill himself. And the answer to these two questions is quite simple: the thirst to commit suicide, which periodically arises in the "prude", is associated with a subconscious desire to turn off the most troublesome, uncomfortable, constantly nagging function - the Physics. And to quench this thirst the powerful physiological imagination inherent in the 3rd Physique, which is able to reproduce ahead of time all the sensations of leaving life. It is enough to imagine how a bullet, having crushed the skull, drills a tunnel in the brain tissue, or how slowly with a gurgle the lungs are filled with river, dirty water, or how the poisoned insides shudder... - and the suicidal obsession disappears on its own.

* * *

The sensorics of the 3rd Physics are refined to the extreme. To hear overtones that cannot be heard by an ordinary ear, to feel the most microscopic changes in the environment, to smell odors that cannot be picked up by an average person's nose, to see tonal transitions that cannot be seen by an ordinary eye - is not very difficult for her. This is why "untouchables" make great masseurs, adjusters, tasters. As a wonderful illustration to the subject of the tasting of the 3rd Physics, let me remind you of the story of the prophet Mohammed. One day a certain widow of a tribal leader killed by the order of the prophet sent Mohammed a roasted ram rubbed with poison. A feast was arranged in the tent, but the prophet took a small piece in his mouth and immediately felt something wrong and spat it out, thus saving his life (although not without painful consequences). The rest of the less sensitive participants of the feast immediately went to the next world.

If the initial refinement of the 3rd Physique is accompanied by intensified exercises and physical traumas (illness, beatings, deprivation), then the perception of the "underdog" can reach a non-human, mystical-magical level. Thus, from the 3rd Physique, severe illnesses and grueling musical exercises formed the genius of Paganini, whose subtlety of hearing has become a legend: "Gifted with the finest hearing, Paganini possessed an incredible sensitivity in this sense: his left ear, accustomed to the proximity of the violin, heard much more acutely than his right, and his eardrum became so delicate that he experienced intense pain if spoken loudly to his side or next to him. At the same time, he was able to pick up the softest sounds at the greatest distance."

Of course, the possibility of refined perception does not equal a love of all things refined, but in the case of the 3rd Physique both are the same. Her taste is characterized by a

predilection for delicate, refined objects, for dim, complex colors, for a fine, rich aromatic range, for a complex soft soundtrack.

* * *

The activity of the "prude" in production also has some specific features. For example, the conveyor belt is completely contraindicated to him. The inherent monotony and monotony of the conveyor belt, the prohibition of self-activity and the doom of monologue traumatize the refined organization of the 3rd Physique and quickly put it out of action.

"Nedotroga" is wary of working mechanisms, so the process of mastering them by the 3rd Physique can be difficult and somewhat prolonged. In production, as well as in sex, she long prefers the role of the slave to the role of the master. However, by the end of training, the timidity of the "prude" usually fades away, and begins a long process of creative, artistic, refined processing of the experience, bringing sometimes a set of even the simplest operations to a state close to the real art.

In this connection, I recall a story about a Chinese carcass carver, who was very proud of the fact that for several decades he used the same knife for carving. The secret of the knife's longevity consisted in the fact that this Chinaman, over time, brought his more than simple occupation to such a degree of virtuosity that, possessing almost X-ray vision, he could see any, even microscopic cavities in meat and with perfect accuracy led the knife through them, cutting carcasses almost without efforts and depreciation of the tool.

As far as China and the 3rd Physics are concerned, it remains to add that, according to my assumptions, it was the 3rd Physics that created such a unique phenomenon as Chinese cuisine. It is interesting because it is the exact opposite of the simple, clear, natural, unadulterated Japanese cuisine created by the 2nd Physics. Chinese cuisine is immense, complex, jewel-like, exquisite, paradoxical... There are simply no colors to describe it accurately, so I will limit myself to stating that if the reader wants to know to what artistry the activities of the 3rd Physics in the material sphere can rise, there is no better illustration than the Chinese cuisine.

The attitude toward the food problem of the 3rd Physique is best expressed in the words of Jean-Jacques Rousseau: "I like to eat, but I am not greedy; I am addicted to everything tasty, but I am not a gourmand. *Too many other inclinations distract me from it. I pay attention to my stomach only when my heart is free.*" Among other things, the hierarchy of the heart (1st Emotion) and stomach (3rd Physique) in Rousseau's confession is remarkable, with the heart clearly taking precedence over the stomach. By this phrase alone, one can begin to build up the order of functions in Rousseau's whole.

The economic relations of the 3rd Physicist are ambiguous and fractured in everyday life and society. On the one hand, its vulnerability requires an endless avarice to cover the sore spot as effectively as possible. On the other hand, pity, imaginary asceticism, superprocessionality of the Third Function provokes a policy of broad gestures, gusts of generosity, thoughtless spending. As a result, the economic face of the "prude" is strangely bifurcated, resulting in what Academician Sakharov self-critically called "a little stingy". Moreover, the 3rd Physicist's stinginess usually takes petty, oddball forms, what we used to call "saving on

matches". And at the same time the 3rd Physicist adores making expensive gifts, considers it her sacred duty to participate in charitable activities, though she usually cannot boast of the size of her purse, and besides she is unable, dislikes and considers it beneath her dignity to earn much, seeing in a large purse obvious signs of bad taste.

Jean-Jacques Rousseau conveyed very accurately the specific duplicity of the attitude of the 3rd Physique toward money. He wrote: "...one of my perceived contradictions is the combination of an almost avaricious avarice with the greatest contempt for money...I understand so well that money was not created for me that I am almost ashamed to have it, much less use it. If I ever had a certain and sufficient income to live on, I would not be in danger of becoming a miser, I firmly believe so; I would spend all my income without trying to increase it, but insecurity keeps me in fear."

The "underdog" has an extremely heightened sense of ownership. He rarely possesses a large number of things, but the few things that the 3rd Physicist has have a special status and meaning. Only in his own house, among his own things, the "prude" feels not just comfortable, but at his own place. No matter how cozy someone else's house is and how comfortable someone else's things are, they are not bad, but they are uncomfortable for the 3rd Physicist already because they are alien.

In terms of socio-economic policy preferences, the 3rd Physicist is closest to the title of "communist". You can call her otherwise: "monk", "kibbutznik" - the essence will not change from this. And the essence is that the "underdog" is internally closest to the equalization-distribution system.

The nature of the Communist sympathies of the 3rd Physique is quite transparent. She feels that she is the weakest and most vulnerable link in society. Therefore, in order not to put her life and health at risk, the "underdog" tries to place the weight of her personal problems on the backs of those around her, insisting on an equalizing and distributive system of economy that promises, regardless of contribution, equal protection for all. The fact that such a system is inefficient doesn't bother the 3rd Physicist much; she has no desire for wealth in principle, and is ready to accept the minimum as long as it is guaranteed.

Vladimir Bukovsky, looking at the communist crawl of some Western intellectuals from the heights of his healthy 2nd Physics, noted caustically and accurately: "Where do socialists get so much mercantilism? After all, most of them are intellectuals, living in a world of ideas, not things. Their theory is amazingly inconsistent: on the one hand, they are always criticizing consumerism, materialism and self-interest, while on the other hand, it is this aspect of life that worries them most, it is in consumerism that they want to establish equality. Do they really believe that if everyone is given an equal ration of bread, everyone will become brothers...? Can people who jealously count each other's incomes and enviously look at every piece swallowed by a neighbor become brothers?" Bukovsky's observation is nothing new; it is an involuntary plagiarism of what Dostoyevsky said much earlier: "...why are all these desperate socialists and communists at the same time such incredible misers, acquirers, proprietors, and even so that the more socialist he is, the

further he goes, the stronger the proprietorwhy this?" It is hard to argue with what has been said, all is fair... But, speaking of the duplicity of the 3rd Physicist, we must take into account that her sly asceticism is sincere or, at any rate, quite unconscious, and when she carefully passes off the flawed communist model as the norm of human society, this is the cunning not of a con man, but of a mentally ill one.

Like the skepticism of the 3rd Logic, the communism of the 3rd Physics is not philosophy, but a flawed psychology. The psychology of an insignificant but influential group of people. Therefore, observing now the demise of communism in its state forms, one should not conclude that the communist idea itself will go into oblivion with it. It will continue to exist, only within its natural boundaries, without any claim to domination, in the form of small parties, communities, communes, monasteries, kibbutzim, it will live - as long as the 3rd Physics is alive.

"Lazybones" (4th Phys.)

The term "slacker" should not be taken too literally. It reflects not so much the manner of behavior as the psychological orientation of the person. On the contrary, outwardly the 4th Physicist often looks like a great worker. She is plodding, undemanding, fearless in the expenditure of effort, executive within the limits precisely assigned to her. "Slothfulness" of the 4th Physique does not consist in visible manifestations of sabotage, simulation or slacking off, but in invisible indifference to the nature and results of her work (if we mean the purely physical aspect of labor). Of course, with the known indifference of the "idler" to the work, it is difficult to expect from him excitement, initiative, creative outbursts and something else in the same spirit, but there is a positive side to this indifference. It is easy to assign any dirty, tedious or pointless job to a "lazy person", which is still in abundance in our society. Someone has to fill out forms, carry out pots, and stand at the conveyor belt, and there is no better candidate to do such work than the 4th Physicist.

For myself, I also call the 4th Physicist the "moon man. Indeed, the "lazy man" has some mysterious connection with the moon. "You breathe the sun, I breathe the moon," Akhmatova confessed. I can only assume that the feeling of an inner connection with the moon in the 4th Physicist arises from their energetic kinship. Just as the moon shines with weak, only reflected light, so the "sloth", according to the law of the Fourth Functions, is only a reflection of higher, autonomous physical energies.

The 4th Physicist herself is a born decadent, in the literal sense of the word ("decadence" - "decay"). The feeling of weakening of the physical beginning in herself lives in the "sloth" from birth, but it does not bother him much. Another thing is that the usual feeling of early decrepitude in young years contrasts strangely with a fresh, healthy appearance, bringing confusion and bewilderment to the environment.

In this connection, an anecdote from the life of the young Alexander Blok comes to mind. A group of Moscow poets were waiting for Blok for the first time and, having read such lines as

"Only here you breathe, at the foot of the graves,
Where I once wrote gentle songs
Of a rendezvous, perhaps, with Thee...
Where for the first time in my waxed features
The distant life You breathe,
Breaking through the grave grass..."

The reality, however, demonstrated quite the opposite. Reality showed quite the opposite. Andrei Bely recalled: "I was trembling all over. Never in my life - neither before, nor after - I have not experienced such a burning discomfort. And disappointment. Deception, deception! I was deceived. It's not Bloch. Not my Sasha Bloch.

But how handsome he was! Tall, slender, handsome. Curly. He was like a halo of golden rays, ruddy with frost. He wore a student's coat, broad-shouldered, with a horny waist. His blue collar made his lovely eyes look even bluer. So handsome, so earthy, so healthy, so heavy."

Of course, the inexorable run of time gradually blurs in the "lazy man" the contradiction between the Physicist's mental self-perception and reality, until by his old age the 4th Physicist is not at all adequate to himself. But before that, such apparent contradictions irritate and shock those around her, making them suspect an element of posturing, of playing decadence, in the behavior of the 4th Physicist. Which in fact is not the case, she is decadent quite sincerely.

* * *

"I had ascetic tastes and did not follow the ascetic path," wrote Berdyaev, and in this phrase of the philosopher the entire economic program of the 4th Phys. is encapsulated, or rather, the absence of it. "The lazy man does indeed do without exertion the minimum, but it does not follow that he is despised by luxury. He is too indifferent to the physical layer of life to take seriously the problem of a personal level of consumption conditioned more by circumstances and environment than by the desires and efforts of the "slacker. For example, Einstein, having provided himself with the most basic income in his old age, could have used a check for \$15,000 from the Rockefeller Foundation as a bookmark.

* * *

"Lazybones" is a creature of utter fearlessness. The 4th Physicist's reckless bravery looks like a great virtue from the outside, but it really isn't. Putting the Fourth Physique in front of a fight, the thing you care least about, is no great feat. Besides, like any virtue, the bravery of the "lazy man" has its flip side: not sparing himself, he is not inclined to spare

others. That is why the 4th Physicist is often no less bloody in his activities than the 1st Physicist. Fortunately, violence in the arsenal of the "sloth" is the last argument, not the first, but if it comes to it, no mercy can be expected from the 4th Physics. A recent example is the policy of President Bush during the Gulf crisis, when, having exhausted all other forms of influence, he coldly, calculatedly and methodically dealt with the Fourth Army of the world.

By the way, the "slacker" is a win-win politician. Being brave, he also does not risk breaking his neck on the things that usually break a politician's neck: money and women. He is shielded from these temptations by nature itself, by his 4th Physics. This is why courage, selflessness and unpretentiousness provide in advance a politician with the 4th Physics with an indefinite carte blanche of the crowd. Let us recall in this connection Robespierre, whose title-name "The incorruptible" guaranteed his feckless, bloody regime an impermissibly long life.

Let us also note that the period of the "lazy" politician's rule is not the best time for the country's economy. The 4th Physicist cares too little about the physical layer of life to deal with it seriously, and this circumstance has a positive effect on the "lazy" politician's rating and a negative effect on the wallets of his voters.

I don't want to scare anyone, but the 4th Physique is more prone to suicide than anyone else. For her, the thought of suicide is not a pose, as it is for the 3rd Physicist, but something ordinary, something that regularly pops into her mind without arousing horror or disgust in return. The thought of suicide is the first and, strange as it may seem, normal reaction to conflicts, problems, and inconveniences of life for the 4th Physicist. Actually, it is in one's character to start solving difficulties by turning off the Fourth Function, so one should hardly be surprised that, getting into a difficult situation, the first thing a "lazy man" does is rush to soap up the rope.

From the outside such an action looks heroic, as it happened with Socrates' suicide, but in essence there is nothing heroic in voluntarily turning off what you care least about. This is something every holder of the 4th Physique should keep in mind before pulling the trigger. The thought of suicide is a normal "lazy" bliss, and one should not be in a hurry to succumb to its first, unfaithful urge.

* * *

The 4th Physique is usually good looking. It is as attractive as the 1st Physics, but in a different way. If the 1st Physics is good for juiciness of forms and colors, the 4th Physics, on the contrary, is good for its subtlety, pallor, refinement. To visualize the difference between the beauty of the 1st and 4th Physicists it is enough to compare the looks of Marilyn Monroe and Marlene Dietrich. Can you feel the difference? They seem very similar, but what Monroe has is full, rough, sweet, Dietrich has is subtle, dry, gentle.

More often a "lazybones" is a thin, thin-skinned, "asthenic" person. However, I have also come across people of large, athletic build among the 4th Physicists. The only thing that

is almost one hundred percent similar to the appearance of the 4th Physicist is the iconic thinness of the features: a thin nose, thin eyebrows, a small, narrow-mouthed mouth (if there are no Afro-Semitic ancestors).

The wonderful thing about the beauty of the 4th Physique is that time has no power over it. I will not say that wrinkles and baldness do not affect the "lazy man". No. But minus those, the appearance of the 4th Physicist from youth to old age remains unchanged, and if someone is spoken of, adding an old literary stamp - "with traces of former beauty on his face" - you can be almost sure that we are talking about the 4th Physicist. Suetonius wrote of Emperor Augustus: "He was handsome in appearance and at any age retained his attractiveness, though he made no effort to make himself beautiful.

There is another outward sign of the 4th Physique. It is sadness, which is read in the eyes of the "lazy man" more often than other feelings. The 4th Physics is born and dies with a sense of the primordial tragedy of being, with a sense of distress. "You know sorrow is something that is close to me" (Gauguin), "Only with grief do I feel solidarity" (Brodsky). Expectation of disaster, misgivings are typical of the 4th Physique, and the words "nightmare," "horror," "sorrow," "longing" are favorite in her vocabulary.

* * *

Here we come to a new and most interesting topic of psychosophy: the combination of different functions. We will talk about the influence of the physical beginning on a person's perception of the world and his worldview, more precisely, about the combination of Physics with Emotion and Logic, or, to be more precise, about what is commonly called "temperament".

I should say at once that the term "temperament" from Hippocrates to the present day has acquired such a layer of interpretations and modifications that the question of its meaning is unlikely to anyone can now answer with complete certainty. Unchanged except that the names of the four types, which are divided into mankind by temperament: sanguine, choleric, phlegmatic, melancholic. Everyone seems to agree with the fact that temperament is in some dependence on physiology, the very terms that denote temperament, derived from the Greek designation of blood, lymph, bile. This is the first.

And the second. Looking at the classification of temperaments from a purely domestic, "kitchen" level, it can be presented as follows: sanguine - Rabelaisian, cheerful, lively man; phlegmatic - a man no less lively, but restrained in the expression of his love of life, melancholic - not to say that the lover, but nature in any case calm; choleric - bitter, not calm and not cheerful. I emphasize that this is a "kitchen" scheme, but we have to proceed from it, because outside the "kitchen" there are endless contradictions and squabbles among the interpreters and modifiers of Hippocrates' typology.

Knowing all this, let us now try to look at the theory of temperaments through the prism of psychosophy. As you know, the hallmark of any reliable universal concept is not the negation, but the inclusion of previous systems: the physics of Newton was part of the

physics of Einstein, the same happened to the geometry of Euclid after the appearance of Lobachevsky geometry, etc. In fact, the theory of temperaments is an integral part of psychosophy.

The fact is that the four temperaments are the four basic combinations of Physics and Emotion, where the position of Physics reflects their essence, the color, the color of world-perception, and the position of Emotion on the steps of the functional hierarchy determines the intensity of expression of world-perception.

It has already been said before that sadness prevails in the mood of the 4th Physicist-it is its hallmark. Everything is true here, but not everything. The whole truth is in the system: the lower a person's Physic, the lighter the coloring of his worldview. And vice versa, the higher one's Physics is, the lighter the coloring of one's perception of the world. Emotion, on the other hand, is responsible for the intensity of color, for resonance, so the higher the Emotion, the stronger this darker or lighter coloring of the world-perception is expressed. And vice versa.

Therefore, through the prism of psychosophy, the system of temperaments looks as follows:

"Sanguine": Physics at the top + Emotion at the top (a pronounced light-colored worldview).

"Phlegmatic": Physics at the top + Emotion at the bottom (a faintly light-colored worldview).

"Melancholic": Physics down + Emotion down (a weakly dark-colored worldview).

"Choleric": Physics at the bottom + Emotion at the top (a pronounced dark-colored worldview).

Just as Physics affects one's worldview, so does it affect one's outlook. The difference is that here Physics enters into a combination with Logic. But the result is naturally the same. Although we must admit that these combinations have not received as developed typology as the theory of temperaments, but in its infancy, a typology of worldview exists and is known to all: it is a division of humanity into optimists and pessimists.

Since enough has been said about the influence of Physics on coloring, I think the reader will have no difficulty in guessing that high-status Physics that colors brightly gives birth to optimists, while low-status Physics that colors darkly gives birth to pessimists. And nothing can be done about it, the process of formation of the worldview and world outlook does not depend on a person at all, and one has to put up with them, as one has to put up with the weather.

THE WORLD AS WILL AND REPRESENTATION

It may seem strange, but the Will as a component of psychological systems is encountered quite rarely, although no psychologist has attempted or will attempt to deny its importance for the human psyche. The explanation of this phenomenon, I think, should be sought in the inexpressibility and universality of the nature of the will itself. It, like the Holy Spirit, is invisible, omnipresent, blowing wherever it wants, which is why it is poorly grasped in the network of psychological techniques.

The implicit but powerful participation of the will in the creation of psychological systems can be particularly clearly studied using the example of Carl-Gustav Jung's typology. On the one hand, Jung claimed that his typology "did not include will and memory... but, in fact, the will was the main differentiator of Jung's typology.

The Jungian division of introverts and extroverts has become commonplace, and it is commonly understood that an extrovert is an outward-looking, very outgoing person, whereas an introvert is an uncommunicative, inward-looking person. But this is "kitchen" Jung. In fact, an extrovert is not an outward-looking person, but an outward-looking person, while an intravert is the opposite. Here are some characteristic quotes from Jung's typology: "...the unconscious pretensions of the extraverted type are actually primitive and infantile, egocentric in nature...The extraverted type is always ready to give himself up (apparently) in favor of the object and assimilate his subjectivity to the object....The danger for the extrovert is that he gets involved in objects and completely loses himself in them...The mental life of this personality type is played out, so to speak, outside himself, in his environment. He lives in and through others - any reflection on himself makes him shudder. The dangers lurking there are best overcome by noise. If he does have a "complex," he finds refuge in social spin, turmoil, and allows himself to be assured several times a day that all is well. To the extent that he is not too meddlesome, not too assertive, and not too superficial, he can be a fiercely helpful member of any community."

The problem of extraversion and intraversion is not in the measure of sociability, contactiveness, but in the measure of the individual's DEEPness or NEED, i.e. it is a

problem of the WILL. In fact, when dividing mankind into extroverts and introverts, Jung divided it into people with a high Will and a low Will, and only then he singled out from extroverts and introverts people of thinking type, sensory type, emotional type and intuitive type, i.e. he developed his typology, deriving types from the will base of man. However, not being a strong-willed person, Jung himself tried to camouflage the personal problem as much as possible and, creating his typology, hid the problem of will behind vague terminology and, as quoted above, even officially took will out of his typology. What has happened is what usually happens in psychology, when a psychologist scientifically solves not someone else's but his own psychological problems, presenting such solutions as universal.

Although Jung's indisputable excuse may be that the Will is the most hidden element of the human psyche, and there is nothing in the world to which one can point as the obvious fruit of the Will, whereas traces of Emotion, Logic, Physics are plentiful. But there is nothing in the vital activity of man that is not filled with Will, that does not reflect the place of Will in the order of the functions of the individual. But all this is only secretly, implicitly. For example, it is customary to speak of the Egyptian pyramids as the greatest creations of human **hands**, but the slave labor was preceded by **the thought** of the Egyptian engineers, but that is not all; the hands and thought were preceded by **the will** of Pharaoh. Pharaoh said: "I want a pyramid!"-and from this all began: engineers and slaves were only derivatives of the invisible pharaoh's will.

Will is a psychic component that is hidden from the eye; therefore, only those who feel an excess of will in themselves, i.e., the owners of the 1st Will are able to distinguish more or less clearly the muffled, deep bass of Will behind the chorus of piercing dictionaries of other functions. One such person, Lermontov, wrote: "Will encapsulates the entire soul; to want means to hate, to love, to regret, to rejoice, - to live, in a word. The will is the moral force of every being, the free desire to create or destroy something, the imprint of the Godhead, the creative power that out of nothing creates wonders."

Some would consider Lermontov's words an exaggeration, but in fact there is no exaggeration in them. I can say more - the position of the Will on the steps of the functional hierarchy strongly influences human legal norms, completely forms ethics (unwritten law), the individual picture of society and the universe. In general, *being one of the functions and subject in its action to the same principles and laws as the others, the Will is simultaneously the invisible pivot of the entire order of functions.*

Accordingly, the 1st Will is all kind of monologue, excess, result, individualism. The 2nd Will is all sort of dialogue, norm and process. 3rd Will - all, as it were, incomplexity, total vulnerability. 4th Will - all sort of waxing and waning, dependence and omnivorousness. Therefore, I would like to emphasize, without repealing anything that has been said before, that the position of the Will in the functional hierarchy is critical to the human psyche. Although by "character", "personality" or "self" we usually mean the sum of mental properties of an individual, in reality it is the Will in the first place, and then, as a supplement, the other functions.

Depending on the position of the Will on the steps of the functional hierarchy, society is divided into "kings" (1st Will), "nobles" (2nd Will), "bourgeoisie" (3rd Will). "serfs" (4th Will).

"king" (1st Will)

The 1st Will is a born leader. It is said that leaders are not born, but become. However, this, as well as many other popular truths, does not stand the test of experience. Leaders are born, not only in people, but also in animals. For example, chickens barely hatch, but they already know which of them is which, as biologists say, an individual "alpha", and it knows itself that it is "alpha", and the first to march to the trough, graciously allowing the others, from "beta" to "omega", to follow it. And the established pecking order never changes.

It seems that the willful order of functions exists not only in chickens, but even in mosquitoes. I will allow myself in this connection a small lyrical digression of a purely personal nature.

I once served as a night watchman. The building I was guarding was old, with warm, damp cellars, where mosquitoes breed unhindered from early spring to late fall. So I had more than enough time and material to observe the habits and way of life of the mosquito people.

So, lying in the darkness on the cot and listening to the mosquitoes sing at night, I noticed that mosquitoes are not as uniform as they look during out-of-town walks: they, they say, as soon as they see a man, they all rush straight to drink his blood. My experience as a night watchman convinced me that the picture is more complex, that there are significant differences in the character and behavior of individual specimens.

Some mosquitoes, apparently with the 4th Will, appeared in my room as if at random, at first only shyly moving along the walls, representing idle gawkers, interested only in architecture. Then, in the same way, seemingly without a plan or personal interest, the mosquitoes began to circle, now approaching, now moving away, and in apparent hesitation approaching again. However, usually it was enough to wave my hand in their direction, and they themselves, immediately agreeing with the hopelessness of further attempts, flew away.

Other mosquitoes, probably with the 3rd Will, were just as timid at first, but showed much more persistence in achieving their goal. With long and consistent circling circles, they would not settle down until they settled on me. A clap of the palm followed, and, if it did not finish off the bloodsucker, the mosquito returned to its original distant position, and the cautious, deadly hunt for me resumed.

But one day I sensed that there was more than just a mosquito interested in my person. It flew into the room and, without hesitation or unnecessary thought, came straight at me. The unquestioning straightforwardness of its behavior gave the impression that it had no shadow of a doubt about its right to suck my blood. I, categorically disagreeing with this and at the same time not finding the mental strength to fight openly, cowardly covered

myself with the blanket. A mosquito, with its wings fluttering, flew up and sat down on the blanket. I can't explain where that feeling came from, but it felt like the tiny creature was literally trampling me. It stood like that for a while, as if surveying its possessions, and began to hop from place to place, slowly dipping its long nose into the folds and crevices of the blanket, in the vain hope of getting to my veins. I lay there neither dead nor alive, though there was no reason to doubt the thickness of the blanket. But then the royal mosquito made a mistake: by the irritable and panicked fluttering of its wings I realized that my tormentor had overdone it, and had fallen into one of the folds of the blanket. God, who knew with what pleasure I, Everest compared to a mosquito, was crushing this tiny but extremely self-confident creature. Later, of course, came the shame of the pleasure experienced, but I still cannot say with complete certainty that the struggle then was unequal. This is the effect the phenomenon of the 1st Will can have, even if it is from another, incomparable level and world.

I will add a similar-sounding historical anecdote to this purely personal story. When General Bonaparte, who had been appointed commander-in-chief of the Italian army and was not yet known to anyone, arrived at his headquarters, the first thing he decided to do was to convene a council of war. Soon the officers, not inferior in rank to Napoleon, entered the commander's office - handsome, bogatys, rubbers, against which the small, thin, yellow-faced Bonaparte clearly did not look good. The commander greeted them with his hat on his head, and the other generals did not bare their heads. As they talked Bonaparte took off his hat, they followed suit, but after a minute he put his hat back on and looked at those around him in such a way that no one dared to repeat his gesture. Later, when the council of war was over, Massena, the brave man, muttered: "Well, that little fellow gave me the creeps." Here is another, perhaps not so mystical, example of the phenomenon of the 1st Will.

* * *

The main thing to start analyzing the psychology of the 1st Will is that it is born with a two-layered picture of the universe. In the subconsciousness of the "king" the whole cosmos and all its elements are lined up in a simple hierarchy of two levels: the top and the bottom. The whole being is divided into upper and lower worlds, heaven and earth, the chosen and the invited, power and people, shepherds and flocks, householders and household members, etc. At the same time, a remarkable feature of the psychology of the First Will seems to be that from birth it feels that it belongs not to any other, but to the highest, elitist, exclusive, elective stage of this two-stage model. Tolstoy wrote: "There is something in me that makes me believe that I was not born to be like everyone else. And decades later, Tolstoy was echoed by Salvador Dali: "Ever since my tender age, I have had the perverse tendency to think of myself as different from all other mortals.

The premonition of the 1st Will of one's being chosen is not just a vague feeling secretly living in a person - it is the program, the character, the way and meaning of an individual's life. It is something embodied in everything the "king" does, thinks and feels.

Belonging to the higher of the two worlds introduces some adjustments to the notions of the 1st Will about the norms of law and ethics. The "King" can by no means be called an amoral being, he honors the law and does not like to violate the norms established in society, but some bifurcation, associated with the two-stage picture of the universe, in the ethics and law of the 1st Will is present. Unconditional fulfillment of all rules, in its view, is necessary for beings belonging to the second, lower world. As for beings of the higher world, for them the observance of the rules of law and morality is necessary, but not unconditionally, but insofar as, and there are situations when the higher expediency permits their violation. The motivations here are very different, but in the end it always turns out that the ultimate goal of the amoralism of the 1st Will is power, career, self-assertion. That is why, when Luther said that "the Church for the sake and for the good of the cause has nothing to fear and a strong good lie," and when Lenin wrote that for the victory of the world revolution "it is necessary....to make any and all sacrifices, even in case of need - to go for all sorts of tricks, stratagems, illegal techniques, reticences, concealment of the truth...", then, at best, both fell into self-deception - all this was necessary for them personally to satisfy their own ambition.

The two-stage picture of the universe in the mind of the 1st Will is connected with another curious, many deceiving feature of the behavior of the "Tsar": his imaginary democratism. The fact is that the 1st Will really treats others equally, without distinguishing between ranks and ranks. However, the source of this phenomenon is not in natural democratism, but in the simplicity of the picture living in her soul: there is only the top and bottom, and more complex hierarchical structures are arbitrary and tricky.

Formally, the First Will is a supporter of equality. But a peculiar kind of equality, where everyone is equalized not in rights, but in disenfranchisement before it. In this connection, it is interesting to observe the "egalitarianism" of the First Will in the example of Emperor Paul I. On the one hand, Paul constantly berated the Russian aristocrats as "Jacobins" because they claimed to be equal to him, even conditionally, but still (the tsar being first among equals). On the other hand, the aristocracy worshipped Paul as an "equalizer and sankulot" because he did not differentiate between officials and ranks among his subjects, equally passionately flogging anyone who came within reach. Once, when they tried to offer Paul condolences on the death of Chancellor Bezborodko, he replied in a very "egalitarian" way: "I have all bezborodniks. This is equality in the "tsarist" way. It is not surprising, therefore, that the Russian aristocracy soon tired of such "equality" and sent the tsar "sanctioned" into the next world. Life is richer than the two-step model of the world, richer than the "tsarist" idea of equality, and violence against society in the spirit of elementary opposition of the top to the bottom often takes cruel revenge on the "tsar".

* * *

The premonition of belonging to a higher world not only subjugates the entire personality of the 1st Will without a trace, but literally crushes it, rapes it. The life of the "king" is tragic at first, because feeling himself an "alpha" chick, he forces himself to behave according to his PRESENTATIONS about "alpha" behavior, sometimes in spite of his own inner inclinations and needs. The trouble is that the 1st Will permits the lower functions to realize themselves only in "regal", hierarchically elevated forms, whereas, say, the Second Function is by nature a consistent democrat and by its tendency to process and richness of expression is quite alien to any aristocratic endeavor.

To make it clearer, I will give the example of Napoleon. With the 1st Will, he had the 2nd Physique. And the 2nd Physique, as already mentioned, is a great lover, it brings to sex processionality, strength, flexibility, versatility, naturalness, caringness. And probably Napoleon with his 2nd Physique, indulging in sexual pleasures with the Countess of

Walewski, was just like that. But he was not always like that, and not with everyone. When he became emperor, Napoleon made it a rule to rape the wives of his ministers, and he did it with a state mind on his forehead, carelessly and without unbuckling his sword. God knows from which recesses of his Corsican memory he dug the memory of the right of the first night, but this is not important, what is important is that doing all the necessary manipulations in such cases, even without unbuckling his sword, he not only raped the wives of his ministers, he primarily raped his own sexually powerful and rich nature. Why? Napoleon's violence over the 2nd Physique was demanded of him by his own "regal" 1st Will. That such self-torture must be carried out through the ministers' wives and the sword is only an individual wretched idea of the forms in which a statesman of the highest vocation must perform his sex.

Even the superprocessional Third Function of the 1st Will makes it cranky and double-handed, putting its action in dependence on public opinion. About Leo Tolstoy, who had the 3rd Physics, i.e. His wife bitterly wrote about Leo Tolstoy, who had the third Physique, i.e. caring and pitying, "If anyone knew how little genuine tenderness in him and how much of it was done according to principle and not by heart, they will write in his biography that he was driving water for a janitor and no one will ever know that he was driving his wife to give her some rest, did not give his child a drink and did not sit with the sick for 5 minutes at 32 years".

The examples of Napoleon and Tolstoy seem to suggest that, in connection with the phenomenon of the First Will, all of this needs to be reconsidered. The effective First Will seems to cancel the processional nature of the Second and Third Functions, and the entire personality of the "king" in the image of the First Function is made effective. However, this is an appearance: the "king" in fact does not cancel his processivity, but drives his processivity inside.

Let us turn for confirmation of this thesis to the personality of Akhmatova. Akhmatova, under the 1st Will, had the 2nd Emotion. And as has been said before, the 2nd Emotion is a born "akyn" who sings everything he sees around him. Akhmatova herself actually admitted her "akynic" understanding of the tasks of poetry, saying that poetry is made up of simple phrases like, "Would you like some tea?" Yet contrary to such a declaration, which implies abundant fructification, Akhmatova's poetic legacy is not distinguished by either large form or a large number of works. The secret of such restraint was once revealed by Akhmatova herself, parsing Simonov's poems. Then she said: "The courageous military commander, all chest in medals, in a whiny voice said women's treachery:" Here's one! And here's another one!" A man should hide it in his chest like a grave." Let us note: considering natural poetic capturing of the simplest elements of everyday life, Akhmatova finds it inadmissible for a man to rhyme lamentation of women's adultery, but not in the rhyme, we think, finding trouble, but in the publicity of poetic foolishness.

The point is that Akhmatova was not simply an "akyn" according to the Second Emotion, but, according to the First Will, a "royal akyn," for whom not everything is allowed in poetry, but only that which does not degrade the dignity and does not prick the author's ego and generally goes back to the hierarchical, elevated system of themes and images

that puts the poet in an exceptional position above the crowd. The default principle of "royal akynism" is accurately outlined by Pushkin in Boris Godunov, when Tsar Boris, instructing his son, says:

"Be silent, must not the king's voice.

It's a waste in the air;

Like a holy chime, it should only broadcast

Great sorrow or great feast.

This principle was very close to Akhmatova, not without reason she herself called the word "regal" in her poems. And the small volume of her legacy seems to confirm the assumption of a strictly elitist approach of the poet to creativity. And at the same time, at first glance, it seems to confirm the previously expressed idea that the First Will, with its aristocratic intentions, cancels the processionality and multi-facetedness of the Second Function (in this case, the Second Emotion).

Everything is so, and everything is wrong. One woman who slept for some time in the same room with Akhmatova said that "the first nights she could not sleep, because Anna Andreevna in her sleep all the time something or other murmured, or sang. The words could not distinguish - only the rhythm, a very definite and persistent: "It seemed, it was all buzzing, like a beehive. A striking testimony, isn't it? Raped by Ahmatov's "First Will" in the period of wakefulness, the Second Emotion still bursts into the period of oblivion and does its due "akynic" work of forming poetically everything experienced during the day, without dividing into the worthy and the unworthy, the low and the high. Akhmatova, humming like a beehive at night, is the ideal image to embody the idea of the indestructibility of the processional element in man, no matter how it is trampled by the excess of the First Will.

However, even temporary relaxation in sleep is not able to compensate for the "king" the agony of the daytime self-torture and remove the overall tragic background of life. As another poet accurately put it:

"Peace and quiet in me.

I willed to narrow my circle...

But I cry in my sleep,

When the knot weakens."

* * *

Another tragic motif in the life of the "tsar" is contained in his voluntaristic slogan "If you want it, everything will work out! The tragedy here lies in the very unrealism of the slogan, the deliberate refusal to compromise with the environment, nature, the world, society, other people's wills and desires. "If you want it, everything will work out!" - shouts the 1st Will, pissing against the wind, but the splashes fly not at all where the Will wants to

go, but where the wind blows. And with this mournful discord between the vital, perfectly organic slogan and the environment, the "Tsar" can do nothing about it.

* * *

Nothing lives the 1st Will like power. Calvin, who since his youth had not come out of the most severe illnesses, who without any coquetry wrote in his letters "my life is like a continuous dying!" seized power in Geneva, lived, lived, lived, buried loved ones and comrades-in-arms. With the iron hoops of the Will squeezing the crumbling organism, Calvin, inspired by the power he had over his fellow citizens, with an inhuman effort lived and worked so that even the rich Calvinist Church is still not able to publish a complete collection of his works, so huge is it.

The 1st Will loves power, loves it with a pure love, devoid of extraneous impurities. For her, power is not a means to wealth or the realization of long-held plans, but an end in itself, valuable in its own right. One of Churchill's biographers wrote that "if Churchill and Lloyd George had been asked at the time why they went to Parliament, if they had been sincere, they would have answered, 'To become ministers.'" And why become ministers? Both would have said with confidence, "To become Prime Minister." And why? Churchill would have answered that question, "To be Prime Minister."

The life credo of the First Will was perfectly summed up by one character in Turgenev's story "First Love. I am quoting the passage in its entirety, which is so expressive and lapidary that there is little to add to it: "*You take what you can, but do not give it to yourself; to belong to yourself - that is the whole point of life,*" he once said to me. Another time, as a young democrat, I began to speak in his presence about freedom...

- "Freedom," he repeated, "and do you know what freedom can give a man?"
- "What?"
- "*Will, your own will, and power it will give, which is better than freedom. Know how to will, and you will be free, and you will command.*

The unshakable confidence of the "king" in his right to power is both his strength and his Achilles' heel. The fact is that fate often deprives the "king" of his throne during his lifetime, and it is often this blow that the iron, but fragile First Will cannot withstand. One of Churchill's contemporaries, having visited him when he had just been deprived of his ministerial portfolio, wrote: "What a strange mood he had. When he was on the rise, he had complete self-confidence; when he was down, he fell into a deep depression." Fortunately, the then young Churchill's body withstood the blow. But there were other times when loss of power and death proved to be joined by an equal sign. Contrary to the power of the 2nd Physique, Tvardovsky and Napoleon burned like candles, the former after his dismissal as editor-in-chief of the New World, the latter after the final loss of the empire.

The 1st Will is too strong, so it is not flexible and very fragile. Interestingly, the problem of the fragility of the 1st Will was of serious interest to Sophocles at the time of writing Antigone, and here are the conclusions he came to: "...too unyielding a temper

Most likely to give up. The toughest one,

Bulat cast on fire rather

It happens to be fractured and broken...

And it is not shameful for the wisest people

Take notice of others and **be persistent in moderation.**

You know: trees in winter showers,

Sloping down the valley, keeping the branches intact,

The stubborn ones are uprooted.

Whoever pulls the sail too tight

And will not weaken, will be overturned,

And his rook will float upside down."

Of course, the demise of a career or lack of prospects is tragically perceived by the 1st Will. But they do not cancel the desire to rise up, but only stimulate the search for new non-standard ways of career growth. Hence the abrupt, incomprehensible to those around him, changes that often marked the fate of the "Tsar. Here is a typical story on this topic, told by the well-known psychologist Steven Berglas. A patient once came to him, supposedly feeling remorse for having sacrificed his family for work. "I suggested that he start going to church with his family," Berglass recalled, "but instead of just attending the service, he became a deacon. That is, once again, he preferred the position to family fellowship." To this we might add that both to the psychologist and to the church the hero of the story went only because his previous job had exhausted his career possibilities.

First Will is a natural-born leader. It is as easy and natural for her to manage people as it is to breathe. The "king" does not usually say bluntly, "I have an abundance of will, so give me yours and follow me. I'm in charge of everything!" But he, more than anyone, knows how to behave like one in power, and people involuntarily obey, not so much seeing as feeling the "king," like chickens feel the chick—"alpha."

The evaluation of the talent of the 1st Will to lead people can be twofold, depending on the circumstances. On the one hand, this talent is more valuable than ever in times of catastrophes, troubles, disorder. The ability to cement society and lead it, even if the unity is not achieved without violence and the goals are dark, is still a good thing, because it simply allows the society to save itself and survive. And vice versa. In times of peace, peace, harmony, nothing is more detrimental to society than the talent of the 1st Will leader, because it is inseparable from monologue, authoritarianism, suppression of personality, from deadly uniformity of behavior, thoughts, feelings.

Margaret Thatcher's father, from whom she most likely inherited her 1st Will, bequeathed to his daughter "never to follow the crowd, never to be afraid to differ from it, and if necessary, to lead it. These words of the father of the future prime minister succinctly and succinctly set forth not just a personal experience and view, but a universal strategy of the 1st Will in its interaction with the crowd. "The King" indeed never mixes with it, never rides in the convoy, rarely stands on the sidelines of traffic and constantly strives to be at its head. And how can he not aspire to the head of the crowd? After all, only with her participation can his natural leadership talent be realized. After all, there is no king without an entourage, empty sky without earth, and the top reveals itself only in the presence of the bottom. So the aspiration of the 1st Will to be at the head of anything is not legal, but natural, because only in such a position it is truly realizable.

And one more conclusion, due to the specific relationship between the "king" and the crowd: despite all his hardened individualism, he - a being very public, very dependent, staying with the crowd in almost mystical, hypostatic connection, in a state of inseparability and inseparability. "I live for show, for people," Tolstoy grunted and ... continued such an ostentatious existence.

At the same time, being a creature of dependence, the "king" is as unceremonious as anyone in relations with those who have become dependent on him, and there is no more consistent and insolent rapist in the world than the 1st Will. However, the "king" is more of a dictator than a tyrant - he does not tolerate interruptions, yet he believes too much in his natural right to power to be seriously afraid of competition and to be hardened in fear of it.

* * *

The 1st Will is born a leader. But perhaps even more than confident in his right to power, a "king" is born confident in his right to disobedience. Time and circumstances are not always conducive to the natural right of the 1st Will to power, but the holiday of disobedience is a holiday that is always with you, a holiday that can be celebrated every day, regardless of time and circumstances. Therefore, the 1st Will is not always the leader, but always the person out of control. I recall an old friend of mine yelling, once again getting fired from his job, "Understand, I can't be ordered around!"

Uncontrollability is the earliest sign of the 1st Will. Children- "tsars" are the most stubborn, the most difficult children in the world. It is almost impossible to come to an agreement with them, violence has no effect, tears are useless. Seven years old, Charles XII of Sweden, when he was taken out of his father's office because the hour of the meeting of ministers had come, first knocked long and hard on the closed door, and then simply ran headlong into it; the bloody, unconscious boy, of course, was brought into the office, although he had nothing to do there.

As a child, even direct, obvious personal gain does not make the 1st Will obedient; it rebels chronically, with or without cause, in a variety of forms. Describing his childhood, Salvador Dali said: "The child king turned anarchist. "Against everything and everyone!"

became my motto and guide to action. As a child, I always acted differently from everyone else, but I never thought about it. Now I realized the exceptionality of my behavior and purposely acted against all expectations. Whenever someone would say, "Black!" - I countered with, "White!" Every time someone lifted their hat in greeting, I never missed an opportunity to spit and swear in public. I felt so different that any accidental coincidence of my actions with someone else's would send me into a trance-I could burst into tears of rage. I was different! I'm different, no matter what it costs me, I'm not like anyone or anything! I am the only one! Hear, one!"

With age, however, the front of the First Will becomes more meaningful, it ceases to revolt over trifles and to direct harm to itself. But ungovernability as such remains the norm of "tsarist" behavior, multiplying the ranks of putschists, right-wing activists, reformers, chicanes, anarchists, dissenters, far-reaching reactionaries and no less far-reaching radicals of all stripes.

Let us ask ourselves: is the uncontrollability of the 1st Will good or bad? As they say, our shortcomings are extensions of our virtues. Therefore the rebellious spirit inherent in the 1st Will is double-edged. On the one hand, it is vital to society; it is the touchstone on which the dulling, retarded public consciousness is constantly being honed; it is not by chance that Socrates said of himself that he was attached to Athens "like a gadfly to a horse, great and noble, but lazy from obesity and needing to be chased. The 1st Will is the enemy of all that is commonplace, habitual, trivial, and in this enmity lies its chief value to society.

On the other hand, the self-value of rebellion often drives the 1st Will into the camp of reaction, makes it row against the current, write against the wind, rape the phenomenon. Returning to Socrates, who compared himself to a gadfly, we can say that the "king" is a gadfly that stings all asses, whether they need it or not. Therefore, the dilemma of who the 1st Will is, a noble rebel or an empty frontrunner, is unsolvable; he is both, and all together, depending on the circumstances.

* * *

If the "king" is religious, and often he is, the rebellious spirit creates additional tragicomic and insoluble difficulties for the 1st Will in its relationship with God. It is impossible to understand how Gorky managed to spy this drama in Tolstoy's soul, but, the fact remains, he saw and described it: "The thought that, noticeably, more often than others sharpens his heart is the thought of God. Sometimes it seems not to be a thought, but an intense resistance to something he feels over himself...He has a very uncertain relationship with God, but sometimes it reminds me of a relationship of 'two bears in the same den.'" Surprisingly true and does not apply to Tolstoy alone. The problem named by Gorky is the general drama of the mystical 1st Will.

On the one hand, the usual religious picture, where the Lord Almighty arbitrarily carries out judgment and punishment of the lower, created world, is a balm for the heart of the "king", because this sanctifies and supports with higher authority the domestic and social

arbitrariness carried out by the "king". But on the other hand, asserting his own monarchic credo with reference to the Higher monarchic principle, the "tsar" together with the rest of the created world falls under God's invisible jurisdiction, which his rebellious soul cannot bear. Atheistic rebellion occurs in the 1st Will sometimes at a very tender age and is obviously of an unconscious nature. For example, when the little Toulouse-Lautrec was brought to church for the first time, he immediately cried out: "I want to pee! Yes, I want to pee here," and despite his family's entreaties, he immediately wet the church plates.

Thus, the religious bifurcation of the First Will results in what Gorky very aptly called the relationship between the two bears in the same den. God-building and God-fighting miraculously coexist in the soul of the "Tsar," now making it happy, now oppressing it. And it is forever. Neither complete reconciliation with God, nor complete divorce from Him in the mystically attuned 1st Will is possible.

* * *

The "king" is an amazing creature; he never relaxes. His self-control is absolute. Like a knight chained in the armor of his iron will, the "king" walks through life, alien to passions, temptations, weaknesses, attachments. Even the Fourth Function, which, as has been said, man usually willingly sets free and entrusts to others, the 1st Will sets free and entrusts only to the extent of his interest in it. The degree of self-control of the "king" can be judged on the example of Napoleon, who, in the midst of the Battle of Wagram, fell asleep, slept under the roar of the cannonade for ten minutes, and then, as if nothing had happened, again took command of the troops.

"I myself am not one of those who are subject to the charms of others," Akhmatova declared. The most reliable sign of the First Will: there are almost no alcoholics or drug addicts among its owners (Toulouse-Lautrec's and Tvardovsky's weakness for drinking is a rare exception). The loss of self-control and relaxation brought on by alcohol or drugs, or any outside influence, is completely unacceptable to the "king". The power of someone or something over oneself, dependence on someone or something are tantamount to the loss of one's "I" and self-destruction of the First Supporting Function for the First Will.

* * *

While the 1st Will is a creature of extraordinary integrity, made of one stone, from the outside it appears as something contradictory, bifurcated, and inconsistent. However, if you look closely, you will find that the contradictory nature of the 1st Will is better characterized by the words "ambivalence," "hypostasis," and is entirely related to the problem of power. There are three positions in which the countenance of the 1st Will presents three dissimilar expressions: when the "king" does not claim power, when he does, and when he has it.

Not engaged in power struggles, the 1st Will, of all the traits inherent in it, outwardly manifests only two: an unshakable belief in a two-stage, hierarchical model of the universe and ungovernability. In all other respects she bears little resemblance to a "tsar. It is a law-

abiding, very decent person, a reliable friend and business partner. And the "tsar", who is not engaged in a struggle for power, has practically no reason to violate the rules of law and morality. There are difficulties. The excess of will is spent only in defense of his own sovereignty, and life acquires obvious features of asociality: celibacy, loneliness, egocentrism, etc., which is quite uncomfortable for such a social being as a "tsar".

As for the differences between a "tsar" fighting for power and one who has it, they are insignificant, although the diametrical contradiction in slogans misleads many. When simpletons see the "oppositionist tsar" in power, they begin to scratch their heads and recall the old aphorisms about the corruptibility of power. But in reality there is no metamorphosis. Both by fighting tyranny and by asserting it, the 1st Will does not betray itself at all, because anarchy and dictatorship are two equal sides of its nature.

This is the usual picture in world history: an ardent opponent of arbitrariness carries out a revolution, then, grasping the seat of power, carries out a more or less "velvet" counterrevolution and asserts an even worse tyranny than before. It would be all too easy and convenient to explain such metamorphoses by the deliberate intention of a scoundrel disguised as a democrat. The reality is more complicated and tragic. Napoleon is said to have fainted at the dispersal of the National Assembly; Lenin was hysterical on the day of the dissolution of the Constituent Assembly. Cromwell asserted his dictatorship even more painfully. He, the mighty advocate of the humiliated Parliament, the implacable enemy of absolutism, having become the head of the country, made many attempts to assemble a parliament in the most various, convenient combinations, but, lo and behold, each of the hand-parliaments dared to claim at least a fraction of the absolute power which was already in the hands of Cromwell, and ... they had to be broken up. In this painful creation-destruction of an ephemeral democracy a considerable part of the life of the English Lord Protector passed. What is here, just naked ambition? No, it is the tragic dialectic of the 1st Will: the more intransigent and consistent the tyrannicide, the more likely it will be followed by unconscious, painfully shaped but inexorable tyranny (the result).

The views of the "tsar" on the structure of government also change diametrically after coming to power. Being in opposition a fierce supporter of self-government, he begins his rule with a consistent replacement of the system of self-government by a self-contained structure of officials appointed by the center, completely independent of the population. Cromwell's system of governor-generalships, Napoleon's system of prefectures, Lenin's system of obkoms, etc., were formed according to this principle.

"King" does not even have to be a politician to be a very tough politician. Freud, for example, was formally engaged in science, but built his school of psychology as a theocratic state, with an infallible, charismatic leader, a bureaucracy, a court, a police force, a propaganda office, etc. Similarly, literary circles, model homes, all kinds of associations with more than one member, which have the bitter good fortune to fall under the stone hand of the 1st Will, are often formed in a similar way.

It is worth noting the degradation that usually occurs with the entourage of the "Tsar" after he has attained power. Let me note the main thing: the 1st Will is not afraid of personalities, it feels itself a super-personality, so the entourage of the times of opposition and the first cabinet of the "tsar" are brilliant, the real cream of society. But time passes, and a strange, at first glance, but consistent process of washing out the personalities from the environment of the 1st Will. This is not because the "king", having taken the steering wheel of power in his hands, becomes less self-confident and feels fear of a possible rival, but because the 1st Will can also front the crowd, but only rule alone. The 1st Will is the first to leave the "king" and, slamming the door, the same 1st Will leaves. Second, and without slamming the door, the 2nd Will self-dismisses. This leaves the camarilla - non-talented, hard-working, but ineffectual and weak-willed people who play the entourage of the "king" until the end of his reign.

The low quality of the entourage, however, is of little concern to the 1st Will; it needs performers, not personalities. Napoleon's statement is characteristic in this regard: "I am my own minister. I conduct my own affairs, and therefore I am strong enough to take advantage of mediocre people. Honesty, lack of talkativeness, and efficiency are all that I require." Loyalty is the main condition for a stable and warm relationship with the 1st Will; if it is present, the other virtues or vices of the environment seem unimportant.

In essence, the "tsar" does not care at all about the creed or the ideology he officially professes, in whose name he swears and calls for himself. It is not he who works for the slogans, but the slogans work for him. Robespierre, enrolled as a hardened republican, a fierce opponent of the monarchy, noted in his papers: "We need a united will. It must be republican or royalist," that is, political principles are indifferent, as long as they lead him to the top of the social pyramid. Robespierre himself did not manage to become an absolute monarch, but his political successor, Napoleon, easily accomplished the evolution of the 1st Will, from ardent republican to emperor.

The "tsar" is unscrupulous in his means. Stubbornly, with his head held high, he walks through mud, spitting, and blood. It is better for people not to judge the results, leaving the judgment to God and history.

However, some prediction of the historic trial of the 1st Will can already be made. In politics, its destiny is to win battles and lose campaigns. Even when, in rebellion, the "Tsar" reaches the highest power (Cromwell, Robespierre, Napoleon, Lenin, Hitler), he often ends badly, and his cause turns out to be stillborn. There are two reasons for this: obviously, the 1st Logic of the "Tsar" is not distinguished by strategic thinking, and is at best effective in solving tactical problems. Secondly, the effectiveness and monologism of the 1st Will, which are common to the First Function, does not imply any other ultimate goal than to achieve and retain absolute personal power, which is hardly tolerated by the contemporaries and is fruitless for the future. The monologism and efficacy make the First Will a natural, often unconscious monarchist, and monarchism is a historically futile thing.

Also. I did not want the reader to get the impression of the 1st Will as a cruel tyrant, automatically professing the Caligula principle of "Let them hate, just as long as they fear." No. The "king" is more of a dictator than a tyrant. Of course, political life under his steely hand can only exist as a ghost. But this does not mean that there is no feedback between the "tsar" and the people. In this case, the relationship between the government and society is based on what Lenin called "democratic centralism. However savage the name may sound, such a system of relations is unprecedented in world history, and its content was exhaustively formulated by Consul Sies: "Power must come from above, and trust from below. That is, power is power, but it should be based on the people's trust, not in direct confrontation with society. That is why usually the "czar" only stifles political life and that which has to do with the Third Function: 3rd Physics stifles the economy, 3rd Logic stifles glasnost, 3rd Emotion stifles the pathos and mysticism of life. Everything else, however, the 1st Will usually agrees to leave free. Therefore, the "Tsar" is more of a dictator than a tyrant. As Stendhal wrote of Napoleon, "Ruled by a tyrant, but there was little arbitrariness."

* * *

The inflexibility of the "tsar's" will, due to his monologue and effectiveness, makes his life uncomfortable not only in society, but also in his family. Rebels and dictators are not loved anywhere, and the family is no exception.

Family life is especially difficult for "queens. Apart from the usual struggle of wills, in which everyone always participates, regardless of sex and age, the woman with the 1st Will is pressed by public opinion, which automatically assigns her a subordinate position in the family. It is not surprising that playing the game of rebuffs on her part becomes a norm of life and takes hypertrophied forms of permanent rebellion, which, understandably, does not make life together any easier. Akhmatova, for example, admitted that by fighting for independence she ruined a lot in her relationship with Gumilev and left a remarkably concise and succinct sample of her position in conflicts with her husbands:

"Are you submissive? You're out of your mind!

I am obedient to God's will alone.

I don't want any trepidation or pain,

My husband is an executioner, and his house is a prison.

The life of men with the 1st Will is not much easier when it comes to clarifying relations with the household members. Although public opinion gives him some head start, the "tsar" does not always manage to exercise his "legal" right to arbitrariness. The character of the wife, contrary to expectations, is often not plasticine, and the domestic battle takes the same form as described above. Here, for instance, is the situation in young Gandhi's family: "I constantly watched her every step; she did not dare leave the house without my permission. This led to quarrels. The prohibition I imposed was actually a kind of imprisonment, and Kastrubhai was not such a girl as to submit easily to such demands.

She decided that she could go wherever and whenever she wanted. The more I forbade her, the more she resisted, and the angrier I got.

The birth of children usually expands and complicates the conflict, rather than humbles it. Submitting children to their will seems easier and more natural to the "king," which is true only in part, up to a time, and ends in a fierce front on the part of the grown children, the fierceness of which is directly proportional to the pressure exerted before. One of Tolstoy's sons, though greatly diluted, confessed: "We not only loved him: he occupied a very large place in our lives and we felt that he suppressed our personalities, so that at times we wanted to get out from under that pressure. As children it was an unconscious feeling; later it became conscious, and then I and my brothers had a certain spirit of contradiction toward my father. As the children grow up and expand, the "Tsar's" family splits, temporary and permanent psychotypic coalitions form, the opposing sides cease to be shy about the means of fighting-in short, everything that happened in Tolstoy's family in the last decades of his life and which was based on the despotism of Tolstoy's 1st Will takes place.

Peace and tranquility in the "king's" family can exist only with the absolute loyalty of the housemates. Love of the 1st Will is despotic and possible only when it knowingly looks down on its partner. Ivan Bunin, knowing for himself the temperament of the "Tsar", briefly and accurately described the tyrannical background of his love: "Yes, it touched me most at that hour when, braiding her braid for the night, she came up to me to kiss me goodbye, and I saw how much smaller she was, without heels, than me, how she looked into my eyes from below up.

I felt the strongest love for her in the moments of expressing the greatest devotion to me, the abandonment of myself..."

* * *

In essence, the "tsar" is a deeply lonely man. "You are a king, live alone," Pushkin said on another occasion, but accurately. In the 1st Will, the "self," the super-personality, the individualism, is too strong for it to feel a genuine longing for pairedness. It may sound insulting, but the 1st Will is not given to love, to truly love, the "king" is given to need, to depend, but not to love. Real love is not consumption, but sacrifice, even personal self-destruction for the sake of another being. Which the 1st Will is utterly incapable of. Although Tolstoy had the word "love" on his tongue, by his own confession he never had occasion to love, he had only a "sexual" interest in Sophia Andreevna, and this kind of affection was clearly burdensome. "Napoleon boasted: "I love neither women nor cards, I love nothing, I'm a creature completely political.

To put it bluntly, the "king" is too busy with himself, too fond of himself to transfer much of this feeling to others and, by and large, deeply indifferent to everything that is not part of his self. Here are three views (one from the inside, two from the outside) on the problem of the attitude of the 1st Will toward others. "I think that every man is self-loving, and all that a man does is all out of self-love... Self-love is the belief that I am better and smarter

than all people. Why do we love ourselves more than others? Because we think we are better than others, more worthy of love. If we found others better than ourselves, we would love them more than ourselves" (Tolstoy about Tolstoy). "He often seemed to me a man, unwaveringly - in the depths of his soul - indifferent to people, he is so higher, more powerful than them, that they all seem to him like gnats, and their vanity - ridiculous and pathetic" (Gorky on Tolstoy). "I understood better Lev Nikolayevich's selfishness and indifference to everything. For him, the same world is that which surrounds his genius, his work; he takes from everything around him only what serves as a service element for his talent, for his work" (Tolstoy on Tolstoy). Is there any question of love here?

Previously, speaking of the independence of the 1st Will from alcohol and drugs, I said that it had to do with the impossibility for the "king" to fall under any kind of power. It is the same picture with "love," by which he usually means his dependence on someone. Love, even in such a diminished form, is still power, and the 1st Will does not tolerate power over itself in any form. Therefore, the "king" not only does not truly love, but also avoids love, feels more comfortable without it:

"My voice is weak, but my will is not weak,
I even feel better without love" (Akhmatova).

About the same thing, but in prose, the young Napoleon wrote: "What is love? It is the consciousness of one's own weakness, which soon completely overwhelms the lonely man; at the same time it is the feeling of loss of power over himself...I consider love harmful both to society as a whole and to the personal happiness of man, that it causes more harm than it gives joy. And rightly so, the gods would do a true favor to humanity if they would free the world from it."

But the boomerang returns, and the people pay the "tsar" back in kind. Grandpa Yepishka, the prototype of Grandpa Yeroshka from "The Cossacks," once directly told Tolstoy that he was "some kind of unloved. Note that this was said about a man whose Emotion and Physics are processional, i.e., about a being, according to the idea, created for love. And yet, there is a great deal of truth in this phrase. The 1st Will is more often respected, appreciated, feared than loved. The inner alienation, the "selfhood" of the 1st Will separates a wall from anyone who would like to merge with it outwardly and inwardly, to become one. The transformation of two into one is the highest manifestation of love, but the distance that the 1st Will automatically sets between itself and others deliberately excludes such a merger. And people feel it.

Being incapable of love, the "king" is at the same time terribly jealous. Moreover, his jealousy is not based on physiology, or rather, not always and not only on physiology. Tolstoy noticeably jealous of his friend, director Sulerzhitsky to Gorky, although he was not a homosexual. And the fact is that the 1st Will is not stuck on sex, but yearns to possess the whole being of the person caught in his field, demands devotion not only in body, but also in soul. The "king" wants to be smiled at, listened to, reckoned with only. This is

unrealistic, and it condemns the First Will, with its boundless self-centeredness, to the chronic torment of jealousy, equally poisoning the life of herself and those around her.

To confess, the most doubtful and vulnerable part of Freud's doctrine has always seemed to me to be that concerning the "Oedipus complex. For as long as I can remember, while loving my mother very much, I have never been jealous of her father, and was even very proud of him for that chivalrous display of love for his wife, which he demonstrated very simply and openly. So, naturally, after getting acquainted with Freud's teachings, I did not accept the concept of "Oedipus complex" at all and considered it a pure fiction.

Now I repent, I was wrong. Freud judged it by himself, I judged it by myself, which is inherent in everyday egocentric psychology, completely fruitless and yields nothing but mutual irritation. So, now it is necessary to admit that the "Oedipus complex" is not a myth, it exists. But, first of all, it is not universal. Secondly, jealousy, not always sexually colored, is inherent in a certain part of society represented by the 1st Will. As for the "Oedipus complex" itself, where jealousy, judging from the description, has an accentuated sexual coloring and is transferred even to relatives with the opposite sex sign, according to my calculations, a rather narrow circle of "kings" in whom the 1st Will is combined with the 3rd Physique suffers from it. Such a combination is really a rattlesnake mixture capable of causing that feeling described by Freud under the name of "Oedipus complex".

Leo Tolstoy had a combination of the 1st Will and the 3rd Physique, but he was not an "Oedipus" in its classical version: Tolstoy's mother died early and his sister went to a monastery, so he transferred the usual jealousy in such cases to his daughters and hatred to his sons-in-law. In the novel "Resurrection," Tolstoy, awarding his complex to the novel's hero Nekhludoff, confessed in him as follows: "Nekhludoff, though he hid it from himself, though he struggled with this feeling, hated his son-in-law. He disliked him for his vulgarity, his self-confident narrow-mindedness, and above all he disliked him for his sister, who could love so dearly, so egotistically and sensitively this poor creature... It always hurt Nekhludoff deeply to think of Natasha being the wife of this hairy, self-confident, with glossy bald face. He could not even hold back his disgust at his children. And whenever he heard that she was going to become a mother, he felt a feeling of sympathy that once again she had caught something bad from this man who was a stranger to them all."

The same feelings were obviously felt by Freud. And since the tradition of attributing all mankind their own sicknesses did not begin with Freud and did not end with him, we can say that the phenomenon of the Oedipus complex is interesting not for its content but for its origin, once again confirming the old thesis about the perfect callousness, deafness and egocentrism of human nature.

* * *

The attitude of the "Tsar" to glory is complex. The main goal of the First Will - the real power, rather than its external attributes (titles, orders, applause, throwing bonnets in the air, etc.), so it usually leaves the impression of a creature indifferent to glory, modest, coldly trolling the most outspoken sycophants. On the question of whether Akhmatova was pleased with fame, Gumilev replied: "That's the fact that almost did not please. It's like she did not want to notice her. But unusually suffered from any offense, every word

of a foolish critic, and on the successes did not pay attention. Without disputing, in principle, Gumilev's opinion, we would like to note that the attitude of the 1st Will to fame is more complicated. The outward indifference of the "tsar" to fame, however strange it may seem, is worked by his extreme ego: knowing that excessive honor usually produces the opposite effect, he emphasizes modesty so as not to put himself in an embarrassing or ridiculous position. Finally, glory for the 1st Will lacks what makes it truly desirable; there is no element of surprise, of revelation. The 1st Will knows for itself that it is a superperson, and confirmation from outside does not add much to the knowledge it possesses from birth.

It does not follow from this that the "czar" is truly indifferent to fame. No, he is very sensitive in this matter and carefully monitors how his image is shaped in society. Akhmatova, according to a contemporary, "was always interested and important what they say and write about her, even when they were and unknown people, not like Blok." And Emperor Augustus even tried to regulate the activities of his sycophants: "He allowed only the best writers to write about himself and only in solemn phrase, and ordered the praetors to see to it that literary contests did not damage his name."

* * *

I seem to have been a little carried away, though not without reason, in describing the political face of the First Will, but I had somewhat forgotten that our shortcomings are an extension of our virtues. The "tsar" has them, too. And they are many. Persistence, determination, resoluteness, unconditional faith in oneself, amazing energy and a burning thirst for primacy - not only paint the face of the 1st Will, but also give a lot to society. Without it, the rest of the Will, which is more inert and inclined to let things run their course, would indeed turn our world into a fly-in-the-sky picture, as the hero of Chekhov's *Duel* aptly put it.

* * *

The line separating the "king" from the rest of us mortals is invisible. But, strangely enough, everyone, not seeing it, feels it and does not risk crossing it. Outwardly, the distance between the 1st Will and the rest of the Will manifests itself in the emphasized politeness of the forms of treatment of those around him to the "king". One of Lenin's close observers wrote: "...when calling Lenin 'Ilyich' there was no familiarity. None of his entourage would dare joke with him or slap him on the shoulder on occasion. There was some invisible barrier, a line separating Lenin from other Party members, and I never saw anyone cross it.

This invisible line separating the First Will from the others becomes even more apparent when it appears in the background and paired with the Will that stands much lower. In this connection, I cannot help but recall the visits to Russia of Galina Vishnevskaya and Mstislav Rostropovich. There was a striking difference in the way people addressed these equally famous partners: Vishnevskaya, the owner of the first *Volya*, was called only "Galina Pavlovna" respectfully, whereas even very young musicians considered her husband to be only "Slavochka".

Akhmatova, remembering Vyacheslav Ivanov, said with envy: "He was a desperate publicist...A most experienced, virtuoso catcher of men! He, a forty-four-year-old man, was led under the arms of gray-haired ladies... This is how he knew how to put himself everywhere.

A person who is only for a moment in the field of the "king" is usually unable to articulate what it was that made him feel the presence of an exceptional, chosen being, but the fact that such a feeling arises is certain.

One of Bunin's acquaintances said: "The fact that Bunin was a special man was felt by many, almost all.

He and I once went to buy cakes at Coquelin's Confectionery on the corner of Passy, where I used to go quite often.

On my next visit, the cashier asked me, embarrassed, "Excuse me, please, but I would very much like to know who this gentleman who came with you the day before yesterday was?" Not without pride I replied, "The famous Russian writer." But my answer did not make the right impression on her. "A writer," she repeated disappointedly, "And I thought some grand duke. He's so...so," and, unable to find an appropriate definition to describe Bunin, she began counting out my change.

Although the cashier mentioned above did not attempt to describe the signs by which she guessed a "grand duke" in Bunin, they exist and with some experience are easy to read.

The gaze is the first among the external features of the "Tsar. The lawyer Kony described the expression of Tolstoy's eyes as follows: "...the penetrating and as if pricking look of severe gray eyes, in which shone more inquiring justice than caressing kindness, - the look of a judge and a thinker at the same time."

Let us add to Kony's statement that the First Will looks with a squint, focusing and as if strengthening the firmness of his gaze. Also, the expression of the eyes of the "Tsar" strangely combines analyticism with aloofness, his gaze as if asking: "Who are you?" - and at the same time warns: "Stay away!"

The gaze of the "king" is firm, fixed, stern, assertive, and he himself knows the power of his eyes. The Emperor Augustus "would be pleased when under his gaze the interlocutor lowered his eyes. "Lermontov knew the power of his eyes and loved to embarrass and torment timid and nervous people with his long and piercing gaze."

I will not insist, but it seems that the game of staring, which the 1st Will often resorts to, goes back to very distant times. After all, gorillas have been known to make eye contact, which means challenge. Therefore, I don't know about chickens, but with humans, it is probably the eyes that are the first to foretell the "alpha" person, the one in power.

The gesture of the First Will is regal. Her plastique is distinguished by a calm grace and majesty. Moreover, the plasticity of the 1st Will is absolutely natural, there is nothing mannered, affectation - her royalty, regardless of origin, natural and non-judgmental as

the shape of the nose or eye color. Gorky wrote about Tolstoy: "It was nice to see that being of pure blood, nice to observe the nobility and grace of speech, proud restraint, to hear the elegant precision of a killer word. Barin in it was just as much as necessary for the serfs. They said of Gauguin that "no matter what he did, even if he held up a match to someone who asked him for a light, his gestures were majestic (as if he was not holding a match, but waving a torch). Akhmatova has been described: "... something regal, as if existing above us and at the same time devoid of the slightest arrogance, was evident in her every gesture, in every turn of her head.

It is a hundred percent certain that if we take a frequent dictionary of the vocabulary of the possessors of the 1st Will, we will find a definite pattern of predominance in their use of the imperative inclination, as well as of hierarchically raised words and forms. However, while I do not have such a dictionary at hand, I will give an example of curiosity rather than scholarship. When Margaret Thatcher was informed of the birth of her granddaughter, she exclaimed: "We are a grandmother!" The English press has been prattling on about this phrase for a long time. And in vain. Common people's origin did not prevent the British Prime Minister to feel his inner aristocrat. And the "we" for her, I think, was more natural than for the great multitude of people who, by right of origin, referred to themselves in the plural.

At the same time, strange as it may seem, loving the high, elitist word, the 1st Will does not disdain the low, rude, obscene word. Perhaps in connection with the universal "royal" principle - "the law is not written for us. In any case, the fact that in the speech of the "king" there is a certain lexical bifurcation is certain. Napoleon was known to be a virtuoso at boorishness. Or another example from Russian history: when Molotov was asked if, according to some sources, it was true that Lenin called him a "stone ass," he answered simply: "If they only knew what Lenin called others!"

And one more observation about the "tsar's" habits of speech: in his conversations with people close to him he likes to use all kinds of diminutives (diminishing those around him). Take Lenin's paraphrase "Nadyusha" (about Krupskaya) or Akhmatova's less well-known "Borisik" (about Pasternak). (about Pasternak). I believe that this tendency to use diminutives stems from the common "patristic" position of the First Will, which perceives those around it as children, lovely, expensive, but in need of constant care, infantile beings. On the contrary, diminutive "tsars" perceive their own address with a gnashing of teeth. Akhmatova, being in a difficult relationship with Alexei Tolstoy, recalled: "He was like Dolokhov, he called me Annushka, which made me shudder, but I liked him...".

It may seem strange, but the choice of clothing of the "king" is subject once and for all to the ideas given to him about the attire appropriate to his ministry and vocation. First, he prefers the most austere clothing, both in color and style. Of course, depending on his social affiliation, the clothing of the 1st Will differs greatly, and the artist "king" dresses quite differently from the "king" politician. However, against the background of his social group, the First Will still stands out for the emphasized strictness of his attire.

Here is a tragicomic episode from my own practice. One day I am walking down the street with a young, long-legged "queen", and noticing a more than revealing miniskirt in front of me, quite tactlessly asked why she, with such length and slim legs, should not wear a mini. "I can't...Understand, I can't..." my companion barely exhaled as she looked down at her knee-covering skirt, and who knew how much anguish was in his look and voice. Here I was once again convinced of the irresistible tragic-masochistic nature of the First Will, which, for fear of losing its "regal" image, does not allow even the most innocent liberties.

Second, being a creature of inner buttoning, the 1st Will likes buttoning up in clothing as well. For her taste, the more buttons, clasps, buttons, belts, etc. on clothing, the better.

Finally, the sense of his own exclusivity requires the "king" to wear something quite non-standard and singular. At the same time, the exceptionality in the clothing of the 1st Will must not carry a touch of cheap exoticism, vulgar showiness. That is why, more often than not, when trying on something, the First Will achieves its goal through the archaization of clothing, by introducing elements of old taste into it ("false-classical" shawl by Akhmatova).

A perfect illustration of the combination of all the aforementioned features of the clothing of the 1st Will - Lenin's troika. Against the background of the military-beaux-beaux-de-vie fashion of his entourage, Lenin's troika stood out for its austerity, buttoned up and archaic exclusivity.

"The Nobleman"(2nd Will)

Perhaps the most difficult thing, when talking about the psychology of the Second Will, is to explain to myself and others what constitutes, obligatory for the Second Function, processivity and normativity in their volitional expression. Nevertheless, I will try.

The processionality of the 2nd Will is what in official language the words "collegiality" and "delegation of responsibility" usually refer to. Having enough fortitude to take personal responsibility for what is happening in his possessions, the "nobleman," unlike the "king," nevertheless avoids re-subordinating someone else's will and tries to involve all the parties concerned in solving the problem, giving himself the place of initiator, stimulator and keeper of the consensus. The aversion to diktat, the desire for a full-fledged dialogue in decision-making, this is the processionality of the 2nd Will.

The embodiment of this same "nobility" is the so-called "delegation of responsibility. Alienated by a predilection for petty tutelage, the 2nd Will, while keeping responsibility to itself, seeks to share it with everyone involved, giving them complete freedom to implement it. No matter how different the two American presidents Reagan and Bush are, both have the 2nd Will, which is why those who have worked with them note one trait in common, which is not, for example, typical of Carter - a desire to "delegate responsibility".

As for normativity, the 2nd Will embodies itself in an equal ability, without internal tension or damage to itself, to both dominate and obey. The 2nd Will is strong and flexible, so it is equally easy to be in a position of authority as well as in a subordinate position.

However, although this situation is already comfortable in itself, it does not quite satisfy the "nobleman. The ideal position for the 2nd Will is not to rule and not to be subordinated at all - which rarely manages to do in our interdependent world, but is a secret dream of all "noblemen".

If we try to take a closer look at the normativity of the 2nd Will, we find that it is characterized by a structure and a strength of mind sufficient to create a regime of personal independence and free breathing for others. In one of his letters Goethe reported, "I am engaged in the education of my grandson. It consists in allowing him to do resolutely whatever he pleases, and I hope in this way to educate him before his parents return." Inner freedom and the ability to set others free is the true norm of the Will. Very well and accurately, without knowing it himself, one contemporary playwright described his 2nd Will: "I am not a leader by nature, but I am not endowed with a herd instinct either... Obviously, I am a hybrid of a leader and a follower. Even my own children tried to give as much freedom as possible. I propose to follow me. Who wants to - please, no - as you wish. But I can't follow anyone myself. I can admire this or that quality of a person, especially his talent. But I would not obey. Not even to Chekhov or Dostoevsky. I'm afraid of crowd-pleasers. But this does not mean that I love only solitude. On the contrary, I love to be with people, and even just the presence of people pleases me."

A "nobleman" is a dabbler of fate. The basis of the human psyche - the Will - takes the best, second line in his order of functions, and thus provides the holder of the 2nd Will with a mental comfort unknown to others. The strength and flexibility of the 2nd Will gives the personality a rare integrity and fearlessness before life.

Even the vulnerability of the 3rd function, which the 2nd Will is unable to cancel, worries the "nobleman" less than others, and the picture of his pathology in the 3rd function is usually thoroughly blurred. In addition, the fearlessness born of the power and flexibility of the 2nd Will allows the "nobleman" to risk successive healing of the ulcer on the 3rd function and, despite blows, mistakes, falls, to achieve its complete healing. Thanks to this, sometimes an ideal state for a person living in the sublunar world is achieved - a state of complete inner harmony.

"My life - continuous adventure, because I have always sought not only to develop what was inherent in me by nature, but to obtain and what she did not give me, " - wrote Goethe, and in another place he himself explained why it is necessary: "He who is not imbued with the conviction that all the manifestations of the human being, sensuality and reason, imagination and reason, must be developed by him to a decisive unity, whichever of these faculties may prevail, will constantly torment himself in joyless limitation." I will not undertake to prove that harmonization is given to a "nobleman" always, easily and quickly (Goethe reached this state only by 60 years of age), I will not venture to say that for others it is unattainable, but the presence of a "nobleman" unique mental prerequisites for achieving inner harmony is beyond doubt. And that is why he is a darling of fortune.

I remember once comparing the Second Function to a river. Well, the 2nd Will is not a function - it is a human river, an integral, inexhaustible personality, freely, broadly, generously giving to all comers without

losing anything at all. Soulful generosity and generosity are simply the normal state for the 2nd Will. The first thing commonly said about a "nobleman" is: "He is a good man!" followed by less flattering characteristics or not flattering at all, but when the characterization of a person begins with such a phrase - more than likely, it is the 2nd Will. Charlotte von Stein, long abandoned by Goethe, still found the strength and words to express to him in a letter: "I would like to call you the Giver. " Here the word "Giver" is very precisely found to express what constitutes the essence of the 2nd Will.

The "nobleman" has a big heart. I don't want to offend anyone, but only the 2nd Will can truly love. True love is self-giving. And only someone who is willing to share, who has something to give, and who can give without the risk of being impoverished, is capable of self-giving. Only the 2nd Will meets all these conditions. Therefore, may the reader forgive me, others are given to need, to depend, to submit, to nurture illusions, but not to love. Love is understood by the 2nd Will as sacrifice, not consumption. It is much more important for her to love than to be loved.

Together with strength, flexibility, normativity, one of the fundamental elements of the Second Function is naturalness. Although it is difficult to speak of naturalness expressed through Will, the specifics of just such an expression lend themselves to delineation. Naturalness according to the Will is personal openness, simplicity, adequacy to oneself in any situation, the absence of a second, backdrop or mask. As Nancy Reagan wrote of her husband, "The key to unlocking Ronald Reagan's secret is that there is no secret. He is exactly what he appears to be. The Ronald Reagan you see in public is the same Ronald Reagan I live with. It turns out that some of the recent presidents were not at all what we thought they were. I honestly don't believe anyone could say something like that about Ronnie. There are no dark corners to Ronald Reagan's character.

Yes, that is the naturalness of the "nobleman. His mental health is so great that he hides nothing, does not show off anything, allows himself to be laughed at, and is often ready to play a playful self-deprecation himself. Moreover, the 2nd Will is so personally invulnerable that, without any serious violence to himself, he dares to do the most terrible thing of all: to repent publicly, openly admitting his mistakes and shortcomings, which the 1st and 3rd Wills are completely incapable of doing.

Labruyere, naming the 2nd Will "true greatness" in his classification of characters, wrote: "False greatness is haughty and impregnable: it is aware of its weakness and therefore hides, or rather, shows itself a little, just enough to inspire respect, while hiding its real face - the face of nothingness.

True greatness is casual, soft, heartfelt, simple, and accessible. It can be touched, touched and examined: the closer one gets to know it, the more one admires it. Driven by kindness, it bends down to those below it, but it costs nothing to straighten up to its full height at any moment. It is at times careless, careless of itself, oblivious of its advantages, but, when necessary, shows itself in all its brilliance and power. It laughs, plays, jokes - and is always full of dignity. Near him everyone feels free, but no one dares to be unleashed. He has a noble and pleasant disposition that inspires respect and trust.

The simplicity and openness of the 2nd Will is not always to her benefit. First, dishonest people sometimes take advantage of these mental qualities. And secondly, it creates in its own way a deserved image of a creature, quite naive, primitive, limited, very simple to understand people, which is the perfect truth, growing out of the bogatyr mental health of the "nobleman" and ordinary human egocentrism, interpreting the whole world on its own example.

The 2nd Will is fearless in relationships with people. Her ideas of the norm in relations are limited to the image of a close, equal, friendly circle. However, she does not have the right to impose her own norm on others, and therefore willingly observes the distance in relationships that the opposite side offers her. At what distance from yourself you would put the "nobleman", at what he will, as a delicate person, stand in the future.

"The nobleman" often leaves the impression of himself as a man rather indifferent to people. "You have always been indifferent to people, to their faults and weaknesses" (Lika Mizinova about Chekhov), "His external kindness is an internal indifference to the whole world" (Sophia Tolstaya about Taneyev). Sometimes the "nobleman" himself speaks of himself as a man of indifference. Berdyaev, for example, admitted: "I probably have a lot of indifference and there is no despotism and a tendency to violence, although in the activity I was autocratic. There is a great respect for every human person, but little attention... I have never had a tendency to fumble with people's souls, to influence them, to direct them."

Despite all these reproaches and confessions of indifference, there is not an iota of truth in them. The 2nd Will is very partial to people, and there is no one more sympathetic than the "nobleman. The other thing is that he is not curious. To put it bluntly, curiosity is not the healthiest of feelings, dictated either by fear or self-interest, or, at any rate, some form of personal interest in other people. The "nobleman," on the other hand, is a delicate, unselfish, fearless, self-sufficient, independent, and moreover, according to the custom of people who see others in their own image and likeness, and therefore - not curious. Hence the myth of the indifference of the 2nd Will. Hence also the biggest disadvantage of the "nobleman" - he is not a psychologist, his credulity and lack of curiosity deprive him of the possibility and desire to discern the secret, hidden side of the life of another's soul and react to it adequately. A contemporary of Vladimir Soloviev said: "He once told me about himself that he was "not a psychologist. He said it in other words, but it was noticeable that he regretted the lack of this trait in him. Indeed, there was a certain blindness and recklessness of the cavalry in him.

Another misconception, often nurtured about the 2nd Will by those around him, is its supposed softness, weakness of character. And we cannot say that it is altogether groundless. The "nobleman," unlike the "tsar," has a firm basis of character not protruding, but hidden. He is gentle, compliant, tolerant, indulgent to himself and others, faithful in friendship and love (which is also sometimes interpreted as weak character). This plasticine appearance "nobleman" deceives many, and in his own way provokes others - to try his character on the strength: to sass, humiliate, subjugate. The results are usually

disastrous for the experimenter. From the plasticine shell suddenly emerges a natural aristocrat, a proud man, a man of inflexible will, able to perish rather than surrender an inch of his dignity.

Those who try to experiment with the character of the "nobleman" and try him on the teeth simply forget a rather trivial truth: only very strong people can afford weakness. One of the people who knew Chekhov well wrote: "Chekhov's will was a great strength; he took care of it and rarely resorted to its assistance, and sometimes he enjoyed doing without it, experiencing hesitation, even being weak. Weakness has a kind of charm that women know well.

But when he found it necessary to summon the will, it appeared and never deceived him."

It is almost hopeless to try to determine precisely the boundary beyond which the solid foundation of the 2nd Will begins to appear. But it is clear that each time we must deal with a certain fundamental, capital question. In Dostoevsky's *The Brothers Karamazov*, Liza asks Alyosha Karamazov, "Will you obey me?" - "Yes!" - "In everything?" - "In almost everything, but not in the main things. I will not surrender to the main things." Similar, "Karamazov-style" lived and acted Abraham Lincoln. Whitman wrote about him: "On those rare occasions when it came to something cardinal, decisive, he was unwaveringly firm, even stubborn, but in general, when it came to anything not too significant, was pliable, malleable, tolerant, unusually pliable.

* * *

It is as useless to flatter a "nobleman" as it is to humiliate him. The scent of incense causes him the most sincere irritation and embarrassment, and more than once I have seen the faces of "noblemen" turn crimson, even in the case of deserved and moderate praise.

Perhaps the most unique feature of the psychology of the "nobleman" is the extra-hierarchism of his picture of the universe. Recall that for the 1st Will the cosmos is divided into top and bottom. So, for the 2nd Will, this antinomy is absent in its internal picture of the world. "...In the human spirit, as in the universe, is there nothing that is above or below? Everything demands the same rights to a common medium," believed Goethe. For the "nobleman" all - from God to the tadpole - are on the same line, all are equal in striving to fulfill their destiny. This extra-hierarchism of the 2nd Will Pasternak very accurately called "*the nobleman's* sense of the equality of all living things." And Berdyaev, for example, confessed: "...I have absolutely atrophied any sense of the hierarchical position of people in society, the will to power and domination is not only not peculiar to me, but a squeamish aversion in me."

It does not follow from this that the 2nd Will denies the existence of the hierarchy all too obviously manifest in our lives. No. But it does not absolutize it. The "nobleman" perceives the hierarchy as a convention, a formality, a system of labels, perhaps, not useless, but not related to the ontological, essential side of being. Chekhov wrote: "I am equally partial neither to gendarmes, nor to butchers, nor to scientists, nor to writers, nor

to young people. I regard form and label as prejudice. My holy of holies is the human body, health, intelligence, talent, inspiration, love, and absolute freedom, freedom from power and falsehood, whatever the latter two may be expressed in."

The question is: What practical conclusions follow from the 2nd Will's non-recognition of the hierarchical picture of the world? There are many conclusions. For example, I will not claim that the 2nd Will was the creator of the norms of law and morality - they are too different, depending on the country and people, to attribute their authorship to one psychology, but the fact that the "nobility" is the sole guardian of morality and law is certain. And the reason for such a particularly important role of the "nobility" in society is precisely related to its natural aversion to hierarchy.

The point is that the other Wills are hierarchical, and hierarchy is what, by differentiating morality and law depending on the position occupied by the subject on the hierarchical steps, practically destroys both of them, blurs their borders to the point of complete disappearance. "What is allowed to Jupiter is not allowed to bull," the ancient Romans used to say, thus formulating the hierarchical principle that was destructive to morality and law. However, they also liked to repeat: "The law is harsh, but it is the law," recognizing the existence of another, protective, extra-hierarchical "noble" principle. Both these principles have been struggling in the world for centuries; the future will show which of them will win; the main thing is that, judging from the fact that morality and law still exist, the 2nd Will has not yet lost.

It is obvious that, according to her political convictions, the 2nd Will is a natural democrat, as opposed to the same 1st Will, a natural monarchist. "Power is better than freedom" said Turgenev's hero to the 1st Will, "freedom is better than power" said any 2nd Will. The struggle between them has also been predetermined from time immemorial, but the picture of the single combat is clearer: so far the 2nd Will is clearly victorious. A growing number of countries are governed by elected bodies, proclaiming the priority of individual rights over all other rights.

The castelessness of the 2nd Will, naturally, extends to its relations in the family, at work, among acquaintances. The "nobleman" is equal with superiors and subordinates, parents and children, in a friendly circle. Moreover, this evenness is shaded by a sense of dignity, coupled with a respectful attitude toward others. Bunin wrote about Chekhov: "It happened that he gathered with people of different ranks: he was the same with everyone, gave no preference to anyone, made no one to suffer from ego, to feel forgotten, superfluous. And he always kept everyone at a certain distance from him.

His sense of dignity and independence was very great.

* * *

Quite peculiar is the attitude of the "nobility" to social movements. It is accurately described in the following autobiographical lines Berdyaev: "...I have been in prison four times, twice in the old regime and twice in the new, was exiled to the north for three years,

had a trial that threatened me with eternal settlement in Siberia, was exiled from my homeland and probably will end my life in exile. At the same time, I have never been a political man. I belonged to many things, but in essence I belonged to nothing, to nothing entirely, except my art. The depth of my being always belonged to something else. Not only was I not indifferent to social questions, but I was also very sick of them, I had a "civic" feeling, but in essence, in a deeper sense, I was asocial, I had never been a "socialist. The social currents never considered me quite my own. I was always an 'anarchist' on a spiritual basis and an 'individualist.

What Berdyaev describes is not a personal position, but a general picture of the socio-social psychology of the 2nd Will. Our task: only to examine it through the single prism of "noble" values. "Civic" feeling described by Berdyaev is the extra-caste nature of the 2nd Will, which, embodied in the close to itself slogan "Freedom, Equality, Fraternity", is able to involve the "nobleman" in major social movements. On the other hand, the natural independence, the deep sense of the uniqueness of his own individuality do not allow the 2nd Will to fully merge with the crowd, dragging it to the margins of social movements. The crowd presupposes some form of delegation of individual wills to those who lead it. But transmitting one's will to others is totally unacceptable for the 2nd Will, while appropriating someone else's is uninteresting and unfruitful. Own and other people's freedom, even in the struggle for freedom, for the "nobleman" is more expensive than anything else. And so he walks on the party-unpartisan fringe, sympathizing with many, but not merging with anything.

Rarely does the Second Will stand in open, uncompromising opposition to the existing order of things, preferring not to front, but simply to isolate itself. Goethe spoke frankly of his undemonstrative tendency to isolate himself from all that can be called social tyranny: "Never in my life have I stood in hostile and useless opposition to the mighty stream of the mass or to the prevailing principle, but I have always preferred, like a snail, to hide in a shell and live in it as I please."

Taking the interaction of the 2nd Will with the world in a broader ontological sense, it is better characterized by the formula of the same hypostatic inseparability and inseparability as the 1st Will. There is, however, an essential difference between the two kinds of interaction. The "king," building his relations vertically, does not assume complete fusion with the world even in theory, whereas the "nobleman" and the world are on the same line and sincerely strive for each other, assuming in the final point of movement to achieve absolute unity. It is assumed, however, that due to the normativity of the 2nd Will, the world should move toward the "nobleman" rather than vice versa.

What I am now trying to express confusingly and verbosely, Pasternak, predominantly a poet, said in four lines:

"All my life I wanted to be like everyone else,
But a century in its glory
Stronger than my whining.
And wants to be like me."

At the same time, the self-confidence of the "nobleman" is only partially justified. His standardization is more of a potentiality than a reality. More precisely, the exemplarity of the 2nd Will makes the "nobleman" consider himself an exemplar, along with other functions that are not exemplary at all. Which makes the 2nd Will at times strangely deaf, unabashed, and pushy. For example, Pasternak liked to tell, without a shadow of embarrassment, how he almost drove a minor literary official crazy with a three-day hysterical monologue of his 1st Emotion while traveling together on a train.

* * *

The Second Will's attitude to fame is also best conveyed by a short quotation from Pasternak: "It is ugly to be famous. Note that the word "ugly" has in the Russian language a double, aesthetic and ethical meaning. And here it is impossible not to recognize the goodness of the choice of the poetic word, because, in the opinion of the "nobleman", the desire to get into the light of the lamp post to the roar of people's applause reverberates equally with bad taste and mental ill-health. "I have always been seduced by incognito," wrote Berdyaev, accurately expressing the aversion common to the Second Will, perhaps not so much to fame itself as to its shameful attributes: hype, pomp, dependence on the crowd, panegyrics, invasions of privacy, etc.

By and large, the "nobleman" does not crave glory, but full self-realization. Which rung of the social ladder the process of self-realization will take him to, and what people's opinion on this matter will be, is a tenth matter. Tolstoy wrote of one of his brothers: "There must have been that precious character trait in Mitya, which I suspected in his mother and knew in Nikolenka, and which I was completely devoid of - the trait of complete indifference to people's opinion of themselves. I always, until very recently, could not get away from caring about people's opinions, but Mitenka did not have this at all." Here I must correct Tolstoy a little, the 2nd Will, which his brother Dmitry had, was not indifferent to public opinion, but not curious, not searching for it. Otherwise, everything is just like with people: pleasant words please, unpleasant ones corrode. But both panegyrics and philippiques are equally unable to break the inner peace of the "nobleman"; he has enough mental health to constantly and objectively judge himself by his own court, much stricter than the court of public opinion.

The mention of Dmitry Tolstoy gives reason to add something else to the appearance and role of the "nobleman" in society. The fact is that, according to such authorities as Leo Tolstoy himself and Turgenev, Dmitry was much more talented than his genius brother and, had he had any grand vanity, the laurels of a great writer would not have passed over him. This circumstance is very symptomatic. No matter how gifted is the 2nd Will, it is, not to say, lazy, but by indifference to the glory does not know the burning passion for action and thus often deprives himself of a place in the pantheon.

To be a figure seriously swaying the hands of the historical clock is not at all the role that nature has assigned to the 2nd Will in society. The 2nd Will is the salt of the earth, a kind of guardian Vishnu, the invisible backbone and support of a world torn by ambition. And who knows what our society, fierce in its struggle for supremacy, would look like if it did not constantly look back on the late, unreliable "nobility".

Although Dmitry Tolstoy did not become a writer, by the very fact of his existence he calmed and ennobled the spirit of his genius brother shaken by paroxysms of vanity and invisibly dictated to him the most profound and soothing pages of his works. So, we can

say that Dmitry Tolstoy in a peculiar way, "noblemenly" invisibly still realized himself as a great writer.

A "nobleman" is first and foremost a man, and then a social function. Therefore, no matter what social heights he reached, no matter how staggering his success, those around him continue to appreciate and love him as a man. Zelig wrote of Einstein: "Many times he told me that the ability to do scientific work depends largely on character. But the more I worked with him and the better I got to know him, the less my attitude toward him depended on the scope of his scientific achievements, because as great as Einstein is as a physicist and philosopher, he means much more to me as a man."

* * *

Human nature is such that, willy-nilly and completely uncontrollably, he brings into society that spirit and that system which lives in himself. The 2nd Will is no exception here, and since the inner life of the 2nd Will is characterized by benevolence, tranquility, peace, self-confident power, the appearance of the "nobleman" in society brings with it silence and tranquility, is something like the grease that in the old days was poured by whalers on the raging waves. In this connection, I cannot fail to mention the description of the almost magical influence of Boris Zaitsev's Second Will at one of the receptions of the Merezhkovsky family.

"It was a particularly tumultuous gathering, like a spontaneously rebellious ocean.

The speakers tried to outshout each other, arguing furiously. Merezhkovsky himself, bursting with inspiration and with his arms wide open, seemed to rise into the air and float above this violently raging ocean, similar to the ocean that had once swallowed Atlantis, the Atlantis that was exactly what was discussed here

And in that moment of the highest nervous tension, Boris Konstantinovich, accompanied by Zlobin, entered the dining room. He entered surprisingly quietly and modestly...

And immediately, although Boris Konstantinovich did not say a single word, the waves of the ocean, already seemingly ready to swallow us, subsided...

On that day-not unlike the usual "resurrections"-no one else argued or "crossed the swords of eloquence.

It struck me then! Zaytsev brought peace to the thoughts and hearts of those sitting at the table with his mere presence...

I had to observe later on how Zaitsev's presence defused the electrified, agitated atmosphere. It was as if it was impossible to quarrel or even argue passionately in front of him.

The figure of Boris Zaitsev, among other things, is remarkable in that his writing perfectly embodied all the advantages and disadvantages of the artistic creativity of the 2nd Will. Zaitsev himself, in one of his letters, described his aesthetic credo as follows: "How much I wanted to appropriate from God's wonderful world! Well, I am built like that: I know

perfectly well how terrible, cruel, murderous this world, but everything in it is the opposite, and I was given to see not ugly, but beautiful it, more to love, not hate....So I am appointed." Comparing Zaitsev with other, contemporary writers, one of Zaitsev's descendants said: "He is poorer than many. But richer than all, it seems, in one thing - in the harmonious structure of the soul... Nothing explosive, no terrible depths, no philosophy. A noble chivalrous tone, Florentine gold of style, a golden mean in everything."

Calmness, benevolence, magnanimity - this is what the 2nd Will infects, dealing with art, infects viewers, readers, listeners. The difference is that such magnanimity in the 1st Emotion is somewhat thunderous (Pasternak), while in the 3rd Emotion it is somewhat ironic (Chekhov), in combination with the 4th Physique, rather sad than cheerful (Blok), in combination with the 1st Physique rather cheerful than sad (Goethe). These combinations practically exhaust the "noble" artistic menu, and there is some truth in saying that the art of the 2nd Will is monotonous. But this monotony is pure monotony, and one cannot become bored with it.

* * *

If you listen to me, it would seem that a "nobleman" is an angel in the flesh, which is not the case. I agree. But, for one thing, he has a poor sense of his own advantages, and he is in no danger of megalomania. Bloch once wrote in a letter: "I - very much believe in myself ... feel in myself a healthy wholeness and ability, and the ability to be a man at ease, independent and honest ..." This is, perhaps, the most that the 2nd Will knows about itself. This is not surprising; mental health is as invisible to its bearer as physical health.

Second, the "nobleman" would really be an angel in the flesh if he presented to the world only his best Will function. But alas, he has three other functions, imperfect, non-standard, inconvenient in the dormitory, and this circumstance greatly distorts the "angelic" face of the 2nd Will.

* *

The first outward sign of the 2nd Will, like all Wills in general, is the gaze. The gaze of the "nobleman" is benevolent, peaceful, and somewhat distracted. He seems to say: "Everything is quiet, I am glad to get acquainted, but, if you want, I will not insist on continuing it.

Heine wrote of Goethe that his "eyes did not look sinfully fearful, pious or unctuous tenderness: they were calm, like some kind of deity," and, of course, somewhat belittled. The gaze of Goethe, like any "nobleman" did not contain anything divine, but was simply non-cerebral: the pupils moved, but moved smoothly, and Heine, who could not boast of a calm gaze, partly romanticized his impression of the gaze of Goethe.

The 2nd Will is a very unimportant actress and fully agrees with Pasternak that he must "not give up one bit of his face." Therefore, when a "nobleman" chooses a career as an actor, he more or less successfully plays only himself, and is unable to reap major laurels

in the acting field (Reagan). How difficult it is for the Second Will to act, we see on the example of Blok, who read all of his poems except "Twelve" himself. And the secret of this strangeness lies in the fact that, if the reader remembers, some parts of the poem are stylized in a square-ballad spirit, and Blok simply could not read them, identifying with what was said, as is customary among "nobility".

The 2nd Will is the only one of all the Wills that organically does not digest profanity and obscenities. Regardless of one's upbringing. It does not digest even when combined with the 1st Physics, for which excursions into the field of physiology are desirable and natural. Boris Yeltsin, with his 1st Physics, who spent his childhood in a barracks, a builder by profession, wrote: "...I could not tolerate swearing all my life, at the Institute even argued with me whether or not I would use even one swear word during a whole year. And every time I won. There is no exaggeration in Yeltsin's words. I have met people with the same order of functions, coming from the very bottom of society, just as intolerant of profanity. Maxim Gorky, who spent his youth in the society of beggars, blushed at the word "latrine" for the rest of his life. Obviously, this is due to the "nobility's" natural sense of dignity and an equally natural respectful attitude toward others.

We in Russia like to argue about what is "intelligence": the presence of a diploma of higher education or a character trait. So, if we consider anyone with a diploma an intellectual, then everything is clear. The character trait is unclear. But now we can say with certainty that intelligence as a character trait is a natural property of the 2nd Will. It is characterized by democracy, delicacy, tolerance, benevolence, naturalness, independence, i.e. by all those qualities which are usually associated with intellectuality. And it has nothing to do with education, upbringing, or social status. A "nobleman" can be illiterate, unable to use a knife and fork, or spend his whole life in prison, and this circumstance will not affect his intelligence in any way.

* * *

A common taste of the 2nd Will is that she prefers discreet, but also does not merge her with the crowd. The main task of the "nobleman" when choosing a dress is rather difficult: having dressed, not to pry into the eyes, and at the same time to feel that individuality is not lost at the same time. The cut is preferable a free, wide, not constraining the movements. Among politicians, the "nobility" can be immediately recognized by the way they hurry to unbutton, loosen the knot of the tie, and, better yet, to change protocol attire for something homely, simple and free.

"The Philistine" (3rd Will)

Beginning my story of the 3rd Will, I want to warn you at once: here we enter the darkest and most painful circle of the life of the human spirit. I therefore apologize in advance to readers of the 3rd Will for the frankness with which I must speak of the hidden and painful side of their existence.

Every third function is bifurcated and wounded. The particular tragedy of the situation of the "bourgeois" is that his Will, the pillar of the personality, on which the entire order of functions rests, has been wounded. And when the pillar is weakened and traumatized, the entire edifice of the human psyche becomes shaky and vulnerable. Life becomes a chronic

nightmare: even a weak blow or a mere touch of any function, not only the Third, can shake the "philistine's" being to its core, send the Third Will to a knockout.

Total vulnerability is a distinctive and most frightening feature of the psyche of the "bourgeois"; it makes the 3rd Will look like a mollusk with the most delicate and defenseless body, which nature has denied a shell and thus condemned from cradle to grave to anger, aggressiveness, secrecy and loneliness.

One must have a great deal of mental health to look into the abyss that is the soul of the "bourgeois" without fear. Dostoevsky's novels are only a faint glimpse of the hell in which the 3rd Will chronically lives.

Only to the psyche of a "bourgeois" is the term "complex" truly applicable, since it really is a whole complex of sores, burns and ulcers, threatening to grow into one multifunctional festering wound. That is why the means of self-defense of the 3rd Will have the form of a complex universal set. If the reader remembers, each Third Function has its own "fig leaf". The 3rd Will also has it: hypocrisy and foolishness. But since the "philistine" is vulnerable to the whole order of functions, he has to cover himself entirely, with the whole sheepskin of existing "fig leafs": now he is either fooling around, now he is sanctimonious, now he is ironic, now he is in the deepest skepticism.

The image of the naked mollusk with the most delicate, vulnerable body, sneaking through life like a serpentarium, wearing a cloak of fig leaves, is an image that quite accurately conveys the inner life of the 3rd Will.

* * *

One of the typical derivatives of the state of mind of the 3rd Will is that, feeling the Will bending and cracking under the weight of the other functions, it tries to shift the center of gravity of the personality to the well felt, excessive First Function in itself.

This results in something similar to a person who, instead of walking on a rope bridge (of four functions), prefers to walk on one rope (on the First Function), believing that one rope, but reliable, is better than four, especially if it is made thicker. Balancing on one First function leads to the fact that the "philistine," striving to strengthen and reinforce the First function, artificially hypertrophies it, already hypertrophied, to such degrees that those around him begin to classify the "philistine's" state as insanity.

Previously, speaking of the First Functions, I have already had to mention that some abnormalities are associated with them in psychiatry. Now it is time to say that the majority of such a risk group consists of "bourgeois" people: combination of the 1st Emotion with the 3rd Will gives manic-depressive psychosis, combination of the 1st Logic with the 3rd Will - paranoia, combination of the 1st Physics with the 3rd Will - pathological avarice and cruelty. The mechanism of these deviations is simple: a person seeks, without relying on the wounded Will, to make even more redundant and reliable what he already has redundant and reliable, thereby falling into such excess that psychiatry

begins to treat his state of mind as pathological. Again, though, these abnormalities are psychotypical rather than psychiatric.

* * *

It is extremely difficult to describe the inner state of the 3rd Will, so it is better to refer to a document. Here are excerpts from a letter of a young "bourgeois," remarkable in that its author not only constantly senses a hidden defect in himself, but also tries to analyze its origins: "I have looked over my past and present, and it turns out that I am a meager impersonality, aware of my impersonality. I had guessed this before, but now I am sure of it.

I never had any friends, or rather, I had one in 2nd grade, but then we became friends. Everyone always made fun of me, I mean my peers, and for some reason in my mind I always thought I was better than all of them. It was different in life...

I don't have the energy to finish the lesson. I am constantly thinking about myself or dreaming. And in dreams I am usually strong, strong-willed and purposeful, not like in life. I didn't do anything in sports, although I rowed for 5 years. I was getting pretty good results in training. But as soon as the competition came, I had the worst results.

I feel shy and uncomfortable with people. I hide my eyes in front of passersby, as if I am guilty of something in front of them. I can't help it!

The last few years, somewhere around 7th or 8th grade, I started to feel very uptight in class. I felt like I didn't have a friend, and those classmates I was attracted to didn't pay attention to me, and I agonized. What I didn't think of. Looking back now, I realize that I never had a face of my own. I was always following someone else's lead. In fact, I feel like I don't feel anything. I can't get angry, I can't laugh my heart out, I can't! I can't or don't know how to be a friend, and I want to have a friend so badly!

When I am scolded, I have absolutely nothing to say against it. I feel that something in me is not right. I don't have some strength in me. My ethics teacher told me that temper tantrums are inherited from parents. Then maybe I got my characterlessness from my father. He hasn't lived with us for a long time, but my mother said that he was an alcoholic and weak-willed man, while my mother is strong, with character.

...How to go on living! It's getting harder and harder every day.

Such a confession. A kind of sorrowful list of the anguish of the 3rd Will. There is no point in commenting on every word of the letter now, because there is still much to be said about the specific psychology of the "petty bourgeois".

* * *

Lying is the earliest and truest sign of the 3rd Will. I will not say that the other Wills never lie; it happens, but only in great need. The case of the 3rd Will is different. It lies frequently, automatically, impulsively, stupidly, senselessly. Lying for a "petty bourgeois" is a universal tool of self-protection and self-assertion and therefore becomes exposed at the

first imaginary or real threat, as well as at the first opportunity to throw dust in the eyes. The Third Will is too vulnerable, too sensitive to public opinion, not to try to protect the wounded core of its nature with lies. Whereas for a "gentleman" people's assessments can only scratch the surface of his powerful being, for a "philistine" any opinion, be it positive or negative, shakes the foundations, excites to the core, stimulating a reaction in the form of an impulsive and usually not convincing lie.

Pretense, hypocrisy, or, more directly, hypocrisy, is an integral part of the same tendency of the 3rd Will to lie. The "philistine" is afraid to reveal himself, to reveal himself, preferring to look like someone, more often a person, more socially important than to be himself. Dostoyevsky wrote: "We are all ashamed of ourselves. Indeed, every one of us carries within him an almost innate shame about himself and his own face and, almost in society, all Russian people immediately try to quickly and at any cost to appear to be something else, but not what he is in fact, everyone hurries to take a completely different face."

The 3rd Will is a born actor of the theater, which is better described not as "social" but as "hierarchical," because the "burgher" acts not only in society, but also in the family.

* * *

"A "philistine" is even softer and more docile than a "nobleman. But malleability is not the same as malleability. Comparing the 2nd and 3rd Wills, La Rochefoucauld noted very correctly: "Truly soft can only be people with a firm character, the rest of the apparent softness - this is often just weakness, which easily turns into bitterness. Indeed, the "burgher" is obedient, but not of his own free will and, secretly hating the abusers over his will, ready to endlessly accumulate resentment, at the first opportunity cruelly paying for his former obedience. Thus, young Paul McCartney, after a parental flogging, declaring complete and utter remorse, would sneak into his parents' bedroom and with the words, "Here you go!" "Here you go!" ripping the kiese off the curtains. Ambiguous obedience differed Russian Tsar Nicholas II, he once made this characteristic confession: "I always agree with everyone, and then do as I please. It was a generic trait among Russian tsars: Alexander I, the great-grandfather of Nicholas II, was called "a meek stubborn man.

The lower the 3rd Will has to bend, the more unexpected and severe the straightening is. People around us usually describe such straightening as "betrayal," but in general, the 3rd Will never betrays, because it never fully belongs to anyone. Loyalty is the lot of either very strong or hopelessly weak people. The "philistine" occupies an intermediate position and is therefore not faithful by its very nature, although he usually gives plenty of assurances and advances on this score.

Recalling Andrei Bely, Berdyaev wrote: "In this very bright individuality the solid core of his personality was lost, there was a dissociation of personality in his very artistic work. This, by the way, was expressed in his terrible infidelity, in his propensity to betrayal...

He gave the impression of being a friend of the house. He constantly agreed with me, as he could not object at all to my face. Then suddenly, for a while, he disappeared completely. At that time he would usually print some article attacking me harshly... I had the impression that he was settling a score for agreeing in private, not agreeing, he was getting even with me in scolding articles.

Betrayal, as a form of voluntary response to external irresistible pressure of will, for the "petty bourgeois" often coexists also as an involuntary response to the same pressure. Gorky, who wrote an article about provocateurs in 1917, received a letter from one such "comrade provocateur," which contained the following expressive lines: "I make no excuses, but I wish that the psychology, even of such a wretched creature as a provocateur, could still be understood by you. After all, there are many of us! - All the best party workers. It is not a singular ugly phenomenon, but obviously some deeper common cause that has driven us to this impasse. I ask you: overcome disgust, come closer to the soul of the traitor and tell us all: what motives guided us when we, believing with all our souls in the Party, in socialism, in everything holy and pure, could "honestly" serve in the guard and, despising ourselves, still find it possible to live?"

The "philistine" is a natural agent-double, because he has neither the spirit nor the will to resist something, nor to belong to something to the end - and this is the only and main reason for the paradoxical split personality that has been, is and will continue to be observed in our already complex, mysterious, metaphorical spiritual life.

* * *

The caste-based, hierarchical picture of the cosmos, society and family that has lived in the soul of the "bourgeois" since birth is an important element of the psychology of the 3rd Will. The main thing in it is the infinite complexity of the hierarchy as seen through the inner eye. If the reader remembers, the hierarchical picture of the 1st Will is very simple and limited to two steps, while the 2nd Will simply lacks it. Therefore, one cannot fail to recognize the peculiarity of the 3rd Will's visible hierarchy, which, in its view, is infinitely complex and made up of an infinite number of components.

It is impossible to describe everything that, in the opinion of a "bourgeois", matters in determining one's place in life: a place on the cosmic ladder, a place on the ladder of nature, age, gender, race, nationality, religion, origin, position, appearance, property, profession, education, and many other seemingly invisible summands, which allow a "bourgeois" to find a special place for everyone in his caste world picture.

The mere recognition of differences among the world's inhabitants would not be alarming if the 3rd Will did not absolutize all these differences and, having absolutized them, did not structure its attitudes and behavior accordingly. How this looks in practice is easy to observe in our literary world and in the figures of such giants as Pushkin and Bryusov. Here are two sketches from nature: "The sense of equality was completely alien to Bryusov. Perhaps, however, this was also influenced by the petty bourgeoisie, from which Bryusov came out. A *petty bourgeois* is not an example easier to bend back than, for

example, an aristocrat or a worker. But the desire to humiliate the other on occasion also grips the happy bourgeois more than the worker or aristocrat. "Every cricket knows his stump", "rank and file" - these ideas were introduced into literary relations by Bryusov directly from the Tsvetnoy Boulevard. Briusov could either command or obey. To show independence - meant once and for all to acquire an enemy in the person of Bryusov.", "Pushkin considered his treatment not with the personality of the person, but with his position in the world, and therefore recognized his colleague most insignificant barich and was offended when the society met him as a writer, not as an aristocrat."

Particularly noticeable is the casteism of the "bourgeois" against the background of the even attitude of the "nobleman. Another contemporary of Pushkin continued: "Delvig and all his Lyceum comrades were alike in their treatment, but Pushkin treated them differently. He was quite friendly with Delvig and listened when Delvig kept him from excessive card games and too frequent visits to the nobility, which Pushkin was very prone to. With some of his fellow students, in which Pushkin did not see anything remarkable, including Mikhail Yakovlev, treated somewhat arrogantly, for which he was often harassed by Delvig.

Like any phenomenon, the casteism of the Third Will has its positive side. It makes the "bourgeois" a highly tactful creature, sensitive to invisible class barriers, which other Wills often stumble over because of their blindness.

The ability of the Third Will to social mimicry is incomparable, and, without wishing to torment the reader with my coarse language, I will simply quote from Gogol in this connection: "It must be said that if our Russians have not caught up with foreigners in some other things, they have far outstripped them in the skill of address. It is impossible to count all the shades and subtleties of our treatment. A Frenchman or a German cannot understand all the peculiarities and differences, he will speak to a millionaire or a petty tobacco merchant in the same voice and in the same language, though of course he will flatter the former to an extent. It is not so with us: we have such wise men who will talk differently to a landowner who has two hundred souls than to one who has three hundred, and to one who has three hundred they will talk differently than to one who has five hundred, and to one who has five hundred they will talk differently than to one who has eight hundred; in a word, one can go up to a million, but there will be shades. Suppose, for example, there is a chancellery, not here, but in a trinity of states, and in the chancellery, suppose there is a governor of the chancellery. Look at him, when he sits among his staff, you can't even say the word out of fear. - And what does not his face express? Just take a brush and paint: Prometheus, resolute Prometheus! The eagle's eagle, he struts and struts and struts. The same eagle, as soon as he leaves the room and approaches his boss's office, a partridge so rushes with papers under his arm that there is no piss. In society and at the party, whether all be of small rank, Prometheus remains Prometheus, and a little higher than him, with Prometheus will do such a transformation, which even Ovid did not invent: a fly, smaller than even a fly, destroyed in a grain of sand! "This is not Ivan Petrovich," you say, looking at him. - "Ivan Petrovich is taller, and this one is both short and skinny,

the latter speaks loudly, basses and never laughs, and this one knows what: squeaks like a bird and laughs all the time." - When you get closer, you see, just like Ivan Petrovich!"

Reading Gogol, let us not jump to the conclusion that the casteism of the 3rd Will concerns only social life. For the "bourgeois" the hierarchical principle is universal. "Philosophers create Platonic systems of a complex co-subordination of worlds. The "bourgeois" theologians rank spiritual forces, saints, and creeds. "Ethnographers assign different ranks to races and peoples in a fascist way. As for the "philistine," the philistine, agreeing in person or in absentia with everything that postulates caste in various spheres of life, seeks first of all, according to his own clear but firm signs, to establish a strict system of co-subordination in his own family.

From the outside, the system of "bourgeois" family deference looks sometimes ridiculous, sometimes frightening. For example, Vasily Rozanov did not allow his housemates to eat meat from his soup and ate it in pride of place alone, and Dostoevsky's father, when he went to bed during the day, made his overgrown sons drive flies away from his face. However that may be, the hierarchy for the "bourgeois" is hardly the only firmament on which he can lean with greater or lesser certainty, which is unusually important in the conditions of a psyche of the Third Will, subject to all winds and constantly shaking to all.

The "citizen," however, would not be himself if he were not, in relation to the hierarchy, both the custodian and the shaker of it. The niche that the 3rd Will occupies in the hierarchy it sees in is a cage, with all the conveniences and inconveniences that this implies; it is a shell and a prison, a shield and a vice. The table of ranks prevents the "petty bourgeois" from falling below his proper place, but it also prevents him from rising above it. Therefore, the 3rd Will is both the keeper and the wobbler of rank. The difference is that the lower the fate places the "petty bourgeois", the more he hesitates, while the higher he is, the more he is a keeper. This circumstance, incidentally, can explain the evolution of many political figures who began their careers as extreme radicals and ended up as extreme conservatives.

However, by and large, every "petty bourgeois" in his deeds is more of a hierarchy builder, while in his dreams he is more of a destroyer. The fact is that he is hindered by a chronic insecurity - the fear that his free floating, unbound by the fetters of officialdom, will not lift him up, but, on the contrary, will drop him to the bottom of public life. Therefore, on reflection at his leisure, he decides that it is safer not to risk and leave everything as it is.

* * *

The 3rd Will loves and hates Power. He loves it more than he hates it. In the subconscious mind of the "philistine," Power is mystically identified with the Will, and since his own Will is wounded, the "philistine" has a feeling for the bearer of power similar to that felt by an old tubercular man for a young, chubby, rosy-cheeked peasant woman.

The 3rd Will envies, hates and at the same time unconsciously and almost disinterestedly flings itself toward Power, striving to stay in Its field longer. Pushkin, the author of very radical poetry, according to his best friend, "had some wretched habit of changing his noble character, and often made me and all of us angry with the fact that he liked, for example, to twirl around the orchestra near Orlov, Chernyshev, Kisilev and others: they listened to his jokes, witticisms with a patronizing smile. It happened from the chairs to make him a sign, he immediately came running.

Through the unconscious and almost selfless love of the 3rd Will for Power, one old and seemingly insoluble historical paradox is easily explained: no matter how cruel a tyrant was, no matter how methodically he mowed down the heads of his entourage, the place around him was never empty. Surprisingly, there were always kamikazes eager to fill the gaps in the tyrant's constantly thinning entourage with their bodies, for the sake of a brief moment in the mantle of power. This craving is akin to somnambulism, akin to the force that irresistibly draws a butterfly to fire. Power as a visible expression of the will is the only thing that the 3rd Will truly loves and for which it is willing to make any sacrifice.

At the same time, the "petty bourgeois," for all his love of power, is prone to engage in covert sabotage, secret fronts, foolishness, demonstrating false humility and outward indifference to authority. And this ambivalent attitude toward power often shocks those around him. As one of the poet's contemporaries wrote: "Pushkin constituted some mysterious, duplicitous being...He was both a conservative and a revolutionary."

* * *

The 3rd Will is fine in the role of a subordinate. It is generally more comfortable to be a slave in decision-making rather than a leader, to take less responsibility. Walter Schellenberg, chief of the Nazi SD, described his first impressions of the spectacle of the organization that later became his home: "I was increasingly delighted by the silent interaction of all the gears of the invisible mechanism that seemed to me to open new doors for me, while **commanding me like a weak-willed puppet**. But the dignity of the 3rd Will as a servant is not in its placidity. The dignity is that she is not bluntly and directly executive, but artistically executive. As a seeker, a cautionary, "burgher" serves not for fear, but for conscience. Like a sunflower watching the sun, he follows his superiors with his inner eye, striving to fulfill even his unspoken wishes. Catching any vibes coming from the boss with the thin membrane of his vulnerable Will, the "petty bourgeois", playing ahead of him, often presents him with something that he does not expect, has not had time for or is too shy to formulate directly.

As good as the 3rd Will is as a subordinate, so terrible is it as a boss. The first thing that makes the activity of a "petty bourgeois" as boss unfruitful is, of course, the inconsistency, half-heartedness, ambiguity of his decisions due to his character, or, better to say, weak character. In my opinion, the best characterization of the 3rd Will as chief was given by Speransky, speaking of Alexander I: "You know the suspicious character of the sovereign.

Everything he does, he does half-heartedly. He is too weak to rule and too strong to be governed."

The second thing that further spoils the case in this situation is the attitude of the 3rd Will toward its subordinates. What was once said of the emperor Caligula can be said of almost every "burgher": "There was no better slave and no worse sovereign in the world." Part of the trouble lies in the same identification of Power and Will that is characteristic of his mental picture. After becoming boss, the 3rd Will decides that the seat should paint it, and begins to imitate the style and behavior of the 1st Will, i.e., the redundancy of the Will. But since the boss's chair does not change anything in the order of functions of the "bourgeois", it turns out to be not a copy, but a caricature of the "king": conceit instead of pride, obstinacy instead of persistence, tyranny instead of dictatorship.

Yes, yes tyrants are born and are born with the 3rd Will. The other wills either have little appreciation for power, or feel strong enough not to abuse it too much. The "philistine" is a different matter. Having been given power, the object of his timid, secret lusts, he is deeply aware of how little he deserves such a gift, and the fear of discovering this discrepancy hastens him to crush everything independent, everything personal, and, on occasion, everything living around him.

At the same time, perhaps the main victim of the "bourgeois" tyrant's autocratic behavior is himself, a victim, above all, of his own psychological nature. The 3rd Will, like no one else, is sensitive to the attitude toward himself and experiences extremely painfully, finding coldness, alienation and fear in place of the former warmth and affection. But in this case, the "petty bourgeois" cannot do anything about it - an adequate reaction, naturalness and evenness in relations are the most difficult to give him, especially in the boss's chair, and the "petty bourgeois" continues to deepen with his own hands the abyss that separates him from his subordinates, which he hates himself. Here is an excerpt from one letter to a psychiatrist: "Everything seems to be well: healthy, athletic, good family, cheerful, many friends, hobbies. I like my work, the collective is nice, though, of course, not without... Recently I became a manager, I will have to manage the department.

Here's the problem.

Can I do it?

The first steps are disturbing. Although I know the case like the back of my hand, I've been awarded many prizes, etc., I make mistake after mistake.

No confidence. Then I disgustingly ingratiate myself, then I fall into stony categoricalness, dry formalism Ibegin to lose understanding with people, trust, spontaneity, warmth. And this is the most precious to me, and for this I appreciate (I'm afraid "appreciate" will soon have to use the past tense). This is the cry of the soul of the "bourgeois" who became the boss.

There is another sure sign that makes it easy to distinguish the "tsar" from the "bourgeois" who imitates him. The fact is that, as mentioned above, the 1st Will with an iron hand

holds all its functions, allowing them to be realized only in regally elevated forms, and does not entrust them to anyone else. The same cannot be said of the 3rd Will, which is quite incapable of controlling the other functions. The 2nd Emotion chronically drove Emperor Nero to the theatrical stage, the 2nd Physics made Peter the Great spend hours at the lathe, and neither of them could do anything about their passions according to the 2nd, though they probably guessed that they did not add authority to them.

The ears of the First Function also protruded uncontrollably in the behavior of the "bourgeois". No matter how much of a barbarian Khrushchev sometimes put on himself, the excess of the First Emotion came pouring out of all the crevices of his nature. The example of Khrushchev makes it clear that the 3rd Will had no power over the Fourth Function either. Khrushchev's 4th Logic was constantly seized by different, often delusional ideas obviously brought in from outside, easily accepted by him for execution, which, understandably, also did little to beautify his pretended image of royalty.

* * *

"Fouché despises people so much because he knows himself too well," Talleyrand remarked self-critically, judging himself. "The 'philistine' fears, does not love and does not respect himself, and in his own image and likeness fears, does not love and does not respect others.

Although sometimes a sense of the gigantic potential in themselves, sometimes gives the "bourgeois" moments of extreme narcissism and extreme conceit. Sophia Tolstaya wrote in her diary: "I think I'm pregnant, and not happy. Everything is scary, I look at everything unpleasantly. *The desire of some power, to be above all. It's hard for me to understand, but that's how it is.*"

The self-esteem of the 3rd Will is a constantly oscillating pendulum from pole to pole. As Honore Balzac's mother used to say, "Honore considers himself either everything or nothing. And this is the holy truth. The bifurcation of the Will - the fulcrum of personality drives the "philistine" from one extreme of self-esteem to the other, almost never keeping him at an adequate mark. And along with the 3rd Will, the whole order of functions swings: constant vacillation in thoughts, feelings, behavior, evaluations is a normal state for it.

The 3rd Will is restless, uninhabitable and perpetually dissatisfied. If you put it in paradise, it will not get along, because the hell in which the "bourgeois" chronically lives is in himself. Jacob Boehme said that an angel standing in the middle of hell feels like he is in heaven, while the devil in heaven feels like he is in hell, and he was right. Our environment is only a reflection of our self. So it is natural that the sick, fractured spirit of the 3rd Will does not see the world as anything other than uncomfortable, unjust, hopelessly flawed.

"The philistine" is a very difficult person in the dormitory. Anger at the whole world, mistrustfulness, resentfulness, unpredictability, capriciousness, sneakiness, replaced by rudeness - do not paint the life of the 3rd Will himself and turn the life of those around him into a chronic torture. Gogol's friend, the historian Pogodin, when the writer moved

out of his apartment, crossed himself and bowed after the departing carriage. Approximately the same gesture was repeated by Dickens when, after a month as a guest, Andersen left his house.

The 3rd Will is very cautious in relations with people and, no matter how the circumstances develop, never makes drastic moves either toward or away from a person. The evolution of the "philistine's" attitude toward others can best be imagined as a funnel. Slowly, in a spiral, he lets a man approach him and just as slowly pushes him away. The evolution of the attitude of Nero to Seneca or of Stalin to Bukharin are clear examples of this.

It does not follow from the cautiousness of the 3rd Will that it is normative in relationships and that its behavior is always adequate to the situation. On the contrary. The constantly fluctuating psychic body of the "bourgeois" never reacts adequately to the situation. A gifted émigré poet was repenting: "Once again I have outraged some, I have bowed down before others. I always - or in the face, or in the legs.

Secrecy and spying is another seemingly contradictory, but in fact an inconsistent character trait of the 3rd Will. She is a conspirator and spy in one person. The tendency of the "burgher" to the underground is not difficult to explain: feeling like a naked clam, he simply cannot allow himself to be sincere, accessible, open.

However, the 3rd Will would not be itself if, in secrecy, it were not drawn to its secrecy and hungry for confession. One gets the impression that the institution of confession in church was created just for the "petty bourgeois", allowing them to be sincere without fear of censure or retribution. Sometimes, even without the church, the 3rd Will had the courage to show his underwear, which surprised people around him. A contemporary wrote of Dumas the Father: "He is at one and the same time sincere and secretive.

It happens that a "burgher" gets drunk on wine vapors, and I know of no sight more horrible than this. Disgusting drunken behavior is the firmest sign of the 3rd Will. I think everyone has witnessed such a picture, when the nicest, kindest acquaintance of yours, having touched a bottle, suddenly turns into a savage boor, whose blackness of soul and mind would be the envy of Satan himself, from whose mouths begin to sound such confessions and such philippiques that the saints take away. The "philistine" usually knows that he is no good on the hop, and wisely does so when he goes off on a lifelong binge solely for this reason.

From the total vulnerability of the 3rd Will, along with secrecy, comes directly from its tendency to snoop. The "philistine" is afraid of people and is therefore curious about them. His chronic fear of being struck makes him watch his surroundings, gathering and saving up stones from behind his back, with the help of which he could repel in the event of an attack. From fear, the 3rd Will is relentless in its analysis of man, his attitudes and reactions, so it can be said that if there is a natural gift of a psychologist, this gift is given only to a "bourgeois".

It is true that the psychology of the Third Will is somewhat one-sided. It is interested not so much in the man in general as in the funny, dirty, ugly, terrible aspects of his nature and existence. The "philistine" is a consistent collector of dirt, and this circumstance awards him with another natural gift: the gift of the satirist (not to be confused with the talent of the humorist). Practically all great satirists have had the 3rd Will. One must dislike and disrespect oneself and others to devote one's life to mockery of human flaws and weaknesses and to do it as talented as Swift, Moliere, and Gogol did.

While the "burgher" himself is a great lover and master of mockery, there is no man who is so afraid of laughter. It sometimes comes to the point of being a joke. Here is one of them: "In the forties, I. S. (I. S. Turgenev - A. A.) once had a company gathered in St. Petersburg: there was Belinsky, Herzen, Ogarev, and someone else. They were playing cards, and as Dostoevsky was entering the hall, somebody got very upset, and so there was general laughter. Dostoevsky went pale, stopped, then turned and, without saying a word, left the room. At first no one paid any attention to this, but as he did not return, I.S., as host, went to see where he had gone... "And where is Fyodor Mikhailovich?" - he asked the footman. "They've been walking around the yard for an hour without their hats on."

It was winter, in a blistering cold. He ran out into the courtyard. "What's the matter with you, Dostoevsky?" - "Oh, pardon me, it's awful! Everywhere I show myself, everyone laughs at me. No sooner did I show up on your doorstep than you and your guests made fun of me. Aren't you ashamed?"

Of course, Turgenev somewhat caricatured the confusion with Dostoevsky, but the story is fundamentally true, as can be seen at least from the way Dostoevsky later repaid Turgenev by drawing a caricature portrait of him in *The Possessions*. But that is beside the point. The authenticity of Turgenev's story is also given by the repetition of this kind of narration. For example, contemporaries of Alexander I reported: "One day Kisilev, Orlov and Kutuzov were standing by the window in the courtyard telling each other jokes and laughing. Alexander passed by. Ten minutes later Kisilev was summoned to his office. The general found Alexander in front of a mirror. The emperor was carefully examining himself from all sides. He decided that they were laughing at him, at his appearance. "What is so funny about me? Why did you and Kutuzov and Orlov laugh at me?" - questioned the suspicious emperor..."

The richest material for analyzing the motives of behavior and reactions of the 3rd Will is provided by the figure of Stalin - the most terrible man in world history. The essence of his psychological flaw was perfectly set forth by Nikolai Bukharin, an associate and victim of the tyrant, saying that Stalin "is unhappy because he cannot convince everyone, even himself, that he is above everyone.... and for this very "unhappiness" he cannot but take revenge on people. Indeed, the thirst for revenge against society for his sense of inferiority was the main incentive for Stalin's actions, from his choice of a career as a revolutionary to his later bloody purges.

However, there was another nuance, not noticed by Bukharin, which greatly exacerbated the state of Stalin's already initially sick soul: bodily defects. The fact is that if a "petty bourgeois" like Stalin has a Physic on top, and this circumstance is accompanied by a significant physical defect, the vulnerability of his spirit increases many times over. An acquaintance of Byron conveyed his words: "If this, - he put his finger to his forehead, - elevates me above people, this (pointing to his leg) puts me below all others. Indeed, Byron's limp, Beethoven's deafness, Dostoevsky's epilepsy turned the lives of these mentally not very healthy, but essentially cheerful people into a chronic nightmare. It was the same with Stalin. Overgrown toes, traces of smallpox on his face, and his dry hand, which developed over time, hyperbolized Stalin's inferiority complex to cosmic proportions. From the combination of the 3rd Will and physical defects grew basically the phenomenon of Stalin, where everything acquired monstrous proportions: hypocrisy, unscrupulousness, guile, cruelty.

One of Stalin's secretaries wrote: "Gradually myths and legends were created about him. For example, about his extraordinary will, firmness and determination. This is a myth. Stalin is an extremely cautious and indecisive man. He very often does not know how to be and what to do, I have seen many times how he hesitates, is undecided and rather prefers to follow events than to lead them..."

This statement would seem to contradict numerous memoirs that speak of Stalin's extraordinary mental strength, elevating him almost to demonism. Here is one of them: "Stalin possessed some kind of hypnotic power, menacing, demonic power... The very place of the interviews, as I perceived it, resembled a field of demonic powers at night. It was enough Stalin appeared in the room, and everyone around him, as if he stopped breathing, froze. With him came danger. There was an atmosphere of fear."

But, strange as it may seem, there is no contradiction between the two testimonies cited. Each person does not inspire society with anything; each person simply brings to it what he or she carries within him or herself. The "tsar" infects society with energy and ambition, the "nobleman" with peace and good-naturedness, the "burgher" with anxiety and uncertainty. Therefore, the atmosphere of fear that arose in society when Stalin appeared was not due to some "demonic power", but the fear that the tyrant felt of those around him, and which invisibly infected them. Each person has his own aura, his own field. The specifics of "petty-bourgeois" aura is that it is saturated with nervousness, anxiety and self-doubt, and a person, having got into its field, is quite capable of being infected by the same moods for the time of contact. Just as, however, one can be infected with calmness in the society of a "nobleman" and with energy in the society of a "tsar".

If the reader remembers, the desire for collegiality in decision-making is one of the attributes of the Will's processionalism. In the "bourgeois," the Will is processional, so he, too, is a supporter of collegiality. But he interprets it rather peculiarly. There are two variants. If the 3rd Will is in subordination, it tends to influence the decision, but takes no responsibility for it. If the 3rd Will is the boss, she prefers to be the sole decision-maker, but takes no responsibility, or shares the responsibility with other people who are not involved in the decision-making. Here is a typical example: when in 1942 Stalin decided

to cheer up the fallen spirit of the troops, he turned to the names, traditions and attributes of the tsarist army. Among other things, Stalin decided to introduce shoulder straps and gave appropriate instructions to Army General Khrulev. Later the general recollected: "As time passed and the question was not resolved, in early January 1943 I insistently asked not to delay the introduction of epaulets. Stalin asked me reproachfully: "Why do you bother with these epaulets and uniforms?" I had no choice but to say that everything was being done on his orders, and the decision, whatever it might be, was important to us.

Stalin ordered me to show him all the prepared samples. Having received his consent, I summoned Colonel General Drachev, the chief intendant, who in 15 minutes was already in Stalin's waiting room with all the shoulder straps and modified uniforms. Stalin ordered him to be put through to Kalinin. Kalinin immediately called and Stalin asked him to come in. In 10-15 minutes Kalinin entered.

"Here Comrade Kalinin," he said, "Khrulev suggests we restore the old regime" (one can imagine Khrulev's face at this moment - A.A.). Kalinin, taking his time, looked at all the samples and said: "You see, the old regime is remembered by you and me, but young people do not remember it. And if this form is liked by the young can be useful in the war against fascism, then this form should be accepted." Stalin was quick to respond, exclaiming: "And you, Comrade Kalinin, are for the old regime?" (it was time for Kalinin's face to stretch out-A.A.). Kalinin reiterated that he was not for the old regime, but for the benefit the form could bring to the fight against the enemy. Probably our insistence and support of M. I. Kalinin had an effect this time, and the decision to introduce shoulder straps was made."

I hope the reader has paid attention to the virtuosity with which Stalin shifted responsibility for the delicate decision made by him alone to Khrulev and Kalinin. Such behavior is typical of the 3rd Will.

Irresponsibility is a characteristic feature of the 3rd Will; it is more difficult for it than for anyone else to take responsibility, to keep one's word, to be punctual, etc. And this is understandable. The "philistine" is too busy with himself, with his own illnesses and wounds, with his fears of an imaginably hostile world, to think seriously about others and to be responsible for himself.

The "philistine" to the grave is a child: dependent, irresponsible, selfish, capricious, wicked. "My father is a big child, which I acquired when I was very young," Dumas the son bitterly quipped. However, in the question of the age of the "burgher" should make some clarification. A child in the true sense of the word would be better described as the possessor of the 4th Will (to be discussed later), while the upper two Wills are completely mature people. The 3rd Will is an intermediate state between adulthood and childhood, a "bourgeois" being an adolescent, and only in the context of this special age in a person's life, do the specific features of the psychology of the 3rd Will become clear. Khodasevich, recalling Gumilev, wrote: "He was surprisingly young at heart, and perhaps even in mind. He always seemed like a child to me. There was something childish in his barber haircut head, in his bearing, rather gymnastic than military. The same childishness was apparent in his fascination with Africa, war, and, finally, in the contrived importance which so astonished me when I first met him and which suddenly slipped away until he remembered and put it back on again. He liked to pretend to be an adult, as all children do. He loved to play the "maître," the literary authority of his "humiliates," that is, little poets and poetesses around him. The poetic children loved him very much. Sometimes, after his lectures on poetics, he would play tag with them - in the most literal, not figurative sense of the word. I saw this twice. Gumilev was then like a glorious fifth-grader who was playing around with the preparations. It was funny to see how in half an hour after that he, playing in the big one,

was having a sedate conversation with AF Kony - and Kony was quite inferior to him in the importance of treatment."

* * *

If a "bourgeois" has Physics at the top, he is usually an unfaithful lover and spouse. And it is not the mighty power of high physics that is to blame. When the number of sexual contacts exceeds several dozens, it becomes clear that it is not peculiarities of physiology (not rich in variants) that drive the Don Juan from one partner to another. The source of a "bourgeois's" tendency to drag is in his attempt to assert himself personally through strong physics, to convince himself and others of the significance of his "self" through the quantity and quality of his love affairs.

"Quality" should not be understood as the partner's beauty, youth, or wealth (although they play a role as well); "quality" for the 3rd Will is primarily the partner's social status or some form of grace to which he is a partaker. For example, Pushkin seduced an old Greek woman only because, according to tradition, she was kissed by Byron, and put her name on his list of donjuanians. John F. Kennedy tried the same thing with sixty-year-old Marlene Dietrich. Vasily Rozanov married a much older former lover of his, Dostoevsky. And Yesenin could boast a whole fan of socially significant and grace-marked women: Chaliapin's daughter, Isadora Duncan, Tolstoy's granddaughter.

Although it cannot be said that the "bourgeois's" donjouanism brings him only dividends. Yesenin, who came to America with Isadora Duncan and found his picture on the front pages of American newspapers, was furious when it turned out that the newspapers did not announce the arrival of the great Russian poet, but Duncan's husband.

Ambition in general terribly muddies the purity of the sexual sensations experienced by the 3rd Will. It is not so much to please the flesh as to dominate and dominate often not over the person it holds in its arms, but over the person it is presenting.

The subject of the love and marriage predilections of the "bourgeois" is boundless. Therefore, I will note only one more trait of his psychology - the tendency to mesalliance. Neither in love nor in marriage does the 3rd Will look for an equal. It either gives preference, in the Balzacian manner, to one who is older, richer, more noble, or vice versa - to one who is younger, poorer, more plebeian (Nabokov's "nymphets"). And the mechanism of such multidirectional preferences is quite transparent. Infantilism and despotism easily and naturally coexist in the soul of a "petty bourgeois", which is why, whichever way the mesalliance is directed, it always responds to one or another need of the Third Will. The main thing is that it should be a mesalliance.

* * *

The 3rd Will in principle does not admit its mistakes and faults. Although in 90 cases out of 100 it is it that is guilty and makes a mistake. At the same time, this does not mean that deep down, the "petty bourgeois" is not aware of the true state of affairs. On the contrary. He is aware of it and very well, but admitting his mistakes and faults is impossible for

him, because for a "petty bourgeois" conscience it is tantamount to admitting his nothingness. Although it is precisely this kind of locking up and gives away his weakness. One of the women close to Gumilev wrote: "He was pretty stubborn, which is also rather indicative of his weak will. No matter how many stubborn people I met, they were all weak-willed.

Gumilev admitted: "I know that I am wrong, but it is difficult for me to admit it to someone else. I cannot. Nor can I ask for forgiveness."

Returning to the subject of combining the 3rd Will with the higher Physic, we would like to note that in this case locking is combined with attempts to make amends in the form of gifts. For example, one of Gogol's acquaintances, being in Rome, once had a strong argument with him, and then this happened: "...after a few thoughtful steps, Gogol ran up to the first lemonade stand in the street, of which there are many in Rome, chose two oranges and, coming back to us, gave me one of them with a serious expression. This orange touched me: it was made, so to speak, a formula by which Gogol expressed the inner need for some kind of concession and reconciliation. Another example: Byron, "once, throwing a stone at a sparrow, he bruised a little girl. She cried. They tried to get him to ask his forgiveness. He closed himself in stubborn anger.

"-Do you know that I am Byron's son? - he told her.

An hour later he brought his victim candy."

I can confirm the system in the behavior of Gogol and Byron with my personal experience. One of my acquaintances, whose 3rd Will was combined with the 1st Physics, once again insulted her roommate and immediately after the quarrel ran to buy a shirt in a neighboring store. She did not apologize even once, but in time her roommate accumulated an impressive pile of shirts.

* * *

Everything is double in the soul of the "petty bourgeois. His attitude to fame is also twofold. On the one hand, he, foolishly, likes to repeat after Pushkin that fame - just a bright patch on a miserable t-shirt, but on the other hand - no one feels a more ardent thirst for fame as the 3rd Will. And if it happens to become famous, it drinks the cup of glory without burping and without being satiated. But here's the paradox: no matter how popular and loud praise, it always listens to "philistine" not without a secret bitterness, and the wine of fame for him is always a little poisoned. Firstly, it constantly seems that it is not enough, and the sound of "hallelujah" could be forced a little more. Secondly, deep down, the "burgher" himself does not believe that he is worthy of such recognition, and this, too, adds a significant spoonful of tar to the triumphant barrel of honey. Finally, in the most powerful, concordant and numerous chorus of praise there is always one true or imaginary detractor - and that is enough - with his single sour expression, he will poison the "petit bourgeois"'s holiday all at once. As Akhmatova very accurately said about Stalin, that he "listened to 'hooray' all day long and that he was a coryphaeus and generalissimo, and how he was loved, and in the evening some Frenchman on the radio says about him: "That moustache..." - and you start all over again."

The 3rd Will adores titles, titles, diplomas, awards. It seems to her that they are the shell that will protect her weak, sick, mental body, that they are the certificates that will certify the fullness of her being, felt from within as inferior (Brezhnev).

The Roman historian wrote of Tiberius who had just ascended the throne: "Although he did not hesitate to assume the supreme power, he immediately decided to use it, although he had already surrounded himself with armed men. A Roman historian wrote of the newly ascended the throne of Tiberius: "Although the supreme power he did not hesitate to immediately decide and take and use, although he surrounded himself with armed guards, the pledge and the sign of domination, yet in words he long refused to power, playing the most shameless comedy. Of course, the Romans would have been in serious trouble if they had refused to participate in this comedy and offered the title of emperor to someone else. But Tiberius had to be understood, too - he couldn't help but break down.

If, however, the fate of the "petty bourgeois" is to be rewarded with titles, then it happens that the itch of vanity leads him to direct forgery. The example of Balzac, who arbitrarily attached to his plebeian surname the noble particle "de", is well known. In comparison, Goethe, with his 2nd Will, having deservedly received nobility, for a long time signed simply Goethe, without the aristocratic particle "von".

* * *

The "philistine" is a man of the crowd. He lacks self-confidence to lead people's movements, he lacks independence to stand on the sidelines, so the "philistine" usually makes up the thickest of social movements, the middle part of them. He is the ballast of society, which is incredibly difficult to move, and once moved, it is impossible to stop.

The 3rd Will loves the crowd in its own way and feels comfortable in it at first. Finding itself among its own kind, it thinks that the sum of the weak is able to become a great force, which is only partly true. Besides, having entrusted her diseased spirit in the crowd to something stronger and more considerable than herself, the 3rd Will begins to breathe easily, thinking that she has thereby freed herself from the burdensome responsibility for herself and others, from the painful necessity of daily independent choice.

However, the "philistine" would not be himself if, feeling the comfort of the dissolution of his vulnerable personality into the crowd, he were not simultaneously secretly rebelling against it and striving to break free. The loss of individuality is the dream and pain of the 3rd Will. The writer Zamyatin, under the impression of the 1905 revolution, wrote to his fiancée, "But it is almost happiness! (...) When something picks you up, like a wave, rushes you somewhere, and you no longer have a will of your own - how wonderful! You do not know this feeling? Haven't you ever been swimming in the surf?" Fifteen years later, the same Zamyatin published his prophetic novel-antiutopia "We", imbued with a savage horror of the coming socialist impersonality.

* * *

Let's give credit where credit is due, the "burgher" is as talented as anyone. And there are at least three reasons for this. First, the position of other functions on the steps of the psychic hierarchy gives him power and freedom in any kind of creativity. A "petty bourgeois" has a weak motor of creativity - the Will, but the whole set of instruments for various operations: intellectual, artistic, material - is quite free. Secondly, the subtlety of the psychic organization of the 3rd Will gives a refined and refined touch to this type of creativity. Thirdly, the 3rd Will is talented already because it is secretly, but frantically and insatiably ambitious. Finally, and most importantly, the dislike of oneself and of others, the critical view of the world that is typical of the "philistine" is an ideal creative incentive that makes it possible to find flaws, deficiencies, and opportunities for change where other Wills, who have a more complacent view of the world, simply do not see them.

It may seem that there is a certain contradiction in the statement about the possibility of talent in the absence of a strong personality core. But in fact there is no contradiction here. Berdyaev wrote: "Andrei Bely, an exceptionally bright, original and creative individual, used to say about himself that he had no personality, no 'T'. Sometimes it seemed that he was proud of it. This only confirmed for me the difference between individuality and personality. Quite rightly noted. The brilliance of an individual is not yet a guarantee of a strong personality, and mighty talent is not necessarily identical with the mighty "I." Or, as Faina Ranevskaya brilliantly put it, "Talent, like a pimple, can also pop up on your ass."

At the same time, there is also a limit to the talent of the "bourgeois", invisibly delineated by his own 3rd Will. For all the vagueness of the panegyric terminology, which is unable to separate talent from talent and talent from genius, we can say with confidence that the path of genius and genuine revelation is not a "bourgeois" path. The fact is that the work of the Third Will is inevitably accompanied by an element of "popsoivism," conjuncture, i.e. an inner openness to the opinion of the crowd, an element of fear of social evaluation, hanging on his hands as a weight. No matter how radical in art, science, or industry a "petty bourgeois" looks, he always knows that he is not alone, but in a certain crowd and fulfills a certain social order. The inability to achieve genuine independence is the misfortune of the 3rd Will, not only in everyday life, but also in creativity, the fruits of which in their highest manifestations are "pop", however resplendent.

* * *

The external aspect of the mental image of the 3rd Will is well conveyed in one description of Gogol, made by his contemporary: "There was something unfree, compressed, crumpled into a fist in the whole figure. No scope, nothing open anywhere, not in any movement, not in any look." The inner unfreedom and crumpled spirit, characteristic of the 3rd Will, manifested in mimicry and plastique, are very typical indeed.

But especially noticeable is the gaze; it is, as in all other cases, the most striking external sign of the 3rd Will. More precisely, its elusiveness. The degree of furtiveness of the gaze in the 3rd Will is different, depending on the depth of the Third Will's ulcer. The "running eyes" often described in the literature are quite rare, and are a sign of the extreme degree of weakness of the Will. More often a "bourgeois" is such an expression of the eyes, as described by Gorky, talking about Yesenin: "From the curly, toy boy remained only very clear eyes, and they seem to have burned out in some too bright sun. Their restless gaze

slid over people's faces erratically, then defiantly and disdainfully, then, suddenly, uncertainly, embarrassed and distrustful. It seemed to me that in general he was unfriendly toward people." I should add that typical of the 3rd Will is an unsteady, elusive, as it were, floating look. This is the first time that you have seen a person, and the second time that you have seen someone else, and you cannot tell what color his eyes are.

The 3rd Will knows that there is something wrong with her eyes and sometimes resorts to all sorts of disguises. Most often, black glasses are used in such cases. This practice is an old one, established back in the days when black glasses were worn only by the blind. About one gifted émigré poet it was said: "...he was an excellent orator. And this despite his extremely unprofitable appearance - the appearance of a blind man. Hence the black glasses concealing his seemingly blind eyes. He can see perfectly well, though. He himself must have been aware of the strange impression his eyes made and never took off his black glasses.

After all, the eyes are the mirror of the soul. But his eyes were hardly the mirror of the soul. They were strange, unpleasant eyes, which made a repulsive impression on many people. They did not reflect his soul - the soul of a poet.

His black glasses were sometimes useful, though. In the subway and on buses, even in busy hours, there was always a seat for him: give way to the blind.

There are more interesting inventions than black glasses. Stalin found an almost ingenious way out. The pipe. Constantly manipulating the pipe: then stuffing it, then cleaning it, then lighting it, constantly extinguished - he could as much as you want to mow his eyes - the elusiveness of the look in this case always looked quite natural.

Another reliable external sign of the 3rd Will is the sour, aloof, angry expression that the "petty bourgeois" most often puts on his face. Which, one must admit, greatly spoils the usually attractive features of "bourgeois" faces. The Marquis de Custine accurately described this expression on the handsome face of Nicholas I. He reported: "When you first look at the sovereign, you cannot help but notice a characteristic feature of his face - some restless sternness. Physiognomists do not unreasonably assert that hardness of heart harms the beauty of the face."

The vocabulary of the 3rd Will, apparently by analogy with the inner state, has a markedly lowered character; it is rich in slang, blattic words, and simple swear words. In general, the 3rd Will has a special talent for scolding, insulting, and boorish. No one is as gifted at verbal abuse as a "bourgeois. I knew an Orthodox metropolitan who would knock out almost strangers with a single phrase. The 3rd Will is the thinnest mental membrane, and the combination of this membrane with a predilection for low, profane, merciless words makes the "bourgeois" a terrible opponent in verbal battles.

A very reliable sign of the 3rd Will can be considered the markedly reduced forms of address of the "petty bourgeois" to his relatives. Of course, these forms differ depending on the language and people. As for Russian "bourgeois" people, they like to address their

relatives either by the reduced form of the name (Ninka, Petka, etc.), or by the surname (remember Chekhov's textbook hopscotch - "Dymov!").

* * *

In terms of his tastes, the "philistine" (pardon the tautology) is a classic philistine. His inherent dependence on other people's opinions, on his environment, on society, makes the "philistine" a hostage to fashion, and moreover, to fashion in its most banal, most impersonal form. And this hostage does not only not weigh on the Third Will, but can sometimes give it a genuine satisfaction. I remember how my friend's first impressions of the army struck me when he said, almost excitedly, "Can you imagine? I'm bald, and everybody around me is bald. I'm in green, and everybody's in green. I loved it so much..." The most striking thing is that I heard this confession from the lips of a professional artist.

Or here is another extremely expressive confession made in an interview with the famous pop singer George Michael. When asked why the furniture in his house is so boring, he replied, "I prefer boring furniture. Who knows, maybe next to some priceless piece of furniture I would look completely mediocre. There must be no more character in my furniture than in myself." A real revelation, a staggeringly full, capacious, and accurate statement of the 3rd Will's tastes. As, indeed, tastes in general. Let us recall that in the house of Gogol's Sobakevich, the furniture screamed: "And me! And I am Sobakevich!" Our tastes are us in our material expression, and everything our hand touches bears the imprint of our psyche.

"Serf" (4th Will)

The "serfs" are the nicest people in the world. It's easy to breathe in their field like no other. And not without reason. For example, the soul of the 1st Will meets any idle visitor at the far approaches with concrete bollards of its "I". The 2nd Will is more accessible, but penetration into its rubbery essence also has vague but clearly perceptible borders. The soul field of the 3rd Will is blurred and makes itself known not so much by hardness as by a nervous electricity spilled in the air.

A different thing, the 4th Will, its field can be passed through, enter on a tank - there will be no resistance. That is why it is so easy to breathe in the field of the "serf" - it is discharged. Darwin with his 4th Will was recalled as follows: "Whoever was ever lucky enough to sit with him at one table ... in a close circle of good friends, and especially if his neighbor was a nice woman, he would not soon forget it. Everyone felt easy and simple with him, he chatted, laughed merrily, teased, but not offensively, but only amusingly and even flatteringly; moreover, he always treated his guest respectfully and always tried to involve a new person in a common conversation.

Outwardly, the 4th Will is practically no different from the 2nd Will. It is characterized by the same naturalness and simplicity of behavior, respectful and delicate treatment, serenity and openness of gaze. In fact, I myself do not undertake to distinguish between a "serf" and a "nobleman" at first glance acquaintance. However, as already mentioned, for

all their essential difference, the Second and Fourth Functions are almost indistinguishable externally.

* * *

The picture of the universe living in the soul of the 4th Will practically repeats the corresponding picture of the 1st Will, i.e. the cosmos is a hierarchy consisting of two levels: the upper and the lower. The difference is that the "serf" does not automatically place himself on the upper level, like a "king", but on its lower one, assigning himself the role of a shepherd, a subordinate, a child.

Hence, one of the most characteristic features of the 4th Will is its untimely childishness, which, due to its sincerity and simplicity, one does not want to call infantilism. In principle, the 3rd Will is also infantile, but it tries to masquerade as an adult and thus repulses. The 4th Will does not disguise itself, and so is very agreeable to itself, although there are features in its behavior which cause bewilderment and consternation. For example, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, having got under a blanket to Madame de Varence, even there continued to call her "mummy," though the character of the relationship obviously contradicted such treatment.

Unlimited confessionality is the Achilles' heel and the most characteristic of the "serf. Tolstoy suffered for a long time from the fact that he could not write with the sincerity with which Rousseau's Confessions was written. And he suffered in vain. Tolstoy, with his 1st Will, simply was not allowed to write with the kind of reckless frankness that only the 4th Will is capable of. And it is easily given to confession because the "serf" has no sense of personal self-preservation, not dear to the Will - the pillar of the personality, the blow on which could seriously shock his being. For example, the Emperor Claudius was able to say publicly in court about one of the witnesses: "She was my mother's ward, from the maids, but she always respected me as a master, - I say this because in my house even now some do not recognize me as a master, "- and not to be embarrassed at all. And not to be embarrassed because the publicity was given to what he, the emperor, already knew: he is not a person and, most importantly, not a person, not at all concerned about his impersonality.

Low self-esteem is an incomparable, priceless gift. It makes the life of a "serf" as easy and unclouded as anyone else's, and the psyche so stable that even time, which inevitably leaves notches on our soul, unscrewing the psychic mechanism, has no power over the 4th Will. When there is no solid basis of personality, flogging is an indispensable companion of life, is no more effective than a swamp flogging.

* * *

The family is the first social unit to which the "serf" entrusts his will once and for all. His age and social status have no effect on his place in the family, he feels like a child of his parents for the rest of his life and does not even try to get on the same footing with them over time. Two of my buddies, men who have already lived and turned gray, still hide

their addiction to tobacco from their parents, as if nothing had changed since the happy childhood days when they could be punished for finding cigarettes in their pockets.

Next comes the school. Here the "serf" stands out for his exemplary behavior. Young Seryozha Kostrikov (Kirov) shocked the teachers with his "exemplary behavior, even unparalleled," and his classmates remembered him by saying "Thank you" right and left, for which he was nicknamed "Thank you".

The example of Kirov, now an adult, clearly shows the danger to the "serf" that lurks in his submissiveness, childishness, and sincerity. When a group of delegates to the 12th Congress of the CPSU came to Kirov and offered him the post of head of the party, he not only flatly refused, but also reported this visit to Stalin, thus signing his and their death warrant.

Only the 4th Will could behave this way, and no other. If, for example, the 1st Will were approached with a proposal for supreme power, it would, without hesitation, respond: "Of course, it is high time! - and would rush into action. The 2nd Will would not show enthusiasm for this, but would agree, conditioning its agreement on the will of the majority of the congress. The 3rd Will refused, but would not inform Stalin about the proposal, but would begin a secret probe for the overthrow of the tyrant in the future. Kirov went his own way, the way of the 4th Will, and we can say that his death was psychotypically predetermined.

Kirov's example is not yet the limit of the suicidal servile psychology of the 4th Will. It happens that the servility of the "serfs" acquires directly pathological forms, leading them to the disease called in psychiatry "lunacy in tandem. At the beginning of XIX century in Berlin, was recorded the following case: "The patient - an elderly woman, convinced that a high-ranking official is going to marry her, gave this idea to her husband, both were placed in the Charité, where the patient soon died, and her husband was completely recovered. Doctors at first tried to explain this case by some kind of "mental infection," but the geography of the phenomenon soon put an end to speculation. There appeared a monograph by Régis, "Madness in Two," in which it was said in other words about the phenomenon now known to us, the subject of conversation - the 4th Will, which in the example given, of course, was in the husband and which, standing above the Will of the wife, drove him to insanity.

The 4th Will is a zombie, but a living, warm one, unlike the classic zombie - a walking dead man. Therefore, the problem of zombification lies not in the field of psychotronic weapons, it is useless, and experiments of special services have shown that the psyche can be broken, but it cannot be manipulated. Almost all attempts to manipulate the human brain remind me of attempts to change files on a hard disk with a crowbar (those who know computers know what this is). Modern knowledge is even more unprepared for zombification, because even the place where the Will is located in the brain is not known, let alone how to influence it (the attempts of Nazi doctors to find some "crystals of will" in the pituitary gland were a failure). This does not mean that zombies are impossible,

they are possible, there are many of them, but it is another matter that distinguishing them from the social mass requires serious psychological work and subtle intuition.

* * *

The 4th Will is the most faithful spouse, the most loyal subordinate. But here is the paradox, it is the "serf" who often looks from the outside as a terrible rebel and frontee. For example, "soft as wax" Bukharin was considered almost a chronic and almost official head of opposition to Lenin, Molotov was the only one who openly argued with Stalin, and this despite the fact that both had the 4th Will. I suggest that this phenomenon can be explained in two ways. On the one hand, in contrast to the "bourgeois" - a sly slave, searching and highly sensitive to the needs of the master, the 4th Will - a slave without guile, serving with soldierly straightforwardness, insensitive to the master, often continuing to move the same course after the boss has already made a turn. Hence the scissor-like behavior of rebellion.

On the other hand, as Thomas Mann said, "Voluntary servitude is freedom. This aphorism, more than any other, applies to the 4th Will. Voluntary and sincere slavery entitles it to the free, direct expression of the rest, above functions, which might well be taken as rebellion, if it had any consequences.

One can only take the revolt of the "serf" seriously by looking at it from afar. It was not for nothing that Trotsky called Bukharin's front a "kneeling rebellion. The inner freedom in expressing one's opinion in the 4th Will has nothing to do with the freedom of decision-making. As Rousseau complained in connection with family squabbles: "To get rid of all this fuss would require firmness, of which I was incapable. I was able to shout, but not to act; I was left to speak, but acted in my own way."

The life of the Fourth Will is the life of a splinter thrown into the water. The "serf" is not his own master, his fate is entirely ruled by fate and inertia. This is why once, when Molotov's interlocutor said that he became a Communist as a result of some consistent and conscious choice, Molotov simply replied: "The wind blew him over, and so he did. The wind carried him, carried him, and carried him. And then he went into exile - there was nowhere to go.

In addition to simplicity, openness, selflessness, the 4th Will is distinguished by a sincere unwillingness to take serious responsibility. The Beatles' biographer spoke of Ringo as follows: "He's open, friendly, and probably the likeliest of all the Beatles. He doesn't concentrate on himself at all. The biographer goes on to make a characteristic statement about Stahr. Acknowledging his success in the movie "Evening of a Hard Day," Ringo said: "After this movie I have received many offers, all for the leading roles. Once I almost agreed to play the role of Watson in the movie about Sherlock Holmes, but then I decided that this is still too serious for me. I do not want to take up the role, which would fall on me the main burden. At least not yet. Can you imagine what a horror it would be to fail? But I'd be all right in small parts. After all, then the responsibility is not on me." Mind you, the role of Watson is certainly not that of Julien Sorel or Raskolnikov, and yet...

Ringo's desire to play secondary roles, as in a drop of water, reflects the psychology of the 4th Will, voluntarily condemning himself to secondary roles, performance, obscurity.

"I think no human being has ever been less naturally vain than I am..." wrote Rousseau, thus noting another important trait of the psyche of the 4th Will: the sincere absence of ambition. And, interestingly enough, history usually goes the way of the "serf" in this matter, making him a rare and occasional guest on the starry firmament of humanity.

The 4th Will itself is unspeakably surprised to find itself at the top of the social pyramid or any serious structure. Darwin wrote quite sincerely: "It is truly astonishing that a man of such humble ability as myself could, in a number of essential questions, exert a considerable influence on the views of men of science. Darwin's bewilderment one wishes to share. To do arbitrary things over something already established, i.e., to actually create, to change something in oneself and others, is possible only by possessing a corresponding more or less solid instrument, the Will. And when it is made of foam rubber, manifestation of initiative, individuality, independence, innovativeness really looks almost like a miracle.

* * *

The different positions of the Will in different peoples will be discussed separately in connection with specific psychotypes. But the 4th Will itself can be fairly confidently attributed to a great number of peoples living in different parts of the world. What they have in common is that these peoples were pushed to the periphery of the oikumene: the far north, the far south, distant islands, tundra, deserts, jungles, marshes, etc. They found themselves in such perilous places, we think, due to mass obedience, because of the 4th Will. The anecdotes about the Chukcha, which is a creature of easy-going, timid, naive and trusting nature, loved by the Russian people, may serve as a weighty argument in favor of such an assumption.

* * *

Concluding at this point the presentation of the principles of psychosophy, all that remains is to list the mental types that it engendered and whose detailed description the reader will find in the next section. The list of psychotypes looks as follows:

TOLSTOY SOCRATES AKHMATOVA

- 1) WILL 1) WILL 1) WILL
- 2) EMOTION 2) LOGIC 2) EMOTION
- 3) PHYSICS 3) EMOTION 3) LOGIC
- 4) LOGIC 4) PHYSICS 4) PHYSICS

TVARDOVSKY NAPOLEON LENIN

- 1) WILL 1) WILL 1) WILL
- 2) PHYSICS 2) PHYSICS 2) LOGIC

- 3) EMOTION 3) LOGIC 3) PHYSICS
- 4) LOGIC 4) EMOTION 4) EMOTION

ARISTIPPE CHEKHOV DUMAS

- 1) PHYSICS 1) PHYSICS
- 2) LOGIC 2) WILL 2) EMOTION
- 3) WILL 3) EMOTION
- 4) EMOTION 4) LOGIC

GOETHE'S EPICURUS BORGIA

- 1) PHYSICS 1) PHYSICS
- 2) LOGIC 2) EMOTION 2) WILL
- 3) EMOTION 3) LOGIC
- 4) WILL 4) VOLITION 4) EMOTION

BUKHARIN ANDERSEN GAZALI

- 1) EMOTION 1) EMOTION
- 2) PHYSICS 2) LOGIC 2) WILL
- 3) LOGIC 3) WILL 3) LOGIC
- 4) WILL 4) PHYSICS 4) PHYSICS

PASTERNAK RUSSO PUSKIN

- 1) EMOTION 1) EMOTION
- 2) WILL 2) LOGIC 2) PHYSICS
- 3) PHYSICS 3) PHYSICS 3) WILL
- 4) LOGIC 4) WILL 4) LOGIC

BERTIER PASCAL PLATO

- 1) LOGIC 1) LOGIC
- 2) PHYSICS 2) EMOTION 2) PHYSICS
- 3) EMOTION 3) WILL
- 4) WILL 4) PHYSICS 4) EMOTION

EINSTEIN AUGUSTINE LAO TZU

- 1) LOGIC 1) LOGIC

- 2) WILL 2) EMOTION
- 3) EMOTION 3) PHYSICS 3) PHYSICS
- 4) PHYSICS 4) WILL 4) EMOTION

TYPOLOGY

(Section Two)

-
-
-
-
-
-

INTRODUCTION TO TYPOLOGY

Now, in a new round of conversation, it's time to go back to where we started, to the order of functions as such, and try to analyze its origins and consequences.

Let's start with the main point: the psychotype - the order of functions - is an inborn phenomenon, not an acquired one. This was guessed by the ancients, and one of Pythagoras' pupils attributed to his teacher the following words: "We are predisposed to virtues and vices in the same way as to health and illnesses, and it depends more on our parents and on the components of our body than on ourselves.

A person is born with a certain psychotype and dies with it. This can be seen at least from the fact that the place of the Will on the hierarchy steps can be guessed from the expression of the eyes even in infancy. Early enough, by the age of three, i.e., even before one can seriously talk about the impact of upbringing, practically the entire order of a child's functions reveals itself quite clearly. So, there is no doubt about the genetic origin of the psychotype.

Until recently, genetics was purely physiological and hardly touched psychology. Experiments with identical twins separated in childhood changed it abruptly. They showed that besides appearance a person inherits habits, predilections, tastes, down to such trifles as a tendency to wear a certain number of rings on the hand.

In the light of the experiments with identical twins it will not seem too surprising that a more capital psychological fund is coded in our genes - mental type with all the worldview, ideological, economic, aesthetic and other attitudes that follow from it. Contrary to popular opinion, a person at birth is not only not a "tabula rasa" in physiological terms, but also in psychological terms. As to the influence of family and society, they can either disharmonize the person's psyche even more, or harmonize it, but they are not able to change anything in principle in the person's psychotype (except the case of acquiring the 25th type - the type of full harmony, which will be mentioned separately).

The psychotype is best compared to the human skeleton, but the skeleton of the mental body. As you know, an anatomical skeleton is a mobile system: one can shake the pelvis, one can shake the head - one cannot change the head and pelvis in their places. The same situation is with the psychotype: its functions are mobile within its stages, can develop or degrade, but cannot fundamentally swap places.

* * *

So how is a psychotype formed?

There are three ways. The first is the simplest way when a child simply inherits the entire psychotype of one of the parents. This variant is very convenient, since mutual understanding is immediately established between the child and the parent from whom the psychotype is inherited. And the other parent, due to the birth of the child, does not have psychological problems in addition to those that already existed in his relations with his mate.

Sometimes a child completely reproduces the psychotype of one of his or her distant ancestors over the heads of his or her parents. In this case it is much more difficult for the child and parents to find mutual understanding, or rather, mutual understanding is simply never achieved, and the child remains good or bad, but under all conditions a stranger.

Apparently, this was the situation in the Chekhov family with the birth of Anton. One memoirist wrote: "... In his appearance, in his manner of holding himself there was some innate nobility, as if he was a strange and alien alien in the house of his parents, maybe nice (Chekhov's mother), but very unpretentious people. Unfortunately, Chekhov's problem of psychotypic incompatibility did not end with mutual alienation as a child. The future great writer was repeatedly whipped, which brought him not so much physical as moral suffering, and not for nothing he is credited with the words "I had no childhood as a child.

The third possible variant of formation of a psychotype is a combination of parental mental genes, which is not identical for any of the previous generations. Here are two well-known examples of such combinations.

FATHER CHILD MOTHER

("lao-tzu") ("Lenin") ("akhmatova")

1) LOGIC 1) WILL 1) WILL

2) WILL 2) LOGIC 2) EMOTION

3) PHYSICS 3) PHYSICS 3) LOGIC

4) EMOTION 4) EMOTION 4) PHYSICS

At first glance, with this combination, the child appears to be closer to the father than to the mother because of the high ranking Logic and Identity in the Third and Fourth Functions. But this is an appearance. In reality, the power of the mother's 1st Will, which has pushed the father's 1st Logic to the Second Stage, from which the new psychotype is formed, is such that it is able to divide the mutual understanding between child and parents almost equally. Although with this combination and mutual misunderstanding in this triangle will be more than enough.

Another example:

FATHER CHILD MOTHER

("napoleon") ("akhmatova") ("pasternak")

1) WILL 1) EMOTION

2) PHYSICS 2) EMOTION 2) WILL

3) LOGIC 3) LOGIC 3) PHYSICS

4) EMOTION 4) PHYSICS 4) LOGIC

In this case, the child is closer to the father than to the mother. Although it may seem that the same top and bottom in the child and mother should provide them with inner closeness. But, first, the crossing of the upper and lower functions themselves, as in this case, gives little to mutual understanding, and second, the identity with the father on such fundamental functions as the First and Third, knowingly pulls the child to the father's side.

* * *

Unfortunately, the current systems of education and pedagogical concepts, contrary to personal and world experience, pointing to the innateness of human mental reactions, the innateness of character, with manic persistence continue to impose the idea of the child as a clay from which you can mold anything you want. Not only that, but every educator considers it obligatory to impose values, ideals, tastes and goals based on his own psychotype, which is quite far from the other twenty-three types that his students may have.

Neither can educational systems that rely on a child's religious, national, class, or gender roots help the cause. Attempts to educate "authentic Christians," "true Aryans," "conscious proletarians" or "real men" are just as unsuccessful as any attempt to psychologically unify people along any other lines. As Baratynsky so accurately noted on this subject:

"Of us, I don't think any of us will say:

To the aspen - "Be an oak!" and to the oak - "Be an aspen!"

Meanwhile, how strange we are,

Meanwhile, some of us have thought of remaking the world more than once."

It does not follow from this that national or class psychology are pure fictions. They do exist. One can speak quite definitely about the psychotype of an "Englishman," "Gypsy," "Russian," or "Japanese. But since nature, thoughtlessly playing with genes, creates, not caring at all about national purity, then in English families "Russians" can be born and are born, in Gypsy families - "Japanese", etc. Therefore, despite the presence of one dominant psychotype in some nations, it is impossible in principle to achieve the psychological uniformity of a nation.

The theory of class psychology is also partly justified. Indeed, belonging to one class or another knowingly presupposes the presence of a certain commonality of outlook and behavioral position. But nature, even in this case indifferent to speculative schemes, forces the stork to carry the "bourgeois" in psychology to the proletarian family, or vice versa, the "proletarian" to the bourgeois family.

True, unlike nationality, granted once and for all, life at the class level is capable of correcting errors of genetics. A "bourgeois" of proletarian origin can reach a position that corresponds to his bourgeois inclinations, just as a "proletarian" with a bourgeois past can easily defect to the camp of those who feed off his hands. The example of Gauguin, who, as a wealthy broker, went bankrupt and, far from being upset by this circumstance, saw in it the finger of God indicating him to the trade of painter, will be sufficiently expressive here.

But the selection that life is constantly making among the social classes cannot achieve true purity in their ranks. And besides, the emergence of each new generation requires it to do this work anew each time, following the example of Sisyphus. So the concept of class psychology was, is, and will be very, very relative.

Psychology based on the religious tradition can boast even less success on the ground of selection. And in the case of Christianity and Buddhism we should, perhaps, speak of a complete collapse of their educational work. It should be noted, however, that this failure was caused by the very essence of Christianity and Buddhism.

At the time of Christ and Buddha, there were probably not many people identical or close to them by virtue of the low-ranking Physics. As time passed, the ascetic tradition requiring sexual abstinence prevailed so much that, having dispersed their supporters into monastic cells, Christianity and Buddhism reduced to a minimum the reproduction of

psychotypes close to them with low-standing Physics. In fact, they themselves depleted the genetic soil from which they grew and upon which they relied. After this, we should not be surprised at the mass godlessness of the non-Muslim world. Although, to be fair, even without the preaching of asceticism, Christianity and Buddhism, because of the hopelessness of attempts to unify human psychology according to a single, however magnificent, model, could not count on an absolute victory.

The so-called "sexual psychology" deserves a special talk. The need for such a conversation is due to the fact that humanity is still under the delusion that a person, along with external signs of sex, receives at birth certain internal qualities, character traits, necessarily linked to the sex. And very surprised to find that this is not the case. "You're a man!" - it shouts in irritation to the person who has only a hairy suit with a penis from a man, who has always felt himself not a man, but a real woman. Rather, it is not sexual psychology that exists, but there are certain psychological claims about gender. And you can't say that they are completely unfounded.

As long as life on earth existed in rather primitive forms and reproduction was limited to egg throwing and fertilization, males and females practically did not differ from each other functionally and therefore there were no psychological claims on the sex attribute. But when the reproductive process became extremely complicated and required a long period of nurturing, feeding and training the offspring, the partners' functions were divided: the male became the breadwinner and provider and the female became the guardian of the offspring and the nest. And this circumstance, in its turn, demanded differentiation of behavioral models and mental settings from the spouses.

I don't know how animals have dealt with this problem, but humans, due to the division of functions, have developed a number of certain mutual psychological claims. According to them, a "real" man must, at least, have a high Will and a low Emotion, while a "real" woman, on the contrary, must have a high Emotion and a low Will (Chekhov's "Dushechka"). A patriarchal system for the selection of the sexual elite, which has not yet been extirpated, was formed on the basis of this kind of pretension. In any case, up to now, strong-willed, cold-blooded men and submissive, sensitive women have a better chance of getting married than people with a different order of function. Probably, with time such selection would have had its effect, and the humanity's desired identity of sex and claims to it would have been achieved, if nature had not been as indifferent to the requests of human sexual psychology as to any other. Playing with genes, she often, by having "elite" parents, transmits the willful character of the father to the daughter, and the emotional character of the mother to the son, and thus in an instant lets the breeding work of the generations go to waste.

Zinaida Gipius spoke directly about her masculinity, Rousseau and Andersen were equally open about their femininity, and in both cases it was not about physiology, but about what can be called "psychological transsexualism," a phenomenon immeasurably more common than physiological transsexualism.

The essence of psychological transsexualism is in the contradiction between gender and character, "femininity" of male psyche and "masculinity" of female psyche. Of course, the contradiction between gender and character is an imaginary, conditional thing, but this does not make it easier for a psychotranssexual, and he is constantly running around, not knowing where to place himself.

Sometimes his search for himself leads him to same-sex love, sometimes it is a milder version, when a psychotranssexual prefers the society of people close to him not by gender, but by character. Byron wrote that he was pleased when women treated him "like a beloved and a little wayward sister. Bulgakov's wife remarked that her husband "felt much easier and freer to talk to women. Probably there is no other way to get rid of psycho-transsexualism as to eliminate the concepts of "real man" and "real woman" and convince mankind to accept man as he is. But how to do this, God alone knows...

* * *

As for pedagogy, as long as it is oriented toward uniformity, even if based on the best example of the human species, its cause is doomed to failure.

If we look at pedagogy through the prism of psychogenetics, then the solution to the problem will reveal itself: there must be several educational systems and schools. I will not insist that their number, according to the number of psychotypes, should correspond to twenty-four. For the initial reform of education and upbringing, it would be enough to introduce four types of schools focused primarily on the development of the Third Functions: with a rhetorical-mathematical bias for the 3rd Logic, with a theatrical-artistic bias for the 3rd Emotion, with a sports-economic bias for the 3rd Physics. As for the 3rd Will, it needs something like American "free-education" schools, i.e., schools that are fully self-governing, where children are taught to solve all their problems independently, freeing their constrained Will.

I emphasize that in this case we are not talking about already existing special schools of sports, art or science. The goal of these schools is the opposite of the goal of harmonizing the individual. By devoting themselves to the "education of talents", today's special schools, in an effort to strengthen what is already strong in the child, i.e., by pumping up the already pumped muscles of the First Function, are further distorting the curved mental body of the student from birth. The task of special schools of the future is the opposite: to develop not what is given, but what is not given, thus harmonizing and developing not talent (which, as it turns out, is a specific form of ugliness), but personality.

* * *

When one ponders the importance of order of function in human life, an image from a novel by Abe Koba always comes to mind. The hero of the novel is a man who has a cardboard refrigerator box as his clothes and home. At eye level, a narrow slit is cut into the box, through which the protagonist of the novel somehow communicates with the outside world.

This image is very suitable for conveying the state in which any man resides to date. The difference is that the box in which he inhabits has not one, but four vertically arranged, different in size and shape slots (four functions). Otherwise, it's all the same. Living in a box and looking at the world through the holes that distort reality in our own way, we naively believe that we see the world as it is. And we are very surprised when we step on the rake in front of us.

Zen Buddhists say, "Subject and object are one," i.e., the world is what we are. Indeed, each of us is our own Greenwich meridian, a line of reference drawn through ourselves, conditional but accepted as absolute. And since there are at least twenty-four such lines, even if we imagine them in the form of the crudest scheme, the chronic chaos observed in our society has been and will remain the norm of existence, not an aberration.

Every view we have of others is not true, though it is supposed to be true. It is useless to ask which portrait of Socrates is accurate: Plato or Xenophon? Which image of Christ is accurate: Matthew or John? They are all chimeras, like everything seen from the outside. But all our curvatures are specific, being a reflection of our own curvature. To correct Protagoras' somewhat famous aphorism, "Man is the measure of all things," I would like to say: ***THE MEASURE OF ALL THINGS IS THE MAN'S FUNCTION ORDER.***

The only way to bring the dispersed individuals together as galaxies, objectifying their points of view, is for each of them to achieve **harmony**. That is, to achieve a position when an individual has a cured ulcer in the Third function, there is a good result in the First, the processes of the Second and Third functions are going on. In this position, the functions work in the power given to them by nature, and **the vertical order of the functions is made a horizontal order, where all the functions are Second**, which constitutes the essence of harmony and gives man a new, perfect nature - **the nature of the 25th, unnamed type**.

The main method of harmonizing the personality will be discussed in the next section of the book, "The Syntax of Love. For now, let us examine in detail each psychotype separately.

ALEXANDER TVARDOVSKY

- 1) WILL ("king")
- 2) PHYSICS ("toiler")
- 3) EMOTION ("dry")
- 4) LOGIC ("schoolboy")

"Tvardovsky was the strangest poet,
Who hasn't written a word about love.

He mumbled to me: "You're about forty years old,
And you're waving your wiener again,"

Yevtushenko wrote, noting, unknowingly, perhaps the most characteristic feature of the Third Estate's poetry - the absence of love lyricism with an obvious lyrical gift and a general craving for the expression of passions and simply strong feelings. Tvardovsky did not let pathos into his oeuvre and could not stand it in others. He could not tolerate any overly sensitive poetry born of the First Emotion.

Tvardovsky's third emotion was wounded by anything garish, pretentious or tasteless; even the color of his socks could seriously influence his attitude toward a person. Viktor Nekrasov recalled: "Any red socks or excessively motley tie could immediately turn him against a man. As well as loose slang expressions ... In general, vulgarity in all its

manifestations, even the most refined, which also occurs as the highest form of bourgeoisie, was contraindicated to him. I saw how his interest in a man who could say in front of him, "You know, I can stand for hours in front of Raphael's Madonna," or that "the beautiful remains beautiful even in ruins, the Parthenon, for example..." was lost before his eyes.

Incidentally, the "Twardovsky's" aversion to posture, pathetics and pathos sometimes takes anecdotal forms. For example, one day Moltke, the great Prussian military strategist and "Tvardovsky" by psychotype, was riding the train along the Rhine. It was evening. The adjutant, looking out the window, crowed something to the effect that the Rhine is especially good when the sun goes down. Moltke replied, with barely a glance at the river, and muttered: "A minor obstacle..."

This phrase, almost insulting to the German heart, of Moltke the "Tvardovsky," is very clearly deduced and justified from Tvardovsky's work:

"Yes, there are words that burn like flames,

That shine far and deep to the bottom,

But their substitution with words

Treason may be equal.

That's why, native land,

Though I am languishing in their excess,

I may be stingy in my application.

My words to your deeds.

Called by the love of a son

To put your labors into words,

I'm like blasphemies - rednecks.

Beware, as a calamity."

Alcohol is one of the few means of softening the stony exterior of "Tvardovsky's" soul, for a short time, pulling the chainmail off his bruised sensibility. "Tsars" in general rarely and moderately drink, Tvardovsky drank often and inordinately, so the memoirs have preserved pictures depicting him in a relaxed state and... after relaxing. Here is one of them: "There were several meetings in a bar on Pushkinskaya... Tvardovsky was sitting alone. In front of him there was vodka in a glass, a mug of beer and a plate with a slice of red fish. He had not touched the fish all evening.

If in the editorial office Alexander Trifonovich was correct and dry with me, and I did not feel his true attitude, now suddenly I felt some involuntary movement of warmth, interest in myself...

It was just the two of us...

He talked about how his father was saying goodbye, how he was being taken away...

And there was an open pain in his voice that struck me, because he was older than I was, and the separation from my father had happened long ago, twenty years ago, but I'd been thinking about my father for thirteen years, but I was much calmer. There was no pain, the wound had withered and hardened. *And he was crying.*

...

What was he crying about? About his irretrievable childhood? The fate of the old man he loved? Or about his own fate, so strikingly different from that of his father? From a young age, fame, recognition, awards, and all for having sung in talented poetry about the very thing that had ruined his father. He cried without noticing me, and probably forgot that I was sitting next to him...

The next day I came to the "New World" for some reason, sat in the lounge and talked to Zinaida Nikolayevna. It was the beginning of the day. Tvardovsky came in, wearing a fur coat, stern and scowling. He muttered "Good afternoon" to Zinaida Nikolaevna, passed me as if he were passing a chair, looked at me point-blank, not seeing me. I mumbled "Hello", and so remained with his mouth open... Why did I need after a wonderful evening to get in his face in the "New World"?

It all reminded me of something. I didn't guess right away - Chaplin's millionaire!"

The parallel with the millionaire in Chaplin's famous film is absolutely correct. Alcohol for the 3rd Emotion is an excellent means of emotional release. But, as it always happens with alcohol, along with the end of its effect, the end of feelings, and the gates of the soul, previously opened wide with a hangover, are locked even more tightly.

At the same time, it was the third emotion that made Tvardovsky a great poet. Only it could describe with such piercing simplicity and unsophisticated simplicity the fate of the soldier, the terrible everyday life of war, to describe quietly, without gusto, and from that even more terrible and expressive. Later, when Tvardovsky became editor-in-chief of Novy Mir, simplicity, artlessness and "aimlessness" became fundamental to the aesthetic of the magazine, so that one of his deputies could openly state: "For me, there is nothing more hateful than style."

But if Tvardovsky fell in love with someone's work, he fell in love with no memory: "...he said that one must love literature jealously and with partiality. "In our youth we solved literary disputes how? I remember, in Smolensk, there was some argument in the newspaper about Leo Tolstoy, one said: "Ah, Tolstoy is shit!" - "What, Tolstoy is shit?" - Without thinking, I turn around and punch him in the teeth. You'll get it for saying that! He tumbled down the stairs..." In this short episode - all of Tvardovsky with all his order of functions. To kick Tolstoy "without thinking" in the teeth, you must necessarily have: 1st Will, 2nd Physics, 3rd Emotion and 4th Logic.

* * *

"Alas, I am far less known abroad as a poet than as the editor of a certain progressive magazine," Tvardovsky complained. In *his own system of values, politics came first (First Will) and poetry came third (Third Emotion)*, and the political bias apparent in Novyi Mir under Tvardovsky was the result of the unconscious, but not accidental, choice of the psychotype of its editor-in-chief. Yuri Trifonov wrote: "A literary friend of mine in the late Fifties always asked, when it came to any novel, story or novella: "Against what?" You tell him you're writing a story or a novella, and he's like, "Against what?" All of Novomir's best works published in recent years have answered this question very clearly."

Tvardovsky himself sometimes did not think it necessary to conceal the overtly political overtones of his literary sympathies. The same Trifonov recalled: "You will soon read a story by a young writer..." he would say, lowering his voice enigmatically, as if our ill-wishers could hear us in the garden, "Great prose, poisonous! It's like all jokes, with a smile, but it says a lot, and evil..."

And in a few words retold the funny plot of Iskander's "Goatlover.

It was there in the garden in the summer that I first heard about Mozhayev's Kuzkin. Alexander Trifonovich spoke of it lovingly and anxiously. "Satire of the first order! It's been a long time since we've had anything like that..."

For all the irony of his worldview (3rd Emotion), Tvardovsky did not like non-toxic jokes and considered them beneath his dignity to print. He had a certain sanitized (1st Will) approach to poetry, and he once greatly offended Zabolotsky with a phrase, constructed in the same way as the phrase with which he reproached Yevtushenko, - "Not a little one, but all jokes." By the way, it will be said that the "tsars" in general are too serious and dignified people to perceive humor. Laughter, jokes, humor voluntarily or involuntarily contribute to hierarchical inversion (see M. Bakhtin's works on this topic), which the proud, caste soul of the 1st Will very much dislikes. Therefore, the lack of a sense of humor is one of the most firm attributes of the "Tsar."

But let us continue. The politician suffocated the poet in Tvardovsky, and this happened even when he encountered poetry identical in its aesthetic credo. Tvardovsky did not accept Joseph Brodsky solely because the latter was apolitical, although Brodsky's muse, brought up on the same aesthetic of the Third Estate, was a kindred sister of Tvardovsky's muse.

And it was not the chair of the editor-in-chief of a fat magazine that made Tvardovsky a politician. He has always been a politician. Recall the tears of a tipsy Tvardovsky remembering his repressed father. Well, the poet's father had his own memories of his son. He and his youngest son Pavel escaped from exile, managed to get to Smolensk and find Alexander. What happened next is this: "Standing with Pavlusha, waiting. But my soul is not calm: I remember the letter from him there, to Lyalya. But I also think differently: my own son! Maybe Pavlusha will take him in. What's the boy done to him, his own brother? And he, Alexander, comes out. My God, how can it be in life, that such a meeting with his own son is so disturbing! In what confusion I looked at him: tall, slender, handsome!

But he was my son! Stands and looks at us in silence. And then not "Hello, father," but "How did you get here?" - "Shura! My son!" - I said, "It's doom for us there! Hunger, disease, outrage!" - "So you fled?" - he asks, as if in a voice that is not his own, and his gaze, which is just not his own, pressed me to the ground. I am silent - what was there to say? Even so, if only Pavlusha had not seen it. The boy was only hoping for a brotherly word, for a brotherly caress of the elder to the younger, and look how it turned out! "The only way I can help you is to take you back to where you were, for free!" - That's exactly what he said."

Of course, it is not Tvardovsky's fault that he had to make such a terrible choice between his relatives and the authorities, but the result of his choice would have been entirely to his credit had not his psychotype, his First Will, decided everything for Tvardovsky from the very beginning. **Man has neither guilt nor merit, but only nature and chance.**

The usual unevenness of attitude and behavior for the "tsar" was fully inherent in Tvardovsky. Here are a few quotes from the memoirs of Yuri Trifonov: "... when I knew Alexander Trifonovich closer, I realized what an intricate character, how naive and suspicious at the same time, how much in him simplicity, pride, arrogance and peasant good-naturedness ... was equal, shrewd and somehow correct with everyone in the same way: with prize-winners, with academicians, with tinsmiths. That evenness and democratism, which were characteristic of the editor of Novyi Mir in his relations with authors, distinguished Alexander Trifonovich in everyday life as well... He was able to suppress people who were unpleasant to him or whom he respected little, and to treat them ruthlessly: with snide remarks, and cold contempt, and even with simple scolding. Such a contradictory characterization. To what Trifonov said, it should be added that Tvardovsky's democratism was specific, "tsarist," i.e. he treated academicians and tinsmiths equally well, because he considered them inferior to himself. Tvardovsky's love also reeked of monarchism, Solzhenitsyn wrote: "A.T. called me in a letter 'the dearest person in literature' for himself, and *he loved me from his heart unselfishly, but tyrannically: as a sculptor loves his product, or even as a suzerain loves his best vassal.*"

* * *

"The Tvardovs are the best fighters in the world. The 1st Will does not expect retreat and fights to the last man. The powerful, flexible 2nd Physique easily holds a blow and cannot be broken, it can only be destroyed.

Trifonov preserved a fine description of Tvardovsky bathing with a very accurately reproduced impression of the view of the 2nd Physika: "Alexander Trifonovich was strong, healthy, his large body and large hands struck with power. Here was a man conceived for centuries! He was very fair-skinned. Only his face, neck and hands were tanned like those of a peasant. He did not move hurriedly, but somehow easily, deftly, he grasped the trunk with force, pushed off and swam slowly for a long time... on the river, from which it floated, I saw a *mature and powerful man, whose mere sight inspired me: he will win!*"

In the order of the first two functions, "Tvardovsky" coincides with "Napoleon" (see) and is the first among the fighters, better than "Napoleon", to be made by the 3rd Emotion. The calm and cold that never leave the "Tvardovsky" in the most desperate skirmish paralyses the enemy and prevents him from reading vital emotional information from his face, essential for battle tactics. The best way to compare a fighting Tvardovsky is to compare him to a bear. Any circus animal trainer will tell you right away that the most dangerous animal is the bear. It is dangerous because a bear is mostly solitary and does not need any special signals informing about its state and intentions, i.e. it is "emotionally deprived" and dry, so its attacks and consequences are almost unpredictable. Exactly the same bear can be considered a "Tvardovsky," a creature strong in mind and body and impenetrable.

The iron nerves of the 3rd Emotions of this psychotype are an excellent additional weapon both in a simple fight and in a military campaign. It is not without reason that such first-class commanders as Nelson, Moltke, Jofr.

* * *

A brief biography of the Austrian Emperor Joseph II gives an idea of what a "Twardowski" who devoted himself entirely to politics looks like. In abbreviated form it looks as follows: "The program of Joseph II was *the most consistent expression of the system of enlightened absolutism*. Joseph was one of the most active people and, sparing neither himself nor others, completely exhausted himself by work. His innumerable journeys were not triumphal strolls, but the hard work of a conscientious auditor. Going into everything himself, he believed in his calling to lead Austria out of its semi-wild state by reforms coming from above. At the same time he followed the old Austrian tradition of strengthening the external and internal power of the state, of bureaucratic centralization, of unifying the different tribes of the monarchy, of *trampling on the ancient liberties of feudal origin, and of subordinating the church to the state*. As a corrective to arbitrariness he allowed, however, public discussion of current issues in the press and open criticism of the actions of the monarch (the press law of June 11, 1781). His humanity was extended to all the disadvantaged, from the oppressed peasantry to orphans, the sick, the deaf-mute, the illegitimate. Nevertheless, Joseph was quite alien to the sentimental and somewhat abstracted complacency of the sensitive XYIII century... He did not seek the praise of fashionable writers; during his sensational trip to France (1777) he did not have a meeting with Voltaire. In 1781 he issued the famous decree of religious tolerance... Eliminating the privileges of the magnates and establishing the equality of all citizens, Joseph recognized the nobility only as a service class and allowed the influx of the gentry into the ranks of the officialdom.... His policies aroused widespread dissatisfaction... On his deathbed, in spite of severe suffering, he continued to deal with public affairs until his last day, and died February 20, 1790, **with firmness**".

Everything is recognizable in this hagiography. Consistent centralism, combined with equalizing tendencies, is the usual policy of the 1st Will. From the 2nd Physic, tremendous capacity for work and concern for the needy. Belief tolerance and unsentimentality are from the 3rd Emotion. Such, in fact, is the busybody of pure politics, the "Tvardovsky".

* * *

Usually "Tvardovsky" is a dense, stocky man with a hard, straight, mocking gaze without glitter. His face is round. He is stout, ceremonious, unflappable. The gesture is calm, stately, confident, precise. Speech is smooth, assertive, ironic, monotonous. He has a secret weakness for music, literature, art, and after drinking he does not mind to sing

something in a soft, expressionless voice. Mimicry is almost absent. The haircut is short and neat, even women rarely resort to hair coloring. "Tvardovsky" is caring, homely, handy, though not without arrogance and irony to the simple cares of life. He is very fond of nature, and pets seem to be the only creatures that have power over this aloof, rigid, cold-hearted man.

LAO-ZY

- 1) LOGIC ("dogmatic")
- 2) WILL ("nobleman")
- 3) PHYSICS ("the underdog")
- 4) EMOTION ("gawker")

When one imagines Lao Tzu and with him the type of "Lao Tzu," one sees a thin, not to say handsome man. The face is oval. The gaze is calm, absent-minded, tilted into itself, without glitter. Gesture and facial expressiveness, free. Lao Tzu prefers freedom in his clothes as well, they are usually not flashy and trivial. Her speech flows without difficulties, but is distinguished by emphasized severity of constructions and is replete with expressions, carefully indicating the consistency of her thoughts, such as "firstly, secondly, and so on". In his vocabulary he avoids expressive and expressive turns of

phrase. In matters of everyday life, economic, sports seems to be a creature almost helpless. Chadolyubov. The opposite sex is to him what the sun is to the sunflower, but not directly, but as if in impersonalities.

* * *

To be fair, it would probably be better to call this type by a double name: "Lao Tzu - Heraclitus". Both philosophers had the same order of functions, and besides they perfectly complement each other by their biographies and works. Almost nothing is known about the life of Lao-tzu, but his main work has survived. Only a few quotations have survived from the works of Heraclitus, but something resembling a biography does exist. Therefore, speaking of the "Lao Tzu" type, we will further appeal to the memory of Heraclitus as well.

It is only known about Lao-tzu that at the end of his life he left China for the West (for the ancients "west", the side of the sunset, is a common symbol of the afterlife). But at the border he was stopped by a customs officer and at his request wrote a philosophical treatise "Tao de Jing", which immortalized the name of Lao-tzu. That's pretty much it.

The story of the creation of the Tao de Jing, Lao Tzu's only work, is plausible if not true. What seems credible in it is that Lao Tzu immortalized himself as if in passing, almost forcibly. And it could be so, because a "dogmatist" is a very uncommunicative person, and having solved the most important questions for himself, he usually settles down on this, not sharing the spoils unnecessarily in the future.

Lao Tzu's 1st Logic is also indicated by the fact that the Tao de Jing is a result, not a process. The Chinese philosopher's views set forth in the treatise are not a subject for discussion, but a dogma that can either be fully accepted or fully rejected. There is no sense of dialogue in the Tao de Jing. The treatise from beginning to end was thought out by one person during the years spent in the silence of the study, very strict, very consistent and does not presuppose objections even in theory. Moreover, the treatise makes an obvious claim to universality, to the fact that its principles would be equally applicable to all elements of existence: significant, insignificant, all kinds. Is it necessary to remind the reader that the monologism and craving for universalism are the brightest of the features of the 1st Logic?

Although only fragments remain from the works of Heraclitus, the capital and unapologetic nature of his judgments is such that the Greek philosopher's identical position of Lao Tzu on the steps of the functional hierarchy raises no doubts. His intellectual arrogance, which allowed him to entitle his work "About Everything", and declare that he was self-taught, "investigated himself and learned from himself", is an extra confirmation of this. The 1st Logic is clearly indicated by the effective lapidary style of Heraclitus, which was considered "incomparable" in antiquity.

* * *

The 2nd Will of this psychotype dictated Lao Tzu and Heraclitus and the very principle of their philosophizing. **Both of them are dialectics**, i.e. all elements of being are arranged in their systems *not hierarchically vertically, but horizontally*: being is a derivative of two equal, opposing and interpenetrating principles (light and darkness, good and evil, man and woman, etc.). Every stirring constantly taking place in the universe is the fruit of just such an interpenetration, interflow, leading to the complete transformation of one element into another. This, however, changes nothing on the cosmic scales, which are invariably in equilibrium. Extra-caste is a typical feature of the "noble" psyche. The merit of Lao Tzu and Heraclitus lies only in the fact that they realized the intuitive usually horizontal perception of the world by the 2nd Will and elevated it to the cosmic principle by the 1st Logic.

In life Heraclitus also behaved quite "noble". He belonged to the royal family, but when the citizens of his native Ephesus thought of seating him on the vacant throne, the city delegation found Heraclitus playing with the children at doughnuts and completely deaf to such a tempting offer.

There are no clear indications in the literature that Lao Tzu and Heraclitus had the 3rd Physics. Perhaps, only Heraclitus' statement that "sight is a lie" directly testifies to it. Since it is to the products of the activities of the low-ranking functions that man is most distrustful and emphatically, aggressively distrustful of everything related to the Third Function. Therefore, Heraclitus' crude philippicism against vision, a bodily sense, is a weighty argument in favor of the assumption that his Physics is vulnerable.

Indirectly, it is possible to confirm the presence of the 3rd Physics in both philosophers by the method of exclusion. Emotion was clearly not the Third. Both are so free, so shameless in expressing their feelings, so prolific and easy on brilliant images in conveying dry, abstract philosophical categories, as no "dry men" could do. So the order of functions of Lao Tzu and Heraclitus is correct: 3rd Physics and 4th Emotion.

* * *

The "Lao Tzu" type is quite rare and is one of the chief purveyors of class mentalists. I think the names of Aesop, Marcus Aurelius, Shankara, Dionysius the Areopagite, Scotus Erigena, Bonaventure, Pope Sylvester II, Montaigne, Spinoza, Sakharov are able to confirm the high reputation of this psychotype.

In all his characteristics, Lao Tzu is a typical intellectual: absent-minded, low-communicative, eternally immersed in his own thoughts, though not alien to aesthetic demands. He is firm in his principles, but tolerant, kind and honest in the details. His appearance is usually unassuming, he is prudish, ascetic, neoprotivleness, pacifism, though in dreams rare brawler and roving. As any "dogmatist", "Lao-tzu" is rather heavy in communication, categorical, dark in speech and not delicate in conclusions, but since his "dogmatism" is colored by "nobility", even being in his native element of reasoning, he is not so hopelessly deaf to other people's opinions as one could expect, and in general he is intellectually completely relaxed person, if not to say - an intellectual cynic.

In everything that does not concern the delicate intellectual sphere, however, Lao Tzu is open, accessible, and tolerant. He has no aesthetics of his own (4th Emotion), so he is

omnivorous in the arts and his art criticism is non-partisan. Lao Tzu's rich soul and skinny purse are always open to his neighbor, and there is some truth in the words of those who knew Bonaventure when they said, "By Brother Bonaventure one would think that Adam had not sinned.

* * *

How the "Lao Tzu" looks and acts in the political arena can be seen in the examples of English Prime Minister Gladstone and Roman Emperor Marcus Aurelius.

The biographer of Marcus Aurelius describes him as follows: "Already from his early years he was distinguished by his seriousness...As a boy he studied philosophy intensively. When he was twelve years old, he began to dress like a philosopher, and observe the rules of abstinence; he studied in a Greek cloak, slept on the ground, and his mother hardly persuaded him to lie down on a bed covered with skins ...

He was distinguished by his pliability, and could sometimes be induced to go to watch a hunt in a circus, to appear in a theater, or to attend a spectacle. He was also engaged in painting under the direction of Diogenes. He loved fist-fighting, wrestling, running, and catching birds; he had a special inclination to play ball and to hunt. But from all these inclinations he was distracted by philosophical pursuits, which made him serious and concentrated. From this, however, his affability did not disappear... *He was honest without intransigence, humble without weakness, serious without sullenness...*

When his family asked him why he accepted the imperial adoption with such sorrow, he outlined to them the troubles of imperial power...

During the famine he issued bread from Rome to the Italian cities and in general he took care of the bread supply. He restricted in every way the spectacles at which gladiators performed...

Among other proofs of Mark's humanity the following manifestation of his solicitude deserves special mention: he ordered to put cushions for the rope dancers, after several boys fell; since then and to this day a net is stretched under the rope... (a very expressive, but long forgotten gift to the world circus from the 3rd Physique wrapped in the imperial purple - A.A.)

He addressed the people as was customary in a free state. He showed exceptional tact on all occasions when it was necessary to keep people from evil, or to induce them to good, to richly reward some, to justify - by showing leniency - others. He made bad people good and good people excellent, calmly tolerating even the ridicule of some."

An important indicator of psychotypic stability is that "Lao-tzu's" politics does not depend on the political system in which he is nurtured, but grows as if from an internal, autonomous from the environment, core of the personality. To see this, it is enough to compare the portrait of the absolute monarch Marcus Aurelius with the portrait of William

Gladstone, Prime Minister of a semi-democratic country, as England was in the Victorian era.

William Gladstone, who served repeatedly as prime minister, was one of the most remarkable figures of Queen Victoria's time, a jewel in the English political firmament. According to Gladstone's biographer, who has attempted to paint a political portrait of him, "In the literature on Gladstone one may find the opinion that in fact *he was always independent among his comrades and did not really belong to any party*. There is much truth in this. Gladstone himself once said that parties are not in themselves a good thing, that party organization is necessary and indispensable only as a sure means to a higher end. In addition to his independence with regard to questions of party organization, another important feature of Gladstone's political outlook, which is already hinted at in his speech to the electorate on October 9, 1832, is his *firm conviction that "sound general principles" must be the basis of political action in the first place. The peculiar properties of his outstanding mind, clarity and logical thinking developed in him this characteristic trait, which appeared early and never weakened*. Throughout his activity, he was constantly looking for and finding a fundamental basis for the views and actions of each moment... The more the range of phenomena available to his observation, the clearer the democratic movement of the century appeared before him, the more convincing became his legitimate demands. He could not help doubting the justice and correctness of the views which the Conservative party continued to hold. Gladstone's intrinsic desire to find the principled basis of any social movement, in connection with his highly honest views of life and demanding attitude to himself, helped him to arrive at the right answer to the question: where is truth, where is justice... *Gladstone was fundamentally a foe of war and of all violence* ... Gladstone's 1850 definition of the role of Foreign Secretary, in an argument with Lord Palmerston over Greek affairs, is highly characteristic. His task is "the preservation of the world, and one of his first duties is the strict application of that code of great principles which has been bequeathed to us by former generations of great and noble minds." He ended this speech with a fervent invitation to recognize the equality of the strong and the weak, the independence of small states, and generally to renounce political interference in the affairs of another state. *Gladstone allowed, however, and even demanded, deviations from the latter rule if humanity dictated it.*

Summarizing everything said before about Marcus Aurelius and Gladstone, we can reduce the characterization of the "Lao Tzu" engaged in the political field to one phrase: **he is a thoughtful figure, a natural democrat, a man, almost excessively compassionate, caring and peaceful** (1st Logic, 2nd Will, 3rd Physics). Which, depending on the political context, can be both a plus and a minus.

ALEXANDER DUMA

- 1) PHYSICS ("owner")
- 2) EMOTION ("actor")
- 3) WILL ("bourgeois")
- 4) LOGIC ("schoolboy")

On the street, "Dumas" can be seen from afar: burly, tall, with a lush, if not beautiful, facial sculpture. He walks along the sidewalk with lazy grace, shuffling and spreading his socks. His face has a complex owl-sour expression. His eyes from under half-lidded eyelids look haughty, but if you try to look into his eyes, you will find that there is no place to look, because his gaze is timidly fixed on the floor. In this connection one is reminded of the discrepancies in the biographies of the Emperor Nero, one of the most prominent members of the "Dumas" family: some wrote about the haughty, others about the timid look of this infamous ruler of the half-world.

So, with a haughty squint, "Dumas" moves lazily down the street. But he meets someone he knows: the most charming smile blooms on Dumas' face, his eyelids rise, revealing large, beautiful, shiny eyes, his gestures awaken energy, and a lively, joyful cackle spreads all over the street. He is usually dressed expensively, brightly, lavishly, and not to say tastefully. Hair is longer than usual, in women blatantly dyed and with an element of artistic disorder. Speech is free, expressive, and often thickly interspersed with mocking profanities.

The most distinctive feature of Dumas' appearance is some absolutely indiscriminate domination of sexuality. Although, looking through the prism of psychosophy, this phenomenon is quite explainable. Excessive 1st Physics is made even more excessive under pressure of the 3rd Will. And the addition of a powerful 2nd Emotion, a function,

as mentioned above, that grew out of sexual signaling, brings Dumas' appearance to the level of a living embodiment of sexual performance. **Sensual and sensitive in the first two functions, he is hypnotically attractive in his sexuality and knows it.**

However, the beauty of "Dumas" almost always has a certain vulgarity about it. It is enough to look at his female version, Marilyn Monroe, and his male version, Elvis Presley, to be convinced of this. And the point here is that in "Dumas" the sensuality of the 1st Physique is not ennobled by a calm faith in itself, as it is in combination with the 2nd Will ("Chekhov", "Goethe") and is not softened by childishness, as in combination with the 4th Will ("Epicure", "Borja"). Dumas' 3rd Will disfigures and vulgarizes his appearance, hypertrophying, on the one hand, the already inflated 1st Physique, and, on the other, sending outwardly, to the surface from the depths of his fractured soul, impulses of fear and constant dissatisfaction, giving his face an expression that in no way can be described as sweet. The phrase of Nero's biographer, "a face rather beautiful than pleasant," may well be applied to this type as a whole.

* * *

The flaws of the "Dumas" appearance, however, are easily concealed by the powerful, infinitely flexible 2nd Emotion. I do not know where it comes from, but fate endows him with such a talent for charm, before which it is almost impossible to resist. I knew a Russian archbishop "dumas": a pathological stingy, sadist, cynic and a rare beast, but at the same time the nicest man, endowed with some completely boundless charm. This bishop's reservoir of charm was such that, if he wished, he could pour it on a victim in buckets, paralyzing and making even people who knew him as a peeled-off man gullible, even if only for a short while.

"Dumas, more than anyone, succeeds in the role of the simple-hearted, sincere open man, the shirt-boy. This role he specially prepares and polishes in front of the mirror for standard situations (a feast, acquaintance, communication in the service sector, conflicts, etc.) and practically hits without a miss. The lion's share of his luck belongs to his talent for charm. More than once I have seen Dumas, caught red-handed or pinned to the wall, try to defuse the situation with a charming smile, like: "I'm just a sweet fool and I don't know what I'm doing," to put a positive end to the conflict.

"Dumas knows too well the power of his charm and sexual attraction not to use them for mercenary ends. That is why **the marriage scam is a universal and win-win hobby of this type**; even the not-so-poor writer who gave this type its name, Alexandre Dumas the father, was not squeamish about it.

Dumas is somewhat less fortunate when he takes on a religious swindle. Although he is able to achieve absolutely fantastic results in this field as well, there is something in the psychotype of the "Dumas" that prevents him from making his success in the field of religious fraud sustainable and long-lasting. The stories of Grigoriy Rasputin and Oshi Rajneesh are all familiar to everyone, and are a perfect illustration of the activities of a Dumas in this field.

Even in appearance, Rajneesh was very much like the bishop I knew well, described above. When he, very imposing and handsome, standing on the pulpit in a richly embroidered sakkos with his cheeks glistening with tears, spoke a vivid, spiritual, extremely deep in lexical selection, illiterate and hollow nonsense, it was simply impossible not to succumb to his magic. The hangover came later, when a sober analysis of the speeches, an acquaintance with the personality of the prelate, the domestic and intimate side of his life, led others, naively believing, to a catastrophic shaking of the foundations. In this case, the most striking thing was not the fact that a church figure of such high rank belonged to the camp of hardened sinners (it's hard to surprise a Russian person with this), but rather the impossibility of reconciling in one soul and, as it seems, equally sincerely preached, absolutely opposite ethical rules. I should add that this property of the soul of "Dumas" remains a frightening mystery not only to his parishioners, but also to the victims of his marriage fraud.

"A charming scoundrel" (Akhmatova about Tolstoy), "a pleasant hypocrite" (Ringo about McCartney) - such ambivalent characteristics are used by everyone who knows "Dumas" intimately. However, there is nothing mysterious about his bifurcation. The powerful, subtle, deeply feeling 2nd Emotion is responsible for charm and declarations of lofty intentions, and it copes with its duties magnificently, *finding ideal forms of declaring aspirations that the other functions have no intention of fulfilling at all*. To make the hardened materialist of the 1st Estate indulge in the ascetic exploits obligatory for almost every religion is an absolutely impossible thing, just as it is impossible to cure the 3rd Estate of hypocrisy, cynicism and anger. So the initial success and the collapse at the end of the religious "dumas" scam are predetermined. The bishop I knew almost simultaneously with Rajneesh shared his fate: even the Russian Synod, known for its patience, was so fed up with him that it sent the bishop to early retirement, allowing only one last chance to rob his subordinate church institution clean.

The aforementioned bishop, having a bottomless charm, at the same time impeccably mastered the technique of moral destruction of man. Sometimes not knowing much about his interlocutor, he could send a man to a knockout with one word, half-turn, and the sight of a subordinate being carried out of his office on a stretcher was almost trivial.

In this connection it is bitterly necessary to admit: **charm, talent for a compliment, for a caress is not separable from the talent for humiliation, for insult, for offense** (remember this, dear ladies, when the time comes to hang up your ears). In "Dumas," the common source of these two seemingly different talents is the combination of the 2nd Emotion and the 3rd Will. The finest membrane of the 3rd Will hears all the noises and squeaks coming from the opponent on an ultrasonic level, by the minutest details of facial expressions, gestures, eye expressions, clothes, speech, like a computer, reads his file. Whereas the 2nd Emotion perfectly senses the mood of the interlocutor and prompts absolutely precisely the appropriate words, turns of phrase, expressions for each particular case. "Dumas is a born, perfect psychologist, and it's the happiness of those around him that not a single psychological trick holds life together.

Finally, concluding the topic of Dumas' adventurism, it remains to be said that while he is almost one hundred percent successful in the marriage scam and quite successful in the religious one, he is absolutely hopeless when the adventure requires exceptional mental effort (4th Logic).

One does not have to go far to find an example - Mata Hari. God knows how the story of this unfortunate woman-dumas has been colored and painted by different snappers. And the truth is this. Once upon a time there was a cocotte, who exploited the lazy interest of European bigwigs in the Oriental exoticism (she lived

for a time on the island of Bali). But the war began, the hunters to stare at voluptuous dancing diminished, age has declared itself, and now, flabby, lazy, greedy, stupid priestess of love decided that, on the occasion of war, it is more convenient for her to rob not individual rich men, and the intelligence warring parties. After selling out to anyone who agreed to buy, she squandered the first installments, never working off a mark or a franc. And could not work, because she was accustomed to work not the way bread is earned in intelligence, which requires a certain intellectual baggage and constant mental effort. It soon took such a turn that the owners of Mata Hari preferred to see their employee rather dead than alive. The tragedy was hastened by the fact that she found herself in Paris during the days of the failed French offensive at Verdun. Shifting responsibility for the defeat to others, the French leadership of the time began to shoot foreigners in batches, and the shooting of Mata Hari was the apogee of this dirty government game. The dim-witted, aging prostitute simply fell under the campaign like a streetcar. And the self-serving vulgarity of the mass media embroidered such patterns on this canvas that they hid the true drama of the creature with the psychology of a "Dumas", who foolishly and greedily got into the millstone of the struggling state machines to his death and died there.

* * *

Perhaps the only sphere where "Dumas" is not only not dangerous, but on the contrary, useful, effective, brilliant and just at his ease is the artistic sphere and show business.

"Dumas is a born actor, and his whole order of functions is as if specially built for stage and screen. Juicy texture (1st Physique), infinite flexibility in perception and transmission of moods (2nd Emotion), subtle psychologism (3rd Will) - a perfect acting set. Is it any wonder that among the stars of the acting class, most are represented by "dumas." Sarah Bernhardt, Sophia Loren, Richard Burton, Yevgeny Yevstigneyev, Jack Nicholson are just the tip of the list of brilliant actors who have made their mark in the unfortunately undemanding environment of the spectacular arts.

In his aesthetic credo, the actor "dumas" is a spontaneous realist, a conscious or unconscious follower of Stanislavsky's system (apparently, Stanislavsky was also a "dumas"). The main requirement of this system is complete adequacy in conveying emotional states (2nd Emotion). Stanislavsky's famed (though borrowed) phrase "I don't believe it!" - is the main and only aesthetic test-check for the actor-"dumas." Let us add that although Stanislavsky's system was created as a theatrical system, it is not theatrical in its essence, because theater is fundamentally unrealistic. Stanislavski's system is a cinematic system, and apparently this is the main reason for its phenomenal success in recent decades. Cinema is fundamentally realistic, and the requirement for the impeccable adequacy of mimics, gestures, and sound is a legitimate requirement for it.

In this connection another interesting observation: historians, speaking of the emperor Nero, often mention with a smile his famous dying phrase: "What an actor dying!" However, let's not be too hasty in repeating the scholarly smirk. Nero was a "dumas," that is, a born actor, and if he did not become famous in this field, it was not his fault. It prevented the origin and specificity of the ancient theater, strictly divided into two extreme genres - tragedy and comedy. But once Nero still managed to stage a performance to his liking and in the spirit of Stanislavski: he set Rome on fire and, standing on a tower in his theatrical attire, sang "The Downfall of Troy". I think that if Stanislavski had been able to see this grandiose performance, he would surely have exclaimed, "I believe it!"

* * *

Dumas finds it more difficult than acting to be a dancer and musician. He does not do well with dancing because of a certain lethargy of the first physics. In ballet, "Dumas" can make an impression with an expressive gesture, sexual rippling of all kinds of appetizing bulges (Mata Hari, Isadora Duncan), but one cannot expect speed, lightness, coherence from his plastique. Therefore, no matter how Caligula, another "Dumas" emperor, sought fame as a dancer, he got it only together with the throne and lost it with him.

Another "Dumas" problem, common to dance and music, is the usual lack of hearing in the 1st Physics. This misfortune, however, is correctable. Chaliapin so passionately wanted to sing that he overcame his natural ailment through long exercises. Not only Chaliapin, but many other "Dumas", even as a composer (Tchaikovsky) are moving in the opera scene and often with great success. In general, for those specifically interested, I can say that the sight of a singer with a lush texture, if not a burly one, with a rich, multi-planned and emotionally complex repertoire does not allow us to state precisely, but with a high degree of probability allows us to assume that there is a "Dumas" on stage.

Recently, with the frenzied development of the video-show industry, the requirements to the performer's external data have considerably tightened, and an attractive appearance has become no less important condition for a music career than an absolute ear and a beautiful voice. This circumstance turned out to be very handy for Dumas, who had neither external data nor gravitation for music. And now this psycho-type dominates almost undividedly in the music business (Elvis Presley, Paul McCartney, Freddie Mercury, Jose Iglesias, Madonna, etc.).

Success awaits "Dumas" in the literary field as well. Here come to mind: Ovid, Byron, D. Annunzio, Dumas the father, Balzac, Maupassant, Verlaine, Esenin, A. Tolstoy.

This list probably requires a little commentary, since the inclusion of Balzac and Dumas, writers of the romantic rather than the realist school of thought, may raise objections. Anticipating such objections, I will simply remind you that the work of the 3rd Will in general has a somewhat "pop", opportunistic character, while the heyday of Balzac and Dumas' writing came during the period of undivided dominance in French literature of the Hugo school, the school of Romanticism. "Dumas" is not so strong-willed and self-confident as to row openly against the current, so both writers, thanks to the flexibility of the 2nd Emotion allowed, obediently moved along the beaten path, sabotaging the norms and precepts of romantic writing from under the table: Dumas with the poorly disguised cynicism of his works, Balzac with detailed, detailed, everyday writing, popping out like an awl from a bag. But time passed, and after the war of 1870 French "Dumas", having shaken off the ashes of romanticism, were able to speak their own language - the star of Maupassant and Verlaine rose. Therefore, if we want to know how and about what "Dumas" writes on his own, without external aesthetic and conceptual pressure, it is best to turn to the works of Maupassant and Verlaine.

Dumas' successes in his native field have no effect on the twists and turns of his character, and admirers of Dumas' talent, who are absentmindedly in love with his 2nd Emotion, are extremely disappointed when they meet the entire order of functions of this psycho-type in person. Here is a short but consistent characterization of Alexei Tolstoy, given by Akhmatova: "He was an amazingly talented and interesting writer, a charming scoundrel, a man of turbulent temperament. He is no longer there. He was capable of anything, anything; he was a monstrous anti-Semite; he was a desperate adventurer, an unreliable friend. He loved only power and vitality.

* * *

The 1st Physics of "Dumas", or rather the combination of the 1st Physics with the 3rd Will, deserves a special talk. And what is said below about "Dumas" can equally be applied to "Aristippus," which is identical with "Dumas" in these positions.

I don't want to scare anyone, but "Dumas" is an exhibitionist by nature. In his super-body, "Dumas" is more than a nudist. Nudism implies a healthy indifference in matters of nudity and is internally closer to the 2nd Physics. "Dumas, on the other hand, is inclined by his excessive 1st Physics already to stick out his carnal beginning, and since the 3rd Will of the "bourgeois" does not support him in any way, but on the contrary gives a feeling of living on a volcano, the flesh becomes the only reliable instrument for "Dumas" to interact with the world. Therefore, Dumas treats his body with more care, attention, and love than anyone else; he cherishes it, adorns it, and tans it at every opportunity he gets. Almost 80% of Playboy and Penthouse models are recruited from "dumas", and it is not only money and career that draw them to the pages of erotic magazines, but also the very possibility of mass demonstration of the best side of their nature. Naturally, the buyers of this kind of publication are mostly "Dumas".

I don't want to scare anyone, but "Dumas" is by nature a rapist. Violence is the simplest and most natural response to difficulties. I have already mentioned a harmless but expressive story from the lives of both Dumas, when, in response to the crying of his young son, Dumas the father simply took him by the scruff of the neck and threw him on the bed. This impulsive reaction of violence to the problem is quite organic to the combination of the 1st Physique and the 3rd Will.

I don't want to frighten anyone else, but "Dumas" is a sadist. The Marquis de Sade himself, who described this phenomenon, was a kind of "Dumas. However, sadism is not the same as sadism, and it can manifest itself in different ways: from a certain coarseness of love caresses to monstrous atrocity. That sadism, which exists in accordance with the criminal code, is inherent in "Dumas" of both sexes and is due to the simple sensory behemoth of the 1st Physique of this type, through his thick skin the tactile signal passes with difficulty and he needs to make great efforts to feel the echo of another's flesh.

With criminal sadism, the case is more complicated. It involves the entire order of "Dumas" functions and is almost exclusively subject to men of this type. The reasons for this exceptionality are in the terrible bifurcation of the psyche of the "Dumas" man.

Usually, "Dumas" is a tall, muscular, hairy man, a living embodiment of masculinity, behind whom other men's virtues are imagined: reliability, bravery, nobility, etc. And only "Dumas" himself knows how much his form contradicts his content and what disappointment awaits anyone who has hoped for his outward "toughness.

Sergei Dovlatov, himself a "Dumas," bitterly stated: "I realized that the greatness of the spirit does not necessarily accompany bodily power. Rather - on the contrary. Spiritual strength is often enclosed in a fragile, clumsy shell. And bodily prowess is often accompanied by inner powerlessness..."

It seems to me that physically healthy people are more likely to be spiritually blind. It is in a healthy body that moral apathy reigns more often.

I knew a man in security who was not afraid of a live bear. But any supervisor's shouting threw him off-balance.

I myself was a very healthy person. I don't know what mental weakness is..."

If we add to this the fact that nature gives a "Dumas"-man a strong emotionality, the feminine transsexual essence of this type will appear in all its ugly nakedness. A cocotte in sheriff's disguise is a "Dumas"-male, in essence a non-male...

Once Alexander I, when society talked about his resemblance to his sister, went out and after a while returned in a woman's dress, he was very pleased, and the attire suited him; the French ambassador said of the Tsar: "His most essential properties are vanity and cunning or pretense; if a woman's dress were put on him, he could represent a fine woman." Balzac hinted very transparently at his femininity in "Seraphytes," and Byron confessed in a letter that he was pleased when women treated him "like a beloved and a little wayward sister."

It is psychological transsexualism that leads the male "dumas" down the road to sadistic crimes ranging from domestic mania to "Jack the Ripper" style murder. **In this case, a woman in a man's suit rapes a woman herself.** The phenomenon of the powerless crime "dumas" is this. "The crime must seem greater when committed on a creature like yourself, and the pleasure is doubled by it," wrote the Marquis de Sade, an expert on the subject, in *The 120 Days of Sodom*.

I happened to read in the newspaper about a sex maniac sitting in a Turin prison for kidnapping and torturing women. This maniac "got permission through a lawyer to have a sex change. Although he will only really be able to do so in a few years, when he gets out of prison, he has already been released from his internal imprisonment. Vincenzo behaves like a woman: he asks to be called Terry, paints his lips and nails, wears an ankle bracelet, and prefers peach-colored jerseys."

And here's a confession from one of the biggest of the "Jack the Ripper", with 53 victims to his credit - Chekatilo: "As a child I went out more, I was friends with girls. And now I

have better contact with women as friends. With men I do not find common topics of conversation.

I was picked on by boys since childhood like a girl. And in the army, and then in prison, and on business trips. And in the end, *I am no longer conscious of which gender I belong to. Such a bifurcation.*

I like a man's courtship..."

The pioneer of literary sadism himself, the Marquis de Sade was a "dumas," and Simone de Beauvoir quite rightly remarked: "...he hated women because he saw them more as his double than as a complement, and therefore could get nothing from them. His heroines are more life and warmth than the heroes, not only for aesthetic reasons, but because they were closer to him. *Sade felt his femininity, and women caused him resentment because they were not the males that he really wanted.*

After catching another "Jack the Ripper" every time there is a question about his sanity and motives. Psychiatrists look for and do not find any pathology in his soul, Freudists torture for childhood mental traumas, but even the ultra-hateful "Dumas" often finds nothing in his childhood except resentment for his pimples (the boy-killer from the suburbs of Moscow). And the fact is that it is not schizophrenia or the Oedipus complex that pushes "Dumas" to the path of sadistic crimes, but his own psychotype, a combination of the 1st Physique and the 3rd Will, and the severity of the crimes directly depends on the degree of development of the 3rd Will. The deeper the ulcer in the Third, the more often "Dumas" has a reason to talk about his real and imaginary humiliations, undeserved insults, the unfairness of life, the bloodier will be the payment he will charge from those around him for them.

It is incomparably less common for a woman "dumas" to commit this kind of crime. The reason for this law-abiding attitude lies on the surface: women "dumas" do not suffer from gender bifurcation, the woman inside them coincides with the woman outside, and therefore gender is not a reason for resentment against the world.

The only social prohibition that the female "dumas" consistently violate is the prohibition against trading her body. Sensual and sensitive (1st Physique + 2nd Emotion) she looks made for sex and skillfully takes advantage of such an appetizing shell. However, due to vulnerability of the 3rd Will, the woman "Dumas" prefers to engage in prostitution not professionally, but amateurishly, i.e. as if by her own choice and not for despicable money, but for promotion, expensive gifts, paid vacation, etc.

Money is a sore spot for Dumas, and rarely would any other type argue with him about greed. When young Paul McCartney was told that his mother had died, he immediately asked: "What are we going to do without her money?"

Material goods together with emotional goods (religion, art, entertainment) are the two main values for Dumas. "As long as I remember Fyodor Chaliapin... there was not a day that passed without some kind of outburst. Especially when the question was about art and ... money," - wrote Korovin.

Sometimes these two passions contradict each other, lust for experience struggles with greed, and often the 2nd Emotion defeats the 1st Physics in this struggle. Dumas himself squandered in revelry almost everything righteously and unrighteously acquired. However, when there is even the tiniest chance of not paying for pleasure, "Dumas" does not pay. Even Chaliapin adored dissipation, but he usually had only three rubles in his pocket for the hour of reckoning. Balzac, on principle, went out without a penny, and all the pleasures and services he received in the street, or not paid at all, or paid by others.

* * *

The question of Dumas' political talents is a moot point. He is charming, artistic, cunning, suspicious, cruel, which is not at all unhealthy for a politician. But he is too suspicious, too and too stupidly cruel to be a good politician; he is greedy, promiscuous, short-sighted, suggestible, and impulsively deceitful. The political face of "Dumas" is easy to observe on the example of the Emperor Alexander I, not the worst representative of this kind: "...he can easily charm, but this must be feared; he is not sincere; he is a true Byzantine of the times of the decline of the Empire.... It is quite possible that he fooled me, for he is subtle, deceitful, dexterous..." (Napoleon), "He was too unstable a person to be able to impose his will. The inconstancy of his nature manifested itself so clearly that those around him have not tried to combine the features of a patricide and a saint, neurotic and a hero, an autocrat and a liberator, a prophet and a voluptuary, a cheat and an apostle ... Vanity, lethargy, weakness, and some childish craving for ambivalence clouded his mind..." (Harold Nicholson), "Conversation with him always leaves the most favorable impression, and you leave convinced that this ruler combines the fine qualities of a true knight with the traits of a great sovereign, a man of skill and energy. His reasoning was impeccable, his arguments persuasive, he spoke with the expressiveness and heat of a convinced man. And so? Ultimately, experience, the history of his life, and what I see every day, warns you: don't believe it. Numerous manifestations of weakness prove that *the energy he puts into his words is not in his character; on the other hand, this weak-hearted man can suddenly feel a surge of energy and excitement sufficient to make the most violent decisions with unpredictable consequences*" (Laferonay), "Throughout his reign he suffered from paradomania..." (Czartoryski)

The last trait noted by Chartorysky - "paradomania" - is also common to all "Dumas" politicians. "Dumas, in general, is a celebration politician. He adores an upbeat, cheerful atmosphere in which he can and does set the tone. And it does not matter how he does it: whether on a white horse at the head of a shouting "Vivat!" army, or as a toastmaster at the head of a long abundant table, the main thing is not just to reign, but **to reign heartily**.

The only trouble is that "Dumas" often alternates his holidays with executions, since cruelty and licentiousness are equally essential components of his soul. Violence is a normal, natural reaction of "Dumas's" 1st Physics to real or imaginary problems arising in the course of political struggle. The low-ranking Will and Logic do not actually control the purely impulsive cruelty of Physics; moreover, the suspicion, cowardice and anger of the 3rd Will spur the "Dumas'" propensity to violence, which does not need any prodding.

Knowing this characteristic of this type, it is easy to clarify some of the dark places of world history. For example, it is still a matter of controversy that Brezhnev, a prominent representative of the "Dumas" family, planned to kill his chief Khrushchev. The answer here can only be one - yes, undoubtedly wanted and planned, the implementation of the plan prevented many things, including his own weak character, which by the usual for the 3 Wills bifurcation both tones the cruelty of "Dumas", and suppresses it.

Dumas is not distinguished by his religious zeal, but like any emotionalist he is superstitious and the emotional side of the religious action is his own. As he feels art is absolutely his own. This is why a passion for the arts, often to the detriment of his work and authority, is one of the most typical traits of a politician "dumas". Of course, the passion of this type of art is not always as evident as in the case of Nero or Caligula. For example, few people know that Saddam Hussein is an excellent connoisseur of Arabic poetry and that Brezhnev knew several poems by Merzhkovsky, including the very long poem "Shakyamuni" by heart - but this kind of thing is an indispensable component of the life activity of even a "Dumas" immersed in politics. The Brezhnev example is especially amusing. What a surprise it would have been for Mereshkovsky and Buddha to find out whom and about whom the lazy, unloving general secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union had diligently studied a poem, who had devoted his life to destroying what Buddha and Mereshkovsky believed in and loved.

The signs described above, I think, already allow the reader to start a personal identification of politicians-dumas. A small list compiled by the author will partly help him to do this: Cleopatra, Nero, Caligula, Commodus, Caracalla, Elagabalus, Ivan the Terrible, Anna Ioannovna, Alexander I, Pope Alexander YI, Sultan Abdul-Aziz, Louis XIV and Louis XY, Charles II Stuart, Trotsky, Zinoviev, Beria, Brezhnev, Mao Tse Tung, Saddam Hussein.

* * *

Turning now to the national question, it is not without sadness to state the predominance of "Dumas" among Russians and Slavs in general. With all the consequences arising from this circumstance. Judge for yourself: "Russians are the first actors in the world... In no other society, if you don't count Polish, have I met such charming people... When Russians want to be amiable, they become charming, and you become a victim of their charms against your will, against all prejudices. At first you do not notice how you fall into their net, and later you cannot and do not want to get rid of them. It is impossible to put into words exactly what their charms are. I can only say that this mysterious "something" is innate in the Slavs" (de Custine), "...in general, I consider Russia to be a touchstone of their merits for foreigners and that he who succeeded in Russia could be sure of success in all Europe. This observation I have always considered unmistakable, for nowhere, as in Russia, are there such masters of spotting weaknesses, ridiculousnesses or shortcomings ..." (Catherine II), "All Russia is a country of some greedy and lazy people: they eat and drink an awful lot. They like to sleep during the day and snore in their sleep. They marry for the order of the house, and mistresses they have for prestige in society. They have a dog's psychology: they beat them - they squeal softly and hide in their kennels, they caress them - they lie on their back, paws up and wag their tail" (Chekhov), "This nation is untrusting, intransigent, timid, but arrogant at the same time... Russians have uncommon physical strength, but they are extremely lazy and most willingly indulge in debauchery... Russians have no concept of truthfulness and see lies only as decoration" (Palmquist), "The disease of will is epidemic in Russia: all Russian literature proves it.

Russians are incapable of persistent effort...Anarchy with its inseparable fantasy, laziness, indecision is a delight for the Russian. On the other hand, it gives him a pretext for innumerable public manifestations, in which he satisfies his love of spectacle and excitement, his living instinct for poetry and beauty...

Whichever point of view - political, mental, moral, religious - *the Russian presents a paradoxical phenomenon of excessive submission, coupled with the strongest spirit of indignation.*

The muzhik is known for his patience and fatalism, his good-naturedness and passivity, he is sometimes strikingly beautiful in his meekness and submissiveness. But here he suddenly turns to protest and rebellion. And immediately his frenzy leads him to terrible crimes and cruel revenge, to a paroxysm of criminality and savagery ... There are no excesses of which a Russian man or a Russian woman would not be capable, as soon as they decide to "assert their free personality. (Maurice Paleologue). "In the very depths of the Russian character one discovers the eternal-female, not the eternal-female, but the eternal-female" (Berdyaev).

The dominance of "Dumas" in Russia took on such a scale that, for many foreigners, Brezhnev became the living embodiment of the Russian people as a whole. Kissinger wrote: "Brezhnev was not only the general secretary of the CPSU, but truly Russian. He was a mixture of coarseness and warmth, simultaneously raw and charming, cunning and disarming... He seemed at the same time full of strength and exhausted... He tried to conceal his uncertainty by his boisterousness, his frenzy, his boisterousness, and his deeply buried sense of inadequacy by sudden bursts of harshness..."

At the same time, I would not insist on the thesis of undivided dominance of "Dumas" in the Russian psychological gene pool. Pushkin" is not much different from "Dumas", he is feminine (1st Emotion +3rd Will), but he is more industrious and kind-hearted (2nd Physics). Together they, "Dumas" and "Pushkin" constitute the essence or soul of the Russian people, so whatever they say about it, Berdyaev's words "about the eternally feminine" in the Russian character will remain the only and universal truth about it.

ALEXANDER BERTIER

- 1) LOGIC ("dogmatic")
- 2) PHYSICS ("toiler")
- 3) EMOTION ("dry")
- 4) WILL ("serf")

For those who are unfamiliar with the history of the Napoleonic wars and to whom the name of Berthier does not say anything, so I will begin with a brief biographical note: "Berthier Louis-Alexandre, French Marshal (1763 - 1815)... His royalism did not prevent him from becoming first a brigadier general in Lucner's army in 1792 and from taking an active part in the suppression of the Vendée rebellion in 1793-96. Appointed chief of staff of the Italian army in 1796, he gained the full confidence of General Bonaparte, *who appreciated his technical knowledge, accuracy in the execution of orders and rare ability to work*. For 18 years Bertier was almost never separated from Napoleon and in all campaigns until 1814 was the constant chief of staff of his army. After the peace of Campo Formio, Berthier was placed at the head of the Italian army, occupied Rome, and proclaimed a republic there (1798). Then he took part in the Egyptian expedition and, returning with Napoleon, actively helped him during the coup of 18 Brumaire, after which he was appointed Minister of War. In 1804 Berthier was promoted to marshal, and after the victories of 1805-1807 he was made duke of Neuchâtel, which was taken from Prussia, vice-connetcell and imperial prince. At the same time he married the niece of the King of Bavaria, Princess Maria. Bertier's actions during the 1809 campaign were severely criticized, but this did not prevent Napoleon from giving him a new reward in the form of the title of Prince of Wagram. Despite all Napoleon's favors, by the end of his reign Berthier had become severely disgusted with his policies. When the fall of the empire became inevitable, he was one of the first to go over to the side of the Bourbons and accompanied Louis XYII on his arrival in Paris. As a reward, he was appointed peer of

France. Napoleon, not believing in the sincerity of his royalism, tried to get him on his side again, and shortly before his departure from Elba informed him of his plans. Berthier did not answer him, but at the same time he said nothing to Louis XYII about the letter he had received. When Napoleon landed, in March 1815, on the coast of France, Berthier hesitated greatly about which side he should take, but in the end he left for Bamberg. Here, during the Russian troops' passage through Bamberg on June 1, 1815, he fell from the window of the castle in which he lived into the street and crushed to death.

Among other things, this excerpt from the encyclopedic dictionary is remarkable in that it clearly demonstrates the inability of any, the most detailed and accurate record to convey our human essence. And Bertier, real, warm, alive, did not at all resemble the Bertier that appears to us from the pages of the encyclopedia.

* * *

Napoleon, a man extremely self-confident and not always restrained with his tongue, said of Berthier that he "made an eagle out of a chicken. Napoleon, of course, was, to put it mildly, oblivious: you can make a chicken an eagle, but you can't make one. Nor did he make anything of Berthier. But the fact that Napoleon found in Berthier the perfect executor of his will is certain.

Strange, at first sight, relations developed between these two so different people. Berthier was one of the few people close to him whom the emperor in fits of irritation did not hesitate to slap. Which had no effect on the Chief of Staff, either physically or morally, since his strong, flexible 2nd Physique and his weak, flexible 4th Will were equally insensitive to beatings and humiliation. At the same time, his handiwork had no bearing on the special trust Napoleon had placed in Berthier; the Emperor constantly consulted him and seemed to recognize his intellectual superiority, which is understandable if we remember the Emperor's 3rd Logic. Indeed, the strong head of Berthier's 1st Logic helped Napoleon greatly, and it also made the chief of staff one of the first to leave the defeated master.

"What was he striving for? No one knew that. He had an astonishing capacity for work, an almost unbelievable professional staff memory, and a special talent for turning general directives from the commander into precise paragraphs of order. He was not suitable for the first and independent roles, but no one could replace him with equal success as chief of staff," the historian wrote, noting unwittingly the main parameters of the "Berthier" type: a powerful and clear 1st Logic, a tireless 2nd Physics and a 4th Will without initiative. In fact, this is exactly what Napoleon demanded of his staff when he said: "I am my own minister. I conduct my own affairs, and consequently I am strong enough to benefit from mediocre people. Honesty, lack of talkativeness, and efficiency are all that I require." And is it necessary to explain how fully Berthier met these kinds of requirements?

* * *

The perfect match for Alexander Berthier is another "Berthier" (not to be mentioned at night) - Vyacheslav Mikhailovich Molotov, Stalin's closest aide. Berthier and Molotov made a fantastic career, without even dreaming about it and without wanting to. And Berthier, like Molotov, could answer the question: how he found himself where he found himself, answer: "The wind has blown ... The wind carried him, carried him, carried him..." Indeed, she is such, this 4th Will, she is carried by the wind...

Lenin, quick on the ugly side, used to call Molotov a "stone ass. But neither he nor his successors were ever able to incriminate this perfect bureaucrat with anything other than monstrous efficiency. In recent years a vast literature has emerged that speaks frankly about the top brass of the Soviet regime; much space has been given to the figure of Molotov. It is therefore now possible to compile from memoir quotations an almost exhaustive psychological portrait of Molotov in particular, and of the "Berthier" in general.

Contemporaries recalled: "I worked a lot with Molotov. He is a very conscientious, not brilliant, but extremely efficient bureaucrat. He is very calm and composed. He was always extremely friendly and courteous to me and very nice in his personal relations with me. He was also very nice to everyone who came near him. He is polite, quite acceptable, no rudeness, no arrogance, no bloodthirstiness, no desire to humiliate or crush anyone..."

Is it really possible to make everything out of this man? Put him in the hands of Stalin, *elevate him in a system where man is a wolf to man, and he will watch indifferently as millions of people perish in cruel suffering. Put him as an ordinary official in a good human system of society, and he will work nights, seeking funds to help the starving peasants of the village of Neelovka ...*"

"By character he was a dry and sullen man. Even in such surroundings as watching some movie comedy with Stalin and the guests, he was formal, rarely smiled and allowed no 'liberties.'"

"I didn't see such bad, mean-spirited sucking up only from Molotov's side. Molotov made *an impression* on me at that time *as an independent man, independently reasoning*. He had his own judgment on one issue or another, and he spoke out and told Stalin what he thought. It was obvious that Stalin did not like it, but Molotov still insisted."

"It struck me that such a tough politician has such a lax handshake of a weak-kneed man."

"His cannonball-like head, his black mustache and smart eyes, his stone face, his dexterity of speech, and his unperturbed manner were a fitting expression of his qualities and dexterity..."

His smile of Siberian winter, his carefully considered and often reasonable words, his affable manner made him the perfect instrument of Soviet policy in a world breathing death.

Only once did I see, as if he had a normal human reaction... We had signed the Anglo-Soviet treaty, and he had a dangerous flight home ahead of him. At the garden gate in

Downing Street, which we used to keep the secret, I took him firmly by the arm, and we looked into each other's faces. Suddenly he seemed deeply disturbed. Behind the mask a man showed himself."

To the above it remains to add that this man "with the smile of a Siberian winter" liked to play the violin in short moments of rest, which in the Bolshevik barracks environment was a unique, almost unbelievable phenomenon and caused constant mockery from the cadres of Stalin's Politburo.

The appearance of the "Berthier" is usually unremarkable: a short, dense figure, his face is round, with almost no facial expression, and there is no scope in his gestures, his elbows are tightly pressed to his sides. He is dressed neatly, cleanly, but dimly, and his haircut is short, without gimmicks. He only attracts attention with a gleamless, tilted gaze that strangely combines intelligence, good-naturedness, and gentleness. The vocabulary is emphatically delicate and dry. A great interest in everyday life, housekeeping, and tirelessness in his work is noticeable. In principle, the "rentier" is Akaky Akakievich from Gogol's "The Overcoat": docile, mild, kind, thoughtful, hard-working, loving to sing something heartfelt at his leisure in a soft monotone voice and play with pets. That's it. Only extraordinary circumstances could make him Prince of Neuchâtel or Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR.

VLADIMIR LENIN

- 1) WILL ("king")
- 2) LOGIC ("rhetorician")
- 3) PHYSICS ("the underdog")
- 4) EMOTION ("gawker")

The order of Lenin's first two functions, their correlation, interaction, and forms of external manifestation are exhaustively characterized by the quotation book specially compiled for this occasion, which is placed below. Its peculiarity is that the authors of the memoirs, Lenin's friends and enemies, were surprisingly unanimous in describing his personality, and only by intonation can one guess who is who.

"...he was a dictator in the best sense of the word."

"Lenin's will surpassed his intellect, and the latter always acted as a servant of the former..." Many critics accused Lenin of a strong lust for power and honors. In fact, *he was simply organically designed to rule and literally could not refrain from imposing his will on others*, not because he craved it, but because it was as natural for him as it is natural for a large body to influence the planets. As for honors, he did not like them...

In his own way, Lenin loved those whom he valued as useful assistants. He easily forgave their mistakes, even infidelity... Malice and vindictiveness were alien to him. Even enemies were seen by him more as some abstract facts. Probably they could not excite in him a purely human interest, being simply mathematically defined points for the application of destructive forces. Purely passive opposition to his party at a critical moment was reason enough for him to shoot hundreds of people without a shadow of a doubt. And for all that, he liked to play with children, dogs, kittens, and kitties in a genuinely cheerful way."

"No one like him could so infect with his plans, so impress with his will, so subdue with his personality, as this, at first sight, such an unassuming and gruff man, apparently without any data to be charming."

"There was nothing of the superhuman in his outward appearance... And yet there was something in those steely eyes that grabbed my attention. In his questioning, half-preoccupied, half-smiling gaze was a boundless confidence in himself and his superiority."

Later I came to have a great respect for his intellect, but at that moment I was more struck by the enormous strength of his will, his intransigence and impassivity. He was the exact opposite of Trotsky, who was also present at our meeting and was surprisingly silent. Trotsky was all temperament, he was an individualist and entertainer, on whose vanity even I could play, not without some success. There was something inhuman about Lenin's impassivity. His vanity could not be influenced by any flattery.

"I didn't like the man at all. First of all, he was terribly grumpy. Second of all, he didn't listen to anyone and wouldn't let anyone speak.

"...Lenin always felt his audience. He never rose too high above its level, but only lowered himself to it in those moments when it was necessary in order not to break the continuity of the hypnotic state controlling the will of his flock. More than anyone, he was aware that the crowd demands to be chased and spurred, to feel the master's firm hand. When he had to, he spoke like a ruler, judging and prodding his audience. "He's not an orator-he's more than an orator," someone remarked, and that remark is quite appropriate."

"But here he feels that the audience is not keeping up with him, that the connection with the listener has been severed. Then he immediately picks himself up, drops down in one leap, and begins his ascent anew, but with a calmer and more measured stride. His voice itself becomes different, freed from unnecessary tension, receives an enveloping persuasiveness...And when the speaker reaches the conclusion a second time, this time bringing the audience to it without losing anyone on the way, the audience physically feels that grateful joy, into which the satisfied tension of collective thought is resolved."

"He argued exceptionally unpleasantly - arrogantly and contemptuously, covering his smoothly flowing speech with sarcastic and often rude antics toward his opponent. Outwardly he seemed perfectly calm, but his small Mongolian eyes became sharp and angry...Lenin did not belong to the number of people striking with power and originality of thought."

Regarding the oratorical abilities of the combination of the 1st Will and the 2nd Logic, I can add to this that, for all the apparent appeal to the listener's reason, *it is not the content that is the strongest side of speeches, but the form*. Lenin's speech can be ambiguous, meaningless, empty, and yet fascinating, thanks to his exceptional, uncritical self-confidence, faith in himself, a powerful will that invisibly filled his every word. The example of Gorbachev (obviously "Lenin"), who kept an audience of thousands of people in suspense for hours with his empty speeches, is expressive enough to imagine the magic of the "Leninist" word. The power of Gorbachev's verbiage reached the point of comedy and gave rise to jokes. For example: Gorbachev asked the famous hypnotist and psychotherapist Kashperovsky to come to his speech and stop it by hypnotic influence in case of speech incontinence. The result was the opposite of what was expected: Kashperovsky himself fell into a hypnotic trance.

* * *

Every Third Function is ambiguous. But Lenin's 3rd Physique, which combined unparalleled cruelty with maternal concern for the needs of others, exhibited such unparalleled bifurcation that it also provoked composing and produced cynical but accurate anecdotes. Here is one of them:

- "Vladimir Ilyich, the participants of the Kronstadt rebellion have been arrested, what to do with them?"

"-Firing squad! Before the execution, give tea to drink. And make sure it's hot!"

This is an anecdote. And there are also similar legends, sometimes passed off as fact. For example, the legend that Lenin himself secretly sent his longtime enemy friend, Martov, abroad. And as if, when asked why he did this, the leader supposedly replied, "Because I am surrounded by people who are far more consistent Leninists than Lenin himself." This phrase one cannot help but believe. Lenin was supposed to be, by the 3rd Physique, the most pitiful of the Bolshevik upper class. And he was indeed surrounded by people with productive and therefore more violent Physicists: the 1st Physicists (Trotsky, Stalin, Zinoviev) and the 4th Physicists (Sverdlov, Dzerzhinsky, Pyatakov)-who, of course, would not let Martov out of their hands alive.

In addition to anecdotes and legends, there are indisputable historical facts testifying to the striking bifurcation of Leninist Physics. For example, the famous portrait painter Yuri Annenkov said that when his father, a former revolutionary and insurance expert, received an offer to become a commissioner of social insurance, he refused and found himself ruined the next day: his bank account had been confiscated. The old man died of starvation in '20, and when this news reached Lenin, he gave his widow a decent pension for life. And so it was.

In fact, it was Physics 3 that brought Lenin into the camp of Marxism; it was Lenin's typical sincere, unconscious compassion for all people of physical labor that made her choose this ideology. The mass shootings of workers after the Communist leader came to power were a derivative not of his Physique, but of his Will. Goethe's words fit Lenin even better than Napoleon: "**Napoleon went in search of virtue, but since he could not find it, he took power.**" From Lenin's 3rd Physics comes also the equalizing distribution system which he introduced during the time of military communism: his laudable desire to support the weakest in his flawed 3rd Physics brought him to the point of absurdity.

Contemporaries rarely mentioned Lenin's attitude to the physical, material layer of life, except to note the simplicity and unpretentiousness of his domestic needs. And this is understandable. It was his 3rd Physics that the leader of the world proletariat hid from prying eyes more diligently than anything else, and it was this, strangely enough, that played a decisive role in his fate. The fact is that if Goethe can be called the standard of a harmonious personality, the standard of a disharmonious personality should certainly be called Lenin.

Fate gave Lenin nothing from its dimensionless stash in the line of Physics. More than unsightly in appearance, short, early bald, with gray skin and small Mongolian eyes, at age 40 he already looked old. All his life up to October 1917, Lenin lived on the condition of being a kept man: family, party sponsors, and Robin Hoods. Especially, I am sure, was Lenin's 3rd Physicist traumatized by the fact that *he had not earned a single penny by physical labor all his life*, i.e., in case his power collapsed at the state or party level, there were no internal resources to maintain a normal life.

There was also little joy with women. They did not give Lenin what would have been the only impeccable proof of his manhood, of his physical wholeness - children. And Lenin could not boast of the number of women; three are reliably known: Krupskaya, Armand and that unnamed secretary whom Stalin, in a fit of rage, threatened to make the leader's widow instead of the obstinate Krupskaya.

People who knew Lenin, who knew about his "fixation" on politics, spoke with a great deal of irony about the leader's sex. One of them wrote: "Lenin was deeply infatuated with, let us say, - in love with Inessa Armand - his companion in the Bolshevik Party. In love, of course, in his own way, i.e., probably a kiss between talking about the treachery of the Mensheviks and a resolution brandishing capitalist sharks and imperialism." In fact, Lenin's sex was not, and he was a passionate lover. Another thing is that, like any holder of the 1st Will and the 3rd Physique, he was afraid of the power that the woman lying next to him received, afraid of female nudity and beauty. An associate in exile said that a very beautiful woman was exiled with them, and, looking at her, Lenin murmured: "*She is an ugly woman. She worries me. A terrible woman.*"

At the same time, it seems that Lenin's hyper-sexuality did not make a very strong impression on women. I deduce this from the fact that the October Revolution took place after all. You may ask: what is the connection between sex and revolution? And in Lenin's case it is the most direct. If this Inessa Armand, languishing under Lenin's caresses, had murmured in a moment of loving languor: "Kotik, you are not an ordinary man, but you have no equal in THIS! - it is quite possible that the revolution would not have happened. Lenin would have rushed with redoubled energy to work on the magical for his psyche flattering characteristic of an exceptional lover, abandoning, at least for a while, the tired posture of the fighter against capitalism. But October came, and this event is the best proof of Lenin's unsatisfied sexual feeling and his insignificant feminine abilities.

Even mentally, absentmindedly and for a moment in Lenin's skin, you feel the horror and ugliness of his situation. *A man born with the third physics, an "untouchable," that is, destined by fate to be vulnerable and vulnerable to physicality, in addition to this misfortune, lives the life of an unsightly, weak-willed dependant, childless and sexually unsatisfied.* Where does personal harmony and its derivatives - decency, benevolence, tolerance - come from, when fate has made a habit of constantly picking at the sore spot with a crowbar? Lenin simply had no other choice but to strengthen even more reliably the only support in life - the 1st Will, already hypertrophied by nature - with a maniacal insistence on the power that alone could protect the crushed 3rd Physique.

* * *

Lenin's contemporaries, deceived by his passion for politicking, were also mistaken about the leader's ability to experience. One of them wrote: "I cannot even imagine Lenin talking about poetry, painting, music, still less about love, about the complex spiritual experiences of man... His interest in man was completely alien to him. Communicating with him, I always felt that he was interested in me only insofar as he saw in me...a like-minded person who could be used for the revolutionary struggle...Lenin's coldness toward people was striking."

This kind of statement is inaccurate, to say the least. Lenin cried at a performance of The Lady of the Camellias (and Physics 3 has a particularly avid interest in the psychology of prostitutes), listened to Beethoven with rapture, and only expressed regret that, contrary to his need for endless enjoyment of the Vienna composer's "inhuman" music, he had to engage in head-cutting. And in relation to people, Lenin was not always such a cynic and parasite, as he is described by his party comrades. The leader followed Inessa Armand's coffin with tear-stained face, reeling with grief, and in this case his feelings clearly outweighed the deceased's contribution to Party construction. So, even the "Leninist" heart is not a stone.

* * *

As a psychological type, "Lenin" is quite rare. It is rare even in a political environment, although politics is in "Lenin's" blood. In this regard, no one but Gorbachev comes to mind. However, the obvious difference in the personalities of Lenin and Gorbachev, gives reason to say a few words about the difference in the fate of people with psychotypic identity.

There is no doubt that Gorbachev is a "Leninist. But the differences begin with **the scale of** the personality of Lenin and Gorbachev. The second, "Lenin" is a dwarf, incomparable in his parameters to the great first image: uneducated, uncultured and simply unintelligent. A stupid "Lenin" as an albino is rare, but Gorbachev happens to be one of these albinos. At the same time, fate was more favorable to Gorbachev than to Lenin. Gorbachev had time to try himself as a physical laborer, knew the joys of fatherhood, his way up was not obstructed by anything fatally insurmountable, was clear and simple from the beginning, which cannot be said about Lenin.

Apparently, all these circumstances determined the comparative softness of Gorbachev to Lenin in the critical moments for the government. Like any "prude" with an aversion and squeamishness to violence, Gorby, organizing bloody massacres in the Baltics and the Caucasus, at the sight of the first blood, took his hands off and pretended as if he had nothing to do with it. Such duplicity in the capital for the government on the issue of violence, lulled Gorbachev's entourage into thinking, not without some reason, that the president of the USSR was a weak politician. And when the head of the entourage begins to visit such thoughts, the death of the leader, biological or only political, becomes a matter of time. Which is what happened in August 1991. Subsequent efforts to regain at least some of his former influence have become a political cadaver dance. But that is another story.

* * *

Speaking of "Lenin" as a type in his purely outward expression, we can say that it is usually: a lean, not to say unattractive, but clearly not sexy man with a pale oval face. The gaze is persistent, attentive, thoughtful, not without slyness and irony, but without a spark. Speech and gesture are free. Neatness and focus in everything: clothing, haircut, makeup. Complete concentration in his behavior and daily routine; the only thing that can knock

him out of his established routine is the chance for sexual adventures. But the most obvious and irreproachable mark of the "Lenin" is a terrible grumpiness - an argument with him is absolutely hopeless.

ABU AL-GAZALI

- 1) EMOTION ("romantic")
- 2) WILL ("nobleman")
- 3) LOGIC ("skeptic")
- 4) PHYSICS ("slacker")

Ghazali was the greatest mystical theologian and philosopher of the Islamic world. He had a great influence on the development of Arab-Muslim culture. According to Islamic tradition, every 500 years a renewer of faith should appear, and many Muslims saw Ghazali as such a renewer. One of his biographers wrote: "If there could be a prophet after Muhammad, it would surely be Ghazali.

Judging by contemporary sources, Ghazali's life was not particularly eventful: an Iranian writing in Arabic, he studied in Nishapur and Baghdad and taught law. When Ghazali immerseded himself in philosophy, the study of this science, caused in his soul the deepest crisis, however, typical for this psychotype. According to one biographer, Ghazali, studying philosophy, came to the conclusion *"about the fundamental incompatibility of faith as an irrational concept and philosophy as a product of rationalistic constructions, which caused him a deep psychological crisis (1095)*. The latter, having given up the post of mudaris (professor), led a life of a wandering dervish for 11 years, and then a hermit".

What seemed to be the reason for the esteemed professor to go into seclusion: was it because the irrationality of faith contradicted the rationality of philosophy? Surprisingly enough, it was. Moreover, almost every "gazali" experiences precisely this kind of mental crisis; it is inherent in his or her psycho-type. Let's remember what contradiction a person within himself feels most acutely: the contradiction between the First and the Third Functions. In "Gasali", therefore, the First Emotion and the Third Logic, i.e. mysticism and reason, are in conflict, and the victory of the stronger mystical, irrational beginning over common sense in this case is inevitably predetermined, which was clearly shown in the example of the life of Gazali, who left professors to become a hermit.

Not only life, but all of Ghazali's philosophy fits more than comfortably into his order of functions. Ghazali's anthropology is as follows: the structure of man coincides with the structure of the universe (microcosm coincides with macrocosm). The universe consists

of three layers or levels. The lower level is the "world of the manifest and tangible", i.e. the material, physical layer of being (4th Physics). Higher is the "world of the spiritual", where by "spiritual" is to be understood a certain volume of knowledge, intellect, will, spirit (3rd Logic and 2nd Will). Finally, above all is the "world of the supersensible and hidden", which is inaccessible to man's ordinary perception, and, being a divine world, it is cognizable only through mystical illumination (1st Emotion). That is, the picture of the internal structure of man and the cosmos turns out to be drawn by Ghazali in his own image: 1st Emotion, 2nd Will, 3rd Logic, 4th Physics.

As a philosopher, Ghazali became famous as the author of the Self-Refutation of Philosophers, which gave rise to skepticism in its Arabic-language version. When Western philosophers became acquainted with Ghazali's work, they found his arguments almost exhaustive and gave the Self-Refutation of Philosophers their highest marks: Munch called Ghazali the first skeptic of the Middle Ages, Renan claimed that after Ghazali "Hume had nothing more to say. And need I remind you that such active, consistent skepticism is the clearest hallmark of the 3rd Logic?

Judging by his persistence in confessing skepticism, Ghazali's ulcer in the 3rd Logic was very deep. This means that his 1st Emotion must have been particularly redundant and powerful. And indeed, Ghazali's mental religious experiences reached such a degree that he almost bodily began to feel the core of his ecstasies. He, speaking of his mystical experience, reported: "It is so peculiar, as if in reality you feel some object. No, it is not for nothing that Ghazali is credited with the "emotionalization" of Islam, previously quite moderate in this respect. Before Ghazali, many had neglected prayers and rituals; he increased the number of prayers and demanded strict observance of rituals because they were instruments of ecstasy, of heart-mystical comprehension of the Godhead.

Ghazali is an ascetic, but his asceticism, as is usually the case with the 4th Physic, is not aggressive at all. The philosopher is simply indifferent to the material layer of existence, he is not annoyed by excess in this sphere, nor is he pleased by belt-tightening. Ghazali writes: "...you must not think that hatred of the world is an end in itself... renunciation of this world has the purpose of desiring neither its existence nor non-existence. This is the pinnacle of perfection...

Perfection with respect to possessions is that money, possessions, and water are equal for you. The abundance of water near you, when you stand, for example, on the shore of the sea, does not harm you, nor does its limitation to the necessary measure harm you.

We see familiar features of "ghazals" in the characters and behavior of people who have nothing to do with philosophy. Moreover, like any holder of the 1st Emotion, "ghazali" is more inclined to artistic activity than to philosophizing. The genus "ghazali" is the genus of artists, poets, musicians, etc. The poet Alexander Blok can be considered a vivid representative of the "Ghazali" engaged in the artistic sphere, and the history of his life is the most convenient example to show those specific features of this psychotype, which have escaped the eyes of Ghazali biographers.

But before examining Blok's life from the perspective we know, I will cite one statement by the poet that perfectly formulates the conflict between the 1st Emotion and the 3rd

Logic that is familiar to us, typical of "ghazals. Arguing once with Gorky, who was respectful of the manifestations of a strong intellect, Blok hotly exclaimed: "*If only we could stop thinking altogether, if only for ten years. Put out that deceptive, swampy light (mind - A.A.) that draws us deeper and deeper into the night of the world and listen to the world's harmony with our hearts.*" How glad Ghazali would be, if he had heard in his grave this phrase of the Russian poet, so succinctly and expressively formulated his cherished dream.

* * *

However, from recognizable traits, let us move, using the example of Blok's life, to the yet unknown features of the "Gazali" character, taking him in a purely mundane aspect of everyday life. A remarkable, though not very pleasant feature of this psycho-type is that he is an involuntary, slang termed "dynamist", i.e. a person who provokes sexual excitement, but does not experience anything of the kind himself. In the case of "ghazali" it should be emphasized that he is an involuntary dynamist, because neither the 4th Physics, nor the 3rd Logic, nor the 2nd Will can participate in conscious sexual provocation.

The light breath of the 2nd Will, its simplicity, accessibility, and natural nobility entices and seduces others in the "ghazals. The refined, refined beauty that usually accompanies the 4th Physique also leaves few people indifferent. However, the decisive role of an involuntary exciter in "ghazali" is played by an excess of the 1st Emotion, which nature itself is supposed (as already mentioned) to be an extremely effective erotic starter. The trouble for anyone who falls in love with "ghazals" is just what attracted him: emotional overreaches of this type do not at all testify to excessive sexuality, and the 4th Estate has not only exquisite beauty, but also a weakened libido, which puts sex on the last place in the hierarchy of values of this type. A typical phrase for a "gazali" sexual relationship is: "I don't understand why **this is** necessary at all.

The history of the relationship between Alexander Blok and women is a good illustration of the thesis about the involuntary dynamism of "ghazals. The first and main victim of the delusion about the erotic abilities of Blok was his wife - Lyubov Mendeleva. When she was still a bride, she wrote to Blok: "You imagined all sorts of good things about me and behind this fantastic fiction, which lived only in your imagination, you and me, a living person with a living soul, and did not notice, overlooked. However, seductive self-indulgence prevailed in Lyubov Dmitrievna over female intuition, and they were married. Immediately after the wedding Blok went abroad, leaving his young wife, presumably, in extreme perplexity. At first, his wife still managed to arouse something resembling a display of sensuality in Blok, but, in her own words, soon "that little bit stopped, too. From that moment on, she, again in her own words, became not a wife, not a widow, not a bride, and remained in this strange state until the death of the poet. Other women were no luckier with Blok than his wife. There was even a legend in St. Petersburg that two of the best local minxes made attempts to seduce the poet, and each time the result was disappointing for them: after chatting with the lady all night on various philosophical and literary themes,

he got up from the sofa and with the words "Madam, morning! The cabbie is waiting!" he saw the temptress off.

Literary scholars have tried to explain the irregularity of Blok's behavior by the brokenness of Russian sexual ideology of the beginning of the century: with its preaching of asceticism in the world, "white marriage," "pageboys" who replaced "knights" in the performance of lowly marital duties, and similar nonsense, really popular then among the morally, mentally and physically corrupt Russian intelligentsia. In the case of Blok, however, this was not the case. Nature is always stronger than ideology, and only their coincidence can create an illusion of ideological dependence, but only an illusion, no more. Nature, the very "gazalievsky" order of functions of Blok implied a great fantasy, intricacy, rigidity and callousness in love relationships. And the fact that he calmly looked at his wife, who was squirming nearby, serenely looked at his former lover standing under the windows of the St. Petersburg winter night, says not about some ideological dependence, but that his main love functions - Emotion and Physics - were **effective**, i.e. existed only for themselves and no empathy on these layers could be expected from him.

* * *

Another typical character trait of the "ghazals" is the light sadness that accompanies him from his youth to the grave, apocalyptic expectations, the feeling of the end, the exhaustion of life. It has already been said before that the 4th Physicist in general has a weakened vitality, hence the chronic sadness. But, pay attention, in "ghazals" this sadness is light and makes it light with a strong light spirit of the 2nd Will, charged with a calm, good-natured perception of the world. However, even the 2nd Will of the "Gasali" is not able to cancel the secret thirst for catastrophe inherent in the 4th Physique, and Blok himself confessed in a letter to Andrei Bely **"I Love Perdition"**.

This phrase explains a great deal. Blok, in his own words, "a joyless and dark monk," certainly could not help but welcome everything that made the world around him akin to his inner tragic world, everything that led to the end of this "underdog" (as Blok called life). Therefore, the mystery of Blok's personality, the mystery of his shocking manifestations of joy at the sight of national disasters, catastrophes, wars and revolutions, rather than in some bouts of meanness in the poet's exemplary decency, is in the 4th Physique.

At the same time, not every "gazali" is so frank with himself and those around him in his greedy anticipation of catastrophes (personal, social, cosmic). This type's love of death is directly proportional to *the real well-being of his life*. Blok has an unsuccessful drama "Song of Destiny," in which the hero makes a characteristically Buddhist confession: "Lord. I can not go on. I feel too good in my quiet white house. Give me strength to say goodbye to it and see life in the world... Is it possible for a living man to live peacefully now, Elena? A living man is broken by everything: he looks around him - only human tears... he looks into the distance - and he is drawn to this distance..."

Don't need hearth and silence-

I want a world with a singing wind!"

The calmer and more nourishing the life of a "gazelle," the stronger the craving for collapse, doom, and apocalypse. And vice versa. The worse life is, the more he presses the natural and never fully overcome tragic spirit within him.

* * *

Gazali feels best in the religious sphere, especially in the early stages of the organizational formation of religion, while church discipline has not yet had time to expel the free and freedom-loving spirit dear to this psycho-type. The emotionalism of the ghazals, their sincere indifference to the demands of the flesh, their enduring sadness and apocalyptic expectations fit perfectly into the procrustean bed of the most rigid religious doctrines for others. It is not surprising, therefore, that a significant and most sympathetic part of the various pantheons is made up of "ghazal" saints. Suffice it to recall the Indian Krishnamurti or the Iranian Luqman, about whom in his hagiography it is very expressively said: "He begged Allah to deprive him of his reason, so that he might indulge in the adoration of God without hindrance. However, if we want to imagine the scale on which the religious activity of the "ghazals" can reach, it is best to turn to the figure of the most remarkable representative of this human species, Prince Gautama Shakyamuni, the founder of Buddhism and the first of the Buddhas.

The beginning of the Buddha's life was, by ordinary standards, enviable; he belonged to a rich and glorious family, married early and happily, and experienced the joy of fatherhood, but the convulsions of the outside world broke into the greenhouse life of the prince and ruined it. The sight of a sick old man, a corpse, and a wandering monk so astonished Gautama that he abandoned everything: the kingdom, his wife, and his son, and retired to a hermitage. The tempestuous ascetic practices of his new companions, at first enthusiastically embraced by the prince, soon disappointed him. Gautama left the ascetic community and on the way to Benares, a revelation came upon him and he became a Buddha (lit. "enlightened"). From that moment on, the Buddha devoted himself entirely to the preaching of his teachings, new to India, and, having achieved a remarkable success in this field, he died in Pawa, having been poisoned by stale pork meat. This is the outward background of the story of the Buddha's life. But there was also an inner, hidden side of his personality that actually determined the Buddha's fate - his belonging to the genus "ghazali" - the psychological dependence on a certain order of functions.

First, the well-being of life for the "ghazals," as already mentioned, is not a reflection, but a provocateur that only makes us feel the tragedy of existence more acutely. In the soul of greenhouse tsarevitch "ghazals" (Blok was sometimes called "tsarevitch") the phrase "I love doom!" sounds louder than in any other soul. This is why Buddha's leap from the ultimate well-being of life to extreme disadvantage is a normal reaction for a "ghazali". At the same time, the atrocity over the physical layer of life, something that was already cheap in Buddha's eyes (4th Physics), could not help but seem to Buddha a shallow aspect of spiritual life, and he left the ascetic community to proclaim the main goal of life - death-nirvana, liberation from life-suffering, "undotykoma. And already by these capital positions one can easily guess the "ghazali" in Buddha. We need only go through his entire order of functions to be convinced of this definitively.

Judging from the Dhammapada, the oldest and the only monument of Buddhist literature attributed directly to the Buddha, the presence of the 1st Emotion in the founder of Buddhism can be considered quite obvious: the Dhammapada is so poetic, so full of

imagery, the proportion of high metaphor in it is so significant that it leaves no doubt on this point.

The signs of the 2nd Will of the Buddha also lie on the surface. First of all, it is indicated by the Enlightened One's spontaneous democratism. The Buddha was perhaps the first Indian reformer to invade the holy of holies of the local way of life - casteism - and began to indiscriminately admit into his community all who wished to do so, regardless of caste.

The first two functions of Buddha coincided exactly with the first two functions of the other founder of the world religion, Christ. And this circumstance allowed specialists not without success to draw parallels between Buddhism and Christianity, between the biographies of Christ and Buddha, especially since striking coincidences between them lay literally on the surface. However, there were also fundamental differences due to the different positions of the two lower functions.

The problem of the role of rationality in human life was of so little concern to Christ that he simply dropped the word "intellect" from his vocabulary. Buddha approached this question differently, and although no traces of a special criticism of the intellect by the Enlightened One have been found, historians of Buddhism have noted his initial orientation "against abstract-dogmatic quests", i.e. skepticism conditioned by the 3rd Logic.

The difference between Christianity and Buddhism is particularly noticeable when it comes to the attitude to the physical layer of life and its worldview derivatives. Christ, with his 3rd Physics, was an ascetic ideologically and consistently ("the flesh uses not a little"); Buddha, on the contrary, considered ascetic self-torture a delusion, although he did not welcome promiscuity. This attitude to the flesh and its pleasures suggests that Buddhism should be gentler to man, more optimistic, brighter than Christianity. But how disappointed a person is when he compares the two religions and discovers that, contrary to logic, Buddhism is much sadder and more hopeless than Christianity. The solution to this supposed contradiction is in the 4th Physics of the Enlightened One. To it goes back the main thesis of Buddhism - "life is suffering" and individual apocalypse as a way of solving the problem, i.e. deliverance from suffering is possible only through nirvana, absolute personal non-existence.

* * *

Trying to draw an average black-and-white portrait of a "ghazali," one cannot help imagining a thin, distracted and sad looking, carelessly dressed, with a disheveled head, without makeup, with iconic features, excited, beautiful, sweet, open, honest, worldly helpless man, sadly whispering: "I love doom..."

PLATON

- 1) LOGIC ("dogmatic")
- 2) PHYSICS ("toiler")
- 3) WILL ("bourgeois")
- 4) EMOTION ("gawker")

I think there is no need to explain to the reader who Plato was. Therefore, let us proceed at once to the analysis of his order of functions, at the same time highlighting with his help some dark places in the biography of the famous philosopher.

The dark places begin with the interpretation of his nickname, Plato ("Wide"). Opinions on this matter have varied widely. But now, on the basis of Plato's 2nd Physics, we can say with certainty that those who explained the nickname by the wide construction of the philosopher's body were right. As it has already been said, the 2nd Physique is stocky, dense, short-necked, rounded, broad-breasted, and if there are people with such appearance among the reader's acquaintances, it will not be difficult for him to mentally reconstruct, approximately of course, Plato's appearance. An additional argument in favor of the version about the 2nd Philosopher's Physics can be the fact that, being engaged in sports in his youth, Plato achieved the greatest successes exactly in wrestling and even, according to rumors, once won first place in this discipline at the Isthmian Games. Very possibly. The 2nd Physique is by nature itself adapted to the sport, since the shortened legs below the average lower the wrestler's center of gravity and thus make their owner undefeatable.

Plato's 2nd Physics is indicated, among other things, by his gigantic capacity for work and restlessness. By "restlessness" of the philosopher should be understood not so much the references to his numerous trips abroad, mostly legendary, as his restlessness in the literal sense of the word - he taught his philosophy on the go, strolling through the alleys of the garden of the Academy he founded. The wicked Greek comedians liked to quip about the new, Platonic manner of teaching and put into the mouths of the philosopher's students confessions such as the following:

"You've come just in time. I'm already exhausted:
I walk back and forth, following Plato,
I wiped my feet, but I didn't make anything up."

After Plato's death, the tradition of restless philosophizing was continued by his disciple, Aristotle, for which his school was called the Peripatetic ("strolling") school.

* * *

Plato's 1st Logic is also not to be doubted. His belief in the possibility of a rational explanation of everything and everything, which reaches the point of absurdity, is clear evidence of this. There is nothing reprehensible in the very attempts to create a universal, applicable to every case, speculative concept - this is the task of philosophy as such. A different thing is that Plato's 1st Logic operated in this field hatchetically, with an obvious violence against the sense of life, experience, and without regard for real life, which led to the creation of utopian chimeras like his State, which makes the Gulag look like a sanatorium by comparison. The same 1st Logic of Plato is clearly indicated by his cosmogony, in which the first, fundamental place is occupied by *the world of pure ideas, comprehensible only by the mind*, the rest of the world - only a poor, corrupted derivative of it.

Biographers love to clean up Plato's image by claiming that he was supposedly apolitical on the grounds that he refused to participate in the tyranny of the 30s. In fact, however, Plato was by nature, by the 3rd Will, a highly politicized man, and to be convinced of this it is sufficient to look at his most capital works such as *The State* and *The Laws*. The biography of the philosopher also clearly shows the invalidity of the thesis about his apolitical nature. The adventurous trips to Syracuse with the aim of changing the existing order of things, of what standing alone. Another thing is that, like any holder of the 3rd Will, Plato was not confident in his right to power, in his ability to subjugate people, so he preferred not to shape politics, but to influence it. According to one of his biographers, Plato had little interest in "any political events, wherever they took place, he was attracted only by the possibility of influencing the corrupt autocrat in the hope of having a beneficial effect on the entire Sicilian public.

Of course, Plato tried to influence the Sicilian tyrants not with the power of his wounded, eternally fluctuating 3rd Will, but with the power of a superabundant, paranoid 1st Logic, which in itself is evidence of psychological blindness, naivety, short-sightedness and, strange as it may seem, a small mind of the philosopher. In Sicily, among other things, he tried to realize the crazy project of his "State", and Plato was lucky that the Syracuse tyrant was too stupid (or too clever), did not listen to the philosophical arguments and did not give land for a unique political experiment.

Contemporaries describe Plato as a man shy, extremely reserved in his youth and unsociable and gloomy in his old age. Such a portrait looks quite plausible if we take into account Plato's order of functions, i.e. the mental type, in which the 3rd Will is combined

with the 4th Emotion. The diseased 3rd Will, by weakness not restraining the freedom of manifestation of feelings, nevertheless tries not to demonstrate them especially, and paints the emotions in sickly, darkish tones. It is not without reason that a playwright contemporary of Plato wrote:

"Ah, Plato, Plato,

For you're the only one who knows how to sulk.

And bend your eyebrows, snail-like."

"Grumpy," after all, seems too harsh a word for the usual "Plato" type facial expression. It would be better to call it "emphatically serious, businesslike," which, combined with an energetic gait, carrying, like a cannonball, a short, dense body, produces, when viewed from the outside, a sometimes strong, if not frightening, impression.

* * *

The type of "Plato" is rare among the human race, and even rarer are its representatives included in the universal or, at the very least, local pantheon. The fate of the "Platon" is a behind-the-scenes role, the role of an advisor, a referent, a secretary to a figure, though not more significant in mental qualities, but more noticeable. And this role of a "gray cardinal" usually suits him fine (Alexander Yakovlev under Gorbachev).

To make the portrait of "Plato" a little more voluminous, I will add that among literary characters this type is more accurately conveyed by Odysseus and Hercule Poirot. If the reader bothers to recall these literary heroes, the image of "Plato" will acquire additional colors, missed here.

* * *

The appearance of the "Platon" is usually unattractive: a low, dense figure. The gaze is floating, irritated, often tilted inward, without luster. Clothes are kind, neat, clean, but standard. Emphasis is markedly seekful toward those above him on the social ladder. He has a keen interest in everyday life, housekeeping, and tirelessness in his work. Gestures and facial expressions are free, but not to say expressive, the vocabulary often slips into harsh, low and even foul language.

- 1) PHYSICS ("owner")
- 2) EMOTION ("actor")
- 3) LOGIC ("skeptic")
- 4) WILL ("serf")

Lucrezia Borgia was the daughter of Pope Alexander I and the sister of Cesare Borgia. She was, according to one biographer, "endowed with all the charms of a rich female nature, but weak and spineless, she became the plaything of the unscrupulous politics and nefarious passions of her father and brother. Characterized by remarkable beauty, wit, education, and a love of art, she could be considered one of the most brilliant women of her time, if she had not been in the shadow of the sad glory of her immoral family. The above lines already describe the entire psychotype of the "Borja," all that remains for us to do is to specify the details.

Lucretia had a special place in the Papa's ("Papa" literally and figuratively) marriage plans, of course, as a tool. She had already been engaged twice before she was thirteen, and at thirteen she was married to a third suitor for her hand. The marriage was short-lived, something in her father's plans changed, and she was divorced and given to another. When Lucrezia turned 20, a criminal couple, her father and brother, once again decided to replay the former marriage scam, organized an attempt on her husband, and he was mortally wounded. Lucrezia did all she could to save her husband and alleviate his suffering, but Cesare, soon after visiting the wounded man, ordered him to be strangled, which was carried out. In her widowhood Lucrezia gave birth to a boy, but it should be added that by that time she was already "raising a three-year-old child, Giovanni, whom she calls her brother, and in two bulls, now preserved in the Modena archive, Alexander YI recognizes the child in one as the son of Cesare Borgia and in the other as his own. This double acknowledgement of paternity and the common rumor of his contemporaries is expressed in Sannazar's couplet:

"Here rests Lucretia by name, but in reality
Taisa, Alexandra - daughter, wife and daughter-in-law."

Indeed, contemporaries told more than savory stories about relations in the papal family: as if Lucrezia presided at papal orgies, covering her nakedness only with a piece of transparent cloth, as if once a herd of stallions and mares was driven into the courtyard in front of the papal palace, the pope and his daughter watched the violent mating horses from the window, and then retreated for long periods in the papal bedchamber.

After her third marriage, Lucrezia "retired from the dissolute orgies of the papal palace in Rome and led a more modest life in Ferrara, surrounded by a brilliant court of artists, scholars and poets. Among the latter was Ariosto, who dedicated an octave to her in his "Orlando the Innocent," where he praises her beauty and high mental qualities. Obviously, the impressionable, soft, weak Lucretia was quite dependent on her surroundings and there was more passive indifference to evil and good in her character than an active criminal will."

In the life of Lucrezia, a creature of sensuality, sensitivity, and malleability (1st Physics, 2nd Emotion, 4th Will), one can easily see the scope of this type. The Borja woman is the

perfect prostitute. Combination of thick-skinned 1st Physics and careless 4th Will makes "borja" insensitive to those bodily and mental traumas, which are indispensable companions of this trade. The presence of the 2nd Emotion only increases her attractiveness in the ways of carnal sin. "Borja is a woman of celebration. Usually lazy, slovenly, sour from clever talk (3rd Logic), she is all transformed when the time comes to leave her affairs, to surrender to her tenderness, nonchalance and merriment. Here "borja" is at her own plate, and there is no one better to decorate the festive table with her developed, appetizing forms, sparkling lively look, cute jokes, charming smile, who would so awaken carnal desires with a sense of permissiveness and excite the feelings of man, asleep under the chloroform of everyday bustle.

* * *

"Borgia" is not only the ideal prostitute, but, in her male form, also the ideal soldier. This parallel may seem strange at first glance, but in fact there is nothing strange about it. The combination of thick-skinnedness and compliant nature inherent in "Borja" (1st Physics with the 4th Will) is as much a prerequisite for successful military service as it is for success in the service of Aphrodite. It is hard to find a better candidate for the role of an ideal soldier than "Borja": fearless, indifferent to blood and suffering (1st Physics), not inclined to discuss orders (3rd Logic), much less to condemn them (4th Will) - he is quite in place in soldiering. To get a concrete idea of what a Borja soldier looks and acts like, let us turn to the figure of Joachim Murat, Napoleon's cavalry commander and king of Naples.

Both his own and others recognized Murat at a mile away. In accordance with his usual tendency to kitsch, he liked to dress up in a Christmas tree-like uniform he himself had invented and to decorate his hat with a plume of incredible size, which both made him smile and smile. Colencoeur recalled: "His unfortunate passion for opulent costumes led to the fact that this bravest of kings, this king of the brave had the appearance of the king of boulevards. The emperor found him ridiculous, told him so and repeated it aloud, but he was not angry at this quirk, which the soldiers liked..."

Although Murat met Napoleon when he was already a brigadier general, there is some truth in the Emperor's words: "He owes me everything. Such is the fate of the "serfs": to owe anything to anyone. I think Murat himself would not dispute what was said, because after marrying the emperor's sister he attributed himself to his kin and liked to call himself "Joachim Napoleon," thereby voluntarily and willingly demonstrating his loyal feelings.

Remembering Murat, Napoleon added: "He loved, even adored me. He was my right hand, but *left to himself he lost all energy*. In the sight of the enemy Murat surpassed all the bravery in the world, in the field he was a true knight, in the office braggart without a mind and determination. There is no general in the world more capable of commanding the cavalry than Murat. At first glance, Napoleon's praise of Murat looks more than ambiguous: Murat is an excellent commander: brainless and indecisive. However, the specifics of Napoleon's (see) views on the merits and demerits of his subordinates should be taken into account. In his opinion, they had to be distinguished by bravery and loyalty,

and he took the rest upon himself (a thinking and independent general would only get in the way and get in the way).

However, the emperor was somewhat mistaken about Murat's mental abilities; he was not as stupid as he might have seemed from the outside, especially from Napoleon's side. For example, Murat, albeit at the instigation of his chief of staff, foresaw the disastrous consequences of the campaign to Russia, but simply did not dare to appear with gloomy prophecies before the eyes of his formidable suzerain and brother-in-law. Colencourt said that Murat "saw the difficulties of the Russian campaign and, in conversations with some individuals, grieved about their consequences beforehand. General Belliard, his chief of staff, had no illusions; a man of noble soul, he did not hide from the King his views and the misfortunes that his foresight foresaw. But the king's best intentions dissipated as soon as he saw the enemy or heard cannon fire. He could then no longer control his ardor. He dreamed of all the success his courage could achieve.

There was no one more obliging than him, even to those whom he thought he had a right to complain about. He loved the emperor, saw his faults, and understood the consequences of them, but he had in his character a tendency to flattery... this disposition almost as much paralyzed all his good intentions as the influence the emperor had long had over him."

From the words of Colencœur it is clear that Murat clamped his mouth out of natural comportment, i.e., in terms of psychosophy because of the 4th Will. And from the characteristic contradiction between the 3rd Logic and the 1st Physics, it followed inexorably that the opportunity to distinguish herself in violence, instantly blew out of her head the few sober thoughts that occasionally visited her. Though to be fair, it should be noted that there was wisdom in Murat's silence. Others, bypassing him, tried to introduce an element of realism into the emperor's ideas about the existing and coming state of affairs, but all their remarks he passed over his ears, it was not in Napoleon's nature to perceive the bitter truth. So, Murat's silence is understandable.

While seemingly absolutely loyal to Napoleon, Murat, after marrying the Emperor's sister and ascending the Neapolitan throne, began to behave ambiguously, began, contrary to his 4th Will, to hesitate strangely. The Emperor, who had known Caroline Bonaparte since childhood, had no difficulty in explaining this metamorphosis to himself. He said: "*The queen has more energy in her little finger than in the whole king ... He has a good heart; deep down he loves me more than his lazzaroni. When he sees me, he is mine, but away from me he, like all characterless men, succumbs to whoever flatters him and befriends him...* His wife is ambitious and has put into his head a thousand crazy schemes: he wants to own the whole of Italy. Thus Murat was caught between the powerful wills of his brother-in-law and his wife, as between a hammer and an anvil, and was completely subservient to whoever was near.

When none of them was near, Murat simply lost his head. This is what happened, for example, when Napoleon left the trunks of the Great Army, which was pulling out of Russia, on him. Under the pressure of circumstances and assertive generals, he quickly

bowed out and fled, thus completing the defeat. But no matter how Napoleon later blamed Murat for the latest misfortune, he himself was to blame, because the Emperor deliberately appointed Murat as commander, against the will of the army, and thus consciously condemned the rest of it to destruction, so that his stepson, Prince Eugene, would not have the laurels of a savior.

After Napoleon's first abdication, Murat began to throw himself into all sorts of adventures, ending with a surprising consistency in his total collapse. This went on until, at the wall of the Neapolitan prison, the last point in the life of the old servant condemned to be shot. But as much as we pity the famous brave and shirtless man, there is something of a pattern in Murat's death. All the Napoleonic marshals, in whose psychotype the 4th Will can be seen (Pears, Berthier, Ney, Murat), could not boast of a happy ending to their lives.

* * *

Among famous politicians, the Polish King Sigismund II Augustus and American President Warren Harding can very likely be considered "Borja". The rule of Sigismund the Poles attribute to one of the most brilliant periods of their history, the rule of Harding the Americans consider a national disgrace, but, according to historians, the former has no personal merit in it, while the latter has no personal guilt. Both were toys in the hands of their entourage, and their political face is roughly but accurately sketched by Harding's father, who once told his son: "Warren, if you were a maiden, you'd be going to sleep forever. You just don't know how to say no." Remembering the fate of Lucrezia Borgia, such an appraisal is eminently prescient.

NAPOLEON BONAPARTE

- 1) WILL ("king")
- 2) PHYSICS ("toiler")
- 3) LOGIC ("skeptic")
- 4) EMOTION ("gawker")

Bonaparte himself defined the order of his first two functions when he declared: "There are only two powerful forces in the world: **the saber and the spirit.** *In the final analysis, spirit overcomes the saber.*" "Spirit," in this case, of course, is synonymous with Will, and "saber" is a metaphor for Physics. Therefore, by calling "spirit" and "saber" the most powerful forces in the world, Napoleon was simply pointing to what he had Above, and by favoring "spirit" out of the two, he was calling his First Function, that is, Napoleon had 1st Will and 2nd Physics, of which he, if not aware, was guessing, judging from the phrase above.

Although it must be said that even without the Emperor's voluntary recognition, his 1st Will is visible to the naked eye. The striking simplicity, nonchalance, and naturalness with which he held positions of command, up to and including the imperial one, clearly point to his "regal" origins. One story of how he, playing cards, managed not to notice that a certain German prince manages to kiss his hand on the fly, worth something.

From the "royal" nature of Napoleon's character, however, it does not follow that power did not change anything in his behavior, simply put, it did not spoil him. Occupying a position of power, Bonaparte allowed himself to be rude, rude even to women, which before it was not noticed. A biographer, especially engaged in the attitude of Napoleon to women, he wrote: "He could sometimes publicly put them in the most awkward position. During receptions, ladies were anxiously awaiting the moment when the Emperor spoke to her. He would compliment them unflatteringly on their toiletries and give away their secrets in front of everyone. It was his way of correcting the manners of the court. A young girl could expect to be asked how many children she had. Young women he could ask what month of happy expectation they were in, and to old ladies he would tell them to their eyes that in all likelihood they would not be long for the other world. If a lady was ugly or not to his taste, he would say to her when she presented herself to him, "My God, madam, I have been told that you are not bad-looking..."

Being extremely egotistical, Bonaparte was less inclined to spare the ego of others. To the only woman he loved, Josephine, he gladly described his adulteries in detail and in response to her tears declared: "*I am not a man like others, and the common laws of morality and decency do not apply to me.*" So, if he does not say so, any possessor of the 1st Will thinks. In this case, though, such behavior seems to have been revenge for the unhealed wound from the horns Napoleon's wife had first given him.

Napoleon's boorish directness had its own flip side, a positive side - the ability, absent in many other leaders and bosses, to listen to the bitter truth without offense. Kolenkur wrote: "At times, even in all his treatment, in the tone of his voice manifested the mood of a man satisfied with the frankness, with which he speaks, and which so are not used to sovereigns. The bulletin issued by Bonaparte after his flight from Russia breathes with soldierly straightforwardness and honesty. However, it lacks the most important point - the name of the culprit of the catastrophe. Self-criticism has never been a strong point of the emperor, and the reader can hardly imagine the pathetic tricks this "genius" resorted to in order to find the cause of disasters beyond the real, lying on the surface causes: his own stupidity and boundless arrogance.

Like all "kings," Bonaparte was fearless in the face of possible competition from other gifted ambitious men and felt this fearlessness in himself. He said: "I am not afraid of energetic people. I know how to use them and lead them; besides, I do not violate equality in any way, and young people, like the whole nation, value only equality. If you have talent, I will promote you; if you have merit, I will patronize you. Everyone knows this, and the general assurance of it goes to my advantage." There is much truth and much slyness in this statement of Napoleon's. Fearing no one, he was, however, insanely jealous of someone else's glory, someone else's authority, was ready to destroy and destroy thousands of people for the mere fear that the laurels of the triumphator may go to another. For example, at the head of the remnants of the retreating Great Army from Russia, Bonaparte deliberately left the stupid, weak-willed Murat instead of the energetic, respected in the army stepson Eugene Beauharnais. Disaster was not long in coming. In

connection with it, Colencœur remarked: "...a kind of distrust of loved ones and of everyone who had acquired personal authority was entirely in the emperor's spirit and coexisted with his character.

Power made Napoleon more suspicious and cynical than before. I hope the reader will forgive me for quoting from Colencœur's memoirs, but it gives an almost exhaustive picture of Napoleon's attitude to people: "In private life he showed no more complacency than in political affairs. Everything was interpreted by him against his neighbor. Always acting as if he was on stage as the emperor, he thought that others were playing with him the roles they had learned. So **his first feeling was always one of mistrust**, though only for a moment. Then he changed his attitude, but you always had to be prepared for the fact that his first impression of you will be little pleasant, and maybe even offensive to you. Always suspecting that underneath your remarks or suggestions there was some personal or secret interest, whether you were friend or foe, he confused friends with enemies first. I have often experienced this and can speak of it with full knowledge. The emperor thought, and on every occasion said, that ambition and interest were the driving motives of all actions. He seldom, therefore, allowed a good deed to be done out of a sense of duty or out of a sensitivity. He did, however, notice people who seemed to be guided by a sense of self-pity or a consciousness of duty. Deep down, he considered it, but he did not show it. He often made me doubt that sovereigns believed in the possibility of having intimates. The author of these lines, Colencourt, met Napoleon when he was already emperor, but mistrust, alienation are common, independent of social position, properties of the 1st Will.

But let's go further, following Napoleon. For the 2nd Physicist, violence is a normal, frequent and natural way of defending and asserting one's self. Napoleon is no exception here, who, remembering his childhood, said: "Nothing impressed me, I was prone to quarrels and fights, I was not afraid of anyone. I hit one person, scratched another, and everyone was afraid of me. He carried his love of fighting from childhood into adulthood and cultivated it in himself from his military career until Waterloo.

It does not follow, however, that Napoleon's 2nd Physique was embodied solely in effective violence. Bonaparte was a caring and affectionate son, brother, husband, father. The thought of the welfare of the peoples under his control also never left him. The emperor said: "... I am moved by the sorrows of nations. I want them to be happy, and the French will be happy. If I live another ten years, prosperity will be universal. Don't you think I like to make people happy? I like to see happy faces, but I have to suppress this natural tendency, because otherwise it would be abused. To these words of Napoleon, contrary to the facts, one cannot help believing: he himself was a workaholic, he appreciated diligence in others and, if he had not always been itching to fight, in ten peaceful years he could have noticeably improved living conditions in the country. In general, *the epigraph to the combination of the 1st Will and the 2nd Physics can be taken Napoleon's words: "...I am a man. Whatever others may say, I also have something inside, I have a heart, but it is the heart of a monarch."*

* * *

The only thing that can stop "Napoleon" in his victorious and irresistible, as it seems, march to the heights of power is his Achilles' heel - the 3rd Logic. And an immediate obstacle can be a competitor with a higher Logic, someone with imaginary or real

intellectual superiority. When Marshal Zhukov, another prominent representative of the "Napoleon family", was asked why he did not remove from power Stalin, who fell into prostration in the first days of the war, Zhukov gave a purely "skeptical" answer: "I did not consider myself smarter than Stalin (with his 2nd Logic - A.A.)".

Fortunately for Napoleon, he did not face the problem of intellectual competition in his career, so his 3rd Logic manifested itself differently. On the one hand, her fears were embodied in severe newspaper censorship. On the other hand, a good envy of other people's intelligence led Napoleon to take scientists with him on his campaigns, to care for them like no other, to take pride in the title of member of the National Institute like no other title.

As Napoleon's career progressed, Napoleon's ideas about his own mental faculties obviously changed dramatically; his self-confidence in this respect eventually reached such a degree that, once a silent artillery captain, he turned into a tireless chatterbox by the time of his coronation. According to Colencœur, Napoleon **"did not have enough of the might of power and the power of force. He still wanted the power of persuasion."** The fact that his thirst for persuasion was impractical and represented a form of self-affirmation is indicated by the fact that the emperor often spent his polemical fervor on small people who did not decide anything, the same Colencœur, who himself was surprised by Napoleon's passion in this matter and wrote: "The more difficult was the emperor to convince me, the more art and ingenuity he used to achieve this goal. Judging by his efforts, by the brilliance of his arguments and the form of his speech, *you could think that I was a power*, and he was extremely interested in convincing that power.

I have often observed in him this eagerness and this perseverance. I am far from attributing it to my own account. He did the same thing to everyone he wanted to convince, and **he always wanted to do it.**

His Logic was the 3rd, and so it remained, with all its derivatives: skepticism, susceptibility to superstition, short-lived forecasts and the superiority of the irrepressible "I want! 1st Will over the sobering babble of reason. The defectiveness of the Emperor's logical apparatus was no mystery to the courtiers and was simply glossed over by them. Caulaincourt, who spent a short time near Bonaparte, wrote: "When the Emperor had any idea that he thought useful, he created illusions for himself. He assimilated the idea, cherished it, was penetrated by it; he, so to speak, absorbed it with all his pores. Can we blame him for trying to give illusions to others? If he was trying to tempt you, he himself had already been tempted before you were. *No man's mind and judgment have been deceived to such an extent, have been so much exposed to error, have been so much a victim of their own imagination and their own passion, as the emperor's mind and judgment...*

Possessing such genius, such hardened character, and such a powerful will that made him stronger than failure, he was at the same time so prone to indulge in dreams, as if he really needed this means of consolation of weak souls.

* * *

Napoleon's 4th Emotion, as is the custom of all Fourth Functions, was non-partisan, malleable, and could create the illusion of good artistic ability. The 1st Will usually uses the 4th Emotion for political purposes, which is what Napoleon did, who liked to say: "I can be a fox or a lion. The whole secret of governing is to know when to be one or the other." Napoleon tried to use his artistic talents in his negotiations with Alexander I, at critical moments playing in front of the Russian king's state of affect. Alexander, however, was a more talented actor than Napoleon (see "Dumas"); he was subtle in his own play and subtly aware of the play of others, so he did not believe Napoleon's affect and responded by grasping the door handle with determination, much better played the offended virtue.

* * *

The "Napoleon" type can be considered quite common in the world. Thanks to the 2nd Physique, he is good at any position. True, "Napoleon" is good as a worker, but he is even better as a master; he is a good athlete, but even luckier as a coach. In short, in all matters concerning leadership (1st Will) in the practical field (2nd Physics), "Napoleon" is hard to beat.

Among famous people, "Napoleons" are very likely to include: Caesar, the Apostle Paul, Luther, Bismarck, Churchill, Franco, Tito, Den Xiao Ping, Marshal Zhukov, Pope John Paul II, Valens and a host of other big and small "Bonapartists" for whom the sphere of application is only an excuse to fulfill a major need, the need for leadership.

The usual "Napoleon" is an ungrown, dense man with a stubborn, good-natured, sneering look. Clothes are emphasized neat, clean, with many clasps and not flashy. His hair is short and practical. Speech is emotionally free, but somewhat retarded. - Dense, stocky man with a hard, straight, mocking gaze. His face is round. He is sassy, ceremonious, unflappable. The gesture is calm, stately, confident, precise. His speech is even, assertive, ironic, monotonous. Secretly has a weakness for music, literature, art, and, after drinking, not averse to sing something himself in a soft, little expressive voice. His eyes are persistent, attentive, thoughtful, without gleam. Mimicry and gestures are almost absent. The haircut is short and neat, even women rarely resort to hair coloring "Tvardovsky" is caring, homely, handy, although not without arrogance and irony refers to the simple cares of life

ALBERT EINSTEIN

- 1) LOGIC ("dogmatic")
- 2) WILL ("nobleman")
- 3) EMOTION ("dry")
- 4) PHYSICS ("slacker")

There were, at first glance, many strange things about Einstein's character. He could, for example, marry a girl just because he liked her voice. Mileva Maric was unattractive, with a limp, and "one of my fellow students once said to Einstein, alluding to her limp: "I would never dare to marry a woman who is not quite healthy. Einstein quietly replied, "Why not? She has a lovely voice." And married.

In this respect, Einstein is reminiscent of Roxanne in Rostov's *Cyrano de Bergerac*. She, as we remember, put her ability to speak deeply and strongly about her feelings far above her outward attractiveness. And as is usual in such cases, the reason for this preference is the mental type of Roxanne and Einstein. **With the 3rd Emotion and 4th Physics, sensitivity automatically prevails over sensuality.**

The heightened sensitivity of the 3rd Emotion, a function of vulnerability, at the same time requires a certain restraint in the manifestation of feelings and not without pleasure restrains their excessively violent

manifestations. A classmate of Einstein recalled: "... it was one of those complex natures who know how to hide under a prickly shell filled with tenderness realm of his intense emotional life. Chance commanded that this thinker spread his tent in the romantic camp of the Winteler family, where he felt happy. Then, as now, he felt just an organic need to perform Schumann's songs "Walnut. "Lotus"...I can't remember all the names anymore. This music was also enjoyed by Heine, his favorite poet. Often there were times when the last chord would barely sound and Einstein, with his witty joke, would bring us back from heaven to earth, deliberately disrupting the enchantment.

Einstein hated sentimentality, and even around people who were easily enthused, he always kept his cool.

The ulcer on Einstein's 3rd Emotion was so deep that he openly opposed romanticism, a current that all "dryers" condemned, but not all openly condemned. He said: "In my opinion, in philosophy, as well as in art, romanticism - a kind of illegal technique, which is resorted to, not too much trouble, to achieve a deeper perception. Moreover, Einstein denied the need for beauty in science, thereby drying up even that sphere of human activity which is dry by its very nature.

"Einstein" is the type of the classical scientist, exactly the way the average man is used to imagine a scientist: eternally immersed in the world of ideas (1st Logic), oblivious of daily bread (4th Physics), indifferent to beauty (3rd Emotion). "Einstein" often looks like a caricature of a scientist, the reality, of course, is much more complicated, but in its main external parameters the caricature is correct.

* * *

According to the custom of the 1st Logic, Einstein preferred the role of a lonely thinker to all roles. He himself wrote that "for a scientist the ideal place would be a lighthouse keeper," and the objections of friends, as if a man for creativity needs society, did not shake his position.

Einstein's craving for solitude was twofold. The intellectual autonomy of the 1st Logic combined in him with the hardened individualism of the 2nd Will. On the "noble" nature of his character he wrote: "My passionate desire for social justice and a sense of social duty has always been in a strange contradiction with the apparent lack of need for close communication with individuals and entire communities. I am a true individualist and have never given my heart undividedly to the state, to my homeland, to my friends and even to my own family, I have been attached to them, but I have always experienced an unremitting sense of alienation and need for solitude; this has only increased with the years... A person of this kind, of course, loses part of his spontaneity, his carefree nature, but he acquires complete inner independence....

In general, analyzing the nature of Einstein, you come to the conclusion that the autonomy and independence of his mind is inseparable from the autonomy and independence of temper, both merged in his nature and appears to the eyes of outsiders as a whole. Einstein classmate wrote: "Taunting fold in the corner of his plump mouth with a slightly protruding lower lip deterred filisters, discouraged them from closer acquaintance.

Circumstances did not exist for him. Philosophically smiling, he looked at the universe and ruthlessly branded a witty joke all that bore the stamp of vanity and pretentiousness ... He fearlessly expressed their views, not stopping to hurt his companion. Einstein's whole being breathed such courageous truthfulness, which ultimately impressed even his opponents.

As a student, Einstein, having received, along with other students, an instruction describing the problem and method of its solution, threw the instruction in the basket and carried out the solutions in his own way. One day an angry professor asked his assistant: "What do you think of Einstein? Doesn't he do things the way I tell him to?" The assistant replied, "That's true, Mr. Professor! But his decisions are correct, and the methods he employs are always interesting." Who will undertake to judge in this case what is of the independence of character (2nd Will) and what is of the selfishness of mind (1st Logic)?

Einstein's unpretentiousness in everyday life and selflessness became a legend. He gave up priceless violins, turned bank checks with many zeros into bookmarks, was anecdotally careless in food and clothing, and I don't need to say that all these features of Einstein's behavior go back to his 4th Physics.

* * *

Perhaps, in justice, this mental type should have had a second name besides the name of Einstein, the name of Berdyaev. The fact is that Berdyaev was not just an "Einstein," but a man like few who looked deeply and honestly into himself, and his book "Self-Cognition" is an outstanding monument of confessional literature. I refer those who are curious to this book, but for now I will cite only a few very expressive quotations that exhaustively describe the "Einstein's" order of functions. Berdyaev wrote: "I noticed the slightest shades in the change of moods. *And at the same time this hypersensitivity was united in me with the fundamental dryness of my nature.* My sensitivity is dry. Many have noticed this mental dryness of mine. There is little moisture in me. The landscape of my soul sometimes appears to me as a waterless desert with bare rocks, sometimes as a dense forest. I have always loved gardens, loved greenery. But there is no garden in me. The highest rises of my life are connected with dry fire. The element of fire is closest to me. The elements of water and earth are more alien to me. This made my life little cozy, little joyful. But I love comfort. I have never experienced melancholy and did not love this state. I did not belong to the so-called "soulful" people. In me the lyrical element was weakly expressed, crushed. *I have always been very sensitive to tragic things in life.* It has to do with sensitivity to suffering. I'm a man of dramatic element. More of a spiritual person than a soul person. There's a dryness associated with that. I have always felt disharmonious in the relationship between my spirit and my soul shells. *My spirit was stronger than my soul.* There was disharmony in the emotional life of the soul, often weakness. The spirit was healthy, but the soul was sick. The very dryness of the soul was a disease. **I did not notice in myself any disorder of thought or bifurcation of the will, but I did notice a disorder of the emotional.** "Einstein's" impeccable self-diagnosis: 1st Logic, 2nd Will, 3rd Emotion.

Berdyaev's autobiographical book contains many examples of the 4th Physics as well. Here are some of them: "Those close to me have even *sometimes said that I have ascetic tendencies. This is not true; in fact, asceticism is alien to me. I've been spoiled since childhood, needing comfort. But I could never understand when it was said that abstinence and ascesis were very difficult...* I had ascetic tastes and did not follow the ascetic path; I was exceptionally pityful and did little to realize it... *Life in this world is afflicted with a profound tragedy... A state of longing is peculiar to me...* I never had a sense of descent from my father and mother, I never felt that I was born of my parents. My dislike of all things ancestral is a characteristic of mine. I don't like family and nepotism, and I am struck by the attachment to family origins of Western peoples. Some friends jokingly call me the enemy of the human race.

* * *

To complete the picture, it would be good to give an example of an "Einstein" politician. And fortunately, there is a fresh and very expressive example of such a politician: George W. Bush.

George W. Bush is, in my opinion, one of the best presidents the United States has ever had. Even during his vice-presidency, he drew attention with his equanimity, correctness, delicacy and loyalty. He played on the Reagan team and behaved in strict accordance with his place on the team and the rules of the collective game. When it was his turn to take over the White House, Bush, without changing anything in the spirit of the Reagan administration (both had the 2nd Will), changed a lot in his appearance and his system of priorities.

The principles of collegiality, "delegation of responsibility," the desire for consensus, working for one's cause rather than for oneself, remained intact. People in the know said of Bush: "He presides, but he does not lead. "... He was born for that role. But he has spent most of his life working for others. One gets the impression that now that he has become the highest official in the state, he works for the presidency itself as president." At the same time, much has changed since Bush came to the White House. Under Reagan, "formal meetings arranged by White House staff turned into welcoming rather than business meetings. As a rule, the president would greet the group with a silly joke, followed by a cheat sheet of remarks that were supposed to raise his profile. As his guests spoke, he crunched his lollipops and nodded understandingly. Then it was "thank you," "God bless you," and "let's take a picture.

Bush was told differently: "Bush is a serious listener and asks serious questions. Cribs and organized photography are a thing of the past. " "To replace the politicians recruited by Reagan... Bush brought in figures of a very different kind. Seats in his government were filled by people who were very competent and usually possessed of the broadest connections and experience. For them, throughout their political careers, ideological leanings have almost always played a secondary role. Pragmatism and professionalism are

the two main qualities that American observers believe are 'abundant' in those who, led by Bush, constitute the core of the new administration."

The difference in the manners of the two presidents apparently determined the difference in the position of Logic on the steps of their order of functions. Logic, Reagan's weakness, was Bush's main strength, and his versatile competence colored everything his administration did. In general, one gets the impression that God is watching America in a special way. The Bush presidency is a clear proof of that. He had to arrange it so that in the most dangerous period of postwar history, the collapse of the Warsaw Pact, the Soviet Union, the collapse of communist ideology, and the Persian Gulf crisis, Bush found himself at the helm of the American state as the most prepared president for this mission. Looking back now, one cannot help but be struck by the intelligence, tact and equanimity with which America emerged from that global turmoil.

Especially revealing from the point of view of psychosophy is the war in the Persian Gulf. As we remember, man conflicts in accordance with his order of functions, consistently, from top to bottom, putting them into action. Bush behaved accordingly with regard to Iraq. Only when the futility of peaceful means of influence on the aggressor became apparent, he struck, but he did so in accordance with his order of functions: coldly and mercilessly (3rd Emotion + 4th Physics).

The cold-bloodedness of Bush's 3rd Emotion had an effect on the outcome of his second term in office. Not positively, of course. Americans were fed up with a president who had no charm, with a strained smile, making clever, but extremely boring speeches. Although we now realize that Bush, by virtue of the 3rd Emotion, only looked insensitive, not was. But... Bush tried to explain himself to the public on this point by saying, "Of course, the president has to switch from domestic policy issues to foreign policy issues, and then back to domestic again, all the time. Sometimes, like today with that handicapped Thai kid from Bangkok singing, *I get caught up in the emotion of the moment, and the emotion comes out*. As I watched the happy face of this blind kid abandoned by his parents on the streets of Bangkok, now singing on the South Lawn, *I must confess I had a spasm*. But then the National Security Council meeting began, and thinking about the kid on the lawn was no longer possible. I had to concentrate on important matters of national security. But that's life. It's part of my job." But the Americans were too lazy to delve into the complexities of the president's mental organization and chose another, more outgoing, saxophone player. Bush had no choice but to console himself with the simple, obvious, but little effective argument: "Pudding is what it tastes like, not what it looks like."

* * *

The extreme rationalism and desiccation of Einstein's mental organization seem to rule out the fruitfulness of this type of activity in the cultural field. However, numerous images of Einstein himself with a violin in his hands already hint at a more often hidden but intense aesthetic life.

Moreover, we can name three "Einstineins" who not only devoted their lives to art, but became the greatest painters in the history of the world. The reader will be surprised, but they are: Andrei Rublev, Leonardo da Vinci, and Georges Sera.

Almost nothing is known about Rublev, very little about Leonardo, and little more about Sera than about Leonardo. But if we sort out the biographical crumbs according to the scheme we know, and most importantly, put their works, which are not comparable in time and space, next to each other, then a typical "Einsteinian" picture of the mental organization of all three will build up by itself.

1st Logic. The works of all three are characterized by an intellectual richness which surpasses all commonplace. An analysis of the compositions of Rublev, Leonardo and Sera shows the mathematical verification of each point, detail and line, i.e. demonstrates the extraordinary strength of the artist's head, visible already from the way he builds the composition. The fact that Leonardo was a great scientist and engineer, while Serra was scolded as a "chemist" and "mathematician" only confirms the conclusions following from the analysis of their special compositional gift. Sera cross marked one characteristic statement in an article from the magazine "Ar": "In art, everything must be conscious" - and there is no doubt that both Rublev and Leonardo would have signed it.

2nd Will. All three were short apprentices, quickly surpassed their teachers and soon found their own path in art. Although Rublev and Leonardo had teachers to envy - Theophanes the Greek and Perugino. All three were major reformers of painting of their time, but they did not create their own schools and did not seem to aspire to do so. The works of Rublev, Leonardo and Sera are characterized by statism and inner peace of the characters and nature, they seem to be washed by silence and peaceful solitude of the self-sufficient man. And all of this is a clear sign of "noble" psychology, strong, independent, creative, calm and self-confident.

The 3rd Emotion. The paintings of Rublev, Leonardo and Sera are not paintings of feelings, but *paintings of moods*, i.e. of matter much more subtle than that usually represented by painting. The gestures and facial expressions of the characters are extremely restrained, and there is no stirring of any kind in the views of nature depicted on the canvases of these artists. Though only the smile of "Gioconda" was dubbed "mysterious", in fact all the art of Rublev, Leonardo and Sera is mysterious in its inexpressibility, in the indefinability of those states, which, existing at the level of ultrasound, can only be guessed in their works. All attempts to describe the moods of "Gioconda", "The Savior of Zvenigorod" and "The Courbois Bridge" are doomed, for there are simply no words to adequately convey their tenderness, subtlety and complexity.

4th Physics. At the same time, if, greatly simplifying and coarsening, we try to formulate a typical mood for the work of all three, to name their emotional dominant, it would be **sadness**. As already mentioned, the "lazybones" are a people weakened vitally and give preference to darkly colored emotions. The sun in the paintings of Sulphur and Leonardo, if it shines, does not warm them. Color in the paintings of all three is complex and not

vivid, volumes are not lush in sculpture, bodies lack power and libido, which is natural to the iconographic tradition of Rublev's time, but completely alien to the Renaissance and Impressionist tradition.

History has left us no psychological portrait of Rublev. Leonardo was sometimes referred to by his contemporaries as a man extremely reserved in his feelings - and only that. Sulphur, however, was the subject of a small psychological portrait of him, which we can, with some adjustments, transfer to Rublev and Leonardo, as well as to all the "Einstiens" involved in art: "Dignified, modest and simple, but so imbued with the idea of the need and sufficiency of science and chemistry in art that it was astonishing.

* * *

Of course, "Einstein," working in the cultural field, is ready to declare his peculiar talent not only in painting. But not to stretch the narrative, I will just mention that a great example of an "Einstein" poet was Nikolai Zabolotsky. Read his poems, they say it all. I will cite only one quatrain by Zabolotsky, in which the poet named the Bottom and the Top with impeccable precision:

"Through mouths, stomachs, gullets,
Through the intestinal prison
The central path of nature lies
To a blessed mind."

* * *

Thin facial features, thinness, carelessness in dress - the characteristic features of the appearance of "Einstein. His hair is short and untidy, and his gaze is sad and ironic. Mimicry and gestures are almost colorless.

HANS CHRISTIAN ANDERSEN

- 1) EMOTION ("romantic")
- 2) LOGIC ("rhetorician")
- 3) WILL ("bourgeois")
- 4) PHYSICS ("slacker")

It is impossible to comprehend "Andersen" from Andersen's fairy tales. Though, the tragic overload typical of the plots of his fairy tales already allows us to guess in him a "romantic" and a "lazy man" (1st Emotion + 4th Physics). Strangers to Andersen in his

fairy tales were the optimistic endings he attached in spite of his own feelings, simply according to the laws of the genre. If genre allowed, one of Andersen's best tales would be the tale of the ugly duckling (3rd Will + 4th Physics) who **knows** (2nd Logic) that he cannot be a swan and who laments his bitter knowledge and fate (1st Emotion) alone in the dark corners of the bird yard in loud, gagging lamentation. Such is the true Andersen, and to see the famous storyteller and his type more clearly, let us turn to fragments of one biography of Andersen.

His biographer wrote: "He made an impression of a funny but charming man, and in addition was distinguished by a naive and open obnoxiousness, which gradually provided him with important acquaintances, even among the wealthy townspeople. He was guided by a thirst for reading... Immediacy - or tenderness of mind, as he himself said - was one of the mysteries of his being and, over time, proved to be a strong feature of his character. But it was closely related to a congenital nervousness, which already then and throughout his later life brought him a lot of suffering, manifesting itself *in particular in periodic depressions* ... *At the root of these fears and anxieties was the inescapable feeling that he was not yet old enough and did not meet the requirements of the adult world.* "I am still as childlike as ever, but I am even happy about it," he wrote movingly...

One sometimes suspects that, despite his anxieties, *he still too often plays the role of the persecuted and resentful. Throughout his life he has been prone to gloomy and depressed moods and has often gone deeper into them instead of overcoming...*

...he was painfully sensitive; more than once the women of the family had to console and reassure him when he left the table in tears, offended by this or that innocent joke...

He looked big and strong, and in certain situations he could give himself a lot of weight. But this strength was deceptive. In reality, he had to suffer all his life because of his very poor health. Strangely enough, none of his contemporaries were aware of this. Listening to him complain about various minor ailments, his friends attributed them to hypochondria, the self-indulgence of a lonely bachelor. So did Edward Collin. After forty years of acquaintance, he wrote to Andersen in 1865, "You have, in fact, excellent health; your nervousness is not killing you, but only tormenting.

It was easy for others to say that he only seemed, for him the weakness was more than real... He had to constantly pick himself up, constantly try to deceive himself from his own sense of powerlessness, constantly have success or at least receive as an incentive praise and support. It happened that *out of grief he would sit at home all day and cry.*

With such a constitution he was inevitably self-absorbed, restless, unbalanced and irritable...

He never felt his composure for long, anything could cause him irritation, he lost patience over small things, at times behaved like a spoiled child or a mentally ill person...

In his large but frail body lived an unrestrained soul, a volcano-like temperament, a fierceness and impetuosity that often enough surprised and terrified him. He was torn by

enormous inner contradictions, and at times all his efforts were devoted to keeping himself in check...

He had a nervous fear of the harsh realities of life; he lacked the masculine firmness that sometimes made him speak of his semi-womanly nature. His indecisiveness manifested itself in his remarkably cautious attitude toward some of his more opinionated friends and, most strikingly, in his more than cautious attitude toward women... His need for women was great, but his fear of them was even greater. He seemed to have an irresistible instinctive fear of intimacy with women, a puritanical fear of sexual attraction...

Even more remarkably, all these features- immaturity, far-reaching vanity, and ridiculous self-absorption-appeared alongside opposing tendencies... There were other contradictions in him, less serious but conspicuous enough that his friends, and he himself, were struck by them: great good nature and a tendency to conceal malice, heartfelt openness and wise calculation, desire for solitude and need for society, cowardly fear and amazing courage at the right moment, pathetic weakness and steadfast endurance...

There was every reason to fear that such a frantic and contradictory soul would one day snap, and in his later years, as his strength began to leave him, at some points he was unable to control the demons raging within him. But fortunately, *there were stabilizing factors in his psyche. For example, a clear mind that allowed him to see himself from the outside and admit his weaknesses and oddities...*

Soberly and impartially he saw a strange contradiction between his own mood and the real reality... All his life he was the sharpest observer for himself and the sternest judge...

Many argued whether or not he could be tolerated and had the right to be unbearable. But most went no further than digging into his quirks and oddities and characterized him with the simplest of clichés: childishness, pride, self-absorption, ambition..."

I think in such a lengthy quotation the reader couldn't help but subtract all the main features of the "Andersonian" order of functions: 1st Emotion, 2nd Logic, 3rd Will, 4th Physics.

Andersen appears to be an exceptional, pathological figure, but in fact there was nothing pathological about his psyche. It is bitter to say this, but "Andersen" does not exist as a disease, but as a norm, a psychotypic norm, a person with a certain order of functions.

"Andersen" is the most tragic of all, rich in the tragic types of human psychology. The weakened vitality of the 4th Physique paints "Andersen's" worldview in tragic tones, makes him live in constant anticipation of disaster. Shakiness of the 3rd Will generates dislike of oneself and others, resentfulness, suspiciousness, capriciousness, hypochondria. When all this chronic nightmare caused by inferior functions is voiced by excessive 1st Emotion with its megaphone power, tears are not the strongest reaction to the polar night reigning in such a soul. I think people with the "andersen" psychotype must prevail in suicide statistics. No wonder the storyteller himself remained virgin and lonely. Such a decision should be recognized as both courageous and wise: to multiply the ranks of similar sufferers and infect his pain to others, did not make sense and could not bring joy.

Usually the "andersen" is a thin, big-eyed, fine-looking person. The gaze is evasive, but if you catch it, you can read the longing, fear, passion, and intelligence all at once in the unusually expressive eyes of this type of person. Carelessly dressed, indifferent to food, comfort, and the opposite sex, "andersen" is a real excitement is only in communication, ready to talk, talk, talk ... Communicating with him could be a torture, if it were not for a special talent to turn his speech into a magnificent dish - the fruit of a flexible, strong, versatile mind and a soul sensitive to all the beautiful and expressive. At the same time, it would be extremely reckless to relax while talking to "Andersen. The most relaxed and heated communication can be suddenly cut off at half a word, instantly transformed into a scandal, cold, alienation, tears, because "andersen" terribly vague, painfully offensive and talented at spiteful language. One can understand Dickens, when he thankfully baptized after leaving his quiet, hospitable home Andersen.

If "Andersen's" life is not finally made a hell, it is only thanks to the strong and flexible 2nd Logic. It is the only healthy part of his nature that can intelligently, aloofly, analyze from the outside what is going on in "Andersen's" soul, diagnose and predict the consequences. A good knowledge of oneself is a very comforting and effective tool for quenching the pain of these painful natures. After another scandal, Andersen wrote to a friend: "I am insane! But it will pass before you receive my letter..." "Andersen" knows himself, and this knowledge at least in part keeps his perpetually sideways, fractured psyche in balance.

The "andersen" men deserve special compassion. Belonging to the most tragic of mental types, they are also the most deprived within this psychotype, deprived by gender correspondence. The "Andersen" man is an eternal teenage girl, stuffed into a bulky suit of an adult masculine being. Explaining what life is like for this girl in such a suit is difficult, complicated and better not necessary. Who knows, knows...

NIKOLAY BUKHARIN

- 1) EMOTION ("romantic")
- 2) PHYSICS ("toiler")
- 3) LOGIC ("skeptic")
- 4) WILL ("serf")

Bukharin was Lenin's closest associate, leader and ideologist of the Bolshevik Party, "the golden child of the revolution," "the Veniamin of Bolshevik leadership," and "the favorite of the party. Executed by Stalin in 1938.

Bukharin's trouble was a common trouble of the "serfs" - controllability. He wanted to be an artist, he was good at it, but at the beginning of the twentieth century Russia was delirious about revolution and revolutionaries were in vogue. Young people are known to be particularly susceptible to fashion, so it is not surprising that Bukharin, with his social-democratically oriented 2nd Physique, found himself among the radicals already in his gymnasium years. What is surprising is that he did not mix painting with political struggle, as many did, but devoted himself wholly to politics, being a creature apolitical by nature. Bukharin himself explained the categorical nature of his choice by saying that "one life cannot be divided between such demanding gods as art and revolution," but I think it was not the incompatibility of idols. A decisive role in the fate of Nikolai Bukharin was played by his closest grammar school friend, Ilya Ehrenburg, a zealous Bolshevik at the time. His superior Will easily recruited Bukharin into the ranks of politicians. Later Ehrenburg, fearing the pressure of Lenin's most powerful Will, crawled away from the ranks of professional revolutionaries and took up art history, journalism, and writing, while Bukharin, having found in Lenin a real master, remained.

The relationship between Lenin and Bukharin is a special section of their biographies. Lenin appreciated the malleability of Bukharin's 4th Will, but was also afraid that this malleability might turn into political prostitution. He wrote: "We know Comrade Bukharin's softness, one of the qualities for which he is so loved and cannot be disliked. We know that more than once he was jokingly called 'soft wax. It turns out that on this 'soft wax' any 'unprincipled' person, any 'demagogue' can write anything." Lenin, of course, was vainly jealous; Bukharin belonged to him indiscriminately, but it does not follow that

Bukharin considered it obligatory for himself, copying Lenin exactly, to transfer political squabbles to individuals. On the contrary, Bukharin was personally quite impartial (the 4th Will) and maintained the friendliest relations even with his most avowed political enemies, frightening the Bolshevik superiors with this omnivorousness.

Another source of friction between Lenin and Bukharin: a certain servile freedom of the "serf" standing above the Will (decide for me, but I think for myself). Bukharin's Logic, though 3rd, was first-rate, especially in comparison with other Bolshevik nonscientists. His decent education gave him a significant head start and allowed him to open his mouth without fear among like-minded people. It turned out that the Party had two ideologues: Lenin and Bukharin - which Bukharin easily put up with, but Lenin did not. He quarreled assiduously with Bukharin, playing offended Marxist innocence, berating him with the last words in their political vocabulary, clearly leading to a rupture. Colleagues in the political struggle suggested to Bukharin the source of the squabble: "...your Lenin cannot tolerate any man with a head around him," - and they were wrong. Lenin was not only ready to tolerate intelligent people near him, but even sympathized with them. A different thing is that he kept the ideological monopoly, as well as the political monopoly, for himself and did not tolerate rivals in this field. This circumstance did not prevent Lenin from drawing a handful of handfuls from Bukharin's scolded articles retrospectively, from publishing explicit plagiarism under his own name.

It seemed more attractive to Lenin to exploit the softness of Bukharin's 4th Will by making him the "settler" of interdepartmental and inter-factional conflicts. And it must be admitted that the choice of such a role for Bukharin was as fortunate as possible. His lack of personal interest, non-partisanship, and sincere benevolence toward the opposing sides ensured his trust in the litigants and the feasible success of his mission.

Lenin's opponents dreamed of using Bukharin in a different way. Finding a certain system in his chronic falling into opposition to Lenin, they suspected in this figure a hardened, consistent and talented frontrunner, ready and able to replace the prickly, uncomfortable Lenin. And, of course, they miscalculated. When a representative of the Left SR promised Bukharin a Leninist chair, he answered with genuine consternation: *"Do I have the necessary data to become the leader of the party and fight Lenin and the Bolshevik Party? No, don't deceive yourself!"*

Bukharin's golden age came between the end of Lenin's autocracy and the beginning of Stalin's autocracy. As one of the key figures in the Party leadership at that time, he withdrew from the struggle for leadership (4th Will) from the outset, bargaining for his neutrality the position of official ideologist of the Party (honey for the 3rd Logic). Bukharin's position as a weight that could tip the scales of the struggle for power in one direction or another not only gave him the position of the first ideologist, but also shaped the face of the country for this period: it humbled the cannibalistic instincts of the main pretenders to the throne (Stalin, Trotsky, Zinoviev), liberalizing the cultural and economic policies of the authorities as much as possible. Private initiative especially blossomed,

soaking up like a sponge the slogan thrown out by Bukharin, dear to his 2nd Physique: "Enrich yourselves!"

The story of the sunset of Bukharin's career and life is banal and sad, like any sunset story of the lives of nice, glorious, but weak people. After receiving sole power from his hands, Stalin thanked his friend only by shooting him as one of the last. Shooting "Bukharinists" and "right-wing deviationists" began even before Bukharin's arrest. By the way, my grandfather, a professor at a Leningrad institute, was also among them, shot in 1937, i.e. a year before the execution of his idol. Bukharin's death is made all the more sad by the fact that, under no illusions about Stalin's character and talents, before his arrest he had made his wife learn by heart a letter to succeeding generations, the contents of which were limited to an oath of allegiance to the tyrant. Sad but true, like any "serf," Bukharin, even in the face of eternity, remained more loyal than a citizen.

About the appearance and character of "Bukharin" as a mental type, it is probably possible to say the same words that were used in describing Bukharin himself by his acquaintances and biographers: "He had the appearance of a saint rather than a rebel and a thinker. His open face with its enormous forehead and clear shining eyes *was in its perfect sincerity almost ageless*. "Charming with women, at ease with children, accessible to both the worker and the intellectual, he was a 'sympathetic personality' even in the eyes of his opponents. His youthful enthusiasm, sociability, intimate humor... was already making an impression on his acquaintances. *They spoke of his kindness, nobility, expansiveness, and love of life.*

* * *

Of the literary characters, the type of "Bukharin" is most accurately conveyed by Tolstoy in the image of Platon Karataev. Karataev's vivid, imaginative speech, industriousness, kindness, caring, sincerity and inescapable fatalism are the best way to reproduce the psychotypical traits of the "Bukharin".

To what others have said about the "Bukharin," I would like to add one notable trait of his character: he is not jealous. I once had the chance to meet a woman of this type. With her usual "Bukharin's" candor she told me that it was her fate to marry a pathological bureaucrat. Remarkably, she was upset by her husband's behavior, but not by his red tape. "I'm not jealous," she said simply. Not even the fact that her husband was eventually imprisoned for attempted rape changed anything. She uncomplainingly went to his camp for the rest of her sentence - to nourish her stomach and sexually. I don't know how their story continues, but there is no doubt that there will be no end to her husband's infidelity or to her wife's patience.

"Bukharin is a living subversion of Freud, a living anti-Oedipus. His 2nd Physique is too strong and flexible to be jealous with physiological jealousy. And the 4th Will has too little self-respect to disagree in advance with cheating.

And vice versa. Berdyaev had the 2nd Will with the 4th Physique, and he wrote: "I am quite incapable of experiencing a feeling of jealousy. One gets the impression that anyone whose Will and Physics occupy the non-injurious Second and Fourth rungs on the hierarchy of functions, i.e. people belonging to the types "Bukharin", "Berthier", "Gazzali",

"Einstein", can be included among the Freudian subversives, people who are not jealous by nature.

SOCRAT

- 1) WILL ("king")
- 2) LOGIC ("rhetorician")
- 3) EMOTION ("dry")
- 4) PHYSICS ("slacker")

The pupils, colleagues and successors of Socrates, the founding father of European philosophy, in the tradition of corporate myth-making have concocted a sweet myth about the kindest, sweetest old man, who allegedly became the innocent victim of the most vile and nefarious of his fellow citizens. However, despite the fact that today the death penalty seems too harsh as a measure of social self-protection, we must still say that Socrates was not the sweetest, kindest old man that the self-serving corporate legend portrays him as. And the sacrifice made by the Athenians in his person was not entirely innocent. In any case, a basic acquaintance with the essence of the conflict between Socrates and his fellow citizens compels us to treat the latter, if not with sympathy, then with understanding.

It should be remembered that Socrates was formally accused by only a few people, and the accusation was, for better or for worse, subject to Athenian law at the time (for example, the accusation of heresy). **In reality, however, Socrates was a bone in the throat of the entire city and was being tried for an unprosecutable reason: his trashy character.**

In Plato's "Apologia of Socrates" (a work which, according to scholars, most accurately conveys the image of the philosopher) Socrates himself set forth, as was his custom in many words, his personal position and the motives of the city's annoyance with himself: "So, O men of Athens, you should defend yourselves and try in a little time to refute the slander that has been going on between you for a long time.... Only I think it is difficult, and it is no mystery to me what an undertaking it is..."

Perhaps some of you will say, "Socrates, what do you do? Where do these slanders come from?" Listen... This fame, O men of Athens, I received no other way than through a certain wisdom. What wisdom is that? Yes, it must be human wisdom. With this wisdom I may indeed be wise... And you make no noise, O men of Athens, even if it seems to you that *I speak somewhat arrogantly*; I will not speak my own words, I will refer to words that are reliable for you. Witness my wisdom, if only it is wisdom, and what it consists in, I will bring you the god who is in Delphi. After all, you know Cherephontes... Well, here we are, coming one day to Delphi, he dared to address the oracle with such a question. I told you to be quiet, O men! So he asked if there was anyone in the world wiser than me, and Pythia answered him that no one was wiser. And though he himself is dead, here is his brother to testify it to you.

Now see why I say this; my intention is to explain to you where the slander against me comes from. When I heard this, I began to ponder with myself in this way: what would God want to say and what does he mean? Because, of course, I myself am not at all conscious of my wisdom; what does he mean by saying that I am wiser than everyone else? He can't lie; he's not supposed to. For a long time I was perplexed what he wanted to say; then, having gathered my strength, I resorted to this solution of the question: I went to one of those people who are reputed to be wise, thinking that here I will most likely refute the oracle, announcing to the oracle that this, they say, is wiser than me, and you called me the wisest. Well, when I had a closer look at this man - there is no need to call him by name, I will only say that the man, when I looked at him, what I saw, was one of the men of state, O men of Athens - so when I had a closer look at him (and had a conversation with him), it seemed to me that this man only seemed wise to many others and especially to himself, but that in fact he was wise, it was not so; And *I tried to prove to him that he only thinks he is wise, but that he is not really wise*. This made him and many of those present hate me... From thence I went to

another, of those who seem wiser than the other, and I saw the same thing; and from that time he and many others hated me.

After that, I began to walk in order. I noticed that I was becoming hateful, I was upset by it and I was afraid of it, but at the same time it seemed to me that the words of God must be put above everything. So, to understand what the saying of God means, it seemed to me necessary to go to all who are said to know something... *After the men of state, I went to the poets...* I am ashamed, men, to tell you the truth, and yet I should tell you. Well, yes, in a word, almost all of those present were better able to explain what was done by these poets than they were... and at the same time I noticed that because of their poetic talent, they considered themselves the wisest of men in other respects as well, which was not the case. I left there too, thinking that I excelled them in the same way that I excelled the state people.

Toward the end I went to the craftsmen... But, O men of Athens, it seemed to me that they sinned in the same way as the poets...so, returning to the saying, I asked myself what I would prefer for myself, to remain as I am, being neither wise by their wisdom nor ignorant by their ignorance, or, like them, to be both. And I answered myself and the oracle that it was more profitable for me to remain as I am.

Even if we disregard the fact that here the essence of the conflict is presented in the mouth of the accused himself, i.e., biased by definition, Socrates' speech looks shocking. It does not take much imagination to imagine how things really happened and in color. A busy man, not the last in his field, is rushed in by a ragged, dirty old man, a notorious slacker and chatterbox in town (even his wife characterized Socrates in this way). And bursting in tells him that his dead friend has managed to get the answer "no" from the Oracle of Delphi to the question: is there anyone wiser than Socrates? The dead man is not much in demand, nor is the Oracle much in demand. But the problem is not even what the oracle said, and not even that the old man piously believed in this prophecy. The problem is that with all the passion and excitement he took it upon himself to prove its validity. Simply put, to prove to the Athenians that all of them, minus one of them, were complete idiots. Not only are such tasks not of great intelligence (only an advanced age can excuse Socrates here), but they are downright unsafe anywhere at any time.

To the Athenians' credit, even the artisans did not dare to beat the old man, and all the offended classes, having agreed, simply dragged Socrates to court, hoping to use him to pacify the philosopher, who was in everyone's sore throat. This is where the main, fatal difficulty was discovered. It was impossible to try him for his bad language and bad temper, and the articles he drew up for the occasion turned out to be "sub-memorable. More precisely, the fact was that the philosopher had ample means and opportunities to avoid death, but Socrates would not have been a "Socrates" if he had not brought the process to the point he did. The temptation to declare himself a figure on a citywide scale was so strong that Socrates simply could not help but fall into his own order of functions. And he did.

Being by his 1st Will a very self-confident man. Socrates refused the services of a lawyer, undertook to defend himself and, defending himself, as can be seen from the above, has already publicly stated what had previously been expressed in private: the Athenians - morons, he - one clever. Thus, the 2nd Logic of the philosopher, having found such a luxurious rostrum, could not refuse himself the pleasure of explaining about this delicate subject in as much detail and at length as possible. Not only did the third emotion not decorate the speech of the accused, but it dried it up and impoverished it to the utmost. Although Socrates, being aware of this weakness, warned the judges: "You will not hear a speech, ornamented, as these people (accusers -A.A.) have, with refined expressions, but you will hear a simple speech, consisting of the first words that come up," - I think the judges could hardly listen to this preface. Finally, the natural fearlessness of the 4th Phys. in general relegated the question of life and death to the end of the philosopher's preoccupations. The question of personal prestige (the 1st Will) stood incomparably above the question of physical existence (the 4th Physics). And Socrates, to his credit, succeeded: his body died prematurely, but his name became immortal and became almost synonymous with the title which the philosopher vainly solicited from his fellow citizens - "sage".

* * *

It is not only the name of Socrates that makes this mental type famous. Calvin, Becket, Newton, Robespierre, Charles XII of Sweden, Berkeley, Peter Chaadayev, Mikhail Tukhachevsky, Khomeini, Thatcher, Brodsky, Putin, former world chess champion Anatoly Karpov belonged to "Socrates". Politicians prevail among the "Socrates", in accordance with their 1st Will, but if you put Socrates, Robespierre and Brodsky in one row, it becomes a vivid illustration of a simple but very important thesis: **psychotype is not destiny, it is only character**. Robespierre realized in politics the 1st Will of "Socrates", Socrates himself in philosophy the 2nd Logic, Brodsky in poetry the 3rd Emotion, but he could have remained in the factory as a turner, realizing the 4th Physics.

Biographies are shaped not only by inner predisposition, but also by external circumstances. Robespierre would have remained a provincial lawyer if revolutionary ferment had not broken out in France at the time. For the poor plebeian Socrates, the road to politics was closed, and to write poetry in the spirit of Brodsky, in Greece at the time, only a madman could do so. Brodsky himself, a Jew in the country of state anti-Semitism, had no career at all, and only literary work allowed him to count on any decent place in life.

At the same time, **psychotype is also destiny**. Despite their different professions, both Socrates, Robespierre, and Brodsky were engaged in the most *socially significant* occupations for their time and place: philosophy in Y century Greece, politics in late XYIII century France, poetry in 60's Russia. Socrates and Robespierre were executed, Brodsky underwent political execution, not the least of which was the self-confidence and fearlessness (1st Will + 4th Physics) of all three. That is, there are biographical points where psychotype, character, converge with fate.

The most important thing for psychology is that profession, time, space, nationality are in principle unable to bury a psychotypical commonality: a system of values, worldview, style, reactions, etc. For example, at all times and any "Socrates", being put before the choice between sex and conversation, will certainly prefer the latter, since he has Physics 4 and Logic 2. And examples from the lives of the three named "Socrates" confirm this thesis very well. When Alcviades, the object of lust of both halves of Athens, tried in a famous way to pay Socrates for the joy of communication, the philosopher said that sex is a beautiful thing, but talking about it is even better. It is known how much effort the most charming of Parisian women spent to seduce Robespierre, but all their efforts proved futile, and the case was limited to a long admonishing monologue. Baryshnikov said that once when he visited Brodsky, he found a beautiful girl in his house. Brodsky, paying no attention to her, seized Baryshnikov, took him to a nearby bar and for two hours reprimanded him for some unsuccessful TV show, which Baryshnikov had forgotten about. And you should have seen the expression of extreme bewilderment and even fright on his face Baryshnikov told this story about an alien to him "Socratic" system of values.

If there is a chance to talk about the sexuality of the "Socrates," it is better not to hide the fact that this type is the most frigid of all those types that, out of laziness, indifference, or coldness, do not hurry to the bed of pleasure. Not only that, but the main sexual functions: Emotion and Physics, are at the bottom of the "Socratic. They are the most libidinous of all: the 3rd Emotion, the 4th Physics. If we remember that the dryness of the 3rd Emotion and the laziness of the 4th Physics are multiplied in "Socrates" by the extreme individualism and aloofness of the 1st Will, then the voluntary virginity of even such eminent men as Newton, Chaadayev and Karl XII will not seem too surprising.

* * *

Of literary characters, perhaps, the most accurate type of "Socratic" is conveyed by the unforgettable Sherlock Holmes. According to the 1st Will, Holmes is an aloof, internally lonely, imperious, self-confident man; his thinking is strict and slender, and his memory is vast in the 2nd Logic; he is dry and ironic, but his coldness is combined with a secret crush on his amateur violin, which is common for the 3rd Emotion; at last, fearlessness and indifference to everyday life and financial problems clearly indicate the 4th Physic of this character. And together they testify to the accuracy of Conan Doyle's reproduction of the "Socratic" type and at the same time confirm the writer's words that Sherlock Holmes had a real prototype.

Conan Doyle was also prescient in making his hero a private detective, a profession of this kind, as well as work in the anti-criminal sphere in general, is given to "Socrates" without difficulty. Which does not prevent them from being quite on the spot as crooks and card cheats (3rd Emotion).

However, the greatest fortune awaits the "Socratic" in politics, a sphere that lives at the crossroads between cops and thieves. Margaret Thatcher's name and image are still fresh in the memory of her contemporaries, so it is easy to imagine a "Socratic" engaged in politics just by her example. Biographers say of Thatcher: "She is best known for her masculine qualities, such as aggressiveness and power. And one MP, who was not one of her admirers, remarked, "She is an absolutely fearless politician." And even when she was

joking, which she did not do more than once a year and only with her loved ones, her humor was stern...

Assessing Thatcher's "absolutist worldview" and her intentions to, as he put it, "change the soul" of the people, her former cabinet member Biffen even called her a "Stalinist"...

One journalist asked Thatcher why her speeches gave the impression of being unfriendly and harsh. Thatcher replied: "I understand why some people might think that. *I try to contain myself at all times.* My parents, who had the greatest influence on my attitude to life, including politics, taught my sister and me to be restrained. I was instilled that I should never lose my temper, at least not in public... If I'm going to worry about what people say or write about me, and I sometimes worry about that, I don't think it would be right to mourn my fate in public." And when a journalist hinted that the impression was given of her as an insensitive woman ("a cold fish," he said), Thatcher remarked irritably, "I suppose people understand the difference between restraint and insensitivity..."

The success of her speeches depended above all on a very good knowledge of the subject. Her speeches proved once again that Cicero (whom she studied at Oxford) was right when he said that oratory is inconceivable without perfect mastery of the subject. In her speeches and press conferences she used to cite a lot of figures, quotes, statements, all from memory, rarely looking at the papers. *She presented her thoughts in simple language*, following the Aristotelian principle that the main virtue of speech is clarity. Therefore, to make it more intelligible, she often compared the affairs of the state with those of the family, the budget of the state with the personal budget, etc.

Her polemical speeches were strong. She herself said of herself: "I like to argue..."

One of the most experienced British journalists wrote: "Interviewing her is like talking to an answering machine. You ask a question, you get an answer.

Although these quotations do not refer to an ancient Greek man and philosopher, but to our contemporary, an Englishwoman and politician, one opens the *Apologia of Socrates* and other works devoted to the philosopher, and the miracle of recognition, of recognition down to the last detail, and of a combined photograph showing Thatcher's face and Thatcher's face through Socrates' face, will take place.

* * *

The "Socrates" appears to be a lean, casually, faintly dressed, but tightly dressed man. He is stately, ceremonious, unperturbed. The gesture is calm, stately, confident, precise. Speech is even, assertive, ironic, monotonous. Secretly has a weakness for music, literature, art, and, after drinking, not averse to sing something himself in a soft, little expressive voice. His eyes are persistent, attentive, thoughtful, without gleam. Mimicry and gestures are almost absent. The haircut is short and neat, even women rarely resort to hair coloring. He is very fond of nature, and pets seem to be the only creatures with power over this aloof, rigid, cold-hearted man

BORIS PASTERNAK

- 1) EMOTION ("romantic")
- 2) WILL ("nobleman")
- 3) PHYSICS ("the underdog")
- 4) LOGIC ("schoolboy")

When you imagine "Pasternak," you see a thin, not so good-looking man. The face is oval. The gaze is serene, absent-minded, tilted into himself, with a gleam. Gesture and facial expressions are exaggerated. Clothing is loose, though usually gypsy-like and not banal. In vocabulary he avoids strongly crude and emphatically expressed turns of phrase. Speech flows without difficulty, but is often raucous, tense, and inconsistent. In matters of everyday life, economic, sports creature seems almost helpless. Chadolyubov. Creatures of the opposite sex are for him what the sun is for the sunflower, but not directly, but as if in appearance.

* * *

"The Pasternaks are extremely handsome, of rare mental beauty, almost medieval, chivalrous in nature. Pasternak's cousin recalled: "I was 20 years old when he came to visit us in an unusual way. He was overly attentive and charmed, though no reason for our everyday life gave him. In Moscow he was living life to the fullest, studying in the philosophy department of the university, playing and composing, educated and subtle. It seemed that he would be a scholar. In worldly terms, he was "out of this world," he was on bollards, scattered and self-absorbed. His Pasternakian nature was evident in the maiden purity he retained until his later, comparatively, years. Perhaps *the most distinctive feature of Boris was a rare spiritual nobility*. Transferring the characterization of Olga Freidenberg on the whole "Pasternakovsky" family, we can say that spiritual nobility is indeed the most notable feature of the nature of this type. At the same time, nobility is provided by a strong, flexible, processive, turned to others and therefore responsive 2nd Will, and soulfulness - by the superpower of emotional potential, by the immense fibers of the 1st Emotion.

Pasternak's "external beauty" usually, like the other three Physicists, does not shine, and this circumstance is usually the only source of his chronic and consistent dissatisfaction with himself. Boris Pasternak, too, was terribly worried about his appearance. After an injury in his youth he had a short leg and his teeth have grown rare, large and protruding. So when Marina Tsvetaeva said that Pasternak "looks like a Bedouin and his horse at the same time" - this phrase was not just a compliment. What was Pasternak's joy and how many bitter words about the tardiness of this measure were uttered when, it seems, in his sixth decade he managed to replace the chronic source of shame and irritation sticking out of his mouth with a beautiful flat prosthesis.

At the same time, the presence of external defects does not deprive the "pasternak" of sexual attractiveness (large, shining eyes, calm, distracted look of a confident person - sufficient compensation for any defects), and they themselves "pasternak" rarely depress

enough to discourage potential sexual partners. Artist Yuri Annenkov wrote: "Boris Pasternak: huge eyes, puffy lips, proud and dreamy look, high growth, harmonious gait, a beautiful and sonorous voice. In the streets, not knowing who he was, passersby, especially women, instinctively looked at him. I will never forget once Pasternak, too, looked at a girl who had looked at him and showed her his tongue. In a burst of fright, the girl ran away around the corner. "Perhaps that's too much," I said reproachfully. "I'm very shy, and this kind of curiosity embarrasses me," Pasternak replied in an apologetic tone.

In general, the presence of major physical disadvantages not only does not humble the sensuality of the "parsnip," but on the contrary, it increases it even more, the hypersexual in itself 3rd Physique is made hyperhypersexual.

V. Kataev was almost the first to talk about Pasternak, this theme was touched upon in his memoirs. Calling Pasternak a "mulatto," he wrote: "I think *his main feature was sensuality*: from his first poems to his last.

From the early, mulatto student: "...that even the mezzanine shook at the sight of your shoulders..." "You broke out, and your bangs touched your weird bangs and your pixie lips..."

From the latest:

"Under a bramble with ivy,

From bad weather we seek protection.

Our shoulders are covered with a cloak,

My arms are wrapped around you.

I was wrong. The bushes of these thickets

Not ivy, but hops.

Well, you'd better give me that cloak.

We'll spread it wide underneath us."

At that time he was already an old man. But what love energy!" This envious exclamation of Katayev at the end, coming from the lips of a man who is by no means insensitive by nature, is remarkable.

Pasternak's attitude to the material side of life in general can be considered a benchmark and an illustration of the functioning of the 3rd Physics. First, there is bifurcation. In his words, while he carefully downplayed the physical side of life, Pasternak, in fact, valued it most of all. Vsevolod Ivanov's wife recollected: "*He liked the fact that the basis of our life, as he put it, was 'spirituality, not materiality'*". Although he also valued materiality in the sense of everyday life. And above all, in his wife. Appreciated her economic efficiency. Appreciated that she did not disdain any physical work: washing windows, floors, working the garden.

As is usually the case with "prudes", Pasternak had few things, but to this few things he had an almost pathological passion. Let us continue to quote the same source: "Boris Leonidovich was extremely unpretentious in clothes. But no matter how he was dressed, he looked fit and even elegant.

He did not want to part with his old clothes, and Zinaida Nikolayevna had to falsely throw them away.

One day Boris Leonidovich was very pleased with a gift from his stepson Stanislav Neuhaus, who brought him a light gray jacket from Paris, which Boris Leonidovich wore for a long time and with visible pleasure.

From the point of view of outsiders, Pasternak had a strange predilection for physical labor, akin in this point to Tolstoy's Physics 3.

"I'm at work earthy.

I'll take my shirt off,

And the heat will hit me in the back,

And it burns like clay.

The malignant Kataev looked at Pasternak's gardening weakness with different eyes and, suspecting the poet of posturing, wrote: "Here he stands in front of the dacha, in the potato field, wearing boots, pants, girt with a wide leather belt of an officer type, in a shirt with rolled up sleeves, leaning his foot on the shovel, which digs the loamy earth. This view is not at all confused with the idea of an exquisite modern poet..."

A mulatto in muddy boots, with a shovel in his tanned hands, seems to be dressed up. He is playing a role of some kind. Perhaps the role of the great exile, getting his daily bread by the toil of his hands." Forgive Kataev's rancor; his Third Function was different, so he could neither share nor understand Pasternak's weakness for the vegetable garden.

Refined and refined in itself, Pasternak's 3rd Physics was characterized by a special supersharpeness of sensory perception, allowing him to penetrate where it was impossible to penetrate, and to empathize with what it seemed beyond the power of human sensorics to empathize with:

"I feel for them, for all of them,

It was like being in their skin,

I am melting myself, as the snow melts,

I myself, like the morning, frown my eyebrows."

And this is not a metaphor; in one early poem Pasternak describes how, when he sees a mosquito on his lover's blouse, he himself is that mosquito and feels its sting piercing the fabric and sinking into the pink puffed breasts of the girl:

"Mosquitoes stick to raspberries.

However, the trunk is malarial,
Right there, you big bastard,
Where is the luxury of summer more rosy?
To burrow an abscess through the blouse
And take a picture of a red ballerina?
Put the arrow of mischief in,
Where's the blood, where's the wet leaves?"

It is difficult for an outsider to imagine what such a thin-skinned man must have felt, having lived almost his entire life in a country ruled by the armored hand of the Bolshevik leviathan, where mass executions, torture, and hunger were perceived as natural and inevitable as bad weather. They say that when, in the early 1930s, the Soviet government came up with the idea of sending some writers through a starving country by train, Pasternak stood out from the whole clan of "engineers of human souls" on the train because he did not swallow a crumb of bread during the entire two-week trip. He couldn't.

* * *

"...compassion up to physical pain, sympathy full of sympathy, often followed by effective assistance. And at the same time there is a clear unintentional, unconscious, perhaps, *detachment from everyday life, its worries and difficulties, its complete subordination to the art, eclipsing reality itself*, which, however, it fed on," Pasternak's sister Josephine wrote, very precisely glimpsing one of the specific features of the "Pasternakovsky" psychotype. For all his talent for empathy, Physics is still in third place in "Pasternak's" system of values, while Emotion is in first place, and, naturally, when a choice is necessary, he always makes it in favor of emotional derivatives (literature, art, music, religion, mysticism), and his interests are concentrated there as well.

"For him, any situation in life, any landscape he saw, any abstract thought immediately and, it seemed to me, automatically turned into a metaphor or a line of verse. He radiated poetry the way a heated physical body radiates infrared rays.

One day our noisy company piled into a huge black car with a humpback trunk. The mulatto and I were squeezed into the deepest part of it, into its humpbacked ass. The car moved, and the mulatto, glistening squirrels, laughing, muttering something incomprehensible beforehand, shouted in my ear: "You and I are sitting in his very m o v e r!" - Kataev recounted.

A life that is purely emotional, i.e., aestheticized and aestheticized, does not cancel the 1st Emotion from what it is. And she is a complete egoist, a gift to herself. Boris Pasternak's 1st Emotion was also exclusively occupied with itself and its own experiences. The unconcern, egocentrism, and addresslessness of his poetry, letters, and speeches often baffled readers and listeners, and it cost them great effort to decipher at least part of the

interesting, unexpected, brilliant, but wild, blind, and dark torrent of words that fell upon them. Isaiah Berlin, after visiting Pasternak, wrote: "His speech consisted of magnificent, unhurried periods, sometimes turning into an indomitable verbal flow; and this flow often flooded the banks of grammatical structure - clear passages were replaced by wild, but always strikingly vivid and concrete images, and behind them could come words whose meaning was so dark that it was difficult to follow them..."

Pasternak wrote: "...the artist's sensitivity and inspiration must be excessive," and thus once again confirmed the presence of the First Emotion in him. After all, redundancy, as has been repeatedly said, is the main feature of the First Function.

* * *

Very expressively revealed itself in everything Pasternak did and said, his Second Will. Here it is impossible not to recall the poet's famous telephone conversation with Stalin about Mandelstam's exile. Stalin liked to frighten citizens far from politics and power with his unexpected calls and often achieved the desired effect - severe mental shock. Pasternak was among the few who easily endured this shock, and even at the end of the conversation began to ask to visit Stalin to enlighten the tyrant, a naive soul. Fortunately for the poet, Stalin soon sensed where the conversation was heading and hastened to hang up. Later, when the time came for outside evaluations of this telephone duel, even such obviously biased arbiters as Akhmatova and Nadezhda Mandelstam rated Pasternak's behavior "a solid four.

About other sympathetic traits of the 2nd Will, being Pasternak's personality, it is probably better to say in the language of people who knew him personally: "He was given a childlike simplicity, sometimes even disarming naivety, and sometimes due to excessive trust in people he even manifested weakness and credulity. He was characterized by childlike directness and ardor, but at the same time, the freshness and subtlety of feeling, sensitivity to people. He had developed this quality to an extreme over the years; he was always afraid of hurting his interlocutor, even involuntarily. Sometimes he did not want to make any decision for fear of offending someone, and then he would leave the decision to life itself. It was not out of cowardice or a desire to fit in, but out of benevolence, respect for the other. Inwardly, he was firm and unwavering..."

Boris Leonidovich was alien to prudence; he was incapable of vindictiveness, contempt, or vindictiveness. He was noble in himself: he was always glad to give his all, asking nothing for himself; he was always eternally grateful for the slightest service. He did not notice his grievances and sorrows in the constant renewal of his whole being, always responding with his heart and soul to everything that life could bring new. And he was always able to look at life, things and people in a new way - with the view of a poet striving for "all-conquering beauty", always ready to "give the way to the future". Life, things and people were constantly new to him. Marina Tsvetaeva could repeat in 1960 what she said in 1922; **not Pasternak a child, but the world in him a child.**

Momentary snapshots of Pasternak's 2nd Will are abundantly scattered throughout his poetry as well:

"Being famous isn't pretty..."

"I wasn't born to do it three times.

Look differently in the eyes..."

"There are in the experience of great poets

The traits of the naturalness of that one,

Which is impossible, having experienced them,

Not to end up completely dumb.

In kinship with all that is, sure

And knowing the future in everyday life,

You can't help but fall into heresy by the end,

Into unheard-of simplicity.

.

"All my life I wanted to be like everyone else,

But a century in its glory

Stronger than my whining.

And wants to be like me."

"Life, too, is only a moment.

Only dissolution

We ourselves in all other

As if as a gift."

* * *

Pasternak's 4th Logic can also serve as a standard for all four Logics. A man who had received a double philosophical education in Russia and Germany, a student of the famous neo-Kantian Kogen, the teacher of the great Cassirer, Pasternak, having finished his studies, simply disconnected from the process of rational comprehension of existence and to the end of his days, good-naturedly ironizing, liked to say that to spend all his life on philosophy is the same as eating mustard all your life. And this phrase alone shows how much he neglected not only philosophy, but common sense as a whole. After all, a lifetime of self-imprisonment in literature, which he condemned himself to, is no better diet. But the 4th Logic is the 4th Logic, and Pasternak, having returned from Germany, threw off his reasoning, like a savage who escaped from the world of white men, throws off his tired

tails at the edge of his native jungle and, inhaling the usual mixture of aromas of dead leaves and musk, returns to himself, again living only by instinct and intuition.

* * *

In addition to the chronic conflict with his time and power in Pasternak's soul another conflict lived permanently - a conflict with his native tribe and tribal religion. He himself spoke about it very cautiously, seldom and streamlined: "I was baptized as a baby by my nanny, but due to the restrictions against the Jews and moreover in a family that was spared from them and enjoyed some fame due to the artistic merits of my father, it caused some complications, and this fact has always remained an intimate semi-secret, the subject of rare and exceptional inspiration, rather than a quiet habit.

Much harsher, more direct and unabashedly, Isaiah Berlin spoke about this mental wound of Pasternak: "Pasternak was a Russian patriot. He felt very deeply his historical connection to his homeland... A passionate, almost all-consuming desire to be considered a Russian writer, whose roots go deep into Russian soil, was especially evident in his negative attitude toward his Jewish origins. He did not want to discuss the issue-not that he was embarrassed, no, he just did not like it; he wanted the Jews to assimilate and as a people to disappear. Except for the closest family members, he was not interested in any relatives, past or present. He spoke to me as a believing (albeit in his own way) Christian. Any mention of Jews or Palestine, I noticed, hurt him..."

To say that the conflict between blood, on the one hand, and profession and religion, on the other, was completely insurmountable in Pasternak's soul, is impossible. Not only is Judaism not an opponent of poetry, but it is actually based on it, recall the Psalter and the Song of Songs. And if he wished, Pasternak could have engaged in bilingual poetry, as many of his fellow Russian poets did.

Religion was a different matter, and the problem was insoluble. Of course, if it were up to him, Pasternak, citing the arbitrariness of his babysitter and his own infant insanity, could have disowned his unconscious baptism. But this did not happen, and it did not happen because **Pasternak was a true Christian**. He was a Christian not by position, obligation, habit, tradition, but by heart. Simply put, Christ, as described by the Evangelist John, belonged to the "Pasternak. This, and only this, is the secret of Pasternak's insistence on confessing Christ; with Him Pasternak confessed himself above all.

* * *

When the occasion presents itself, one cannot but comment on the problem of the structure of the Fourth Gospel and its central figure, Jesus of Nazareth.

First, the mystery and fascination of the Gospels is that they describe two psychotypes: the "fat man" in Matthew and the "parsnip" in John. In Scripture, the two Gospels of these apostles are polarized, and the task of the intermediate Gospels of Mark and Luke was to reconcile and smooth out, if possible, the contradictions of the extreme Gospels. Mark and Luke succeeded in this, and the result was a truly inhumanly multifaceted, polyphonic image of the founder of Christianity, recognizable by many in the mirror and therefore extremely attractive. Dostoevsky complained that, in his imitation of Christ, when

painting the image of Prince Myshkin, he never really got close to the original. And no wonder, Myshkin is one-dimensional, just as his creator was one-dimensional, not knowing that the peerlessness of Christ's image lies in the collectivity of his sculpture.

In the Evangelist Matthew, with his 1st Will, Christ the "fat" is strict, stern, tyrannical, jealous; the phrase thrown to the disciple who is sent to the funeral, "Follow me, and leave the dead to bury their dead," exhaustively characterizes the 1st Will of the Matthew Christ the "fat". Not only is this phrase absent from John the Evangelist, but in his Gospel the "parsnip" Christ does not use the imperative inclination at all.

To which psychotype did the real Christ belong, the model seen through different prisms of different psychotypes of different Evangelists, it is impossible to say with certainty now. However, taking into account psyche-yoga, some corrections can be made to the evangelical and later descriptions of Christ. Most importantly, Matthew and John agree that the Savior had a 3rd Physic, clearly visible from his psychic abilities. And from this it follows that Christian art has hardly guessed the appearance of Christ, reproducing His features thin, shallow, to the point of being sugary beautiful, i.e. painting the 4th rather than the 3rd Physic.

There is every reason to suppose that Christ was a short, stooped man, with a thin, nasal face, whose only ornamentation was the big, shiny, very expressive eyes characteristic of high-status Emotion. Moreover, it is more than likely that he had some large and very noticeable physical defect: something like a shrunken arm or leg. I deduce this from His psychic heightened perception and from the fact that His usual attraction to prostitutes, i.e., to women, an open, uninhibited, demonstrative sexuality, which is common in male 3rd Physics, never led Him to sin. Although Jesus obviously created all the prerequisites for sin himself, clearly preferring the society of harlots to all others. But. God was merciful and gracious most likely because fear was stronger than lust, which for a "parsnip" is only possible in the case of an objective, unconcealable failure of external data.

* * *

"Pasternak belongs to that rare type of people who, despite a strong 2nd Will, studiously avoid a political career. Only chance can push him into politics, as it did not happen to the joy of Boris Pasternak himself at the end of his long-suffering life.

It is most likely that only fate made another "pasternak's" political career, the Roman emperor Antoninus Pius, founder of the Antoninus dynasty, fervently loved by the Romans and father-in-law and stepfather of Marcus Aurelius (see "Lao-tzu"). The incredible, almost miraculous forms that even absolute power acquires in the tender, affectionate hands of the "parsnip" can be seen in the excerpts from Antoninus Pius's biography placed below: "He distinguished himself by his appearance, was famous for his good manners, was distinguished by his noble charity, had a quiet expression, possessed extraordinary gifts, brilliant eloquence, excelled in literature, was sober, diligently engaged in cultivating the fields, was gentle, generous, did not encroach on others' things, - for all this he had a great sense of proportion and lack of all conceit... He was nicknamed

"Pius" (The Pious One) by the Senate ... because he was by nature very merciful indeed and did not commit a single act of cruelty during his reign...

His first utterance in his new position, it is said, was this: when his wife began to reproach him for showing little generosity to his own on some occasion, he said to her: "Foolish, after we have been called to run the empire, we have also lost what we had before...."

As emperor, he accorded the senate the respect which he would have liked to have accorded to him by another emperor when he was a private man.... Neither in respect of the provinces nor in respect of any other matters did he pass any judgment without having first spoken to his friends, and he formulated his decisions in accordance with their opinions. His friends saw him in the garb of a private man, in the midst of his domestic affairs.

He governed the nations subject to him with great care, guarding everyone and everything, as if they were his property. During his reign all the provinces prospered. The troublemakers disappeared....

...No one before him had such authority with foreign nations, although he always loved peace to such an extent that he often repeated the words of Scipio, who said that it was better to preserve the life of one citizen than to kill a thousand enemies...

Among the many other proofs of his warmth of heart is this: when Marcus (Marcus Aurelius) mourned the death of his tutor and the court servants persuaded him not to show his feelings openly, the emperor said: "Allow him to be human; for neither philosophy nor imperial power deprive a man of the ability to feel..."

He is perhaps the only sovereign who lived without shedding, as far as he was concerned, the blood of citizens or enemies, and he is justly compared to Numa, whose happiness, piety, peaceful life, and sacred actions were his permanent possessions.

It is true, reading this, one cannot help believing in miracles: how at almost the same time as Christ, in a state that had made cannibalism, debauchery, and arbitrariness a tradition, absolute power could be in the hands of a man of such high morality that it is difficult to find an analogue even in our enlightened and humane age.

The length of quotations during the stories about the lives of Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius (see "Lao-tzu") was aimed not only to draw in as much detail as possible a psychological portrait of representatives of these types who found themselves at the top of the state pyramid, but also to partially restore historical justice. After all, everyone knows about Nero and Caligula - the worst representatives of the imperial power of Rome, while few people know about its best representatives - the first Antoninas. And it is not a sin at all to remind once again about such remarkable people. Finally, the example of the lives of Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius suggests another idea, so far not trivial, that the political system itself does not decide much in the life of society; the decisive word belongs to the people who stand at its head.

* * *

The type of "Pasternak," strange as it may seem, is not so rare in the human race. One can even speak of entire peoples in whom the share of "Pasternaks" happened to be so significant as to be able to color the physiognomy of the national psychology in their own, "Pasternak-like" way. To such peoples, I think, first of all, should be attributed the Jews, Armenians and Roma. There seems to be no need to prove that the excessive 1st Emotion dominates in these ethnic groups and that they are highly artistic natures, too. Jews, Armenians, Gypsies - people are freedom-loving, independent and even in diaspora do not tend to lose their individuality (2nd Will). Their 3rd Physics is clearly indicated by greedy fertility, almost pathological childbearing and hypersexuality, combined with extreme sensitivity in matters of sex (virginity, fidelity, etc.).

So, no matter how Pasternak and Christ treated their countrymen, they themselves were the psychotypical salt of their nation.

ARISTIPP

- 1) PHYSICS ("owner")
- 2) LOGIC ("rhetorician")
- 3) WILL ("bourgeois")
- 4) EMOTION ("gawker")

Aristippus was the founder of hedonism, a philosophy centering on the priority of carnal pleasures over all other pleasures.

Diogenes of Laertes, in his biography of Aristippus, gives the following characteristic episodes from the life of the philosopher: "...he was the first of Socrates' disciples to begin to charge his hearers and to send money back to his teacher. One day, having sent him twenty mines, he received them back, and Socrates said that Demonius forbade him to accept them: indeed this was not to his liking.

Xenophontes disliked Aristippus: so he attributed to Socrates a speech condemning pleasure, and directed against Aristippus...

He was rebuked for taking money from his disciples as a follower of Socrates. "You bet!" - he said, "True, when Socrates was sent bread and wine, he took only a little, and returned the rest; but his subsistence was taken care of by the best citizens of Athens, while mine was taken care of only by the slave Eutychidus..."

Someone said that he always sees philosophers at the door of the rich. "But even doctors," said Aristippus, "go to the doors of the sick, and yet everyone would rather be a doctor than a sick person.

One day he was sailing on a ship to Corinth and was caught in a storm and terribly frightened. Someone said: "We common people are not afraid, but you philosophers are afraid?" Aristippus replied, "We both worry about our souls, but our souls are not of the same value..."

To the man who censured the luxury of his table, he asked: "Would you refuse to buy all this for three obols?" - "Of course not," replied the man. "Then it's just that you value money more than I value pleasure...."

Hetera said to him, 'I have a child by you,'" "You don't know that," Aristippus objected, "as if you were walking through the reeds and said, 'This thorn pricked me. Someone rebuked him for abandoning his son, as if he had not begotten him. "And phlegm and lice are also generated by us," said Aristippus, "but we, knowing this, still discard them as far away as possible for lack of use...."

He was able to apply himself to any place, time or person, playing his role in accordance with all the circumstances. The same is true for the court of Dionysius (the tyrant of Syracuse - A.A.), he was more successful than all the others, always perfectly mastering the circumstances...

When Dionysius spat at him, he bore it, and when someone began to scold him for it, he said: "Fishermen expose themselves to the splashes of the sea in order to catch small fish; will I not bear the splashes of saliva, desiring to catch large fish?"

Dionysius gave him money and Plato a book; in response to his reproach, Aristippus said: "So I need the money more, and Plato needs the book."

Such is Aristippus in the description of Diogenes of Laertes: greedy, thick-skinned, cynical, tongue-tied - and this portrait, judging by its order of functions, is quite close to the original. The last example of the Dionysian gifts to Plato and Aristippus is especially expressive. It shows that even in those distant times and even tyrants were subtle enough psychologists to sense in those around them their First Function and act accordingly: Plato with his 1st Logic really needed a book more, while Aristippus with his 1st Physics needed money.

But Aristippus thought as he lived, his philosophy was simple: "There is no difference between pleasure and enjoyment, neither is sweeter than the other. Pleasure is attractive to all living beings, pain is repugnant... Pleasure is a good thing, even if it is generated by the ugliest things... even if the deed be unworthy, yet pleasure is still a good thing, and should be sought for its own sake."

* * *

Although Aristippus' philosophy is limited to the realm of ethical teaching, unethical according to our understanding, "Aristippus," like other psychic types, is not only moral, but a whole worldview. Therefore, the "aristippos" who lived much later than Aristippus considerably extended the scope of his original philosophy.

One of them was the English philosopher Thomas Hobbes, and while he fully agreed with Aristippus on the principle of the primacy of sensual pleasures over all others, he also proved to be such a hardened atheist that he first had to flee England to France and then from France to England. The whole cosmos, according to Hobbes, is thoroughly material and consists only of bodies, nothing immaterial, spiritual in nature exists. Hobbes is a consistent empiricist who accepts as true only that which is confirmed by experience, by the bodily senses. Man's peculiarity lies only in the fact that he is given the thinking to

analyze and systematize these experiences, to see the past clearly and to predict the future plausibly.

In retelling Hobbes, let us not make the mistake of thinking that his teachings contain something original, purely individual. Such is the world-formed or unformed, spontaneous outlook of any "Aristippus," because it derives directly from his order of functions. The superfluous 1st Physics conditions the consistent materialism and empiricism of Aristippus' philosophy; it also easily converts him to atheism, for the 1st Physics abhors the asceticism more or less characteristic of most religions. "Aristippus" believes neither in God nor in the devil, also because his 1st Physics mates with the 2nd Logic. It is well known that any faith contains too many contradictions not to irritate a strong, healthy Logic. And the common for religion appeal to feelings is powerless before the cold-bloodedness of "aristippus", in whose Emotion occupies the last, fourth line and is therefore the least reliable instrument. The same 2nd Logic also determines the fact that in the worldview of the "aristippus" he most values clarity of thought and vastness of knowledge after carnal pleasures. Therefore, there is nothing individual in Hobbes' combination of crude materialism with an equally crude rationalism that goes beyond his "aristippus" psychotype.

* * *

Hobbes is not original in his political doctrine. He is both in life and in theory a consistent monarchist, which is more or less inherent in all "aristippos," and to a greater or lesser extent in the possessors of the insecure 3rd Will in general.

What an "aristippus" is as a functioning politician can be seen in the example of such brilliant figures as Emperor Tiberius, James I Stuart, Talleyrand, Joseph Stalin, and Fidel Castro. An "aristippe" politician is a tyrant by definition, just as any "bourgeois" is. His tyranny is original only in that it is the tyranny of a well-informed, clearly and incessantly thinking person. This circumstance guarantees the "aristippus," minus the possibility of losing the throne as a result of external aggression, a long stay at the top of the power pyramid until the hour of death. Cemetery peace inside the country ensures "aristippus" both unparalleled cruelty (combination of the 1st Physics with the 3rd Will) and quick, dodgy mind (the 2nd Logic).

Another notable detail of the image of the "aristippus in power" is the general opinion of those around him about his unparalleled talent for comedy. But there is an error here. "Aristippus" is certainly a hypocrite, but no more so than any other "burgher. The illusion of some special gift for acting is created by his Fourth Emotion. As we remember, the Fourth Function is characterized by the ease of its extrinsic grasp, so it is easy for an "aristippus," a captive of his feelings, to laugh with those who laugh, to cry with those who weep. However, it is the "aristippus" who is guided less by his emotions when making decisions and taking action, which is why it was such a great shock for a society that seemed used to everything when someone with whom yesterday the "aristippus" was laughing and crying, today laid his head on the scaffold. But, I repeat: it was not a special

talent for comedy in such cases, but a simple combination of the 3rd Will with the 4th Emotion.

The boundary between the world of politics and the world of crime is transparent, if it exists at all, so if background, upbringing, circumstances or the scale of personality do not allow an aristippe to pursue a political career, he moves easily into the criminal sphere. As in politics, in a criminal organization, the aristippus is rarely made boss, and if he is, it is by right of succession, not by right of creation. The aristippus lacks character and determination (the 3rd Will) for a true unquestionable leadership, so in gangs he more often takes the place of a vizier under the boss, becomes the brain center of the criminal organization, carefully developing both the general strategy of criminal activity and the tactics of individual operations (Meyer Lansky?).

However, the Aristippus carefully avoids direct participation in operations. The fact is that as a creature of cruelty, sometimes pathological, with complete equanimity, he is not, to put it mildly, a brave man and is too afraid of retaliatory violence to take personal risks. Because of this typical character trait of the "aristippus", it is easy to answer the question of Stalin's direct participation or non-participation in the terrorist attacks by his revolutionary gang, which has long been raised in history. Now with full confidence we can say: no, he did not. And certainly right was Trotsky, not a brave man himself and generally psychologically close to Stalin, when he wrote: "Political opponents clearly exaggerated this side of Stalin's activities, saying how he personally dropped a bomb from the roof of the first square in Tiflis in order to seize public money. However, Stalin's name is never mentioned in the recollections of direct participants in the Tiflis raid. He himself never said a word about it. This does not mean, however, that he stood apart from terrorist activity. But he acted from behind the scenes: he selected people, gave them the sanction of the Party Committee, and he himself timely stepped aside. This was more in line with his character.

When circumstances force the "aristippus" to do lawless things alone, he usually chooses a career of swindling, and, one must admit, this choice is almost always successful. The example of Count Cagliostro, the king of adventurers in the extremely rich in adventurers XYIII century, shows: what heights an "aristippe" can reach in this field, even when he is ill-mannered and ignorant. To surpass such no less impudent, but better educated and more cultured swindlers as Saint-Germain, Casanova, Mesmer, Krenk, it was necessary to have not only a special talent, but also a corresponding psychotype.

* * *

The Aristippus is also lucky in marriage scams, or rather, any marriage is a big or small scam. This luck is aided by the fact that often the "aristippus" is handsome with lush, sensual beauty (1st Physics), and if not always handsome, he is always diabolically cunning and totally unconscionable. I happened to know one "aristippus" who, rising from the bottom, from juvenile prison, from wife to wife - seven marriages - improved his situation immensely: financially, socially, geographically. By "geography" I mean in this case, that as a native of a remote province, he married for the seventh time a Muscovite, of course, for the sake of a Moscow residence permit. And my "aristippe" had a curious, perhaps irrelevant, but curious, slip-up with his registration. The day after the wedding, early in the morning, before the passport office even opened, he was standing at the door with his passport in his hand. One can imagine the shock of the passport holder, who is

well aware of the Russian tradition of multi-day drinking sprees after the wedding, when she found her husband, who had just been sober before dawn, at the door of her office. The passport-issuing lady quite rightly suspected cheating and kept my "aristippe" busy with the registration as long as she could.

Speaking of the marriage scam, we have come very close to such an important topic as psycho-type and family. And though we didn't want to say it, we will have to say it: **"aristippe is the most dangerous man on earth.** He is ruthless, evil, deceitful, hypocritical, and violent, which makes him akin to "Dumas" (a combination of the 1st Physics and the 3rd Will), but at the same time he is absolutely cold-blooded and strictly rational (a combination of the 2nd Logic and the 4th Emotion), and this last circumstance makes "aristippe" the most dangerous creature in the world. No, it is not for nothing that my acquaintance, the "aristippe" described above, a shy-looking wretch, liked to say that he had never met his equal in the criminal world.

Naturally, the "aristippus" family is particularly at risk, since it stands closest to the source of the danger. Recall the emperor Tiberius, who cut out his kin almost entirely, finding this villainy the sweetest mythological consolation, often saying that "Priam, who survives his loved ones, is happy.

Usually only self-interest and vanity are able to lead the "aristippus" to the wedding, and until the purse and connections of the amiable half are exhausted, he will not let go. If the half of the "aristippus" is poor and simple, but young and good-looking, he is easily made a pimp, using her as bait for rich and influential people (such was the marriage of Cagliostro). A remarkable feature of "aristippe" pimping is that it gets along remarkably well with rabid jealousy. Therefore the encouragement of adultery is easily replaced in his family by violent scenes of jealousy, usually accompanied, if the victim has no influential defenders, by ruthless hand-to-hand violence (combination of the 1st Physic and the 3rd Will).

Aristippus sex, if not directly accompanied by sadism, is still so coarse, selfish, and unscrupulous that it is more reminiscent of rape. This brings to mind the legend that the intimacy between Stalin and his second wife Nadezhda began with rape. As if some relative with a gun came running at the screams of the victim, and Stalin only by vowing to marry her saved his life. Participants in this drama are long dead and can neither confirm nor deny this legend, but there is no doubt that it is highly plausible, given Stalin's psychotype. Aristippus sex is rhinoceros sex, and there is simply no line between voluntary and forced intimacy.

* * *

In my description, "Aristippe" looks like a complete villain, and perhaps this picture could be limited if there were a single psychotype so simple and one-dimensional in life that a single color would suffice to recreate it. Absolute villainy is as unrealistic as absolute virtue; they exist only in movies. There are attractive traits of their own in the character of the "aristippus." Naturally, they are connected, as in every human being, with his

Second Function, in this case the 2nd Logic, and if the "aristippus" is turned to his partner exactly by this better side, contact with him can be a real pleasure.

"Aristipp is a genius and a titan of intellectual communication. From his point of view, Fidel Castro's fifteen-hour interviews are not a feat, but an unheard-of success. In his irrepressible talkativeness, Aristippe would be completely unbearable were it not for two important circumstances: the pithiness of his verbal outbursts and delicacy, i.e. the ability not only to talk, but also to listen with interest. At the same time, possessing a strong, flexible, morbidly cynical mind, the "aristippus" is often somehow timid in thought and is rarely a pioneer, a true revolutionary in the field of intellectual work. This timidity is conditioned by the third Will of the "aristippus," for it is not enough to have a free and energetic mind for true innovation; it is necessary to have the character and the will to be able to see through his deductions, whatever they may be, and to make them public, even against the prevailing opinions and prejudices. But it is precisely with the will that the main mental disadvantage of the "aristippus" is connected.

Another remarkable characteristic of the Aristippus is that he has an absolutely irrepressible thirst for knowledge. Of course, his awareness varies greatly depending on his background, upbringing, and circumstances. But one can be sure that in the circle of information outlined to him by fate, he will try to scoop it all. According to Gabriel Garcia Marquez, Fidel Castro "does not miss a single opportunity to extract information. And at any time of the day or night he is willing to read any paper with letters on it... His cars...are always equipped with lights for reading at night. Often he picks up a book as soon as it begins to get light..."

I know of a case in which an "aristippus" performed an almost heroic act, giving up his bread-and-butter job for a librarian's position with the scantest content, just to be closer to sources of information. And this story makes me say a few words about the almost unique psychotypical bifurcation peculiar only to the "aristippus". It is hardly only this type that is inherent in the contradiction between the upper functions: First and Second. The fact is that the pay for intellectual labor is almost everywhere so low that it is completely incapable of satisfying the usual need for the 1st Physique - to live 20-30% better than its social group. That is why the soul of the "aristippus" is chronically divided between self-interest according to the 1st Physics and intellectual thirst according to the 2nd Logic. And to the delight of those around him, the latter often triumphs.

Also. Like other holders of the 3rd Will, the "aristippe" is doubly lonely. The fact is that high ranking Logic is rare among people in general and is so rarely demanded by society that anyone who possesses it lives with the feeling of being an orphan until the end of his days. "Aristippe is an orphan twice over, hiding the vulnerable corpus of his personality (3rd Will) from strangers; even if he turns his best intellectual side toward them, he often encounters indifference, even dislike, and full-blooded communication; that is, maximum realization of the normative, strong, flexible, dialogical 2nd Logic is more a dream than reality for an "aristippe". The same Marquez wrote of Castro: "Private parties are not in his character, for he is one of the few Cubans who does not dance or sing, and those rare house parties at which he does appear take on a completely different mood with his arrival. Maybe he doesn't notice it. Maybe he does not realize how he immediately begins to dominate everyone and take up all the free space ... But, no matter how you look at it, as

soon as he appears, the dancing stops, the music stops, the dinner is moved away, and the audience concentrates around him to engage in the instantaneous conversation. It's a state you can stay in - on your feet, without booze or food - indefinitely. Sometimes, before he goes to bed, he'll knock on the door of a trusted friend's house at a late hour, only to appear unannounced and tell him he's only here for five minutes. He says this with genuine sincerity. But gradually he becomes engrossed in a new subject, falls into a chair, stretches out his legs, and utters: "I feel reborn." This is all he is: tired of conversations, he finds rest in conversations. In his complimentary essay about the Cuban dictator, Marquez tries not to notice that, in Russian, "an uninvited guest is worse than a Tartar," that the refusal of Castro's interlocutors to dance is hardly entirely voluntary. And most importantly, he does not see, or tries not to see, the real drama of his favorite, the drama of an isolated intellectual standing orphaned in a crowd of his mindlessly dancing compatriots, a drama that makes the "aristippe" even more timid and lonely than nature has created him.

* * *

If we imagine an Aristippus from a purely external point of view, we imagine a tall, broad-boned man with a lushly sculpted face. His hair is short and uncomplicated. Clothing is expensive, solid, but discreet (especially in men). Women may overuse makeup. The look is elusive, sly, and without glitter.

JEAN-JACQUES RUSSO

- 1) EMOTION ("romantic")
- 2) LOGIC ("rhetorician")
- 3) PHYSICS ("the underdog")
- 4) WILL ("serf")

Admittedly, I have long been puzzled by the question of what order of functions one must possess in order to have a tendency toward masochism. There were no difficulties with the sadistic order of functions (see "Dumas," "Aristippus"). But masochism, no matter how much I shifted functions, was still not given. This went on until Rousseau opened my eyes to the problem with his "Confessions."

To begin with, to be fair, masochism should be renamed "Rousseauism," since it was Rousseau who described the phenomenon just as fully, but much earlier than Sacher-Masoch. This is how the awakening of masochism looks like under the pen of Jean-Jacques: "...Mademoiselle Lambertzier loved us as a mother, she used her maternal power as well, extending it to the point of subjecting us at times, when we deserved it, to the punishment customary for children. For a long time she confined herself to threatening us, and this threat of punishment, new to me, seemed very frightening, but when it was carried out I found that the punishment itself was not so terrible as the expectation of it, and the strange thing was that it made me love the one who had subjected me to it all the more. It took all my sincere affection, all my gentleness, to prevent me from seeking the opportunity of experiencing the same treatment again, having earned it; for I found in the pain and even in the shame itself an admixture of sensuality that aroused in me more desire than the fear of experiencing it again from the same hand. True, there was undoubtedly a certain amount of premature sexual instinct mixed in with this, and the same punishment I received from her brother did not seem pleasant at all..."

Who would have thought that this punishment, inflicted on an eight-year-old child by a girl of thirty, would define my tastes, my desires, my passions, myself for the rest of my life.

Rousseau's story is repeated almost verbatim by Sacher-Masoch: "My parents were often visited by Countess Sobol, who came to me as a third cousin. A woman stately, beautiful and with a captivating smile, but hated me, as had a reputation in the family of Messalina. And I treated her to the last degree clumsily, impolitely and spitefully.

One day my parents went out of town for a while. My aunt decided to take advantage of their absence to give me a sample punishment. Suddenly she came into the room in her fur-lined katsaweika, accompanied by the cook, the barmaid, and the little cat, whom I had neglected.

They grabbed me and, despite my desperate resistance, tied me up hand and foot; then my aunt rolled up her sleeves with an evil grin and began to whip me with a thick birch so hard that blood spurted, and I finally, despite all my heroic spirit, screamed and cried and just started begging for mercy.

Then she told me to untie me, but before leaving me alone altogether, she made me kneel down to thank her for the punishment and kiss my hand.

Imagine this supersensible fool! Under the lash of that gorgeous beauty, who seemed to me in her fur coat as an angry queen, I first awoke a man's feeling for a woman, and my aunt began to seem to me from that time on the most enchanting woman in all God's world.

There is no doubt that one of the basic components of masochism is the hypersexuality of the 3rd Physicist. This is evidently indicated by a reverent, enthusiastic attitude to physical contact between the sexes, a phenomenon rather trivial and commonplace for other Physicists. Another clue - a typical for the "prude" split attitude to the intimate side of life, where contrived sanctimonious rejection is combined with hidden greedy sexuality. About this very frankly wrote Mazoch himself: "Even in the cradle, as I was told later by my mother, I showed" oversensitivity ": I could not stand a healthy breast nursing and had to be fed with goat milk. As a little boy I discovered a mysterious shyness before women, which lurked, in fact, an abnormal attraction to them...

Apparently, all my catholic sternness and all my timidity before women was nothing but a refined sense of beauty. Since that time sensuality has grown in my imagination to the point of a cult of sorts...

Woman was my true cult.

I saw sensuality as something sacred-even solely sacred.

At the same time, the 3rd Physics itself does not make its owner a masochist; it stimulates sexuality, but it does not determine forms into which this supersensuality is clothed. In case of masochism, this hypersensitivity is exactly that, because the 3rd Physics is combined with the 4th Will. That is, along with the sexual-physical element, there is also a volitional-hierarchical element in it.

Moreover, if Dostoyevsky is to be believed, masochism can dispense with the first sexual half at all and simply take pleasure in the 4th Will from the sexless manifestation of its servility. Recall that in The Idiot, Rogozhin threatens to whip one sticky official, to which the latter happily replies: "*And if you whip him, then you won't reject him! Seki! I have flogged him and thereby sealed him...*"

In fact, **masochism is one of the manifestations of an understated, infantile self-esteem of the 4th Will, sometimes colored, sometimes uncolored by the hypersexuality of the 3rd Phys.**

That this is the case, and not otherwise, is evidenced by two of the greatest experts on this subject: Rousseau and Sacher-Masoch. The latter explicitly explained his unusual predilection by the fact that he had a "soft, compliant, sensual nature," i.e. he combined a

weak character and heightened sexuality. Moreover, his love confessions were undividedly dominated by the first element - the promise of sincere servility. He said: "...if I had the right to choose - to rule or to be controlled - *it would seem to me much more attractive the role of a slave* of a beautiful woman. But where would I find such a woman, who would not achieve influence by petty grumpiness, but manage to rule in a calm consciousness of her power?" In tone with Masoch wrote Rousseau: "To be loved by all my loved ones was my deepest desire. I was meek..."

All my life I have lusted and been speechless before the women I loved most...To be at the feet of a haughty lover, to obey her commands, to have cause to ask her forgiveness-all this gave me very tender pleasures; and the more my lively imagination inflamed my blood, the more I resembled a lover seized with passion. It is clear that this method of courtship does not lead to particularly rapid success and is not too dangerous to the virtue of those who are their subjects.

It has already been said that the 4th Will has a hierarchical perception of the world, in which, just as in the view of the 1st Will, everything is divided on two levels: the upper and the lower. The specifics of the philosophy of the 4th Will lies in the fact that it always places itself on the lower level, the level of dependence, secondary importance and subordination. There the "serf" is more comfortable, more natural, more convenient. That is why the pleasure of the flogging received by the "russo" and his fellow inferior function "Augustine" (see) is physiologically connected only with the fact that the hand holding the lash belongs to a creature of the other sex. The spiritual joys of violence against himself are experienced by him when he receives more than tangible proof of being on his own lower plane ("you have whipped me, so I am yours").

* * *

The particular difficulty in capturing the image of "Rousseau" lies in the unsteadiness of his mental image. Like any "serf," he is an involuntary Proteus, living in that world and in that system of values, which was easily imposed on him by the person who happened to be nearby. Therefore, there is no certainty that tomorrow he will be the same as yesterday. The capacity for sincere chameleonism was recognized by Rousseau himself as a certain inherent property of his nature and did not even arouse internal protest or anything resembling a lynch mob. What to do - he was born that way...

Telling how, from a boarding house claiming to be an enlightened and refined institution, he at once found himself in the workshop of an artisan, Rousseau recounted the metamorphosis that had occurred to him as follows: "My master Ducommen was a young man, rude and harsh; and in a very short time he succeeded in marring my joyful childhood, in coarsening my gentle, lively character, and in reducing me intellectually, as I was already reduced in my very position, to the level of a true journeyman. Latin, the ancient world, history-all were forgotten for a long time; I did not even remember that there were Romans in the world... The lowest inclinations, the vilest mischief took the place of the sweetest amusements, leaving not even a memory of them. Apparently, *despite the most favorable upbringing, I had a great tendency to moral decline, as it was committed very quickly, without the slightest difficulty ...*"

And so Rousseau passed from hand to hand, constantly mimicking, until he fell into the steel claws of his mother-in-law, Madame Levasseur. A sweet, simple-hearted masochist before marriage, Rousseau under the heel of his mother-in-law's 3rd Will became "mansplainingly" vindictive, envious and fearful, so the philosopher's post-marital mental appearance appeared to the world not in his own, but in his mother-in-law's makeup. Although the memory of himself, in his natural form, continued to live in Rousseau, and the following excerpt from the Confessions shows how the self-owned "Rousseau" looks in those brief moments when he is not held by the scruff of his neck. Rousseau confessed: "...a mediocre existence was largely the result of my character, **ardent but weak, more inclined to despondency than to enterprise.... A character alien to great virtues and even more alien to great vices, which constantly returned me to the carefree and quiet life for which I felt myself born, and which never allowed me to strive for something great, both in good and in evil.**" The whole order of the functions of "Rousseau" is reproduced here in full: 1st Emotion, 2nd Logic, 3rd Physics, 4th Will.

* * *

"Rousseau" is thin, not to say handsome or shy. Her eyes are big and sparkling. His facial expressions and gestures are sweeping, his speech is hot, passionate, but it lacks the energy to be convincing. Dressed casually, hair long and poorly groomed. Particularly affectionate and accommodating to creatures of the opposite sex.

ANNA AKHMATOVA

- 1) WILL ("king")
- 2) EMOTION ("actor")
- 3) LOGIC ("skeptic")
- 4) PHYSICS ("slacker")

.

Akhmatova was still a little girl, had not yet written a line, and her father already called her a "decadent poetess. That is, in the case of Akhmatova, the psychotype declared itself so early and openly that it became read by those close to her long before it became her destiny.

The sadness, coldness, despondency, and lifelessness inherent in decadent poetry were organic to Akhmatova's 4th Physics, as were the precision and expressiveness of the word (2nd Emotion) in conveying these states. So the early recognition of Akhmatova's future by those close to her is not particularly surprising. When little Anna sat down to write, her poetic experiences only confirmed her father's long-standing diagnosis. Akhmatova

herself recounted how her mother suddenly cried after reading her daughter's poems and muttered: "I don't know, I only see that my daughter is bad."

Akhmatova's psychotype is programmed for tragedy, and external circumstances have no power to change anything in this program. Knowing Akhmatova in the days when her position would have been the envy of any woman, her first husband wrote:

"A queen or maybe just a cranky child,
A tired child with a powerless agony of gaze..."
"Who will explain to us why
That wife is always sad.
The eyes are half-dark..."
"Her soul is open eagerly.
Only to the brass music of verse,
Before a life that is low and pleasant,
Arrogant and deaf.
"If you click it, it wrinkles,
If you hug it, it's torn,
And the moon will come out - it will languish,
And watches and groans,
It's like burying
Somebody," he wants to drown himself.

In prose Gumilev said the same thing: "Anna Andreevna for some reason always tried to seem unhappy, unloved. And in fact - Lord! - How she tormented me and how she made fun of me. She was devilishly proud, proud to the point of self-abasement. But how lovely she was, and how I was in love with her!"

And it seemed that who else but her should be happy? She had everything others could only dream of. But she spent her days lying on the couch, languishing and sighing. She always managed to pine and grieve and feel miserable. I jokingly advised her to sign her name not Akhmatova, but Anna Gorenko (i.e. her real surname - A.A.). Grief - you can't think of a better one."

Fifty years from now, our contemporaries will be describing the same proud woman lying on the couch, languishing and sighing. They will think that the source of her grief lies in her tragic fate, and they will be wrong in doing so. She was born that way. With that psychotype. Akhmatova's only doubtful luck is that her psychotype tragically "collapsed" with fate, life has confirmed the correctness of her innate worldview. There were shootings

of husbands, expulsion of lovers, hard labor of her son, persecution by the authorities, poverty, and all this naturally influenced the perception of the reader accordingly. But these tragic circumstances had no effect on the muse Akhmatova, her perception of the world has always been catastrophic and external prosperity or disadvantage did not add anything to the sown by nature.

At the same time, Akhmatova, like no one else, knew: what a powerful resonator of poetry is the fate of the poet, not without envy she, learning about the trial of Brodsky, not without envy threw up: "What a biography they make of our redhead! It's as if he hired someone on purpose." She herself almost exploited the horror of her life, initiating even barely acquainted people into it from the threshold, and the venomous Isaiah Berlin, stunned by her frankness on her first visit, wrote: "The account of the continuing tragedy of her life went far beyond anything I had ever heard." Yet the effect of such a frightening preface was not inconsiderable. Another pilgrim to Akhmatova admitted: "She attracted to her not only her poems, not only her mind, knowledge, memory, but also the authenticity of destiny. First of all, *the authenticity of destiny*.

* * *

If we're talking about the 4th physics (which, as we remember, is the source of chronic sadness), then we can trace, on the example of Akhmatova, all of her turns in the different planes of physical existence.

In her disregard for everyday life, Akhmatova could have rivaled the most fanatical hermits. Here is one of the testimonies: "Akhmatova lived then - you can't even say: poor. Poverty - it is a little something, she had nothing. In an empty room stood a small old bureau and an iron bed, covered with a bad blanket. You could see that the bed was hard, the blanket cold. The readiness to love, with which I crossed that threshold, mingled with a mad longing, with a sense of the proximity of disaster ... Akhmatova invited me to sit down on a single chair, she herself lay down on the bed with her hands behind her head (her favorite pose) and said: "Read a poem.

Although in this case Akhmatova's asceticism can be considered forced, the appearance of money did not change much in her life. Let us continue quoting: "After Stalin's death Akhmatova immediately felt better, at least in terms of money. Was released her translation of the play "Marion Delorme" in the collected works of Victor Hugo, she received the first big money - they gave her a lot of pleasure. True, she did not change her life in any way and did not indulge in life. Having lived homeless all her life, she did not start a household in her later years. I once asked Anna Andreyevna: "If I became rich, how much time would I get out of it?" - She answered with her usual clarity: "Not long. Ten days."

It is interesting to note that impracticality, helplessness Akhmatova in the face of pressing problems played a double role in her life: often put her on the brink of death and just as often saved. For example, during the war, Lydia Chukovskaya, Akhmatova's closest friend, when she came to Tsvetaeva in Elabuga, said, wading through the local mud: "Thank God, Akhmatova is not here, here she would have died... "Here life would have killed her... she can't do anything." And at the same time, during the escape to Tashkent together with

Akhmatova, the same Chukovskaya "could not help but be amazed at Akhmatova's ability to be above the physical hardships of travel.

"Other men's most faithful friend," Akhmatova said of herself, and she did not lie. Although, on the other hand, faithfulness to a man did not cost her much trouble. "Lazy men", i.e. holders of the 4th Physique, are not inclined to cheating at all out of simple indifference to sex.

The only things that can drive the 4th Physicist to adultery are vanity, revenge, dependence, and political considerations. The "Akhmatova," like any 1st Will, has politics in her blood, so sex for her is not so much a carnal pleasure as a political instrument of family or social purpose. Quality, quantity of candidates for possession, flashiness of gestures in courtship play for "Akhmatova" a dominant role and, if successful, are worn like orders on her chest and for life. Akhmatova herself liked to tell that when she had an affair with Gumilev, "she went to the Crimea. Gumilev went there to see her. He arrived at the cottage, went to the fence and looked into the garden: she was sitting in a white dress, reading a book. Gumilev stood, didn't dare to call out to her, and left for St. Petersburg. She told me this and with bitterness, but also *with pride* ..."

Akhmatova's sex itself is passionless, and Zhdanov was very close to the truth when he stigmatized Akhmatova with the stolen phrase about the half-adulteress-half-monk. Although usually the nun prevails in "Akhmatova" over the harlot, and if the qualitative side of intimacy does not cause the partners any reproaches, the quantity often does.

Another shocking detail of "Akhmatova's" intimate life is her tendency to, as they say, "spin the dynamo," that is, to provoke sexual excitement without calculating how to satisfy it. Moreover, unlike other types, "Akhmatova" often provokes such situations unintentionally, unconsciously, "dynamics" purposefully and deliberately. The aim - common for the "royal" persons - is politeness, the desire to form an entourage around themselves, without which playing the monarch is unthinkable. It must be said that Akhmatova almost always succeeds in "Dynamo", and it is clear why: subtle, refined beauty, ease of discussion of the most delicate topics (4th Physics), the strength and richness of her emotional system (2nd Emotion) can seduce even a saint. An absolutely charming picture of "dynamism" in its "Ahmatovian" version was given by Sasha Chyorny:

"She was a poetess,

A poetess of the Balzac years.

And he was just a jerk,

A curly and spunky brunette.

The povesta came to the poetess.

There were spirits breathing in the semi-darkness,

On the sofa, as in a solemn mass,

The poetess bent poetry:

"Oh, be able with a fire-breathing caress

To stir up my sleepy passion.

To the foam of the thighs, behind the scarlet bandage

Don't be afraid to put your lips to it!

I am as fresh as the breath of a leucoi,

Oh, let's weave the exhaustion of bodies!"

The sequel went like this,

That the curly-haired brunette blushed.

He blushed, but he recovered quickly.

And I thought, "I was not!

It's not the minister's Duma speeches here,

It's not words that are needed here, but deeds..."

With the unrestrained power of a centaur

The poetess was attracted by the daredevil,

But the shrill, vulgar, "Moor!!!"

It cooled the boiling tide.

"I'm sorry," he jumped up, "you yourself..."

But in her eyes there is coldness and honor:

"You dared a decent lady,

Like a janitor with a hug?!"

Despite the caricature nature of the picture drawn by Sasha Cherny, it faithfully reproduces Akhmatova's system of sexual provocation. Moreover, we know of a case when Akhmatova, who was then well past the age of balzaca, tried to be hugged "janitorially" by none other than Boris Pasternak. And he received an appropriate rebuke.

What aggravates the situation in Akhmatova's love games is that no matter how much she talks in the full force of her 2nd Emotion about love, she, like any "tsar," is not given to truly love. And the objects of passion feel this. Gumilev wrote:

"Then the lunar maiden, then the earth maiden,

But forever and everywhere a stranger, a stranger."

It was as if Akhmatova herself agreed with her husband in her poems:

"I drink to the ruined house,

To my wicked life,

To the loneliness of the two of us,

And to you I drink..."

* * *

About the natural royalty, majesty Akhmatova did not write only lazy. Here are just a few of the many such descriptions: "... In her eyes and posture, and in her treatment of people there was one major feature of her personality: majesty. Not arrogance, not arrogance, not arrogance, but the majesty: "Imperial", "a monumental and important step, an inviolable sense of respect for themselves ... ", " ... something royal was in all that touched her. She unambiguously gave an audience, for how else can you describe the way she patiently took the flow of endless visitors ... ", "... the most important feature of her - aristocratism. Both the appearance and her mental structure was characterized by an extraordinary nobility, which gave a harmonious majesty to everything she said and did. Even the children felt it. She used to tell me how little Leo used to ask her: "Mother, don't be king!"

I think it is superfluous to say that this way of holding oneself is a direct derivative of Akhmatova's 1st Will. But. Not every "Akhmatova's" First Will is to be expected to demonstrate such obvious superiority. *But only from that First Will which achieved the result*, the result for the "king" is when his entourage is formed, his subjects appear, the "monarch" creates a "monarchy", and only on this basis can he successfully play at being superior, at being a charismatic leader.

The circle of certain people around Akhmatova never ceased, the retinue, carelessly called "Akhmatovka" by Pasternak, never left her even in the harshest years, so that she had someone to exercise her First Will on. Speaking of her subjects, she sometimes even used a vocabulary borrowed from the Soviet nomenclature. For example, she called her search among her admirers for the person she needed at the moment "digging through the frames"(!)

However, it was the achievement of the 1st Will Akhmatova noticeably spoiled the organic stately image of the poetess pettiness, resentful, vain, looking back at others' opinions, "she was capricious, despotic, unfair to people, at times behaved selfishly. Bunin Akhmatova did not forgive to death a vicious epigram on himself, blok for life resented the lack of attention to his person, Pasternak openly envied and jealous of his, as she thought, undeserved fame ("Nobilevka", international scandal, etc.).

Although Emotion, in this case the Second Will, is responsible for the disposition of poetry, Akhmatova's style of poetry is dictated by the First Will. Her verse is characterized by majesty, classical simplicity, laconicism, clarity, "fear of unjustified poetic exaggeration, excessive metaphors and worn-out tropes" (Zhirmunsky), "imperious restraint... Sometimes she would drop a syllable or two in the last or penultimate line of a quatrain, which creates the effect of a throaty throat or involuntary discomfort caused by emotional pressure" (Brodsky), "Akhmatova's vocal delivery itself, firm and rather self-assured... Akhmatova's voice itself, firm and rather self-assured, testifies not to tearfulness... but reveals a lyric soul which is hard rather than too soft, cruel rather than tearful, and clearly

dominant rather than oppressed..." (Nedobrovo). Akhmatova's word is a "regal word," and she captures almost her entire order of functions in four very expressive lines:

"Gold rusts and steel decays,
Crumbling marble - everything is ready for death.

All that is strongest on earth is sorrow.

And more lasting is the royal word."

The processionality of Emotion and Logic, i.e. the functions of speech, suggests that Akhmatova must have been verbose. However, this was not the case; according to contemporaries, "she was taciturn. And besides the natural fearfulness of the third Logic, this circumstance is also conditioned by the "regal" first Will, "the stately behavior restrained the free outpouring of thought" - talkativeness is not a monarchic trait.

In general, in the example of Akhmatova, one can observe with laboratory clarity the tragedy of self-destruction under the press of the 1st Will. Korney Chukovsky, who saw Akhmatova up close, but not from the crowd, wrote: "I felt terribly sorry for this hard-living woman. She is somehow all focused on her fame - and barely lives for others."

Akhmatova loved to play the game of carnal relaxation, but she could not bear self-pity and was absolutely right in this ruthlessness to herself. The story goes that during Akhmatova's farewell to Moscow, "there was a well-behaved old woman... (who) long before the departure of the train several times hugged and crossed her even shed a few tears. When she left, Akhmatova... said: "Poor thing! She feels so sorry for me! So afraid for me! She thinks I'm so weak. She has no idea that **I am a tank**. And everyone who has dealt with "akhmatova", there is a chance to be convinced of the justice of this confession.

* * *

Logic 3 was also quite evident in Akhmatova's behavior. She grew dull and withdrew into herself during intellectual disputes, though she valued learning in itself, and her son's scientific successes were a matter of enduring pride. Her vulnerability to Illogic 3 can be seen from the fact that when, in one of her prefaces to a collection of poems, she happened to read "Akhmatova was not clever enough...", she suffered a severe attack of angina. This case is a good illustration of the not quite banal idea that soul, spirit, mind, and body (psychosomatics, in one word) are in such an indissoluble connection that any influence on one department, in one way or another, affects the others. In this case, the impact on the 3rd Logic is reflected in the 4th Physics.

Akhmatova's purely external allergy to all forms of highbrow does not mean that people of her type avoid serious intellectual pursuits. Not at all. The example of such Akhmatovs as Schopenhauer and Kierkegaard shows not only the predisposition of this type to philosophy, but also what kind of philosophy they can profess. Of course, skepticism is at the heart of the "Ahmatovian" philosophical system. The basis of the universe is thought to be the brainless World Will, deprived of rational brakes, which drags an individual doll

with childish thoughtlessness over the mounds of existence, and when played with, throws him down into the abyss of oblivion. Schopenhauer considered this world the worst of all worlds and called his philosophy "the philosophy of pessimism. Which is very appropriate for the entire "Akhmatovian" generation, experiencing a chronic sense of loneliness and sadness. Right, only Schopenhauer's mindset of despair (1st Will + 4th Physics) can correspond to Akhmatova's mournful muse. We think that if Akhmatova and Schopenhauer had lived at the same time, they would have made a good pair.

* * *

By their 2nd Emotion, the "Akhmatovs" are by nature themselves disposed to artistic creation, and therefore the list of glorious representatives of this kind, who devoted themselves to the arts and literature, is certainly not exhausted by Akhmatova. Aeschylus, Virgil, Dante, Camões, Bach, Tasso, Lermontov, Leopardi, Leonora Duse, Paul Gauguin, Vrubel can be added to the Akhmatova type, Knut Hamsun, Villiers de Lille-Adan, Bunin, Marlene Dietrich, Maya Plesetskaya, Galina Vishnevskaya, Coco Chanel, John Lennon, Alexander Solzhenitsyn.

Of the painters, Akhmatova was most fond of Chagall; she preferred Giotto to Raphael, El Greco to Velázquez, and did not like Gauguin. Certain preferences of Akhmatova in painting are easily explained. She favored artists of spiritualistic direction, alien to sensuality and earthiness. Only her antipathy to Gauguin, who belonged to the same "Akhmatovian" family, seems unclear.

The explanation here may be very simple. Akhmatova, as a poetess, immediately found herself, spoke her own language, aided by the general decadent-tragic mood of the 4th Physique dominating Russian poetry of the time. It was more difficult for Gauguin; he had to break through the sunny, sensual, cheerful painting of his predecessors and contemporaries to himself - lunar, ethereal and mournful. Gauguin never quite managed to find his own language, but when looking at his paintings, the viewer can't help feeling some uneasiness, ambiguity, the contradiction between the expected and the visible. Tahiti is a sunny island, its natives are cheerful and lively, but the coloring of the Tahitian cycle of Gauguin's paintings is dark, the models are austere, pensive and submerged in shadow. Gauguin was promiscuous and painted naked women, but his "nudes" are strangely libidinous, flat and sexually deprived. The appearance at the end of Gauguin's life of several paintings with a lunar landscape and mystic-ritual subject seems to testify to the achievement of the envisioned self-identification of the artist's soul and its pictorial expression, but it was at the moment when the artist found his voice that his earthly existence came to an end. Therefore, we can speak only hypothetically of Gauguin's true self-expression - a fate that, fortunately, was avoided by Akhmatova, who therefore did not recognize in the artist a brother in spirit.

Here's another twist on the psychotypical theme: it doesn't matter who you were born as, as long as it's appropriate.

* * *

Although the artistic sphere is extremely convenient for the Akhmatova, this type is rarely realized in its entirety. The 2nd Emotion finds in literature and the arts inexhaustible nourishment, but the 1st Will is not always realized, except at the conductor's stand or in the director's chair. Bohemia and the artistic milieu are too anarchic, too Brownist to organize themselves on any kind of basis. It is well known that attempts even by such a powerful figure as Gauguin to bring order to the riotous crowd of post-Impressionists ended in utter failure.

This is not the case when Akhmatova turns to religion, to mysticism - here she can be fully realized. Not only does her 2nd Emotion find constant fodder in the religious-mystical sphere, but the 1st Will also finds under her feet the steps of the organizational structure that Akhmatova lacks in art and which leads her upward, to where the only thing greedily desired by the 1st Will - Power - lives.

Akhmatova's type, if it were to find itself in the religious sphere, might better be called the "guru type," a guru of rather tantric orientation. This characterization is due to the fact that the absolute power (1st Will) of the guru in the "Akhmatovian" type of sects is combined with the concept of an exclusively emotional perception of the Absolute and an exclusively emotional pressure on Him: ecstasy, mantra recitation, dreams, visions, glossolalia, etc. (2nd Emotion). Another distinctive feature of "Ahmatovian" sectarianism is the absence of a developed ideology (3rd Logic) and harsh norms limiting the demands of the flesh (4th Physics).

Akhmatova, as we know, affiliated herself with Orthodoxy, but we think there was more political fronting than sincere religious feeling in her Russian ecclesiology. For Akhmatova's inner sense of Christianity was too ascetic, not tragic enough, too speculative, and painfully prone to gender segregation that excluded a serious female church career. Akhmatova felt more like an Old Testament prophetess, a mystical judge, Cassandra (as Mandelstam called her):

"I spelled doom for the dear ones,

And they died one by one.

Oh, woe is me! These graves

Predicted by my word."

"No tsarevich, I'm not the one,

Who do you want me to be?

And for a long time my lips

Not kissing, but prophesying.

Don't think I'm delirious.

And tortured with longing,

I cry loudly for trouble:

That's my trade."

Fate did not give Akhmatova a chance to prove herself in the religious and mystical field; the role of the accidentally surviving patriarch of the martyred poetic school and the living idol of the few true connoisseurs of poetry is her fate. Some other representatives of the "Akhmatova family" were more fortunate, and they fully realized their psychotypical potential in this most convenient area. It is very likely that such figures include: St. Bernard of Clairvaux, the founder of the Russian schism Protopop Avvakum, the founder of "Christian Science," Mary Becker-Eddy, and Pope Boniface YIII.

The figure of Pope Boniface is especially interesting to the psychologist because it makes it easy to bridge from "akhmatova"-mystic to "akhmatova"-politician. For the papacy, political excitement is a normal, almost obligatory phenomenon, but few popes could match Boniface on this score. "Religious, in spite of the words he uttered in moments of irritation, which were incompatible with his dignity and gave rise to accusations of heresy, Boniface sincerely and deeply believed in the Church"; the pope's "temperament contributed to the failure of many of his enterprises and caused him to lose all understanding of real relations at the end of his pontificate". Boniface, characterized by "the eagle's keen eye" and "the courage of a lion," "aroused protest and resistance by the imperious features of his character and his rare haughtiness. He tolerated no hindrance to his will, confident that "he would live to see all his enemies strangled." Incapable of friendship and intemperate, he could call the French dogs to his face, call the King of Naples a bastard and threaten Philip the Fair to throw him off the throne like a boy. Boniface was even less ceremonious with his subordinates, the Catholic clerics. The result of the pope's policy, devoid of sober calculation, based solely on emotion and extreme self-confidence, was deplorable; he died persecuted and abandoned by all.

* * *

On the example of Boniface YIII it is easy in general terms to imagine the character, behavior and fate of the "Ahmatova" engaged in politics. To complete the picture I will only add that of famous politicians the following belonged to this family: Alexander the Great, Emperors Augustus and Hadrian, Louis the Holy, Wallenstein, the last Russian Empress Alexandra, the last German Emperor Wilhelm II, Adolf Hitler, Indira Gandhi, Dzhokhar Dudaev, Alexander Lukashenko... The sum of psychotypical traits of the "Akhmatova-politician" can be considered unpretentious power, unshakable faith in herself, uncompromising, fearlessness, militancy, ruthlessness, unpretentiousness in everyday life, tendency to mysticism, oratorical talent, tragic predictions, impulsiveness, irrationality, unpredictability of behavior, plans, moods and often the result is a sad, usually violent end to a political career.

Such a controversial figure in world history as Adolf Hitler deserves a special talk in connection with the political activities of Akhmatova. His image was so distorted by the propaganda of the allies in the anti-fascist coalition that to this day a caricature of Hitler,

drawn during the war, is taken for him. However, it is worth uncovering Hitler's Table Talks, and the failure of the stereotype of the "demonic Führer" becomes apparent, and the reader is presented as, perhaps, an overconfident, not too smart, not too and one-sidedly educated, but a perfectly normal man. If there was anything extravagant in the Führer's behavior, it was not for the norms of his psychotype, but for other psychotypic norms. Hitler was, engaged in politics, an "achmatova," and thus the problem of the Führer's psyche, one might say, is exhausted.

The Akhmatova-Hitler parallel seems, at first glance, blasphemous, but let us read these lines:

"He's not going to be a nice husband to me,
But he and I deserve that,
That the Twentieth Century will be embarrassed.

Recognizable? It sounds very Hitlerian, and this is a quote from "Poem Without a Hero. And the reason for this insight into the future of Akhmatova's created apocalypse is as delusional as the motives of Hitler's political hallucinations. Akhmatova imagined that her meeting with Isaiah Berlin was epochal. Berlin himself wrote about it in this way: "We - that is, she and I - unintentionally, by the simple fact of our meeting, began the Cold War and thereby changed the history of mankind. She... was absolutely convinced of this and saw herself and me as characters in world history, chosen by fate to start a cosmic conflict"(!) The extreme conceit characteristic of the Akhmatovs, multiplied by an irrational tragic forecast, always gives one and the same smug apocalyptic picture, and in whose head it arises - the Russian poetess or the German politician - is not so important.

On the example of Hitler in general it is convenient to observe "Ahmatova"-politician in its purest form. The combination of the 1st Will and the 2nd Emotion made Hitler an excellent orator, an orator appealing not to the public's reason but to its emotions. For Germans humiliated by the Treaty of Versailles and in a democracy, this combination could and did prove particularly effective. Hitler himself was well aware of the decisive role of the 1st Will as a component of his oratorical talent and even linked the time of his speeches to evening hours, a period of tiredness and discouragement. He said: "In the morning, and even during the day, the human will is much more resistant to attempts to subjugate it to other wills and other people's opinions. Meanwhile, in the evening people are more easily influenced by a stronger will. Indeed, every rally is a struggle between two opposing forces. The oratorical gift possessed by a stronger, more apostolic nature will be able at this time of day to capture the will of others who are experiencing a natural decline in their powers of resistance much more easily than it would succeed at other times with people who have still retained full control over the energy of their mind and will."

The second component of Hitler's oratorical gift after the 1st Will and the key to his political success was the powerful processional 2nd Emotion. The Führer also sensed it clearly in himself, which is why he often referred to himself as an "artistic nature" and

threatened to abandon politics for the sake of art. Hitler's 2nd Emotion demonstrated its power in all its brilliance on the rostrum. Its ability to sense the condition of the crowd at every single moment of the speech and to respond to it instantly with precise, vivid wording allowed the Führer to look directly into the soul of the German and immediately find words to express the vague, unformed aspirations of the crowd. Combined with the self-confidence and assertiveness of the 1st Will, the hypnosis of Hitler's 2nd Emotion turned the listener into a zombie, at least for as long as he was directly in the field of Hitler's speech magnetism.

The weakness of the Führer's oratorical gift was that he appealed exclusively to human emotions, neglecting the arguments of reason in his speeches. Thus only those with Emotion at the top and Logic at the bottom were susceptible to his lasting influence. The beads of Hitler's eloquence fluttered in front of strong-willed, thinking people in vain.

Many things in Hitler's speeches deterred thinking people, above all his blatant anti-intellectualism, conditioned, as we now understand, by "Ahmatov's" 3rd Logic. Hitler's "skepticism" manifested itself quite openly as a child, little Adolf was not only a poor student, but also proud of it, and when he received his high school diploma, the first thing he did was wipe himself with it (a perfect gesture for the 3rd Logic). Adolf Hitler also demonstrated the typical ambivalence of the third function in his third logic: in his own words, he dared not open his mouth when he was in obscurity, but as he climbed up the social ladder his tongue became more and more unleashed, and at the end of his career his subordinates had to complain of his "spontaneous speaking" and "linguistic egotism".

Even Hitler's famous anti-Semitism was based in part on the "skepticism" of the 3rd Logic. He was fond of saying, "Jews are the most dangerous germs of decay, capable only of analytical rather than synthetic thought. It is unlikely that the Führer himself could explain what he meant by "synthetic thinking," but by hateful analytical thinking he seems to have meant thinking as such, or rather the tendency to rely seriously on it in his views and actions, which Hitler himself was not really capable of doing. I deduce this from the fact that he despised and feared scientists almost as much as he despised Jews. In "Table Talks" one finds the following characteristic passage: "In some fields any professorial science has a pernicious effect: *it leads away from the instinct*. It denigrates it in the eyes of men.

The dwarf who has nothing but knowledge is afraid of power. Instead of saying: knowledge without a healthy body is nothing, he rejects strength. Nature adapts itself to the conditions of life. And if the world were entrusted to a German professor for a few centuries, in a million years we would be surrounded by solid morons: huge heads on tiny bodies.

Logic 3 is the Achilles' heel of the "Ahmatov type" politician, and it is on skepticism that he most often gets burned and destroys his career. Moreover, the course of history is such that reasoning in general and its fruit - science in particular - are becoming more and more powerful arguments in political games, and thus almost automatically makes "Ahmatova" an outsider in this field. Hitler's final life, as well as the picture of the world, could have been different if he had not neglected basic science and not saved on the nuclear program.

Militant skepticism is half the trouble with the "Akhmatova" politician. Much worse is the fact that, finding no support in the 3rd Logic, politicians of this type give all their trust to the 2nd Emotion, i.e. they are actually guided by moods and superstitions. The biographer of Emperor Augustus wrote: "He attached great importance to dreams, both his own and those of others, relating to him... Some signs and omens he considered unmistakable... But most of all he was concerned with miracles." And need I remind you how easily one of the German Führer's most vulnerable points can be guessed in this characterization of the Roman emperor?

Hitler, unpretentious in everyday life, indifferent to money, a non-baby man (no matter what they say about it), a vegetarian, clearly had no serious interest in the material world, but was not seen in consistent asceticism either, i.e. his physics was obviously the 4th. Its other derivatives in the Führer's psychology can also be read without difficulty. From the 4th physics Hitler's tragic outlook, apocalyptic prognosis, fearlessness (he was awarded the cross in the First World War), cruelty, genuine indifference to human suffering and death.

The question of choosing between fame (the 1st Will) and death (the 4th Physics) was never an issue for Hitler, or for any other "Ahmatova," success was the measure of all things and the size of the payment for it was of little concern. Here, as in the case of the 3rd Logic, the "Akhmatovian" order of functions set the leg of the "Akhmatova" politician. Hitler, preferring the glorious demise of the armies of Paulus and Rommel to their inglorious tactical retreat, markedly hastened the decline of his life and political career. For Hitler, his own life, the life of his people, in its purely biological aspect was of no interest or value. He said: "If the war is lost, the people will die. This fate is inevitable. And we have no reason to care about preserving the material foundations that people will need for their continued primitive existence. On the contrary, it is better for us to destroy it ourselves, for our people will be weak and the future will belong exclusively to the stronger eastern people. Only the inferior will survive the war anyway, since the best will die in the battles. What is there to say: "Ahmatova" (1st Will, 2nd Emotion, 3rd Logic, 4th Physics) - that's all.

* * *

There are several other episodes in Hitler's life, which clearly show how invisible sympathetic threads, threads of loving recognition of oneself in others, stretch between representatives of the same type through time and space. Hitler was a politician, Schopenhauer a philosopher, Hamsun a playwright. What did they seem to have in common? But all three are "Ahmatovs." And so it becomes clear why Hitler carried a book by Schopenhauer in his satchel during the whole of the first war, and why Knut Hamsun was the only famous Scandinavian who publicly supported the Führer. Such facts are worth pondering, especially when we psychotypically recognize ourselves in others - those far away and those close to us - and find an unknown source of agreement, a kinship of souls...

* * *

Among the population of the earth, the "Ahmatovian" type is not so rare. There are even nations where this psychotype makes up a significant share of the population, noticeably influencing the national physiology, psychology and culture. In connection with Akhmatova, Spain and the Caucasus come to mind first and foremost. It seems to me that Spanish and Caucasian folk dances are the perfect embodiment of the "Akhmatova" spirit. They strangely combine **proud aloofness, openly strong passion, and frigidity...** Recognizable?

If we try to convey in one phrase the lifelong inner state of "Akhmatova," it is best to limit ourselves to a quotation from a poem by Alexander Blok, where he speaks of his father's **"heavy flame of sorrow.** Indeed, *it is "Akhmatova's": sadness is from the 4th Physique, the flame is from the 2nd Emotion, and the heaviness of the flame is from the 1st Will.*

* * *

Usually "Ahmatovs" are thin, with thin, iconic facial features. The gaze is persistent, analytical, and glossy. The gesture is calm and majestically careless. Speech is reserved and weighty. Women's makeup is minimal. Their hair is neat and smooth, but somewhat longer than usual. Clothing is restrained, austere, tight, but there is a certain artistic, eye-catching element in "Ahmatovsky's" attire in form and color.

JOHANN WOLFGANG GOETHE

- 1) PHYSICS ("owner")
- 2) WILL ("nobleman")
- 3) LOGIC ("skeptic")
- 4) EMOTION ("gawker")

Goethe is one of the few who, albeit unconsciously, but accurately described his psychotype. He did so, however, in a rather peculiar way: first, in poetic form; second, by starting his functions from the end, from below; and finally, the occasion for Goethe's description of his order of functions was his correspondence dispute with the evangelist John, who began his preaching with the words: "In the beginning was the Word" (Jo. 1.1.).

Goethe discovered the Gospel and his soul (or rather, the order of functions) rebelled against such an unquestioning definition of the Beginning of all beginnings. So he decided to argue:

"In the beginning was the Word." From the first lines
Mystery. Did I get the hint right?
After all, I don't put my word that high,
To think that it is the basis of everything.

"In the beginning there was Thought. Here is the translation.

It conveys this verse more closely.

I will consider, however, that right away

Don't ruin the job with the first sentence

Could a thought breathe life into a creature?

"There was Power in the beginning. That's what it's all about,

But after a little hesitation

I reject this interpretation.

I was again, as I can see, confused:

"In the beginning was the Cause," the verse says.

In this passage from Faust one is struck not so much by the impertinence of Goethe in arguing with the apostle as by the fact that the apostle's opponent in this matter was none other than Goethe - himself recognized as the greatest master of the word. It seemed that how could the brilliant poet, novelist, and playwright declare: "I do not set the word so high." And yet. The best way to explain this phenomenon is through psychosophy: Goethe had the 4th Emotion, and, naturally, regardless of his occupation, in his inner hierarchy the value of the word as an emotional retransmitter could not be significant.

Above the Word Goethe put Thought, i.e., Logic. But he did not hasten to put it as the basis of the universe, but simply placed it above the 4th Emotion, as the thing more valuable in his opinion, thus prompting us that Goethe had the 3rd Logic.

Further on in Faust we read: "There was a Power in the beginning. This is the point, but after a little hesitation I reject this interpretation. Force, if its nature is not mechanistic, is synonymous with the Spirit, the Will ("power of the will"). And since Goethe put Force above the 3rd Logic, but not in the first place, Goethe's 2nd Will appears quite clearly in this his decision.

So, what is paramount in Goethe's system of values? "In the beginning was the Cause," he proclaimed, presenting the physical act (the Cause) as the beginning and support of the universe, i.e., simply put, his 1st Physics.

What was really at the beginning and who was right in this dispute: John the Evangelist or Goethe - is not the point. The main thing is that by reflecting on the origins of the world Goethe unwittingly built his system of values, and with it his psychotype. The difference between the Goethe of "Faust" and the psychotypical "Goethe" is only in terms. Let us compare:

Goethe ("Faust") "Goethe" (psychotype)

1) Case 1) Physics

- 2) Strength 2) Will
- 3) Thought 3) Logic
- 4) Word 4) Emotion

It was also characteristic of Goethe's type to contrast the First Function with the Third, i.e., in this case, the First Physics with the Third Logic. Recall the classical one:

"Theory, my friend, is dry,

But the tree of life is green."

Remarkably, however, by the age of 60 there came a moment in Goethe's life when, having healed his natural ulcer in the 3rd Logic, he was able to part with the innate fig leaf of skepticism. And when young Schopenhauer with fervor of the same, but his 3rd Logic tried to return the wizened old like-minded man to the bosom of skepticism, assuring him of the perfect helplessness of reason, Goethe, pitying his young opponent and sympathizing with him, still did not find words of comfort for him.

The biographer wrote about the poet experienced at the time of the metamorphosis: "In the scientific interests of Goethe changed. Had he not previously been skeptical of mathematics and astronomy, as to the invisible sciences? Hadn't he kept away from stars and numbers because his five sacred senses were powerless here? Now he extols astronomy as the only science that rests on an absolutely solid foundation and can step through infinity with complete confidence..."

Before, he had attacked Newton because his Goethean eye did not see what emerged from Newton's experiments. And now he is again arguing about the same subject with Schopenhauer, a young Kantian. "How," Goethe exclaims, "does light exist only because you see it? No! You yourself would not be in the world if light did not see you!" Goethe thus became one of the lucky few who achieved harmony while still in this life, without waiting for the transition to the next world in which all ulcers, including those of the Third Function, are healed.

* * *

Expressive and somehow particularly consistent were the fruits of Goethe's 2nd Will manifested in his work and destiny. Let us begin with the poems. One of the last is as follows:

"When in the vastness of nature,
 Where, repeatedly, everything flows,
 Countless vaults are growing
 And each vault grows into a vault,
Then the star and the worm are wretched

*Equal before the power of being,
And we think we are at peace in God
All the world's crowds."*

Surprisingly deep, intelligent, heartfelt and true. The capacity of the poetic form . only intensified the effect of the feeling of the 2nd Will of the author: strong, flexible, calm, democratic. In prose Goethe spoke of the same organic sense of aversion to caste: "...in the human spirit, as in the universe, there is nothing that is above or below; all require the same rights to a common medium."

The most interesting thing, however, is that Goethe's "nobleman's" ethics left an indelible mark on a field that seemed quite distant from philosophy and morality - the natural sciences. The fascination of Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, the Privy Counselor and king of European literature, with botany, zoology, and anatomy, which is remarkable in itself, is doubly remarkable because it was not intellectual curiosity that drove Goethe on the path of natural science, but the Will.

An initially unconscious sense of **the injustice** of the scientific dogmas of the time led Goethe to rush into battle even when it came to the classification of plants. Paying tribute to Carl Linnaeus as a botanist, Goethe, prompted by his 2nd Will, could not help but rebel against the recognized authority when the fate of the picture of the world was being decided. Goethe wrote: "After Shakespeare and Spinoza, Linnaeus made the greatest impression on me, precisely because of the contradiction he aroused in me; for what he forcibly tried to separate must, *because of the deepest need of my being*, come together." As it turned out in time, in the dispute between Goethe and Linnaeus, Goethe was right, and later on plant morphology developed precisely in the direction he indicated.

Goethe's anatomical investigations developed in the same direction. At the time, science was dominated by the theory of human exceptionalism in the animal world on the grounds that among the bones of his skull there was no intermandibular bone, indispensable for the skulls of other mammals. Goethe, of course, could not get past such a blatant genocide against our lesser brothers and, taking a child's skull in his hands, found the unfortunate bone, shaming once again the credentialed donkey scientists.

* * *

To put it bluntly, "Goethe" is one of the lucky few, about whom nothing can be said but: "Here God has bestowed beauty of body and soul. Indeed, looking at "Goethe", one can only envy: the abundant, lush relief flesh of the 1st Physique is ennobled in "Goethe" by the calm, firm, strong spirit of the 2nd Will and therefore does not look vulgar. Goethe himself was often called the "Olympian", and deservedly so - there is something Olympic in the form of "Goethe": in the large, powerful body, in the bearing plastic, in a slow, quiet, but weighty speech, in a calm, somewhat distracted gaze. The feeling of strength, reliability, peace and comfort is the first and unchangeable impression in contact with the Goethe.

The figure of Goethe has recently become of particular interest in connection with the political sphere. The relevance of such interest in this case is conditioned, oddly enough, by the fact that the democratic political system is becoming dominant in the world. And under such conditions psychology has a place to run wild. I will not reveal America if I say that democracy is built on the electoral principle, not on the dynastic right of succession and not on the right of the strongest. In the latter two cases, common for past centuries, the psychologist had nothing to do, because the psychotype of the ruler was a matter of chance and arbitrariness. Democracy creates different conditions, when the sympathies and antipathies of the electors play a decisive role in matters of power. Not to say that democracy knowingly denies the right to power to some psychotype, and leads another, on the contrary, into the royal chambers under the arms. But there is no doubt that democracy has its favorites and its stepchildren.

"Goethe" in general is a darling of fortune, a general favorite. In politics, too. And not without reason. Here is the most approximate list of "Goethe", who by the will of fate found themselves at the top of the power pyramid: Emperor Diocletian, George Washington, Tsar Alexander II, Ronald Reagan, Hosni Mubarak, Helmut Kohl, Boris Yeltsin.

What can be said of the "Goethe" politician, based on his order of functions? Obviously, Physics 1 makes him a consistent supporter of private property, a man inclined to regard personal enrichment as a sinless affair. Goethe himself half-jokingly and half-seriously said that if he had been born in England, he would not have been born without an income of 6,000 pounds. A similar point, but on a national scale, was made by "Goethe" politician Ronald Reagan: "First of all, I want our country to remain a place where a man can always get rich. And the practice of economic reforms by Reagan, Kohl, and Yeltsin shows that reliance on private-proprietary interest is not a declaration, but an intrinsic need of the "goethe" Physics 1.

While taking care of the public welfare, the Goethe never forgets about himself. When a delegation came to Emperor Diocletian, the only princeps in Roman history who had voluntarily retired, with a request to return to the throne, he exclaimed: "Don't bother me with any nonsense; better to see what cabbages I have now. George Washington's business at Mount Vernon was as busy as national affairs, even in America's darkest days.

The use of force in politics is internally very close to Goethe's 1st Physics. Think of Reagan with his "peace by force" doctrine and his attacks on Libya and Lebanon. Remember Yeltsin's aggression in Chechnya and Hosni Mubarak's brutal massacres of Islamic fundamentalists. Even when fate spares the Goethe from using arms, his impulsive propensity for violence comes out of him like an awl from a sack. It has been written of Kohl that he "can wrestle with his opponents in the most trivial way. As a young man his quarrels with the Social-Democrats were not without physical violence. The chancellor must have remembered his youth, when last year he threw himself headlong into a crowd which threw apples at him in Halle. In a word, the Goethe cannot be called a pacifist in politics.

But no matter how one feels about the problem of political violence or the regulation of the economy,¹ the "goethe" physique already disposes voters to one's own appearance. The height, weight, and facial features of the aspirant to power are not the last factor in democratic elections. For all the other usually vague virtues, it is still more pleasant to have a man of unquestionable presentable appearance as head of state: tall, lean, with a lush sculpted face, etc., which is almost always answered by the Goethe and is aware of his advantage. For example, about Kohl it was written that "the Chancellor attaches political importance to his weight - 120-125 kilograms with a height of 193 centimeters. The chancellor says bluntly that he "owes his imposing appearance to many things.

The 1st Physics would have made a "Goethe"-politician an inveterate villain and robber of a national scale, of which history has known many, if his 1st Physics had not been held by the iron bonds of the 2nd Will. The Second Function, as has been said, is the best side of man, and if the Will is on the second step, the worst features of the First Function are not cancelled, but considerably smoothed, levelled out. Thus, the 1st Physique of the Goethe neither in public nor in private life makes him a robber nor a stingy man, he is rather a stingy, calculating man, nothing more.

The "Goethe's" propensity for violence is also ennobled by the 2nd Will. This type one would like to call "the sheriff", so much so that this Hollywood image accurately conveys the external side of his psychology. "Goethe" both in life and in politics is a noble hero, a man of few words with stone fists, bull-headed tenacity and a pure heart. That was the image Reagan played in the movies, and nothing changed when he traded an acting career for a political one. For nothing in the substance of his nature changed with this exchange. Like a Hollywood sheriff, the Goethe, when he uses violence, must know that he has a legal and moral justification for it, without which violence is both highly desirable and completely impossible. Let's open our heads in our minds to the unceasing inner torment of the Goethe, to the constant storm raging in his chest, when the chronically itching stone fists of the 1st Physics have to be held in the steel handcuffs of the 2nd Will.

"Power for me is responsibility, not pleasure," said Hosni Mubarak, and perhaps the equation between "power" and "responsibility" captures quite accurately the essence of Goethe's politics. It is also true that power is not a pleasure for him. The examples of Diocletian, Washington and Yeltsin, who voluntarily gave up power, are clear evidence of this.

"Responsibility" is a key word in Goethe's political vocabulary, and voters feel that he can be trusted. When Kohl was still a candidate for chancellor, voters were asked: Would they buy a used car from him? Most answered positively. And you don't even need to know the Germans particularly well to understand the significance of this result. Few of the politician's contemporaries would have passed this test.

As already mentioned, the 2nd Will is naturally democratic, so that the nature of the Goethe is in perfect harmony with the political system, a circumstance which increases

his chances of coming to power. The original democratism does not leave the Goethe even when he has the steering wheel in his hands.

First, in his work he strives for consensus, trying to sit his team exactly at the round table and not at any other table. This is an excellent quality, but, like all good things, not without a flaw. One journalist wrote: "The quest for consensus has sometimes lead Reagan into deadlock, sometimes even paralyzing his will. That would happen when the positions of his advisers differed sharply. That is why he so often followed contradictory impulses.

Second, the "Goethe" politician is characterized by what political scientists call "delegation of responsibility," i.e. the boss does not try to hold all political strings in his hands, but gives his assistants complete freedom within the limits of their authority. Fortune magazine once asked, "What can managers learn from Reagan?" And he himself answered, "Gather around the best people you can find, give them authority and don't interfere." Among other things, it was a pebble in the eye of Jimmy Carter, who, grasping at everything himself, often found himself at a standstill, overwhelmed by piles of big and small things.

In Reagan's gullibility, however, was a strength as well as a weakness. He ignored the Iran-Contra scandal and did not even have the courage to demand a response from his national security aide before the scandal began. They wrote of Reagan: "This approach was characteristic of Reagan in almost every area of foreign policy. He usually announced a tentative course, with his concepts of the state of affairs so vague and his perceptions so simplistic that he depended on his staff to a greater extent than most other presidents in all circumstances."

"Goethe," to put it bluntly, is no goldsmith. Although fate usually rewards him with a sophisticated mind, and life can give him a decent education-the 3rd Logic does its job. The 3rd Logic makes him usually speak slowly, with difficulty, diligently simplifying his vocabulary. This fact creates the impression of the Goethe as a strong, reliable, but short-tempered and simple-minded person. Strangely enough, the supposed simplicity of the Goethe also works for his political image. The average voter does not like intellectuals, so the image of "his man" with his robust physique gives the Goethe a head start in elections. One political scientist wrote: "Kohl preferred not to go deep into papers, he relied more on his advisers, deliberately creating the image of a 'good-natured giant', a bit 'simple-minded'.

When Reagan was running for governor of California, his opponent used what seemed to be a win-win tactic: always emphasizing Reagan's incompetence. But paradoxically, despite the obvious fairness of the criticism, it "benefited not him... but Reagan. but for Reagan! Speaking to voters, it was as if Reagan was saying: I am one of you, I am a simple man who does not know what is happening at the top, I just want to take the governorship to get to the bottom of it. Thus an amazing phenomenon arose with Reagan's personality: in the eyes of voters, his weaknesses were easily transformed into his strengths, and most critics were eventually forced to admit the pointlessness of their attempts to demonstrate that this popular leader simply did not know what he was talking about."

Thus, even the Third Function, which usually works against its owner and does not paint him at all, is gilded for the "Goethe" even in a democracy, and in fact his entire order of functions ensures that his political career is trouble-free. In short, the Goethe is not only the favorite of the gods, but also the favorite of the voters.

* * *

Another remarkable character trait of the Goethe associated with the 3rd Logic is that he tended to be superstitious. The same Reagan put a cherished coin in his pocket every morning, threw salt over his left shoulder when he spilled something, and avoided going up and down stairs before eating. But Goethe is no mystic, and such fables are no guide for him at all. He is an empiricist by nature, an apostle Thomas the Unbeliever, who believes only in what he can see and feel. Therefore, Goethe's superstition is rather proto-skeptical. The 3rd Logic, finding no foothold in the mind to analyze and predict life, simply defends itself with old-fashioned omens against it, having no real faith in them. So, "Goethe" is superstitious, but superstitious on occasion, from skepticism.

The innocuous tendency toward superstition does not end with the manifestation of Goethe's 3rd Logic. Like any vulnerable function, it carries a direct threat to those around it. For example, the story of one of the two most tragic duels for Russian literature is connected to Goethe's 3rd Logic. The psychotypical peculiarities of Pushkin's death in a duel will be discussed in a separate place. We shall now speak of Lermontov's death.

For all the apparent unkindness, tolerance, relaxedness, impenetrability, as if dormancy of the demigod, there is a word - and this word is "fool" - capable of turning Goethe into an enraged bull, suddenly silently, impulsively setting in motion the stone fists of his 1st Physique. And the tragic consequences of such outbursts are not uncommon. Lermontov's death in a duel is one of the saddest examples of such outbursts.

Lermontov's unfortunate murderer Martynov was called "the statue of the commodore" by his contemporaries and described as "tall", "handsome", "silent", "the noblest man". Martynov was a "Goethe". That is why, having arrived in the Caucasus, Martynov first of all dressed up in exaggerated "Circassian" attire, and even put an incredibly large dagger on his belt in accordance with his 1st Physique. Lermontov ("akhmatova"), a scoffer and a sarcophagus, of course, could not miss a magnificent opportunity for mockery: his caricatures of Martynov made up an entire album. Everywhere he could, Lermontov ironically characterized Martynov as "a highlander with a long dagger. Martynov tolerated all this in his "Goethean" complacency, but he tolerated it until a woman came between him and Lermontov.

The fact is that before Martynov's arrival in the Caucasus, Lermontov had enjoyed the attention of a local socialite. With the appearance of handsome Martynov the situation changed, the lioness shifted her attention to him. Lermontov's bile from this circumstance, understandably, was not diminished. And so at one of the parties, where all three were present, in a sudden silence that arose throughout the room, like a cannon shot, sounded Lermontov's pronouncement of French "poignard" (dagger). Martynov went pale, approached Lermontov, and said: "How many times have I asked you to keep your jokes to the ladies," and went out.

The question of who initiated the challenge remains moot. Yes, and it is not important, the duel in such a situation was inevitable. In the evening, in a thunderstorm, they dueled.

Martynov came to the barrier, Lermontov remained standing. The second-in-command commanded "two-three," but no shot was fired. The duelists obviously had no desire to fight. Tension was growing. The irritated seconds shouted: "Come together or I will break up the duel." And then Lermontov utters the phrase that cost him his life: "I will not shoot with this *Fool*". Martynov immediately pulls the trigger and Lermontov falls dead.

People who knew both duelists evaluated the event this way: "As a poet, Lermontov rose to genius, but as a man, he was petty and obnoxious.

These shortcomings and a sign of reckless persistence in them were the cause of the death of a brilliant poet from a shot made by the hand of a good, hearty man, whom Lermontov drove by his mockery and even slander almost to madness. Contemporaries, rightly seeing in the cause of the duel the dissimilarity of the characters of the duelists, have not seen and could not see the reason for the death of the poet. After all, as often happened at the time, the duel could do without shots, shots in the air or at the feet. No, the good-natured Martynov suddenly lost all his good-naturedness and shot precisely in order to kill. And the reason for Martynov's sudden ferocity lay in the word "fool" carelessly uttered by Lermontov. "Fool!" - is a kick in the groin for the 3rd Logic, and if it is combined with the 1st Physique, as in "Goethe," a purely impulsive response in the form of physical violence is almost inevitable.

* * *

Finally, there is a circumstance that provides a happy opportunity to say a few words about "goethe" not only as a person, a scientist, a politician, a writer, but also about the manifestations of his psychotype in the visual arts.

To begin with, "Goethe," by virtue of the 1st Physics, prefers three-dimensional art, i.e., sculpture, plastic art, of all kinds of fine art. Two-dimensional art (painting, graphics) are too ephemeral, too incorporeal for the excessively carnal nature of the 1st Physics. Goethe himself was a famous collector of copies of ancient sculptures, and his collection of cameos was considered one of the best in Europe.

But in order to understand not only what he loves, but also how the "Goethe" psychotype is directly manifested in the fine arts, we should turn to the work of one of the greatest sculptors of the twentieth century - the work of Henry Moore. An architect who visited the sculptor's studio while Moore was still alive said, "...the sculptures are especially good among wildlife, for they become part of the landscape. Sheep hide in their shade from the summer heat, and the whimsical silhouettes of the figures merge with the hills and trees. Most of Moore's works are deformed female figures: fat-assed, with powerful hips and *small, almost decorative heads*. *When not needed, the head may be absent at all: the sculptor prefers to speak to the viewer in body language...* (3rd Logic?) "Moore himself said about his work: "One of the properties that I would like to think is inherent in my sculpture is **strength, durability, inner energy...**" We can add from ourselves - and **peace**.

In a review of the Moscow exhibition of Henry Moore it was reported that a museum curator, who lived for several days among the Moore sculptures, thought that a stay among them should be prescribed for nervous people instead of tranquilizers, such an amazing sense of balance and tranquility endowed these sculptures. Indeed, the sight of Moore's

mighty, powerful, normally reclining female torsos is unusually calming, and at the same time can serve as an illustration of both the external and internal mental state of "goethe.

* * *

Describing the exterior of the Goethe, one would like to describe him this way. A large, muscular, growing creature. A look that combines energy, good-naturedness and absent-mindedness. Gesture and facial expression relaxed. He is silent. he does not easily choose his words. His hair leaves the impression of being well-groomed, but in a kind of loose state. Women overuse makeup. Clothes are expensive, often overly opulent, but not flashy.

ALEXANDER PUSHKIN

- 1) EMOTION ("romantic")
- 2) PHYSICS ("toiler")
- 3) WILL ("burgher")
- 4) LOGIC ("schoolboy")

Upon learning of the poet's death, Prince Paskeevich wrote to the tsar: "I pity Pushkin as a literary man, at a time when his talent was maturing; but he was a bad man. We, who from childhood were in love with Pushkin's poetry, cannot help but be offended by such a characterization, but, alas, it is difficult to argue with it. Even if we change the word "bad" for more delicate "heavy", this substitution will not avoid this strange, at the first sight, contradiction, which is inherent in Pushkin's nature, that Pushkin the poet was much higher, better, cleaner and even smarter than Pushkin the man. However, this contradiction is not unique, it directly stems from the inherent in any "Pushkin" functional order, where the poetic motor - strong, excessive 1st Emotion, is opposed to a weakened, vulnerable 3rd Will, and together with the Will, as it was said before, also to the personality in general.

Heinrich Heine, "Pushkin" by his psychotype, confessed: "...my image is a sauerkraut sprinkled with ambrosia!" Almost the same, but more elaborate confession was made by Pushkin:

"Until it requires a poet.

To the sacred sacrifice of Apollo,

In the cares of the vanity of the world

He is cowardly immersed;
His holy lyre is silent;
The soul tastes of cold sleep,
And among the children of the lowly world,
Maybe he's the lowest of the low.
But only the divine verb
It touches the sensitive ear,
The poet's soul is awakened,
Like an awakened eagle.

A remarkable self-portrait, everything in it is true: the feeling of his insignificance, vanity and cowardice (3rd Will), it is even true that the work of the soul is done, as if in jerks, with pauses for sleep, but feelings, once awakened, soar to a great height (1st Emotion). It is even more remarkable that Pushkin found the courage not only to make a poetic half-recognition, but also to directly expose his ulcers. In one of his letters he repented: "... my temper - uneven, jealous, resentful, irritable, and yet weak - that is what inspires me a painful reflection. Pushkin frailty is not a mystery to close friends, one of them wrote: "Sometimes you could think that he has no character: so he weakly succumbed to the momentary force of circumstances. Meanwhile, for nothing so much he did not respect the other as a character ...".

"With all his good-heartedness, Pushkin was rather vindictive, and not so much because of his inborn nature and passion, but because of his calculation; he, so to say, obliged himself, made it a rule to remember the evil and not to forgive his debtors," one of the poet's closest friends remarked, thus characterizing not his personality or even "Pushkin's" psychotype, but the 3rd Will's owners in general. More or less originality of "Pushkin's" offensiveness is only given by the fact that it is revealed through his terrible ranting. The combination of the 3rd Will with the 1st Emotion awards "Pushkin" with an absolutely amazing gift of a detractor. Moreover, the 3rd Will defines anger and fearful observation to weaknesses and uglinesses of an opponent, while the 1st Emotion puts these poisonous notes into such murderous expressions, images and metaphors, that the word "murderous" sometimes has to be understood literally. In any case, it is said of the ancient Greek poet Archilochus that he, being rejected by a young woman, wrote such a poem that the entire family of the chosen one hanged themselves. Unfortunately, Archilochus' poem has not survived, but we can say with great certainty that it was not a simple, name-calling set of profanity, like "you are such, such and such, such and such..." No. Let us recall a classic from Pushkin:

"Every time you go to Smirdin's house,
You won't buy anything there.

Or push Senkovsky,
Or you will step in Bulgarin's shoes."

Pushkin's talent for wickedness lies in innuendo, figurativeness, and circumlocution. Poison is injected stealthily, at the last moment, so that the victim does not immediately realize about the lethal injection. Here is another masterpiece-example from Martial (from memory):

"Seven husbands were buried by Xanthippe,
Now she's married to you, Anixtus.
It seems she wants to visit her dead husbands."

Yes, to write with such sizzling sarcasm about someone else's wickedness, one must of course have the psychotype of a "Pushkin. Poetic talent and knowledge of the subtleties of this craft are only tools of that bileful talent, which "Pushkin" is awarded by nature from the beginning. Therefore, it is not surprising that the majority of "Pushkin's" poets, exercising their blasphemy, easily make do without iambs and chorais, but this circumstance by no means reduces the killing power of the fiery "Pushkin's" word.

Emotionally, i.e., through language, through blasphemy, through shouting (1st Emotion), "Pushkin" begins the struggle, but in his shout, no matter how deafening, one can still feel the rattle of an insecure person (3rd Will). An old friend of mine had a dog who, when greeting guests with loud, even furious barking, had a habit of simultaneously wagging his tail with incomprehensible friendliness. I nicknamed her - "Pushkin. And indeed, for a "Pushkin" such behavior is typical. Rebellious, fighting, conflicting, he first of all seeks to hit the enemy with a thunder of his shout. This works. But if you listen to Pushkin's scream, in its overtones you can clearly hear the lack of confidence, the readiness for surrender, the doubt in the effectiveness of his cry, some inner wagging of the tail.

* * *

In accordance with its order of functions, after the striking word (1st Emotion) "Pushkin" has a fist (2nd Physics) as a fighting argument. We cannot say that "Pushkin" is a tough fighter; his strong, flexible Physics is programmed for cooperation and creation, not for destruction and violence. And yet. When the conflict demands, when emotional pressure does not reach its aim, "Pushkin" easily proceeds to physical violence. Moreover, "Pushkin" fights with the 4th Logic turned off and the 1st Emotion spurting over the edge, i.e. self-forgetfully, in a state of complete eclipse, with complete loss of any self-control (the 3rd Will) and looks like an enraged boar from outside. "In rage I am not responsible for myself," Dostoevsky (another "Pushkin") warned. The effect of such attacks can be very impressive. I know a case when a tiny girl of the "Pushkin family" beat with a sledge and turned six big guys to flight.

The typical "Pushkin's" free hand partly determined Pushkin's own demise as well. In keeping with the spirit of the nineteenth century and the nobility, his pugnacity took the form of brexit. Although the 2nd Physique

itself would not have made Pushkin such an inveterate duelist, as he was, if his Physique had not been provoked by the insulting and mistrustful 3rd Will. Literary scholars, too enamored of the poet's poetry to be objective, tend to blame anyone else for his death (Dantes, his wife, the tsar, society), but not Pushkin himself. However, contemporaries were more insightful, and one of them wrote: "He adored his wife, proud of her beauty, and was quite sure of her. He was jealous of her not because of her doubts, but because he was afraid of secular rumors, afraid to become even more ridiculous in front of secular opinion. This fear was the cause of his death, not Mr. Dantes, whom he had nothing to fear. He stood up for a grievance that did not exist, but was afraid of publicity, afraid of the word of mouth, and saw in Dantes not a serious rival, not an encroachment on his real honor, but an encroachment on his name, and this he could not bear."

The inevitability of Pushkin's death in a duel, in the context of his time, class and, most importantly, psycho-type, is well seen in the story of his other, unsuccessful duel. A friend of the poet, Putyata, said: "Pushkin once sent me a French note with his coachman and drogues. The content of the note confused me, and here it is: "When I went up yesterday to a lady who was talking to Mr. de Lagrée (secretary of the French embassy), he said to her loud enough for me to hear: "Send him away!" Being compelled to demand satisfaction for these words, I beg you, gracious sovereign, not to refuse to go to Mr. de Lagrée and have a word with him. Pushkin." I immediately boarded Pushkin's cart and went to him. He told me the incident with passion and indignation, claimed that he had definitely heard the words that offended him, explained that the note was written by him in such a form and so ceremoniously just so that I could show it to Lagrée, and insisted that I demanded satisfaction from him. There was nothing to be done: I went to Lagréne, with whom I was well acquainted, and showed him the note. Lagrée, with a look of astonishment, said that he had never uttered the words attributed to him, that Pushkin had probably misheard them, that he would not allow himself anything like that, especially with respect to Pushkin, whom he deeply respected as a famous poet of Russia, and spread himself in expressions of this kind. Taking advantage of this mood, I asked him if he was ready to repeat the same to Pushkin. He said yes, and we immediately went with him to Al. Sergei. The explanation took place in my presence, the opponents shook hands with each other, and that was the end of it.

In the story of Pushkin's failed duel with Lagrée, as in a drop of water, the mechanism of the destructive duel conditioned by "Pushkin's" psychotype is reflected. Even if the phrase "chase him away!" had really been uttered, not everyone would have reacted in Pushkin-like fashion. The 1st Will, having heard such a thing, would directly approach the supposed offender and ask whom he meant, i.e. would go for a direct volitional confrontation. The 2nd Will, due to its healthy indifference to the opinion of others, would have let this phrase pass by, considering it does not concern itself. Otherwise, like Pushkin, the 3rd Will would react to this kind of "challenge": it could neither pass over its ears nor make a direct volitional confrontation, but was not able to digest the offence either. It was necessary to retaliate and revenge in accordance with the order of functions. So in the case of "Pushkin", the psychotype obliged: to run away from the offender home (3rd Will), to write him an exquisitely boorish cartel, such that not to say reconciliation, a formal duel would be impossible (1st Emotion + 3rd Will), and then to go to the barrier in cold blood, putting up her felt invincible, strong flexible, like a rubber baton, 2nd Physique in the

fight. This is the usual behavioral scheme of "Pushkin", a 19th century nobleman, in a conflict situation, and there is nothing surprising that the real Pushkin became an unwitting victim of this suicidal scheme.

* * *

Every man is contradictory. But it is difficult to find a figure like "Pushkin," all woven of contradictions. First of all, in his consciousness he miraculously coexists an extremely overestimated assessment of others with an extremely underestimated one. Pushkin himself gives a magnificent example of such a double standard in relation to his beloved Anna Kern. On the one hand - textbook:

"I remember a wonderful moment:

You appeared before me,

Like a fleeting vision,

Like a genius of pure beauty."

Although the "genius of pure beauty" is stolen from Zhukovsky, the poem seems to leave no doubt about Pushkin's sincere and extremely lofty assessment of the object of his passion. But what a shock it is when the reader turns to the poet's epistolary heritage and discovers lines concerning Kern that are insulting and simply obscene, replaced by a dotted line in the publishers' editions. Is it savagery? Hypocrisy? A paradox? Nothing of the sort.

Neither "genius of pure beauty," nor the "Babylonian harlot" Anna Kern was not, she was an ordinary, earthly woman, quite frivolous, by the standards of the time. That's all. The phenomenon was that Pushkin never perceived Kern for what she was, objectively. He observed her through two differently distorting functional prisms: the 1st Emotion and the 3rd Will. Independent of the object, the blinded 1st Emotion, by its redundancy, worked to terribly magnify the image, as if Kern were a "genius of pure beauty." As for the epistolary scolding against her, it is the fruit of Pushkin's diminishing and equally biased prism of the 3rd Will. "The philistine" dislikes, disrespects himself, and readily transfers this dislike from himself to outsiders. So, there is nothing paradoxical, from the point of view of psychosophy, in Pushkin's attitude to Kern, just as, indeed, in all other cases where "Pushkin" reveals his love duplicity.

In general, "Pushkin's" combination of the 1st Emotion and the 3rd Will is inexhaustible in surprises, though usually not very pleasant, especially in matters of love. "Pushkin" is an amazing lover. Excessive 1st Emotion is an almost failsafe starter of sexual excitement. The 2nd Emotion is indefatigably caring and attentive in everyday life, sex is devoid of sanctimony, natural, sensitive, tactful, abundant. Beauty "Pushkin", however, usually does not shine, his appearance is typical for the 2nd Physika: a small height, round face, stocky, short, chubby figure. However, his "ugliness" is more than offset by the accuracy, energy of movement, amazing plastics. In addition, a lively, bright facial expressions and gestures,

a loud infectious laughter, quick sparkling eyes work extraordinarily exciting, completely hiding flaws of the "Pushkin" appearance.

The combination of the 1st Emotion with the 2nd Physics in "Pushkin", creating around him a cheerful, sensual, Rabelaisian atmosphere, awakens the libido and fosters illusions, as if love relations with him should be easy, pleasant, unclouded. Nothing of the sort. Love for "Pushkin" and love for "Pushkin" are painful, bitter, like everything connected with the psychology of the "bourgeois". Firstly, it is difficult to imagine a person in whom such a gigantic gulf would lie between a feeling, a word (the 1st Emotion) and an action, a deed (the 3rd Will). Judging by Pushkin's deeds, his love ardor, enthusiasm, passionate assurances are an unusually talented, fascinating, effective, but absolutely impeccable lie. However, in fact, the supposed *insincerity of "Pushkin" is the sincerity of a timid, shy, insecure man*. Secondly, being frantically jealous, "Pushkin" himself is a consistent lover in his infidelity. And often not by virtue of sexual dissatisfaction with not only the strong, but also the flexible 2nd Physique. By his constant dragging, the "Pushkin" either asserts himself or takes revenge for real and imagined wrongs. Although, as it usually happens with the combination of the 3rd Will with high physics, even good luck with donjooism does not erase "Pushkin's" wicked notes from his memory and does not add to his self-respect. Here, I think, it is superfluous to say that ambiguous behavior, anger, infidelity of "Pushkin" have little beauty for life in a pair with him, and many disappointments await anyone who started with expectations of easy, cloudless, reliable relations.

* * *

Another amusing paradox of the "Pushkin" psychotype is revealed with age. It turns out that after becoming an adult, he retains all the outward signs of childhood. The reason for this phenomenon is also the combination of the 1st Emotion and the 3rd Will. Previously, we spoke about the infantilism of adult "petty bourgeois", about their naive lying, slyness, inconsistency, resentfulness, capriciousness. But in the case of "Pushkin", this behavioral infantilism is extremely reinforced in adult individuals by what is usually considered childish emotionality. One contemporary wrote of Mark Twain ("Pushkin"): "He remained a boy until the end of his days... With a heart of a good boy or bad, but always willful, and most of all, when he wanted to show what a boy he was. Not for his age and rank a perky, irrepressible laughter, inappropriate age tearfulness - create in outsiders (along with signs of behavioral immaturity), the idea of "Pushkin," as an incorrigible big kid. This is only partially true, because "Pushkin's" normal age-related work of accumulating experience and knowledge is done in the same way as in all other people.

The impression is further intensified by "Pushkin's" childishly unrestrained propensity for winking, mocking, and mugging. Especially striking is this trait, causing a kind of pleasant little shock when you notice it in the honored husbands and seniors crowned with gray hair. "Pushkin" in general has a special gift of a clown. A keen sense of humor and the ugly (3rd Will), intensified by facial expressions, intonations, gestures (1st Emotion), automatically awards the "Pushkin" with a clownish gift, which is often a means of

existence, giving the "Pushkin" a comic role in circus, theater and cinema. Not without reason, the greatest comedian of all time, Charlie Chaplin, belonged to the "Pushkin family.

Especially paradoxical is the combination of the 1st Emotion and the 3rd Will in "Pushkin's" men. The point is that heightened emotionality together with cowardice corresponds not only to the society's idea of childishness, but also to the same idea of femininity. Typical for "Pushkin" shouting and cunning pliability makes his male version not only a child, but also a psychic transsexual, making us feel "womanish" in him and often characterize his behavior as "womanish" from outside.

The next surprise usually awaits those who, having acquainted themselves with the artistic work of "Pushkin," mostly sublime and romantic, come face to face with the author. The notion that the creator of these works, as if cut off from all earthly life, is an ideal being nourished by the air of mountain peaks, is subjected to a terrible breakdown on personal meeting. It turns out that "Pushkin" is not at all a thin, tall, pale man with eyes rolled up to the sky, as thought, but on the contrary, he is an ugly and material creature, both outwardly and inwardly. Here are some typical characteristics: "I met the poet Pushkin. A face promising nothing", "...the majestic priest of high art we were expecting was a medium height, almost a short little man, wiry, with long, somewhat curly hair at the ends, without any pretensions, with lively, quick eyes." Similar about "Pushkin"-Heine: "Heine was like Jupiter, but with too short legs, to whom his very conspicuous belly and exuding contented manners gave the appearance of a *bon vivant*," "I imagined the author of his Traveling Pictures to be a pale, slender and tall man, being misled by his portrait, "I imagined the author of Travelling Pictures to be a pale, slender, tall man, misled by the portrait of him that had long adorned my room, while before me stood a stocky, full man of small stature, with a figure that might rather have belonged to a wealthy broker than to the most celebrated, perhaps the greatest German poet. *Never had anyone's appearance contrasted so strongly with the image I had of this man.*

But most shocking of all is "Pushkin," imagined in absentia as an exceptionally romantic figure, by his amazing talent for lewdness. "Pushkin is a lover of the obscene. Unfortunately, I know this and I could never explain this antithesis of the transition from the obscene to the sublime," wrote one of the poet's contemporaries, not knowing it himself, noting one of the most characteristic features not personality, but a whole mental type. The talent of obscenity is precisely psychotypical and naturally stems from the "Pushkin order" of functions. His 1st Emotion easily finds appropriate words and vivid images, the ease of attitude and love of the 2nd Physique to any manifestation of physiology gives a theme, while the 3rd Will, with its passion for everything petty and degrading, shallows and degrades both form and content. However, Pushkin's scabrousness, like blasphemy, is not a simple, primitive calling everything and everything in its own words, but mostly appears under a kind of sanctimonious cover, being embodied in hints and allegories.

Moreover, the most remarkable thing about "Pushkin's" talent for obscenity is not so much in the frequency of its use, but rather in the ability to quickly detect obscenity, and it seemed that it was absolutely in place.

I once happened to go to a painting exhibition with a member of the "Pushkin family. With a sourly indifferent look we passed from one painting to another, until we came to one, next to which hung a modest plaque with the name of the artist - Wasserman. My companion responded instantly, smiling slyly, she whispered: "Well, what's your reaction Wasserman?" After a moment's hesitation, I muttered in the spirit that, of course, it was positive, but even then I was amazed at her ability to extract profanity from nothing and almost instantly. Or here's another example. I happened to attend a meeting with the biggest whales of Russian industry and art; the atmosphere was dull, a boring question was being decided: the list of people in charge of different events was being made. It was decided that the list should be completed by, let's say, Ivanov. Suddenly one of the deputy ministers present, a captain of industry, a grey-haired and distinguished man, raised his pen above the list and suddenly asked Ivanov, with a sly twinkle of his eye: "Look, Ivanov, should I put you under Petrova or under her? Everyone laughed, the boredom of the meeting dissipated, but I think I was not the only one who was surprised at the perversity of the old bison's mind, squeezing out of the situation what seemed in principle not to be squeezed out of it.

"Pushkin is an extremely practical person. But here's another paradox, he, being left to himself, is rarely successful in practical matters, especially if serious intellectual efforts are required in the meantime. Pushkin himself lost at cards to everyone he could, and he died leaving a huge debt to his family. Dostoevsky, losing to nothing at roulette, erected a monument to his madness in his novel *The Gambler*.

I think that with all accuracy of perception of the material world (2nd Physics) "Pushkin's" strange impracticality is caused not only by the 4th Logic. The 3rd Will terribly interferes with his fruitful business activity, bringing "Pushkin" to a point of mindless excitement and simply insanity by its secret ambition. After all, gold, money is at least freedom, but at most - both freedom and power. And the temptation of freedom and power for "Pushkin" is so strong that neither the 3rd Will nor the 4th Logic is able to resist it. Any adventure, if it promises a lot at once, knocks out the remnants of reason from "Pushkin" and, naturally, punishes the naïve crook briefly, quickly and cruelly. Dostoevsky has best described the phenomenon of "Pushkin's" useless greed, aiming at Nekrasov but hitting himself: "A million - here is Nekrasov's demon! Well, he loved so much gold, luxury, pleasure, and to have them, went into practicality? No, it was rather a different kind of demon, it was the darkest and most humiliating demon. It was a **demon of pride**, a thirst for self-sufficiency, a need to wall himself off from people with a solid wall and independently, calmly face their anger, their threats."

Usually, the only thing that saves "Pushkin" from poverty is that he is a "workaholic" (2nd Physics). And her tireless work plugs the budget holes punctured by useless scams. Yes, and in the dramas of the personal order there is no better medicine for the "Pushkin" than labor. A contemporary of Pushkin wrote: "Labor was for him a shrine, a font in which all the sores were healed, the weakness and discouragement were refreshed and the relaxed forces were restored.

However, neither labor, nor wealth, nor nobility are able to cancel the 3rd Will and save the vulnerable mental body of a "petty bourgeois" from blows and fear of them. Pushkin lived in prosperity, belonged to an old family, but that did not prevent his acquaintances to characterize him as follows: "I must admit that with all due respect to the great talent of Pushkin, it was an intolerable character. It's as if he was afraid that he has little respect, not enough honor rendered..." "... He felt humiliated and had neither enough fortitude to escape the humiliation, nor enough meanness to put up with it.

* * *

World history assigns "Pushkin" the role of the main creator of cultural values. It is enough to name just a few names of this kind to imagine the enormity of the scale of "Pushkin's" contribution to world culture: Martial, Rembrant, Chaucer, Mozart, Burns, Hogarth, Rabelais, Goya, Dostoevsky, Edouard Manet, Heine, Georges Zand, Beethoven, Hugo, Kipling, Cézanne, Hoffmann, Chaplin, Picasso, Mark Twain, Majol, Mikhail Bulgakov, Edith Piaf, Fellini, Garcia Marquez.

Already from this list of the first names that come to mind one can see that "Pushkin" psychotype is the backbone of world culture, and it is difficult to imagine what a wisp it would look like if nature would not produce "Pushkin" from time to time.

* * *

Pushkin's appeal to the sphere of speculation (Nietzsche, Rozanov) is not without interest. However, the best that comes out of "Pushkin's" pen in such cases is mistakenly called philosophy. Pushkin's thinking is devoid of philosophical strategism and systematicness, which is why it produces essays rather than philosophy.

"Pushkin" is more superstitious than religious. And in any case he is no longer a Christian. He is not even a militant non-Christian. It is not without reason that the above-mentioned "Pushkin" essayists, Nietzsche and Rozanov, were the most ardent and consistent critics of Christianity in the 20th century. The point at which Christianity and "Pushkin" fundamentally diverge lies on the surface: their attitude toward Physics, the material layer of life. Asceticism, contempt for the flesh, does not fit in the "Pushkin's" mind, which with good reason considers the body and everything connected with it the best side of its nature.

If one were to choose a religion for a "Pushkin," Judaism would suit him best. And there is a hidden meaning in the fact that the backbone of believers in the synagogue is usually made up of "Pushkin" Jews. Judaism is purely emotional (1st Emotion), devoid of any tendency towards asceticism, on holidays it is almost bacchanically carnivorous (2nd Physics) and on the Sabbath it allows some slyness in relations to God (3rd Will), which even gave birth to a special folklore genre - the Jewish religious anecdote. In a word, Judaism is balm for "Pushkin's" soul, it is his religion. It is not without reason that Nietzsche and Rozanov not only criticized Christianity, but also made a direct example of Judaism.

* * *

It is difficult to call "Pushkin" a successful politician. Judge for yourself, the "Pushkins" in political history are very likely to include: Henry of Navarre, Catherine the Great, Jaures, Nicholas II, Mussolini, Khrushchev, John Kennedy, Nicolas Ceausescu, Vaclav Havel, Mobutu, Noriega, Zhirinovsky.

Perhaps typical of the political career of a "Pushkin," if it does not depend on dynastic considerations, rarely begins with unconditional leadership. More often than not, "Pushkin's" career in politics is facilitated by his talent as an orator and journalist. Indeed, the emotional, passionate, imaginative "Pushkin word" makes its bearer a necessary and

important figure in the party apparatus. In addition, "Pushkin's" ascent up the political career ladder is facilitated by the 2nd Workaholic Physique and the 3rd Will, which makes a super-flexible back and psyche, combining jouissance with a secret but frantic ambition. Advantages and disadvantages of flexibility "Pushkin" politician very well described on the example of Walter Schellenberg one journalist who knew him well: "When, for example, Schellenberg came across in a business dispute on the stubborn resistance, he was able to change tactics, to abandon the brute psychological pressure. Within seconds, his embittered tension would disappear; laying down his arms, smiling sweetly, he would agree to a surrender whose terms he tried to haggle over with unflappable tolerance. *So strong was his desire to influence the world and people around him, so easily did he himself succumb to the influence of others.*

In this strong receptive talent lurked a capacity for spiritual adaptability, which no doubt explains to some extent the mystery of his brilliant career. At the same time it also manifested itself as a dangerous weakness. Adaptability meant also unreliability; with an almost feminine sensibility coexisted the capriciousness of an operetta diva, no longer confident in her own success. Schellenberg did not have a pronounced truly masculine character. It would be an exaggeration to call him a strong personality.

Pushkin's psychotype, from the point of view of politics, is a complete disadvantage. 1st Emotion makes him a bad diplomat, shouty and tactless: Khrushchev's UN boot scandal is the clearest example of this. 2nd Pushkin's Physics rewards him with personal fearlessness, which makes it easier for terrorists and conspirators. 4th Logic deprives our hero of strategic thinking, the example of the same Khrushchev, who created the Cuban crisis from a poor idea "to run a hedgehog in the pants to the Americans", is much more illustrative. And the combination of the 1st Emotion, the 2nd Physics and the 4th Logic gives birth to such a sad phenomenon as favoritism during the reign of "Pushkin": foreign diplomats at the court of Catherine II, for example, complained about the unpredictability of Tsarist policy, which depended entirely on who was in the empress's bed at night. And all of this, together with the 3rd Will, creates that phenomenon of the "Pushkin" politician, which is reproduced very precisely under the pen of the political scientist Avtorkhanov in his portrait of Khrushchev: "Those around Khrushchev had to deal with one Khrushchev in the morning, with the second one at lunchtime, and with the third one in the evening. His constant inconstancy, his marvelous gift of chaotic improvisation, his morbid itch to endlessly organize and reorganize, his imperious recklessness multiplied by his haplessness and carelessness, his dangerous talkativeness, his groundless ambition to know everything, see everything, do everything himself, his treachery in friendship and his self-assurance in politics are only some features of such a rich, colorful, dynamic character of Khrushchev. This trait made him an exceptionally dangerous dictator..."

* * *

The Pushkin family is, if not the most numerous in the world, one of the most numerous, and there is no country where the Pushkins do not constitute a very significant group among the population. But, perhaps, there is only one country in the world, where the

"Pushkin" clan has multiplied to the absolute dominance - it is Japan. It is this psychotype that has formed specific features of the Japanese national character and life style.

The Japanese are a singular people of universal aesthetics: poetry, painting, music, and the admiration of nature are integral and extremely important elements of the full-blooded life of the Japanese. Knowledge of the rules of poetry was explicitly prescribed for samurai, but poetry in Japan is not a samurai privilege; numerous annual poetry contests gather tens of thousands of applicants. And the forms in which the Japanese prefer to put their inspiration (haiku and tanka) are as close as possible to the 1st Emotion.

2 The physics of the Japanese is also quite obvious. He is a "workaholic. The Japanese are sturdy, hardy, fearless fighters and generally a man of endurance (the average life expectancy in Japan is probably the highest in the world). Japanese prefer simplicity and naturalness in everyday life, and their cuisine is close to raw food. Japanese attitudes in the flesh are devoid of both excessive enthusiasm and sanctimony.

The dominance of the 3rd Will in the character of Japanese society is also evidenced by much. It is typified by the uncontested need to delegate individuality in favor of social formations: family, firm, state. The "bourgeois" psychology of the Japanese is indicated by the emphasized etiquette and casteism of Japanese society. A stewardess of international lines once said that when an American delegation flies in, she cannot tell at once who is the boss and who is a subordinate, whereas in the Japanese delegation, the position of each member of the delegation on the job ladder is visible a mile away. Another example: when there is a conflict between two Americans, they unconsciously strive to be face to face. The Japanese, on the contrary, in similar situations try to stay away from each other and look for a mediator to resolve the conflict, for fear of a direct confrontation of the will.

The Japanese mind is extremely practical and directed only toward concrete, tangible results. Thinking for the sake of thinking, abstraction is alien to the Japanese 4th Logic, which is why neither serious philosophy nor fundamental science was born on the Japanese islands. Finally, one more not so weighty, but in its own way remarkable "Pushkin" omen: according to Professor Kohei Tani, Dostoevsky is the favorite writer of the Japanese - and Dostoevsky is naturally "Pushkin" and seems to be the most frank, the most confessional of the "Pushkin" sort.

AURELIUS AUGUSTINUS

- 1) LOGIC ("dogmatic")
- 2) EMOTION ("actor")
- 3) PHYSICS ("the underdog")
- 4) WILL ("serf")

In the memory of almost everyone is stored, usually associated with youth, transgression, remembered more often than others, unusually bright and with particular bitterness. As a rule, this transgression is a minor one, and the fact that it is the first one adds to the acuteness of the memory of it. He is like a sinful fall, like the loss of innocence, after him all the other sins, sins and even crimes are already as if by themselves are taken for granted, ordinary, and therefore the memory of them is shorter and more vague. For example, for Jean-Jacques Rousseau, such a milestone was the theft of a ribbon that caused the maid to be refused a home; for Leo Tolstoy, it was a card debt. Something similar happened to Blessed Augustine at the age of sixteen. He recalled with shame: "I wanted to steal, and I did it, pushed not by poverty or hunger, but by an aversion to justice and from eating sin. I stole what I had in abundance and, moreover, was much better; I wanted to enjoy not what I sought to steal, but theft and sin itself.

Next door to our vineyard was a pear tree, laden with fruit that was not at all tempting either in appearance or taste. Unfit boys, we went out to shake it off and get our booty at the dead of midnight: it was a pernicious custom that our street games were delayed until that time. We carried away a great burden not to eat for ourselves (if we even ate some); and we were ready to throw it to the pigs, if only to commit an act that was pleasing because it was forbidden."

The shaking off of a pear is a perfectly innocent transgression, and in Augustine's mind it took on the appearance of a true crime, obviously because it was committed deliberately. The child is sinless, shameless, and unprejudiced because he does not know what he is doing. Augustine, at the age of sixteen, was already aware of the shameful nature of what he had done, and so he began his penance with this in the *Confessions*.

Augustine's attitude to childhood was, to put it mildly, contradictory: a great child (the 4th Will) lived in him for life, he loved children and corresponded with them until his death. Yet the same Augustine, in *On the City of God*, wrote: "And who would not be horrified and would not prefer to die if he were offered the choice either to undergo death or to relive childhood again?...with what stock of vain desires, beginning to open already in the child, is man in this life, so that if left to live as he would want to do whatever he would wish, he would either spend his whole life or most of it in crimes and atrocities."

On the one hand, it is hard to disagree with Augustine: children are vastly superior to adults in greed and cruelty. Although their justification lies on the surface - growth and immaturity. On the other hand, Augustine had his own psychotypical reasons for not liking childhood: the sense of abandonment and orphanhood, painful to the "serfs," are indispensable companions of the early period of life, when the 4th Will, stripped of its external restraint, lives as an unsettled soul. For the "serf" such a state seems especially dangerous because he sincerely believes in the absolute power of the superior supervision, without which all human life must really turn into a never-ending chain of crimes.

But let us return to the chronology. Augustine, having passed through all the stages of the ancient education of the first millennium, soon won the fame of a remarkable rhetorician and gained weight and influence at the imperial court. And already his very court position obliged to include in his speeches a criticism of Christianity, in word to support the pagan party. Biographers, I think, are misleading in explaining the first pagan period of Augustine's life by the "sad tradition" of blaming all the troubles on Christians. His father was rather agnostic, but his mother was a consistent and sincere Christian, so it is simply impossible to attribute Augustine's initial comportment to mere ignorance.

It is unlikely, however, that Augustine put much heat into his glorification of paganism. Even before his arrival at the imperial court he had become acquainted with another religion persecuted in the state, Manichaeism, and in time he became fully involved in its orbit. The essence of the Manichaean doctrine was that in the universe a struggle between Light and Darkness had been waged from eternity. This struggle permeates all manifestations of life, including man. In our age, the king of Darkness is attacking the kingdom of Light, as always, and so far he has been victorious. Besides the simplicity, clarity, and supposed obviousness of this concept, Augustine apparently had purely personal reasons for becoming a consistent Manichean. Since the time of the shaken off pear, sins have accumulated in abundance, and, in Augustine's own words, mindful of the predestined victory of evil, he was "flattered to excuse himself and blame something else, which was with me and at the same time was not me (the 4th Will)."

Augustine did not take long to console himself with Manichaeism. But when he parted with the Manichaean doctrine, he did not immediately turn to Christianity; he first went through the cleansing font of skepticism. Skepticism is the last refuge of the disillusioned intellect. The special beauty of skepticism is that its font is not filled with water, but with the strongest acid. To seek out and with secret joy find a flaw in any thought, to deny all positive knowledge from the threshold, from a single frontier - there is in this the inexplicable pleasure of a mind tired of verbiage.

However, it was not in the character of Augustine and his 1st Logic to live long in naked denial; his soul yearned for truth, and he continued his search. From this point begins the last final period of Augustine's life. It is not the place to list here all the circumstances that influenced his final choice. The main thing is that at the age of thirty-three he was baptized, a few years later was ordained a priest, and after the death of his mentor, Bishop Valerius of Hippo, he inherited his pulpit.

It is in the bishop's chair that Augustine finds himself. He is extraordinarily active. Almost all the funds of the diocese go to help the poor, and if they are not enough, the bishop orders the destruction and sale of valuable church utensils. The bishop preaches lavishly and brilliantly, and writes; his legacy consists of 16 volumes, and these volumes are organically included in the golden fund of world theological and philosophical thought.

A special place in the work of St. Augustine is occupied by the *Confessions*, the most popular, most frequently translated, and most frequently published work. "The Confession, to a reader free of unthinking piety, makes both an affectionate and a grievous impression. It has an amazing poetry, powerful pathos, enthusiastic and childlike sincere faith. But what burdens it is some kind of diligent flattening of oneself in the face of the Absolute, an infantile tendency to shift everything that happens on Him, down to the smallest detail: it is at least strange to read that Augustine could have his teeth hurt by God's will and that God's will could make the pain go away.

Augustine's thirst for petty self-care is, of course, not accidental; it is a direct consequence of his Fourth Will. Neither is the fact that he turned to the genre of the confessional, which is inwardly so close to the childlike sincerity of the "serf. But let us return to the pear tree that Augustine shook off as a child. In analyzing this episode of his biography Augustine comes to the conclusion that he did bad things simply for company, not of his own free will. He wrote: "...I alone would not have done it, no way would I have done it alone. Behold, Lord, before You I vividly recall my condition. *Alone I would not have committed this theft*, in which I did not like to steal, but to steal; alone I would not like to steal, I would not steal. *Oh, the hostile friendship*, the elusive corruption of the mind, the thirst to harm for laughter and amusement! The desire for another's loss without the pursuit of one's own gain, without any lust for revenge, but *simply because they say: come, let's do...*" To shake off a pear is no great sin, but the anxiety of such a thoughtful man as Augustine over such a small matter is well founded.

The **controllability**, so evident in the pear story, is what inspired Augustine's self-awareness, fear, and grievous thoughts. In this connection, one cannot but say that, following the 1st Physique, the 4th Will is the most criminogenic. And it is understandable why. Augustine was still lucky: apart from the torments of conscience, there was no other payback. I know many cases in which "serfs" followed their more willful comrades to more serious crimes, went for their friends and sat down for their friends, with the same "Augustine's" childlike serenity in their eyes.

"I saw, however, in the deeds I committed against my will, the manifestation of a suffering rather than an effective beginning, and I considered them not guilt but punishment," wrote Augustine quite rightly, being, indeed, the party suffering and not responsible for his deeds. The story of the search for that Puppeteer who manipulates him is a major theme in the story of the intellectual life of the Bishop of Hippo. Childhood friends, his mother, the Manichean prince of darkness, the Christian God, they all consistently held the strings leading to his will, and this purely personal experience, by the habit of men to judge by themselves, Augustine extended to the whole world, elevated weakness to a cosmic principle.

The polemic of free will was not started by Augustine, but by the monk Pelagius. He denied the original sinfulness of mankind and asserted that man himself, without help from above, was able to acquire grace. Naturally, Augustine came out against Pelagius from completely opposite positions and won. At the Ecumenical Council of Ephesus, Pelagius' teachings were anathematized. And it seems to have been too hasty. Augustine's concept of absolute unfreedom of will, which became the official doctrine, called briefly "Quietism," when consistently embodied, led to indifference, deafness and irresponsibility.

Fortunately the dispute between Pelagius and Augustine did not end with the anathema of the Council of Ephesus. To this day the question of where God's will, fate, karma, external circumstances end and personal will, personal responsibility, begins is one's own decision.

* * *

Parallel to the 4th Will, Augustine's 3rd Physique lived its own life. And as is customary for this function, sex was at the center of Augustine's inner carnal struggle. All other sensual pleasures, little by little humbled, found themselves on the periphery of this battle. Augustine wrote: "...as a young man I was very miserable, and especially miserable at the threshold of youth; I even asked You for chastity and said, 'Give me chastity and abstinence, just not now. I was afraid that You would not immediately hear me and immediately cure me of my evil passion; I preferred to quench it rather than extinguish it.'

Augustine's sanctimonious cry, "**Give me chastity, but not now!**" - conveys the state and attitude of the 3rd Physicist toward the sexual side of life.

Augustine's 4th Will for a long time could do nothing about the ambiguous fornication of the 3rd Phys: "...my sins multiplied. Torn from me, as an obstacle to matrimony, was the one with whom I had long lived. My heart, attached to her, was cut open, and it bled. She returned to Africa, vowing to you not to know another husband, and to leave with me my illegitimate son who was borne by her. But I, unhappy as I was, could not imitate this

woman: not having endured the delay (the girl for whom I had wooed, I could get only in two years), I, who did not seek marriage, but a slave to lust, got myself another woman, not as a wife, of course. The sickness of my soul was sustained and lasted, not weakening, and even intensified by this satisfaction of a long-standing habit, which drove me under the power of my wife...

The things that adorn marriage: an orderly family life and the raising of children - attracted... very little appealed to me. I was held in painful captivity chiefly by the insurmountable habit of satiating insatiable lust...

I sighed about it, unchained by anyone, but in the fetters of my own will. My will was held by the enemy; he made a chain for me and bound me. From the evil will comes lust; you slave to lust, and it becomes a habit; you do not resist the habit, and it becomes a necessity. In these mutually interlocking rings (that's why I speak of a chain) I was held in cruel bondage. And the new will, which was beginning in me, which wanted me to honor You for Your sake and to be comforted by You, O Lord, my only sure consolation, was still powerless to overcome the former, hardened and aged one. And my two wills, one old, the other new; one carnal, the other spiritual, were struggling in me, and *in this strife my soul was torn.*

The war with other carnal temptations occupied Augustine less and did not lead him to extremes, following the example of the hermits. Here are a few of Augustine's statements on this subject: "Abiding in these temptations, I struggle daily with gluttony... My throat must be restrained, tightening and loosening the reins in moderation... The charms of smells don't bother me. They are not there, and I do not seek them; they are there, and I do not drive them away; I agree to do without them forever..."

Augustine had a more complicated relationship with hearing and sight. They are conduits of emotional information, and for his 2nd Emotion a forced blocking of these channels is an almost unreal thing. So in the vacillation between the speculative demand to renounce sensual pleasures (1st Logic+3rd Physics) and the urgent emotional-bodily need (2nd Emotion+3rd Physics) for colorful and sonorous experiences passed the entire life of the Hippoite bishop. "The pleasures of the ear have more firmly entangled and enslaved me...on songs animated by Thy sayings, sung with a voice sweet and processed, I rest somewhat, not, however, frozen in place: I can get up whenever I want... Sometimes, it seems to me, I give them more reverence than I should: I feel that the holy words themselves kindle our souls with a more fervent piety, if they are well sung; bad singing has no such effect...

What remains is the pleasure derived from these carnal eyes of mine... The eyes love beautiful varied forms, bright and pleasant colors. May they not possess my soul... They trouble me all day long, while I am awake, and I have no rest from them as I have from the ringing of voices, and from the beloved sounds in the silence that comes. And the king of colors himself, this sunlight that floods everything we see, wherever I am in the daytime, sneaks up on me in every way and caresses me, though I am busy with other things and

do not pay attention to him. And he is so dear that if he suddenly disappears, you look for him with longing, and if he is gone for a long time, the soul is darkened." Isn't that an amazing sensuality for a Christian saint? And on the other hand, it is the heightened sensuality that is the trademark of Christianity.

* * *

Without having won any particular laurels in the field of practical struggle against carnal pleasures, Augustine more than made up for this deficiency with a speculative battle against empiricism and sensationalism, that is, against theories of knowledge which proceed from the absolute reliability of experimental knowledge and which recognize as true only those phenomena which are accessible to the physical senses.

The critique of empiricism and sensationalism itself was not new in Augustine's time; the skeptical school danced heartily on these two concepts. In Augustine's case, the only thing new was that a dogmatist, not a skeptic, undertook this kind of criticism. Although if we recall the principled opposition between the First and Third Functions in the psychotype, in this case the 1st Logic and the 3rd Physics, nothing strange is found in Augustine's penchant for criticizing empiricism. He wrote: "Apart from carnal lust, which demands pleasure and pleasure for all the external senses and ruins its servants by removing them from You, these same external senses inspire the soul not to enjoy in the flesh, but to explore with the flesh: this vain and greedy curiosity dresses itself up in the garb of knowledge and science. It consists in the desire to know, and since of the external senses sight provides us with the most material for knowledge, this lust is called in Scripture "the lust of the eyes" ...

...in all bodily visions the testimony of the other senses, and especially of the mind, i.e., the mind, is required, in order to find, as far as possible, what is true in this kind of object. In spiritual vision, i.e., in bodily likenesses which are contemplated by the spirit, the soul is deceived when it thinks that the images it contemplates are the very bodies, or what it imagines by supposition and false conjecture...

He who interprets the vision of another is more of a prophet than he who sees the vision himself. Hence it is clear that prophecy belongs more to the mind than to the spirit in its own sense."

The natural conclusion for Augustine's 1st Logic follows from this: "**Reasonable sight does not err,**" even though his own life provided many examples of the mind's deepest delusion.

* * *

In himself "Augustine" is thin, not to say sexy, a sweet, shy, thoughtful person without any serious claims in his personal and social life. He does not give much hope and, if any, rarely justifies them. In any case, apart from Augustine himself, only Darwin comes to mind from representatives of the same type. Moreover, Darwin's success came as a pleasant surprise to those around him as well as to himself. Not in the least flirtatious,

Darwin wrote: "It is truly amazing that a man of such modest ability as myself could, in a number of essential matters, exert a considerable influence on the views of men of science.

The most noticeable traits of "Augustine's" nature are his talent for communication and rare chadolatry. As his speech functions are at the top (1st Logic + 2nd Emotion), communication with "Augustine", full of thoughts and images, is a real pleasure. Chadlove of this type also runs on two counts: 3rd Physique adores making children and taking care of them, 4th Will finds in the children's society ideal partners for the infantile "Augustinian" psyche.

LEF TOLSTOY

- 1) WILL ("king")
- 2) EMOTION ("actor")
- 3) PHYSICS ("the underdog")
- 4) LOGIC ("schoolboy")

To characterize the type of "fat man" in one word, it is best to call him a "prophet. Being a born leader (1st Will), he is most of all disposed to realize his passion for leadership exactly in prophetic, religious-mystical-artistic sphere (2nd Emotion). And in this or that form "Tolstoy's" prophetic doctrine is inevitably colored in communist-ascetic colors, though "Tolstoy" personally is not very firm in following this point of his doctrine (the 3rdVersion). And there is no more lively and vivid illustration of what has been said about the type of "thick" than Leo Tolstoy himself, the titanic exponent of all the advantages and disadvantages of his type.

Having early realized his "royal" destiny, Tolstoy could not help but ponder the ways of realizing his inherent gift of leadership. In purely theoretical terms, Tolstoy had two paths: the path to the top of secular power and the path to the top of spiritual power. But this dilemma existed as pure fiction at the time. The Synodally arranged Russian Orthodox Church had long ago transferred its authority to secular power. In turn secular power, organized on the principle of hereditary monarchy, excluded a legal way to reach its apex.

Of course, one could try to climb to the top of the social pyramid in an illegal, revolutionary way, as Cromwell did ("thick" in his psychotype). But at that time there

were no serious prerequisites for a revolution in Russia. However, remarkably, Tolstoy apparently did not give up hope of becoming something like Cromwell and, contrary to his calls for non-resistance to evil by violence, in private conversations he spoke approvingly of the terror deployed against the government by the Russian revolutionaries.

The deliberate deadlock of the traditional paths to the top soon led the young Tolstoy to believe that there was yet another unconventional path to power. In 1855, at the age of twenty-seven, he wrote in his diary that he felt he was "**the herald of a new religion**". However, he did not fully realize his vision without much success until several decades later.

It was Tolstoy's good fortune that by the middle of the nineteenth century an informal spiritual force had formed in Russia that took the place of the stagnant, state-dominated Russian Church. This is literature. I say "luckily" because in the early nineteenth century literature was not such a force, and should Tolstoy have been born earlier, his activity in this field would scarcely have gone beyond amateur experiments, such as his experiments as a composer. *The First Will is too socially oriented to be involved in anything that does not have a public sounding.* By the middle of the nineteenth century, literature had become a marked social force in Russia, and it is not surprising that it was at first chosen by Tolstoy as an instrument of his ascent to the heights of power.

Here Tolstoy's good fortune awaited him. The subtle 3rd Physique allowed him to live absolutely naturally in the physiology of a woman in labor, a horse, a dying man. And the 2nd Emotion endowed Tolstoy with the widest range and most subtle perception of the sense detector. All this ensured his leading position in Russian literature. However, the glory of the writer himself, pleasantly tickling his ego, could not satiate him, to give him complete satisfaction. His thirsty leadership of the First Will was not realized, and the chronic lawlessness reigning in literature did not allow us to hope for the future structuring of this artistic disaster.

The thought of a career in religion, a field akin to art but amenable to organization, beat more and more insistently in Tolstoy's heart, and the youthful dream of becoming "a messenger of a new religion" no longer seemed unattainable.

However, Tolstoy had more failures than triumphs on the path of religious reformation. To begin with, there was no "new" religion. His intense study of religious and philosophical texts showed that he could not invent anything new in this field. Most importantly, the magical word of the Evangelist Matthew ("thick" in his psychotype), which presented Christ with the same order of functions as Tolstoy's, ruled out for the writer the path of anti-Christian rebellion.

Everything that matched his inner psychological attitudes had already been invented. So there was nothing left to do but to revolt within Christianity, choosing as his target the official church, to follow the path of the heretical, the founder of the sect. However, Tolstoy did not show any ingenuity in the way of heresy either, there was no "new" here again, and the Tolstoyites could not even, because of their small number, register as a sect.

That is, Tolstoy, a great Russian writer, was not able to do what the similarly sensible uneducated peasant Syutaev was able to do.

Looking from the outside, one could consider the religious phase of Tolstoy's activity a complete failure, were it not for the specificity of the value system of the First Will, easily satisfied by the small number and low quality of the flock, as long as power over it was real and undisputed. Tolstoy was not embarrassed by the smallness of his flock; moreover, having acquired a long-awaited prophetic status, he began bombarding the last Russian tsar with funny letters giving him instructions on how to live and what to be. Tolstoy's dazzle at his own and the tsar's expense was so great that he seriously considered himself a match for the tsar, as the master of people's destiny, in the cares of which he could neglect the needs of those around him. When Tolstoy was reminded of the need to increase the salary of the servants, he declared: "One thing is the good of the Russian people, discussed with the tsar, another: a salary increase for a footman..."

Having imagined himself the Russian Samuel, the maker of tsars, Tolstoy, it seemed, having fulfilled the dream of his youth, should have settled down. However, the peculiarity of informal leadership is that it is given and held at great cost. That Tolstoy himself experienced to the full. He had to rape the best emotional side of his nature for the sake of the status of prophet, refusing from music and artistic creativity. And along with the 2nd Emotion he had to rape the 3rd Physique, portraying a total aversion to comfort and sex.

The endless squabbles among Tolstoy's small but loud-mouthed community wore him out to death. Finally, the nationwide enthusiasm for his personality has been replaced in society by a complete polarization of assessments, a clear division of unqualified well-wishers and equally unqualified haters of Tolstoy. "I feel that people's attitude towards me - the majority - no longer as a person, but as a celebrity, most importantly, as a representative of a party, a direction; either total loyalty and trust, or, conversely, denial, hatred," - complained Tolstoy, but in his complaints, however unconsciously, contained a large proportion of hypocrisy. He himself had long ago divided society into insiders and outsiders, and behaved according to his personal party guidelines. Here is a characteristic scene, described by Tolstoy himself without a shadow of self-irony: "Last night we had a very touching conversation with a student who came to visit from the Caucasus. Gusev said that he seemed to be a petitioner. He handed me an envelope, asking me to read it. I refused, then began to read from the end. About monism and Haeckel. I began to tell him unkindly. He got terribly agitated. Then I found out that he was consumption, hopeless. He started to leave and said that reading "On Life" was an experience for him. I was surprised and asked him to stay. I read his note. It turned out to be a very close person. And I had insulted, tormented him. I was both hurt and ashamed. I asked him to forgive me. He stayed in the village overnight. He came back this morning, and we talked to him in a tender way. A very touching man. I fell in love with him." Tolstoy, apparently, and himself is not aware of all the comedy of the situation, when caressing and repulsing

people depending on the acceptance or rejection of his doctrine, he simultaneously complains about the unevenness of human attitudes toward himself.

At the same time, one cannot claim that Tolstoy's voice was a voice crying in the wilderness. Not at all. In face-to-face interactions, even those who were in the mood for an argument did not feel the urge to oppose him. And it was not the truth of Tolstoy's views that was the reason. The peculiarity of the combination of the 1st Will with the 2nd Emotion is that it rewards the speech of its owner with the highest persuasiveness. Impeccable flair in the choice of words, corrected by the finest ear for the mood of the audience, gives the 2nd Emotion. The effect is multiplied by the 1st Will. It fills the precisely chosen word with such an unshakable faith in himself and in the truth of what he is saying that it is simply impossible to resist.

However, as often happened in such cases, including Tolstoy's, time passes, the magic of words fades and "Tolstoyites for an hour" return to their former way of life and thought, often even more critical of Tolstoy's teachings than before, in retaliation for the moments of mental weakness and credulity experienced in Tolstoyan society. Here is how Repin describes the effect of Tolstoy's speeches: "*L.N.'s talks always make a sincere and deep impression: the listener is excited to ecstasy by his hot words, the power of persuasion and obeys him without question* (1st Will + 2nd Emotion). Often on the second and third day after speaking with him, when one's own mind begins to work independently, one sees that one cannot agree with many of his views, that some of his thoughts, which were then so clear and compelling, now seem incredible and even difficult to reproduce, that some of his theories evoke the opposite even conclusion, but during his powerful speech this did not occur to one."

By the way, Tolstoy's listeners were very fortunate that he was a flock within the Yasnaya Polyana and did not have a national rostrum. Another "Tolstoy" - Oliver Cromwell got such a rostrum and so baffled the English Parliament with the magic of his empty hypnotic words that he led it to civil war, execution of the king, his foolish rule and restoration, which returned everything to the way it was. Lucky for us Tolstoy lived in non-parliamentary Russia.

Sensing that his magic is short-lived, that the effect it produces is short-lived, Tolstoy, by his harsh public statements, tried to provoke violence on the part of the government in order to win a martyr's crown - an impeccable and weighty argument for his rightness. Gorky said: "He knows that martyrs and sufferers are rarely despots and rapists - he knows everything! And yet he says, "If I had suffered for my thoughts, they would have made a different impression." This has always thrown me aside from him, for I cannot help feeling here the attempt of violence over me, the desire to possess my conscience, to blind it with the gleam of righteous blood, to put the yoke of dogma around my neck." The government, fortunately, was not so foolish and did not let Tolstoy suffer.

Tolstoy in general was often and badly mistaken, deluded even about the nature of his literary success. He wrote about himself: "Rarely have I met a man more gifted with all

the vices: greediness, selfishness, anger, vanity and, most importantly, self-love. I thank God that I know this, that I have seen and see all this abomination in myself, and yet I struggle against it. This explains the success of my writing." Here again Tolstoy was, to put it mildly, lying. His asceticism was not sincere and was a declaration of intent intended for a gullible public. At a time when the bankrupt nobility was selling off land, Tolstoy bought and bought land, shouting that land ownership was a sin, that land was not someone else's, but God's, and finally bought so much that he could provide individual estates for all of his many offspring. In sexual insatiability Tolstoy admitted himself and complained of his wife. And really looks fantastic assertion that Tolstoy's fame is based on his ostentatious struggle with his vices.

As for vanity and self-love, Tolstoy did not try to struggle with these properties of his nature. Tolstoy's ideal spy - his wife wrote: "If anyone knew how little of his gentle true kindness and how much of it is done by principle, not by heart ... All made up, done, stretched, and lining is not good, most importantly, everywhere vanity, insatiable thirst for fame ..." Tolstoy grudgingly agreed. Tolstoy reluctantly agreed with his wife: "I live for show, for people.

In Tolstoy's notes the principle of opposition of the First and the Third functions is also formulated with utmost clarity, i.e. in translation into his psychotype: opposition of the 1st Will and the 3rd Physique. Here is how this antagonism sounds in Tolstoy's diary entry: "Egoism is the most evil state *when it is bodily egoism*, and most harmful to self and others; and egoism, *the consciousness of one's higher self, is the highest state* and most good for self and others." Note, according to his 3rd Physique, according to Tolstoy, carnal selfishness or, more simply, greed and voluptuousness are unconditionally bad, whereas according to the 1st Will the feeling of superiority over people, that is, arrogance and pride are just as unconditionally beneficial.

* * *

The dubiousness of Tolstoy's personal success in the prophetic arena is not evidence that such a mission is beyond Tolstoy's abilities. Yes, he can. "Tolstoy" was created for spiritual leadership, and only circumstances can diminish or exaggerate the extent of his activities in this arena. But not undermine. The example of another "Tolstoy", who began his life journey as a poor shepherd boy suffering from epileptic seizures, and ended it as the ruler of a vast empire and founder of the world religion, is expressive enough to imagine "Tolstoy's" prophetic potential.

The reader, I think, has already guessed that we are talking about the founder of Islam, the prophet Muhammad. His fate cannot fail to amaze. It seemed that from the scraps of Jewish, Christian and pagan traditions, heard by a young poor shepherd at the caravan fire, he managed to create a world religion, and with it, a world power, is incomprehensible. But only at first glance. Muhammad's iron 1st Will, stirring up his own and paralyzing others, and absolute faith in himself and his mission were one of the two main components of his success.

The 2nd Emotion gave Muhammad the gift of a great artist, which is why to this day the Qur'an is considered an unsurpassed monument of Arabic poetry. It is said that a certain pagan Arab poet immediately converted to Islam after reading just one surah nailed to the door of a mosque. If one adds the element of good fortune that constantly accompanied the prophet, the phenomenon of Muhammad does not seem out of the ordinary.

Other, inferior functions of the "Tolstoi" psychotype given by nature to Muhammad have also left their imprint on the image of the Muslim world. The Prophet's 3rd Physics, which colored the material layer of life in communist colors, put a yoke on formerly carefree Arabs in the form of tithes for the poor (zakiyats), holiday fasts and quotas on the number of wives (not more than four). Although, as usual, the Prophet's 3rd Physics would not have been itself if it had not been a trickster when it came to sexual matters. For example, Muhammad personally left the question of the number of wives open for himself, clearly not satisfied with the quota he himself introduced, which was revealed at the funeral of the prophet, whose coffin was followed by six women.

The intellectual life of Islam in the first centuries of the Hijra was not without the participation of Muhammad's 4th Logic. The prophet himself clearly did not pretend to seriously comprehend the most fundamental problems of the world's reasoning. And as is often the case, this circumstance had a twofold result. On the one hand, Muhammad's followers easily burned libraries, considering their content either secondary to the Koran or superfluous. On the other hand, Arab domination, indifferent to speculative questions, ensured an unprecedented flowering of intellectual life in the best Islamic universities of the day, and it was from the hands of the Arabs that Europeans received anew their own, seemingly forever lost, ancient philosophical and scientific heritage.

* * *

In comparison with Muhammad, the figures of Oliver Cromwell and William Boots, the founder of the Salvation Army, do not look as large. Yet they, too, are "fat" figures who have left a marked mark on world history. But this is interesting: Tolstoy, Muhammad, Cromwell, Boots, being people of the same psychotype, were imprinted in human memory in different ways. Muhammad we remember as a prophet, Tolstoy as a writer, Cromwell as a politician, Boots as a philanthropist. And this circumstance testifies once again that psychotype is not destiny; destiny is too complex a category to predict it, even with such a perfect instrument as psychic typology.

* * *

From the outside, we would like to describe the type of "fat" as follows: thin, not handsome, persistent, analytical, with brilliance. Usually "fat" is not much of a talker, but when he touches a nerve, he demonstrates a brilliant gift of a polemicist. He is dressed cleanly, neatly, simply, not without elegance. His hair is upright, but a little longer than

usual. His gestures and facial expressions are not flamboyant, but majestic, energetic, and very expressive.

ANTON CHEKHOV

- 1) PHYSICS ("owner")
- 2) WILL ("nobleman")
- 3) EMOTION ("dry")
- 4) LOGIC ("schoolboy")

The artist Ilya Repin gave a short but almost exhaustive description of Chekhov's entire order of functions. He wrote: "*An enemy of sentimentality and pretentious hobbies, he seemed to hold himself in the mouthpiece of cold irony and to feel with pleasure the ring of courage on himself.*

He seemed to me like an indestructible strongman of body and soul.

To us, who did not know Chekhov personally, imagining him through his late photographs and plays, Repin's characterization would seem strange, to say the least. In today's perceptions, Chekhov is a sickly, early-aged, refined intellectual, a nice man, but weak in body and spirit.

However, in fact, Repin's description stands much closer to the original than our modern stereotypes. First of all, Chekhov was handsome, handsome with juicy masculine beauty. This was said by women who knew him well and were not deprived of the attention of handsome young men. But of Chekhov's photographs, perhaps, only one - Chekhov at the age of nineteen (1879), still without a beard and pince-nez, gives an idea of his unusually attractive appearance, relief and juicy face molding.

Chekhov was by no means indifferent to money, things, comfort, contrary to the intelligentsia tradition. However, the possessive instinct inherent in him did not make Chekhov either a miser or an egoist; it is not without reason that Gorky called Chekhov's love for things "noble".

Perhaps the only sphere in which the writer's 1st Physics was quite clearly reflected was the sexual sphere. Previously, thanks to censorship, Chekhov appeared as a libidinous singer of twilight, suffering from sexual indifferentism. However, the recent publication of excerpts from his letters painted a completely different picture. We are presented with a very lively gentleman, sharing in his letters his impressions of visiting prostitutes, complaining about the lack of brothels in Sumy, etc.

The great Russian literature of the second half of the 19th century (Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, Kuprin, etc.) loved to choose prostitutes and prostitute-contestants as its heroines, devoting many pages and sometimes entire works to them. One great writer, who perhaps knew this juicy subject better than others, was silent on the subject: Chekhov. Perhaps only once did he speak on the subject in a story he wrote to order, "Seizure", but he did so in a peculiar way. From the beginning to the end of the story we see the wryly concealed

irony of his thematically similar writings, wonderfully spiritual, filled with civic pathos and secret lust. The heroes of the story are three students: a medic, an artist, and a lawyer. If we remember that Chekhov himself was a medic, and his two brothers an artist and a lawyer, the autobiographical basis of the story is clearly visible. So, the three students go on a trip to the brothels. For the medic and the artist (the older brothers) such visits are commonplace, but for the lawyer (Mikhail is a lawyer, the youngest in the Chekhov family) they are a novelty. The student's trip to the brothels ends with the chaste lawyer venting angrily at his promiscuous companions. And in response the artist says something quite indecent for Russian literature: "I knew that it would end. I should not have messed with this fool and chump! You think you have great thoughts and ideas in your head now? No, goddamn things, not ideas! You're looking at me now with hatred and with disgust, and I think you'd rather build twenty more houses like that than look at me like that. There is more vice in that look of yours than in the whole alley!" It is not clear from the story which side the author is on, but judging from Chekhov's letters expressing sympathy for brothel-goers and dissatisfaction with the absence of such institutions, the artist's rebuke in "The Seizure" is a reflection of the author's position.

In itself, a conversation about Chekhov's sexual preferences would make no sense if this particular one did not reflect the whole - the writer's 1st Physique. One must have an excessive, productive, monologue-like, thick-skinned, and absolutely fearless flesh in order to make do with the services of prostitutes for almost the entire mature period of one's life. From the 1st Physique, augmented by the 3rd Emotion, also comes the slowness with which Chekhov decided the question of marriage. When the writer finally decided to tie himself by the bonds of Hymen, a full-fledged family life was impossible for him, and such a situation is generally characteristic of Chekhov's order of functions.

The 1st Physique could have made Chekhov an egoist, a miser, a consumer, a man indifferent to the needs and sufferings of people, if it were not constantly held by the outwardly deployed 2nd Will. Kuprin found this combination enigmatic, he wrote that Chekhov "could be kind and generous without loving, affectionate and compassionate without affection, a benefactor without expecting gratitude. And in these traits, which have always remained unclear to those around him, lies perhaps the main clue to his personality. Another writer (Potapenko) is even closer to understanding the nature of Chekhov's altruism, according to whom "there can be no doubt that A.P. had no sincere inclination to be a doctor. The misconceptions of the observers are explained by the fact that for the attraction they took exclusively the developed in him sense of duty, which forced him to do with a smile on his lips what was unpleasant and even repugnant to him...".

Indeed, a heightened sense of duty - a derivative of the 2nd Will pushed Chekhov's selfish 1st Physique toward people. Not with his gut, not with his skin, he sympathized with the needy and suffering, but with the strong, flexible spirit of his "I". It was the 2nd Will that forced Chekhov to treat free of charge, build a village school, help financially his family, collect a library for his hometown of Taganrog. To the same 2nd Will goes the best aspects

of Chekhov's nature: decency, delicacy, democracy, modesty, etc. But Chekhov owes his immortality to the 3rd Emotion.

* * *

There is no doubt that he had the third Emotion. About it, only in other terms, was reported by people who knew Chekhov well: "His usual calmness, evenness, external coldness of some kind, which seemed impenetrable, armor surrounded his personality. It seemed that this man carefully protects his soul from prying eyes.

But this is not the kind of secrecy where a person deliberately hides something that is inconvenient to show and more profitable to keep under cover.

"Dry people" rarely choose the artistic field as their main occupation. Usually literature, music and art are a hobby for them, not a profession. Chekhov himself, as if hinting at the unseriousness of his literary pursuits, liked to say that medicine was his wife and literature was his mistress. However, the beginning of his writing career really looked non-serious in content and form and pursued one goal - to earn money. The fact that at first Chekhov chose a humorous genre for himself is very understandable: the 1st Physique painted his world outlook in bright, cheerful tones, the fig leaf of the 3rd Emotion - irony - found in everything around him an occasion for mockery, but the good-natured 2nd Will made this mockery malignant. Thus, the first humorous period of Chekhov's work, or rather, not yet Chekhov, but Anton Chekhonte, emerged from the whole sum of the order of functions.

However, with the passage of time, acquaintance with serious literature and serious writers, the accumulation of unhappy life experience, tuberculosis and general exhaustion of strength, much has changed, and Chekhov gradually turned into the Chekhov we are used to imagine him as: a classic singer of twilight, a writer of quiet light sadness. The 1st Physique thinned both in Chekhov himself and in his work. What remained was the spitelessness, honesty and bashfulness of the 2nd Will, indifference to the speculative problems of the 4th Logic, and the gentle, barely audible whistle of the 3rd Emotion became the dominant feature of his work.

It was the 3rd Emotion that set the themes, the tone of the second and last period of Chekhov's writing, simultaneously making Chekhov the greatest reformer of the theatrical art. The essence of the reform consisted in the fact that with his dramaturgy began, in the precise expression, "the theater of moods. This theater - without plot, pathos, edification, it - only muted almost to the ultrasound radiation and interaction of emotions, watercolor of experiences. And here it is superfluous to say how difficult Chekhov's theater was to perceive and perform. Tolstoy, albeit in his ear, told Chekhov directly about his dislike of his dramas. Often Chekhov was not accepted by big actors. However, it was mutual. One writer who knew the theatrical world of those times believed that Chekhov "did not like anything pathosy and unselfishly preserved his emotions and characters from beautiful expressions, pathos and artistic poses. In this he may even have gone to extremes, it forced him not to accept tragedy: by the way, he never felt M.N. Yermolova, and Chekhov was not close to her as a writer. It was two poles: realism of life and romantic realism.

Chekhov's prose was also not to everyone's liking. Akhmatova, from the height of her exemplary 2nd Emotion, judged Chekhov thus: "...his universe is monotonous and dull, the sun never shines in it, swords never sparkle, everything is covered by a terrifying gray fog; Chekhov's world is a sea of mud, in which poor human beings are floundering..." Akhmatova's assessment, of course, is not indisputable, but there is something in it. Chekhov's prose can indeed be quite bleached, quite dusty. Although I don't really want to be too harsh on him as a writer, bearing in mind the ailing third Emotion.

* * *

Chekhov's 4th Logic is also unquestionable. Of all what can be called a worldview, only ethics, which comes not from the mind, but from the 2nd Will, and aesthetics - from the 3rd Emotion, differed from him in certainty. Chekhov himself admitted that he changes his views every day. He looked like a man of uncertain views from outside as well. In Chekhov's diary there is the following entry: "There is a whole enormous field between "there is God" and "there is no God", which a true sage has difficulty in passing. The Russian man knows one of the two extremes, the middle between them does not interest him, and therefore he usually knows nothing or very little. Commenting on this place, one of Chekhov's acquaintances remarked: "Somehow it seems to me that Chekhov himself, especially in his last years, never stopped struggling to move through this field, and no one knows at what point his death caught him."

* * *

The very combination of the 1st Physics and the 3rd Emotion suggests that their possessor is unhurried in marriage and reproduction. Chekhov's life story is a clear confirmation of this. Therefore, "Chekhovs" are rare in this world. However, oddly enough, there is a whole country where this type has taken a dominant position and shaped the national character.

We are talking, as it is not difficult to guess, about England. Total seriousness in matters of health, appearance, money, and living ("my house is my fortress") - all this, as well as many other lesser traits, clearly point to the 1st Physique of the English. Britain-the birthplace of democracy, of present-day legal consciousness and free-thinking-could certainly not have become so, without the prevalence of the 2nd Will among its inhabitants. Only a lazy man has not written about the cold-bloodedness, dryness, and restraint of the English...

Is it necessary to explain after this: why in England they love Chekhov so much, love him even more than in his homeland, in Russia?

* * *

"Chekhov" from his outside would like to describe him as follows: a tall, athletic-looking man with a lushly sculpted face. His gaze is good-natured, absent-minded, with a kind of inner smile. His speech is reserved, ironic, and monotonous. Gesture and facial expressions are without scope, almost imperceptible. He is easily silent in society, most

of all he likes fun, jokes, but his laughter is almost inaudible. He is dressed well, but discreetly, his hair cut short. Women are reserved about make-up.

BLAISE PASCAL

- 1) LOGIC ("dogmatic")
- 2) EMOTION ("actor")
- 3) WILL ("bourgeois")
- 4) PHYSICS ("slacker")

"Let there be an abyss in everything: in deeds, in words...

And a dark abyss was Pascal's soul,"

Baudelaire wrote, in general terms and on his own soul, guessing what the Pascalian psyche was like. Pascal is the most tragic of figures in the history of world thought, "Pascal" is the most tragic of types of psychosophy.

Similarly to "Andersen" (see), the combination of the 3rd Will and the 4th Physics gives a monstrous gloominess to the perception of oneself, others, and the world in "Pascal". It has already been said before that the hopelessness of perception is inherent in the "lazy man," and if the tragedy of the 4th Physics is multiplied by the dislike with which the 3rd Will looks at himself and the world, then the result is what it is - Pascal's "Thoughts.

"People hate each other-it is their nature. Even if they put self-interest at the service of the public good, these attempts are only hypocrisy, a counterfeit of mercy, because hatred is still at the root... We long for the truth, but we find only insecurity. We seek happiness, but find only sorrow and death. We cannot help desiring truth and happiness, but we are incapable of solid knowledge or happiness. This desire is left in our soul not only to punish us, but also to remind us hourly of the heights from which we have fallen... man is nothing but pretense, lies, hypocrisy, not only to others, but also to himself. He does not want to hear the truth about himself, he avoids telling it to others. And these tendencies, opposed to reason and justice, are deeply rooted in his heart."

Even man's religiosity was explained by Pascal's antipathy toward himself and others, and it may well be that his own faith did stem from this not the purest of sources: "...the only true virtue is in hating ourselves (for the human self is so self-interested that it is only worthy of hatred) and seeking the being that we would love because it is truly worthy of love. But we are incapable of loving that which is outside us, so let us turn our love to a Being who, without being us, lives in all of us without exception. But there is only one such Being in the universe."

* * *

It does not follow from this that Pascal hated all human beings, cumulatively. There is one quality of human nature that makes it worthy of respect, and, of course, according to Pascal's 1st Logic, that quality is intelligence. It is intelligence that places man above

everything in the universe, above the universe itself. "Man is but a reed, the weakest of nature's creations, but he is a thinking reed. You don't need the whole universe to destroy him: a whiff of wind, a drop of water is enough. But even if the universe destroys him, man is still higher than the universe, because he is aware that he is parting with life and that he is weaker than the universe, and the universe is not aware of anything.

So all our dignity is in our ability to think. Only thought elevates us, not space and time, in which we are nothing.

At the same time, Pascal would not have been a "bourgeois," i.e. a being from the beginning monstrously contradictory, if he had not simultaneously cursed reason, if dogmatism had not organically coexisted in his mind with skepticism. The main thesis for the 3rd Will about the nothingness of man shakes even the firm belief of the 1st Logic in the superreliability and omnipotence of the rational beginning, pushes to skepticism.

Moreover, the "Pascalian" specificity of the contradiction between the First and Third Functions is precisely that **man's greatness is described as a realization** (the 1st Logic) of **his nothingness** (the 3rd Will). He writes: "Man's greatness is so great that he is conscious of his nothingness. The tree is not aware of its nothingness.

So man feels insignificant because he realizes that he is insignificant; that's what makes him great.

* * *

In addition to the ironic view of all wisdom, there is another element in Pascal's work which also seems to remove him from the ranks of the philosophical corporation: the beautiful literary language with which he presented his views. God knows how, but there is a perception that wisdom must necessarily be clothed in gray, dull, ugly, serpentine clothes, otherwise it is not wisdom. Pascal refuted this wild but pervasive prejudice with all his work. His thoughts are "thought-images," his fame is not only that of the "French Archimedes" but also that of the "French Dante. Pascal's work is not only clever, but also expressive, aesthetically significant.

Pascal supplemented Descartes' "philosophy of mind" with a "philosophy of the heart," however wild such a supplement might sound to the ear of an intellectual orthodoxy. The fact is that, unlike Descartes (see "Plato"), Pascal had not only Logic, but also Emotion placed on top, and therefore he simply could not contrast the two strongest sides of his nature, the experience of mind and the experience of heart.

The upper position of the "Pascal" of Logic and Emotion, the functions that are predominantly verbal, makes a representative of this type an excellent conversationalist. "Pascal" is generally a "communicative person" who is both thoughtful and deeply sensitive, judicious and witty. All unilateralism is repugnant to him in communication, universalism is his element. Clearly referring to himself, Pascal wrote: "You will not be known as a connoisseur of poetry, or mathematics, or any other subject, if you do not hang

up a sign "poet", "mathematician", etc. But the comprehensive man desires no signboards and makes no distinction between the craft of the poet and the goldsmith.

A person who is well-rounded doesn't get labeled a poet or a mathematician, etc., he is both and can judge any subject. But this does not catch anyone's eye. He easily joins in any conversation he catches when he enters the house. No one notices his knowledge in this or that field until it is needed, but here it is immediately remembered; in the same way, they do not remember that he is eloquent, until they talk about eloquence, but it is worth talking and everyone immediately remembers what a good orator he is.

* * *

Like anyone who possesses the 4th Physique, Pascal is a Buddhist. In his *Thoughts* there is a passage that would do honor to another bodhisattva: "By nature we are unhappy always and under all circumstances, for when desires paint us an ideal of happiness, they combine our present circumstances with pleasures not now available to us. But now we have found those pleasures, and our happiness has not increased because circumstances have changed, and with them our desires have changed."

Being "lazy," Pascal was distinguished by a rare unselfishness, he easily endured asceticism and illness, and even wrote "Prayerful meditation on the conversion for the benefit of illness. Here is a characteristic passage from this work: "Lord... You gave me health to serve You, and I wasted it for vanities. Now You send me sickness to reform me: do not let me anger You with my impatience. I have abused my health, and You have justly punished me. Help me to profit properly from Your punishment... If my heart was full of attachment to the world while there was some power in it, destroy that power for my salvation and make me unable to enjoy the world."

Pascal's attitude to the material plane of life appears from the outside to be a nice, not only non-threatening, but even an attractive oddity. But it does not follow that all "Pascals" are selfless, philanthropic, and ascetic. The 4th Physique is nonpartisan and depends on those around it for its attitude toward the world. Therefore, if Pascal had found himself in a barracks instead of a monastery, it is very possible that self-interest, callousness, and cruelty would have been as organically incorporated into his flesh and blood as monastic asceticism and unselfishness.

* * *

Pascal's Third Will has already been mentioned. It remains to add that, acutely feeling his smallness, vulnerability, nothingness, he clearly felt and other typical "bourgeois" ills: bifurcation, abandonment, egoism, longing, vanity, vanity. Pascal wrote: "Contradiction. - Man by nature is trusting, untrusting, timid, courageous.

Description of the man: dependence, thirst for independence, neediness.

The human condition: impermanence, longing, anxiety.

Longing. - The peace that is not disturbed by his passions, his activities, his amusements, or his occupations, becomes more and more unbearable. Then he feels his nothingness, abandonment, imperfection, dependence, powerlessness, emptiness. From the depths of his soul immediately crawl hopeless longing, sadness, bitterness, bitterness, and despair.

...Honor is a man's cherished goal; he will always strive irresistibly for it, and no power will eradicate from his heart the desire to achieve it.

And even if a man despises his own kind and equates them with animals, still, in spite of himself, he will seek universal recognition and admiration."

Although Pascal speaks in "Thoughts" as if in an abstract way, about some man in general, in fact it is a confession, and all that is said in them about the height and meanness of human nature is the fruit of exclusively personal observations, observations on the 1st Logic, the 2nd Emotion, the 3rd Will, and the 4th Physics.

* * *

From the outside "Pascal" can be characterized as follows: thin, with thin, iconic facial features. The gaze is pained, floating, pensive and sad. Gesture and facial expressions are timid, but expressive. Speech is bright, interesting, but characterized by some nervousness and irritation. Clothing is careless, and there is quite an artistic mess in her hair. Women rarely resort to makeup.

EPICUR

1) PHYSICS ("owner")

2) LOGIC ("rhetorician")

3) EMOTION ("dry")

4) WILL ("serf")

In spite of the 3rd Emotion, Epicures do not give the impression of being cold at all. They are warm, and by first impressions they can easily be compared to teddy bears: the same massiveness, combined with slowness, laziness and softness. The obvious mercantilism of the psychology of the "epicure" does not at all reek of avarice, but takes almost bizarre forms of a loving, penny-perfect monetary calculation. A timid half-smile often lights up the childishly untimely face of the "epicure. The speech is quiet, smooth, but consistent in its logical coupling, it lacks one thing - energy filling, in order to be truly convincing. And it is by smooth, considered, but unsteady speech that an "epicure" is easiest to recognize.

* * *

As far as Epicurus is concerned, there is a long-standing misconception which confuses his worldview with that of Aristippus (see), Epicureanism with hedonism, i.e. a philosophy based on the principle of the primacy of carnal pleasures over all others. But in fact, since the psychotypes of Epicurus and Aristippus are different, their philosophies differed accordingly. Apparently, the misconception about Epicurus' views was born during his lifetime, and he had to publicly disavow accusations of hedonism. Epicurus wrote: "...when we say that pleasure is the final goal, we do not mean the pleasures of debauchery or sensuality, as those who do not know, do not share or poorly understand our doctrine believe, - no we mean freedom from suffering of body and from confusion of soul. For it is not the endless drinking and feasting, or the pleasures of boys and women, or the fish table and other delights of luxurious feasting, that make our lives sweet, but only sober deliberation.

At the same time, Epicurus was not an ascetic wandering in a world of pure abstractions. He had the 1st Physics, which made him take everything connected with sense perception with the utmost seriousness. But since Epicurus had the 1st Physics combined with **the 4th Will, which does not crave self-affirmation, and with it extremes**, so the strong tendency to debauchery, gluttony and covetousness did not find ground in his psyche. If there is one thing in which Epicurus's 1st Physics is clearly evident, it is in the crude materialism of his philosophy. Here is perhaps one of the most characteristic passages of Epicureanism: "Every feeling, he says, is irrational and independent of memory: neither by itself nor by an outside push can it add or subtract anything to itself. Nor can it be disproved... Reason cannot disprove perceptions, because it rests entirely on perceptions; and one perception cannot disprove another, because we trust each of them. The very existence of perceptions serves to confirm the truth of the senses. For we indeed see, hear, and feel pain, and from this we can deduce the meaning of that which is not so clear, proceeding from the obvious. For all our thoughts arise from sensations by virtue of their coincidence, proportionality, similarity or comparison, and reason only contributes to this. The visions of the insane and the asleep are also true, because they set in motion (the senses), while the non-existent is incapable of this.

...those who claim that the soul is immaterial are talking nonsense: if it were so, it could neither act nor experience action, whereas we clearly see that both of these properties are inherent in the soul... the soul is composed of atoms most smooth and round..."

From the statements of Epicurus it clearly follows that his hardened materialism went as far as possible: even hallucinations and dreams for him are true because they are visible, and the soul consists of atoms and even known which ones. However, such a position is natural for the 1st Physics.

It is even more curious that Epicurus placed reason after sense perception. Although he directly deduced intellect from sensation and from it alone, i.e., he denied the existence of pure abstractions, rationalism obviously took second place to materialism in Epicureanism. And this is a clear sign of the 2nd Logic. The same is evidenced by Epicurus' unique prolificacy (300 scrolls), according to biographers, surpassing anything done in the golden age of Greek philosophy.

He was also wonderful as a conversationalist. Every day crowds of disciples and admirers gathered in Epicurus' famous garden, but such gatherings did not burden the philosopher, but on the contrary, gave him real pleasure. Generally speaking, for a man like Epicurus, who has processional Logic and Emotion, functions primarily of speech, communication is the main and never unsatisfying delight of life. Is it any wonder, then, that Epicurus devoted all his time, when he was not writing books, to unhurried conversations in the garden, neglecting even the carnal pleasures that were so rich in the Greece of his time?

Few indications of Epicurus' 3rd Emotion have survived, but they are there. First of all it is characteristic for his writings dryness, faintness of presentation. Moreover, this kind of stylelessness was fundamental to the philosopher. Describing the true sage, such as he imagined it, Epicurus said that "he will not speak beautiful speeches. In the same place there is another remark characteristic of the 3rd Emotion: "The wise man alone is able to judge correctly poetry and music, though he himself will not write poetry.

Epicurus was sincerely indifferent to politics and, even a little afraid of it, asserted that the wise man "will not be engaged in public affairs. He did not, however, rule out the possibility that the wise man "will also help the ruler when the occasion comes," but certainly "will not become a tyrant. Epicurus himself, in spite of all his influence in society, carefully avoided all official positions, and in such apoliticality under the most favorable conditions for engaging in politics and the terrible politicization of Athens of that time already shows the 4th Will of the philosopher. Epicurus knew that he was not born for power, for leadership, and everything he offered from himself to the leader, to the ruler, consisted in a kind of "help", not clear in content, nothing more.

In general, the philosopher's wish for his students to "live their lives unnoticed" can be considered programmatic for the 4th Will.

* * *

It is clear from the life and philosophy of Epicurus that people of his type rarely leave a noticeable trace in world history. And therefore, when trying to find other "epicures", and even in politics, only one came to mind - Georgy Malenkov - the Caliph of the Soviet Union.

Khrushchev and Molotov explicitly spoke of Malenkov's weak character, and when this kind of reproach is hurled at people who themselves are not known for their strength of

character, it is obviously the 4th Will. Malenkov began his career as a military clerk, and probably would have remained at the bottom of the social ladder if he had not married a petty but ambitious employee of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. It was she who began to push him on his back, forcing him to move his feet on the steps of a clerical career (it was not for nothing that Epicurus was against marriage!) It was his wife who got him a job as a technical secretary in the Orgbureau of the Central Committee of the Party. At this place he proved to be a savvy bureaucrat and was promoted to technical secretary of the Politburo. Here, apparently, Malenkov was noticed by Stalin. Feeling a kinship on the 1st Physics and 2nd Logic and experiencing confidence only in people with the 4th Will, people loyal, malleable, Stalin himself has already dragged Malenkov on the steps of the career ladder.

Strange as it may seem, among politicians other than Stalin, Malenkov was appreciated only by foreigners. Here are a few foreign characterizations of him: "He is as clever and cautious as a wild cat. A French politician who met with Malenkov during his rise told me: "He reminds me of a young Laval. Like the latter he combined a sharp mind with the greatest self-possession and prudence." "His Russian was the best I had ever heard from the lips of Soviet leaders. Listening to his speeches was a pleasure. Malenkov's speeches were well-constructed and there was logic to be seen in them... More importantly, Malenkov was, in my opinion, the most Western-minded of the other Soviet leaders. At least he understood our position, and although he did not accept it, still, I felt, understood it. With the other leaders, especially Khrushchev, there was no common ground, no common language..." "He gave the impression of a secretive, cautious and morbid man, but under the folds of his fat skin, it would seem that a very different man, a lively and intelligent man with intelligent, perceptive black eyes, should live."

There is no reason to list all the stages of Malenkov's path to the pinnacle of power. The secret of his success obviously lay in his absolute loyalty to Stalin. When the latter organized grand booze parties for his entourage in the hope of revealing his secret enemy this way, Malenkov drank himself senseless. Although, as it turned out later, he hated alcohol, and after Stalin's death he himself stopped drinking and shut down drinking places in the country, thereby giving rise to the sad custom of drinking vodka for three in the back alleys.

Malenkov's finest hour came when the dying Stalin, of all those close to him, shook hands with him alone. From that moment Malenkov was at the head of state for almost a year, until Khrushchev freed his hands to take the reins out of Malenkov's weak hands. He relinquished power almost without any resistance and, perhaps, like any "epicure," with a secret relief of being relieved of his unbearable burden. In any case, when he returned home after his overthrow from Olympus, he said one thing to his anxious relatives: "Everything remains the same. Judging by this statement, Malenkov did not even notice how from the chair of the first person in the state, fell into the chair of a simple minister, an event which, if he had a little ambition, of course, would have been taken tragically. For Malenkov, however, everything really remained the same, for the modest comfort that

he and his kin had before his overthrow, by Western standards, was not encroached upon (1st Physics + 4th Will).

The state career of Malenkov ended as the director of Ekibastuz SDPP. And what is noteworthy: the local Regional Committee once reprimanded him "for his fraternization with the workers", which would not seem surprising to us, if we remember Epicurus, who held himself even with slaves as an equal and let into his philosophical garden anyone who comes.

SYNTAX OF LOVE

(section three)

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE "SYNTAX OF LOVE

In Plutarch's "Instruction to Spouses," there is a curious old anecdote. It goes like this: "A Roman, whose friends reproached him for divorcing his chaste, rich and beautiful wife, put his foot forward and said to them, 'This shoe also looks beautiful and not a bit worn out, but no one knows where it sticks to me!'

A similar-sounding tale was told about Kuprin. It was said that when asked how he lived six months after the wedding, he supposedly answered: "A good wife is like a worn boot, you can't feel her."

At first glance, nothing but the theme and the "shoe" metaphor unite the two stories. But in fact they do not. In both stories there is clearly and covertly **a sign of trouble**. The ancient Roman felt too keenly the closeness of his spouse, Kuprin did not feel it at all. But, regardless of the degree of comfort of the situation, both testified in their statements to the presence of some flaw in family life, albeit differently felt.

God knows where and by whom we marry, but the conscious or unconscious sense of dysfunction in family life is so widespread that one thing is clear: they are being arranged anywhere but in heaven. A gigantic percentage of marriages (pardon the pun) simply exclude divine providence.

Many people see marriage as the grandest deception or self-deception of their lives. And the most unfortunate thing is that in fact it is. We are so ignorant of the mechanisms of the formation of our own and others' inner worlds, of the system that determines mutual attraction or rejection, that in about a hundred cases out of a hundred we rush to the false sound of the hunter's call and become convinced of our mistake only when we find ourselves on the fatal shot.

In literary circles of the first half of the nineteenth century, Belinsky was fond of teasing about his marriage. It was said of his wife that "when she married, she was already mature, sickly through and through, with a nervous tremor in her whole body. Her movements were clumsy and bereft of any grace. Maria Vasilievna, who followed Russian journalism, brought Belinsky to absolute delight with reflections, deduced from his own articles. He took the lesson she repeated as a manifestation of his own development; he was carried away passionately, as he was generally inclined to be carried away by the ideals of his own fantasy..." and got married. Of course, even a man as enthusiastic as Belinsky could not go astray indefinitely; the truth eventually revealed itself in all its terrible nakedness and, quite probably, partly brought the famous critic's premature death closer.

The story of Belinsky's marriage, at first glance, looks like a curiosity, but in fact the only curiosity in it is that the source of Belinsky's delusion lies on the surface and can be seen with the naked eye. More often the causes of deception and self-deception are hidden so deeply that they remain a mystery not only for outside observers, but also for the participants of the marriage drama themselves.

It is impossible to list all the sources of mutual tension, so I will cite only one seemingly paradoxical but correct observation of Labruyère, according to which they can become even what in society is considered a virtue. He wrote: "Cléant is a most noble man, and he married an excellent, very reasonable woman; each of them is the ornament and pride of any society. There are seldom in the world such decent and courteous people, but... Tomorrow they part: the notary already has a deed of separation ready. Obviously, other virtues are incompatible, other virtues are incompatible."

Among other things, Labruyere correctly identifies the nerve of the problem: compatibility. The goodness or badness of life together is not based on conventional categories such as "vice," "virtue," etc., but on the compatibility or incompatibility of the sum of the mental properties of one individual with the sum of the mental properties of the other. - but on the compatibility or incompatibility of the sum of one individual's mental properties with the sum of the other's mental properties.

* * *

But what is this "morgan veil" that, while promising man unearthly bliss in the company of his chosen one (or her), so cruelly deceives him in the end? In most cases, the answer is the same: love. Love is an almost universally known, but elusive feeling, which has been analyzed countless times and yet has not been given to researchers. And since the topic of love is in no way new, I think it would not be a great sin if I make another small contribution to the long-standing dispute about its nature.

It has already been said before that love is closely connected with the Emotion, and one learns about its coming by the strength of the experienced and observed experiences. Therefore, a "romantic" with his excessive 1st Emotion is born to be in love and potentially to be loved, while a "dry man" with his ulcerous 3rd Emotion is, on the contrary, as if from the beginning, not disposed to be in love and to arouse passions. Thus, nature by emotional function alone seemed to automatically distribute: who to love and be loved, and who not. This would be the case if Emotion were the truly autonomous and exclusive source of such a complex feeling as love. In fact, the felt and observed ***bubbling of feelings is not an entity, but a derivative of love.***

The true essence of love is the hope or, better to say, the illusion born in the subconsciousness of a flawed individual, as if at last a man has been found, with whom it is possible to achieve the wholeness and fullness of being that was absent before, but passionately desired. Let us recall Plato's myth of androgyny. According to it, the first human beings were two-sex beings (androgynes), but the gods cut them up, and since then each of the severed halves has been looking for the lost one, the other one, by merging with which it could become a complete being again, invulnerable, self-sufficient, harmonious.

In fact, the androgyny myth is the only true figurative expression of the essence of love. The hope of a warped individual that he has found a soul mate capable of exactly filling all the fractures of his being stimulates emotional outbursts, fosters illusions of achieving "happiness" soon, i.e. achieving wholeness, completeness, harmony and even objectivity in perceiving the world. After all, as Gogol rightly wrote: "Everyone has something that another does not have; everyone is more sensitive than another nerve, and only a friendly exchange and mutual assistance can enable everyone to see with equal clarity and from all sides of the object."

* * *

In saying that love is a derivative of the initial hope of the flawed individual to fill with another being the "chasm," the fracture of his nature, thereby achieving wholeness and invulnerability, one cannot get past the problem of the being of the "chasm" that drives one person to another.

If we look at the matter through the prism of psychosophy, it becomes obvious that the First Function, redundant and productive, needs neither a supplement nor a partner.

The Second Function has different demands. She feels the need for a partner, but not from scarcity; she simply values the process over the result, and there is no full-blooded process without a partner. The Second does not love, but pities. But not for nothing in Russia in the olden days the word "pity" was almost synonymous with the word "love". There is some attractive, incomprehensible strength in weakness, and there is also sweetness in pity. Therefore it can be said that if not to

love, so to pity the Second Function is very prone, although it is not in any way disposed to hot passion, and the feeling it usually feels for a partner is difficult to characterize as love.

That leaves the Third Function. And this is where we must stop in our search. The Third meets all the necessary conditions: it is processional and therefore interested in having a partner, and it is also flawed, vulnerable and therefore in need of supplementation, development and protection. It is the Third function, whatever it may be: Emotion, Logic, Physics or Will, that tends to stimulate the search for a mate more than others. In short, let us not be further cunning and admit at once that the only erogenous function in the literal sense of the word is the Third. Only it, by its weakness and vulnerability, is capable of warming the blood, breeding illusions, and making self-deception desirable and joyful.

* * *

"Love" is a special state of euphoria, caused by the illusion of finding "happiness" in a pair with a subject sufficiently endowed with those mental qualities that are lacking.

But here I must distress the reader at once: the essence of love is better characterized not as hope, but as illusion, precisely because the aspirations of the lover either do not come true at all, or come true when the aspirations themselves, and with them the euphoria, have long since evaporated. "Love disappears when it ceases to hope or fear," said La Rochefoucauld. And he was right. Euphoria dies with the death of rainbow expectations and the fears associated with them.

If you recall your own unhappy experience, look through special and fiction literature, you can even name the time period given by life to "love," i.e., to euphoria. Both specialists and experienced people, I do not know why, but almost all of them call one figure - 3 years (it is enough to remember "Three years" by Chekhov).

.It is interesting to note that these extremely subjective observations on the part of the three-year term have recently received experimental scientific confirmation. American endocrinologists put forward the hypothesis that the stimulant of love excitement is a special hormone called "REA", this very hormone turns lovers into amorous addicts and fetishists. But because over time the receptors of the brain become addicted to "REA" and there are no resources to increase the dose, in 2-4 years the hormone loses its power. There is also a biological explanation for this phenomenon, as an evolutionary means of keeping parents together for the most difficult and dangerous time for a child - the first 2-4 years.

In general, one gets the impression that if the mental typology is responsible for **the nature** of relationships, then the endocrine system is responsible for their **intensity**. Feelings and the hormones responsible for them have a property to

mature, so the same combination of psychotypes that caused only mutual sympathy in youth, i.e. a burst of such dim hormones as endorphin and serotonin, can cause real love, true passion, i.e. an explosion of all blinding hormone "REA" at a mature age. I know of such cases.

Of course, getting used to "REA," or, to put it another way, parting with illusions, is a terribly painful process, completely emotionally and spiritually devastating. Memories of former feelings bring additional tension to the relationship of former lovers, and the electricity between them is accumulated the stronger was the love. As Tolstoy wrote: "The main cause of family misfortunes is that people have been brought up with the idea that marriage gives happiness... The same things that should redeem: care, satisfaction, help, all this is taken for granted; all the faults, however, as not due, and from them suffer the more the happiness of marriage was expected."

Based on this, one would assume that the end of the third year from the beginning of an affair should be the time of abrupt moves, breakups, divorces, etc. However, this is not the case, and it is quite the opposite. The end of an affair is usually the time of complete calm in a relationship. There are several reasons for this. First, by that time the person has acquired so many derivatives of his love: children, relatives, possessions, friends, etc. - that the rupture with them is more painful than the rupture with the object of his former passion. Secondly, by the end of the novel the individual feels so spiritually, emotionally, and physically devastated that he usually does not have the strength to look beyond the circle outlined by the novel; in addition, the one-sided and cramped nature of all love does not suggest any serious alternative that could distract him from the recently still so desired object of love.

Finally, the very fact of the loss of rose-colored glasses does not mean that, having given up illusions and looked at his partner with an objective, but calm, eye, one is automatically convinced of his error and finds further life together impossible, unpromising. The final words of the hero of Chekhov's story "Three Years": "Let's wait and see," accurately reflect the mass mentality of people who have given up their illusions and lived through the storm of love. "We shall see..." - They follow Laptev in Chekhov's footsteps, looking at their partner for the first time with a poker-faced, aloof and expectant gaze. This is the usual conclusion to love. As for the future life scenario, it depends not on passions, but on the psychotype of the participants of the drama and the "love system" which once attracted them to each other.

There are three "systems of love" or, to put it differently, three basic combinations of the Third Function with the functions of the opposite side, which can cause euphoria, give rise to love. And in order not to reinvent the wheel, let us use three terms known since the times of Ancient Greece to denote different kinds of love: "eros" (love on the principle of opposition), "philia" (love on the principle of

identity) and "agape" (love-evolution, moving partners from opposition to identity) to denote each of the "systems". Of these "systems," only the last one, "agape," is truly fruitful and can claim to be a true "formula of love," but to be sure of this, it is necessary to analyze all kinds of love combinations.

EROS

"Eros" as a model of interpersonal relationships in marriage is much more common than the others. And this is no accident. As the principle of "eros" consists in the mutual attraction of opposites, nature, having laid down physiological differences between the sexes, as if predetermined the tendency of mankind, along with physiology, to consider in marriage the natural and necessary dissimilarity of psychologies.

Into the essence of the physiological differences between the sexes are dedicated, some deeper than others, but almost all. On what the psychological distinction between people is based, there is still no clarity. Therefore, based on the concept of psychosophy, we can now give a completely unambiguous answer to this ancient question: psychologically, the First and the Third functions are opposite in their tasks and expression. That is, a man feels the opposite of his mental attitudes when he comes face to face with a being whose First Function is the one that man himself has the Third. If we imagine that such a situation turns out to be reciprocal, then this is "eros. The essence of "eros" is the antagonism of crossing over from the Third to the First function. Schematically, the nerve of "eros" can be depicted as follows:

HE HAS

- 1) 1)
- 2) 2)
- 3) 3)
- 4) 4)

In itself, the purely speculative notion that a difference in physiology must necessarily be followed by psychological antagonism would certainly not have made "eros" the dominant concept of marriage, had not an unconscious, animal instinct-like, extremely effective mechanism of mutual attraction been embedded in the very intersection of the Third function on the First from the beginning.

The mechanism is simple: when a man, tormented by the scarcity and vulnerability of his Third function, suddenly discovers opposite to himself a being who has the same, but in the form of the First, i.e. in excess, he thinks not only of the correspondence of the situation to the common worldly ideas about the prospects of such marriage, but first of all the assumption that the opponent will cover his

scarcity with its excess, will cover his ulcer with its armor. The course of reasoning in this position, if it is presented as if from the woman's point of view, is as follows: "He is so smart (sensitive, powerful, strong-willed) that it costs him nothing to share with me, a stupid (cold, frail, weak-willed) one part of his surplus, so that I, a cinderella, can be transformed into a harmonious, invulnerable, irresistible and perfect princess.

That is how, by her own admission, thought dry by the third Emotion Nina Berberova, when she saw a certain N.V.M. She wrote: "The meaning of our meeting and our rapprochement, the meaning of our common life (ten years), all together experienced happiness, the value of this love for us both in that he for me and I for him were a personification of everything that was for both - in this stage of life - the most important, most necessary and precious. What was necessary and precious for me then (or maybe always?) was **to go from being dry, businesslike, cold, calm, independent, and reasonable to warm, wet, shaken, dependent, and crazy**. In him for me and in me for him came together in focus everything that we had lacked before in other rapprochements."

To say that in the situation of seeing with sick eyes the Third Function's eyes shining with health and power of the First Function, illusions multiply like bedbugs, is to say nothing. Illusions, however, as previously stated, are the only starter of love experiences. So, feelings boiled up, the heat of passion ran through my veins, I got dizzy - love came in its "erotic" expression.

If in the course of reasoning we remember that the First Function is not only redundant, but it is also a business card of a person, something that he unconsciously first lays out on the table when meeting him, it becomes clear: love- "eros", if the heart is free and ripe for pairing, falls on a person suddenly and uncontrollably, like an avalanche, without any preliminaries and adjustments. He does not have time to understand anything, he hears only a deafening explosion and sees in a momentary flash of light the long-awaited, strangely recognizable face of his soulmate (or soulmate). "It's him (her)!" - the individual's jingle in the spoon when, at the first meeting, he bumps his eyes on a business card of exactly the First Function he needs. The heart immediately ignites, the eyes close, and the person flies headfirst into a whirlpool, from which he will be able to come out with open eyes and a cold heart only in a few years.

The picture of "eros" would be distorted if we imagined it as an endless arch of rainbow rings. It is a complex feeling that can best be characterized as love-hate. This is partly due to the inherent bifurcation of the Third Function: the sight of the First Function in this case not only caresses the eye, but also irritates it. The property of the First Function to step on the Third from the very beginning and not even notice its clumsiness due to its thick-skinnedness does not please the Third. In short, an ambiguous spirit of lust and dislike constantly hovers over "eros." As Catullus wrote:

"And I hate her and I love her. "Why is that?" - you ask me.

I don't know myself, but that's how I feel and I'm longing.

Everything would be all right, and in anticipation of the coming bliss one could hold back irritation, if all the troubles of "eros" were not a waste of time and effort. The most tragic thing in "eros" is that the hopes that the Third Function has placed on the First Function in this "love system" are not destined to come true. The root of the problem is not that one is impoverished, while the other has a surplus, but in the principal incompatibility of attitudes: the First is productive, the Third is processive, and this fact dooms the bearers of both functions to eternal mutual deafness.

To make it clearer how and why this happens, here is an example. Let's say a woman with 3rd Physics meets a man with 1st Physics. Naturally, she is fascinated by the power of the function opened before her, which she herself is bruised by, and decides: "That's him!" Since her Third Function, which made the choice, is superprocessional, the calculation is simultaneously based on the fact that with the given partner she will begin a rapid joint process of creation of everything related to the physical layer of life.

If we translate the illustration to the culinary plane, then, say, a woman begins to dream about how they will cook together some luxurious dish. And expensive in this action will be not so much the dish itself as the process of cooking it together. At the same time the woman, by her subtle Third Function, will take over the final stage of cooking and give the dish a unique subtle flavor.

The reality is just the opposite of the dream. When it comes time for lunch, it turns out that her partner, with his productive, monologue-like 1st Physics, has already cooked everything himself and eaten it all himself. The process of destroying the air castles has begun. Of course, the woman cannot immediately reconcile with the specific psychology of her opponent's physics and demands that henceforth he takes care not only of his stomach, but also of hers. It is possible that the loving husband will be sympathetic to the woman's demand, but it does not mean that her dream will come true. He will simply bring a bucket of semolina and put it in front of her with the words: "This is for you, sweetheart, eat it!"

Looking at this situation through the prism of psychosophy, we can understand both. The owner of the 1st Physics, for whom the result is important, and the result is excessive, rather simplified in form, could not behave otherwise. But, on the other hand, one can also understand the dismay of the owner of the 3rd Physics, who seemed to receive by that function (Physics), which she wanted to receive by, but so NOT THAT and NOT THAT, that what is happening is perceived as a blow and is really a blow to Physics.

However, it is impossible to reject the sincerely offered gift, the porridge has to be eaten, and while the woman eats, there is still hope in her soul that what has happened is only a mishap, a small mistake caused by mutual misunderstanding, which can be corrected in the future. However, this hope is not destined to come true, since the different orientation of the functions makes the mishap chronic and irresistible. Only this circumstance will be found out after several years.

Of course, the culinary example does not look tragic, but if we imagine that the mechanism of conflict is equally valid for the entire physical layer of life (economics, law, procreation, sex, etc.), then I think the tragic background of the contradictions between the Third and First Functions will appear quite clearly. At the same time, it would be wrong to think that the life of the Third Function in "eros" consists of only blows. The First Function not only strikes, but also protects. I think no man with the 3rd Physique would refuse to have such a mighty and fearless spouse as was Goethe's wife, who personally threw a crowd of Napoleonic soldiers out of the poet's house. The greatest evil of "eros" is that the First denies the Third **the PROCESS OF COOPERATION**, the only means for her to heal a wound that is always nagging.

Eros is made even more burdensome when the crosshairs from the First to the Third function are supplemented by the crosshairs from the Second to the Fourth. As in the diagram:

HE HAS

- 1) 1)
- 2) 2)
- 3) 3)
- 4) 4)

Here we encounter a familiar pattern of dissimilarity between the principles of the procedural Second and the productive Fourth. The main thing in it: the same impossibility of the process. Using a familiar culinary example, we can say that the 4th Physicist does not share the sincere and tireless interest of the 2nd Physicist in eating, at the table she is an indifferent guest, chewing without passion everything that is served, not getting upset even when she is refused the table. She is a dependent, fully entrusting her partner with her Physique and believing such a gift to be sufficient for family life.

True, the antagonism between the Second and Fourth does not look as dramatic as the antagonism between the First and Third. There are two reasons for this. First, both the Second and Fourth are non-traumatic, so the conflict between them is mutually painless. Second, the Second function usually easily captures the Fourth and, like a boat barge, forces it to move in its wake, which creates the illusion of full consent and unanimity of the spouses in all issues related to this layer of life. The illusion of well-being in such a system of relationships is that the Second receives submission instead of the desired process of co-creation, which, you must

agree, is not the same thing. And while being strong and flexible, the Second does not suffer much from this circumstance, at the same time she feels some unconscious itch to feel that in such company the best side of her nature is not fully realized.

* * *

Based on what has been said about "eros," one may think that two crossings of processional functions into productive ones, or, as one might call it, "full eros," are the hardest version of marriage and a long cohabitation with such a combination is impossible. And this is partly true. As far as the severity of such a variant is concerned, this assumption is absolutely correct - there is no heavier variant than that. As for the impossibility of living together, such a conclusion would be premature. Let me give as an example the life story of a couple I know well. The psychotypes of this couple combined or, rather, did not combine as follows:

GHAZALI (HE) BERTIER (SHE)

- 1) EMOTION 1) LOGIC
- 2) WILL 2) PHYSICS
- 3) LOGIC 3) EMOTION
- 4) PHYSICS 4) WILL

They got married rather late in the day, when most of their friends and acquaintances were already married. They were not very enthusiastic about each other, judging by a few passing phrases, but the time was right, she was the smartest girl he knew, he was the most emotional young man she knew, and this cross over from the First to the Third Function decided the matter, tied their fates. A child was born, the only one left, which, with her 3rd Emotion and his 4th Physique, seemed to suit both of them.

Life went on in its own way, not too painful, but not too pleasant either, although the contradictions of "total eros", of course, made themselves felt. "Bertier" was troubled by "Ghazali's" emotional withdrawal from herself, "insensitivity", if we may say so, interspersed with explosions of often darkly colored (4th Physics) experiences that hurt her extremely reserved (3rd Emotion), but cheerful (2nd Physics) nature in essence. "Ghazali was depressed by Bertier's taciturnity, her refusal to indulge in what might look like idle chatter, and if Bertier condescended to talk, she turned it into a monologue of stony dogmas that were not subject to criticism.

However, there was a silver lining to this situation. When the Bertier's friends tried to press her emotionally and even accuse her of being insensitive, she called her husband and he, immune to this kind of pressure, shouted down any attempt to

impose a foreign emotional order on their home. A similar practice was developed by "gazali," when in arguments with friends he felt that he was drowning, he would call his wife, and she would hammer them with her unquestioning judgments, just as she usually hammered him. In short, the usual picture of the First Function crossing over to the Third was unfolding.

In this case the crossing from the Second to the Fourth function also looked common. So it turned out, for example, that the "ghazali" with his Second Will had to constantly decide the fate of the family alone and alone to bear responsibility for everything, getting instead of a full partnership, albeit comfortable, but leaving him alone before the blows of fate, obedience of the Fourth Will.

Goncharov described very precisely the specifics of the relationship between the 2nd and 4th Wills in his novel Oblomov, recreating the relationship between Olga (the 2nd Will) and Oblomov (the 4th Will). Goncharov wrote: "She understood more clearly than him what was going on in him, and therefore the preponderance was on her side. She looked openly into his soul, saw how the feeling was born at the bottom of his soul, how to play and come out; saw that with him the female guile, cunning, coquetry ... would have been superfluous, for **there was no fight to be had.**

She even saw, too, that in spite of her youth, she had the first and main role in this sympathy, that from him one could expect only a deep impression, **a passionately lazy submission, an eternal harmony with every beat of her pulse, but no movement of the will, no active thought.**"

Returning from "Oblomov" to the relationship of the couple we describe, we would like to note that, in turn, the 2nd Physicist was embarrassed by the absence of her spouse's genuine, inherent excitement about sex and everyday life, although the 4th Physicist was not caught sabotaging him in these matters either.

"Full eros" is rarely without cheating. There was one in this case, too. "Ghazali" cheated. "Bertier", having learned about the betrayal, and already on the 4th Will not distinguished by decisiveness, at the crisis simply turned off the Will and, falling into prostration, began to wait for the decision of his fate. "Ghazali, by his 1st Emotion, was in euphoria, and was even going to divorce and remarry, i.e. to shift the responsibility of the 2nd Will from the wife to the separated woman. However, as it turned out, the only affair in his life ended in nothing.

The reason why "ghazali's" affair broke down is because married people of the 3rd Logic usually break up their affairs. Because both his marriage and adultery were exclusively intellectual. Having married a woman with the 1st Logic for the sake of her analytical abilities, which, as it later turned out, kept his mouth shut, "gazali", exhausted by communication, could not but pay attention to a woman, most likely with the 4th Logic, who agreed to talk less and listen more. As for physical adultery, "gazali" by his 4th Physics was not inclined to it, but he did not see any obstacles to pay for his girlfriend's pleasing silence with bodily intimacy. When the divorcée

demanded a divorce from him, then the idea of divorce "Gazali" in the end rejected. **After all, what was the honey and the meaning of his affair, was the comfort of communication, not cohabitation.** To ruin the situation for the sake of satisfying the need for a grateful listener seemed to be an exorbitant price, and, by and large, it was.

The novel "ghazali" fell on the most fateful period in human life between the 35th and 45th years. The danger of this period, or maybe even the grace of it, lies in the fact that, feeling the hopeless ill-being of his life, a person realizes: the period called by the Greeks "acme", a period of fullness and flourishing of personality, is coming to an end, so the problem of life ill-being, if it exists, cannot be postponed for later, destiny must be changed now, otherwise there will be neither the spirit nor strength to change it, and the misery until death in the current situation is inevitable. It is during this period that strange madness, sharp turns in the lives of overripe uncles and aunts, suddenly infected with the heat of youthful passion, trying to cheat fate and start everything as if over again, occur.

The end of "acme" was also a crisis for "gazali". But the crisis in this case passed without changing anything. As the years passed, he began to remark that he was happy to return from work to a formerly not very appealing home. "Bertier," on the other hand, was by nature a very homely creature, and had always seen the home as the center of her interests. The habit of living together, the division of spheres of influence, and the measure of mutual alienation that allowed them to live together without stepping on each other's toes have done their work, and there is no doubt that the rest of their days will be spent together, although the content of this "together" will differ sharply from the ideas they had when they entered into marriage. And only the unconscious feeling that life with another spouse could be fuller, more interesting, brighter, will probably add some secret bitterness to the broth of their senile peace.

A reasonable question is: what then destroys families if even such a self-exploding model as "total eros" does not always lead to divorce? Well, the "syntax of love" does not take it upon itself to govern the essentially formal acts of marriage and divorce. Its sphere: determination and prediction of measures of mutual attraction and estrangement, measures of mutual interest, combinability. No more.

In addition, "eros" usually comes down on the spouses with the full weight of their inadequacies only when they remain face-to-face for a long time, without intermediaries. Most often this situation occurs during vacations, and it is vacations that are remembered by them as the most critical periods of coexistence. In ordinary life, however, there are many factors that drive potential opponents to different corners of the ring. The lion's share of time is taken away by work. In addition, a person is usually surrounded by enough people (housemates, relatives,

friends, co-workers) with whom he or she can vent if the soul is not vented, but rather traumatized in direct contact with the spouse.

Finally, I will reveal the main reason why even with "full eros" divorce does not occur. The fact is that divorce as a legal act involves only two of the four functions: Will and Physique. This legal act regulates mutual responsibility and liability to offspring, placing special emphasis on the physical side of life. Therefore, during "eros," only the processional Wills and Physiques truly show a willingness to break up. What cannot be said about the processional Logics and Emotions.

Let's remember why, before the divorce, the affair of the famous "gazali" burst. Obviously because, experiencing the greatest discomfort under the 3rd Logic, he could, without putting his family foundations to the test, simply communicate on the side, in parallel. Such intellectual "polygamy" is not subject to any judgment. It is different when in family life the Wills and the Physicists are traumatized - here there should be no parallel life to compensate for the formal marriage arrangement, at least in the European view. And divorce becomes the only way out.

In this way we can deduce a kind of "law" of divorce in "total eros. It might sound as follows: "Full Eros," the hardest form of interpersonal relations, is resolved by divorce when Physicists and Vols are in procession, and is not resolved when Logics and Emotions are in procession, though it is fraught with crises.

To make it clearer, here's an example. Akhmatova sometimes spoke with ill-concealed scorn of women who could not leave their husbands when the last spark of love in their hearts burned out. But, sadly, Akhmatova's own life did not fit her theory: she did not usually leave her husbands, they usually left her.

There is no reason to suspect Akhmatova of hypocrisy. So it is better to look at the order of her functions and make sure that one simply could not find a more faithful wife than Akhmatova. Let me remind you that Akhmatova had **1st Will, 2nd Emotion, 3rd Logic, 4th Physics**. And from this order of functions it is clear that there is no contradiction between word and deed in Akhmatova. As a person with the 1st Will, she was really a master of her own destiny, and if she decided on any changes in family life, she made a final and irrevocable decision. A different thing is that there was no need for Akhmatova to change anything about her. Her First Will was absolutely independent as it was, and the physical layer of life under the 4th Physique was too insignificant to seriously influence her family choices. If something in her husbands' behavior did not conform to her ideas of what was proper in emotional and logical terms, it was not difficult for her to compensate for this discomfort without divorce among her colleagues and admirers.

Among other things, Akhmatova's example is remarkable in that it points to the existence of types who are predisposed, as it were, to the stability of marriage, regardless of the situation. This circumstance could be extremely attractive to

people who are eager to find something grounded in the stormy sea of life, if marriage in this case were not a purely formal act, securing something that in fact cannot be - marriage. Akhmatova and the types close to her are too autonomous and too indifferent in precisely those points that constitute the essence of an informal marriage: too autonomous and too indifferent in matters of Will and Physique to strive for true pairing.

In essence, life is never about the dilemma of whether a stable marriage is better or an unstable one. It is interested in another: do people need each other or not? Although the confusion between the two, due to humanity's short-sightedness, does exist.

* * *

Another "erotic" model of interpersonal relations, where the crossing from the First to the Third function is combined with an identity on the Second and Fourth, can be considered not so heavy in comparison with "full eros. Such a "system of love" is probably more conveniently called "semi-eroso" and can be traced in the most striking example of the marriage of Leo and Sophia Tolstoy. Schematically, the system of the relationship between the Tolstoys can be depicted as follows:

"Tolstoy" (L. Tolstoy) "Dumas" (S. Tolstaya)

1) Will 1) Physics

—

2) Emotion 2) Emotion

3) Physics 3) Will

—

4) Logic 4) Logic

In The Kreutzer Sonata, angry at his wife, Tolstoy described and explained the impulse that had once long ago forced him to put his neck under the bonds of Hymen: "One evening, after we had ridden in a boat and at night, by moonlight, were turning home and I was sitting beside her and admiring her slender figure, covered in jersey and her curls, I suddenly decided that it was her. It seemed to me that evening that she understood everything, everything that I felt and thought, and that I felt and thought the most sublime things. In fact, it was only that the jersey looked especially good on her, also the curls, and that after spending the day in intimacy with her, I wanted even more intimacy.

Despite the belated sarcasm and caricatured description of the motives that drove the writer to the young Sophia Beers, it is essentially correct. The latent hypersexuality of Tolstoy's 3rd Physique was indeed a major factor in determining his choice. Looking at the young, strong, healthy, beautiful, excessive flesh bride,

he, however, not only excited, but also hoped that in the vicinity of this young female and his own weak flesh will become younger, stronger, healthier, more beautiful, that, having added their merits, they will give birth to numerous, perfect, beautiful and in spirit and body posterity. But, alas, much of what Tolstoy dreamed of at that time was not destined to come true.

Probably out of spite, Tolstoy omitted in "Kreutzer Sonata" several other important circumstances that influenced his choice. In addition to Tolstoy's alien but extremely attractive corporeality, Sonia Bers had qualities in which one could guess not the opposite of him, but a kindred soul. She also, according to the 4th Logic, did not rank high on the arguments of reason and, according to the 2nd Emotion, had no less power and richness of experience.

Tolstoy did not overlook the fact that Sonya is manageable, obedient, and this feature of the bride's character also came to his heart, although he himself was not distinguished by his obedience. Later, raising the faceless Chekhov's Dushechka to the model of a woman, Tolstoy confirmed the attraction of weak-willed women for him, and his wife wrote bluntly and briefly in her diary: "He needed a woman who was passive, healthy, wordless and without a will. All true, but Tolstoy, noticing during visits to the house of Bers obedience Sonia, as it turned out later, terribly mistaken on this score, her humility was imaginary, crafty, and in contrast to Chekhov's Dushechka Sophia Bers was not the 4th, but the 3rd Will.

Happiness would not have helped, but unhappiness did. For it was Sophia's Third Will that determined her choice, awakened her feelings, and made Tolstoy's figure more than attractive in her eyes. Having guessed in him by a hard look and tightly clenched mouth man strong-willed and self-confident, Sonya could not help but light up at the thought that next to him, she would lose her usual for the third will of uncertainty, become more resolute and purposeful. And the title of count and the glory of a major Russian writer to the limit inflamed the already frantic, though secret, ambition of the daughter of a doctor.

At first glance, everything in Tolstoy's future marriage was perfect, promising long, unmarred happiness. Both received what they wanted, and even in excess. And at the same time, along with the desired dissimilarity, there was something in their characters that implied a knowing and complete agreement. The situation, it seemed, could not be better...

* * *

The first and most terrible blow, from which he could never recover, Tolstoy received immediately in the bedroom. The fact is that women with the 1st Physic often suffer from anorgasmia because of their thick-skinnedness, and because of their weak excitability are lazy in the performance of marital duties. Whereas people with the 3rd physics are inclined not only to give into sex their whole soul and strength, but are also sexual altruists, for which the evident evidence of

pleasures experienced in their company is almost more expensive than one's own pleasure. Comparing these characteristics of the two different Physicists, it is not difficult to imagine the tragedy that played out in the Tolstoys' bedroom.

"With him, the physical side of love plays a great role. This is terrible - I have none, on the contrary," Tolstaya wrote in her diary, noting with this entry just the tip of the iceberg that has forever settled in her bedroom. The conflict in the meantime was much deeper than a simple conflict between sexual excitement and laziness. It was not a question of whether or not Tolstoy's wife refused intimacy, but that there was no reaction on her part to that intimacy. No matter how much fervor Tolstoy put into his wife's young, blooming body, he heard no echo from her in response to his labors. There was a particularly terrible conclusion for Tolstoy's third physique: if such an intoxicating, clearly created for love's blissfulness body is silent in his arms, then it is not in her, it is in him. *HE IS NOT A MAN*. It was something to be horrified and despair...

I am sure it is this secret tragedy of Tolstoy, maybe even he himself is not fully aware of, is connected with a mysterious fact of his biography the first years of his marriage: the obsessive thought of suicide, a thought so persistent that he even hid the rope from himself, afraid to hang himself. Echoes of the experiences of those years can be found in Anna Karenina, Kreutzer Sonata, diaries: and the credibility of their reliability is not in doubt. It's just that we now know their source: the contradiction between his 3rd Physique and her 1st Physique.

As the years passed, the crisis softened; Sophia Andreevna proved prolific and often bestowed Tolstoy with visible proof of his virility. After thirty years, childbirth and breastfeeding had thinned her formerly thick skin to such an extent that she began to experience orgasm, and with it came passion and lust for pleasure. But Tolstoy, while naturally rejoicing in these changes, at the same time did not cease to be tormented. So wrong and not so he got in the bedroom because of the selfishness, rudeness, mechanistic, hurried and straightforward sensuality of his wife, that sex remained for him a tantalizing torture. Tolstoy saw the desired fruit, but could not truly taste it, and in The Kreutzer Sonata, unable to endure, publicly signed his hatred of this torture. Gorky, who knew Tolstoy an old man, said: "I always did not like his judgments about women - in this he was too 'commonplace,' and something fake sounded in his words, something insincere, and at the same time - very personal. It was as if he had been insulted once and could neither forget nor forgive.

As the years passed, it became clear that the metastases of contradiction between the 1st and 3rd Physicists are not only in the bedroom of the Tolstoys, but they affect practically the entire physical layer of their life together (everyday life, property, money, etc.). It turns out: he is almost ascetic - she adores luxury, he is "unapologetic" - she beats the children and surrounds the estate with armed guards, he is wasteful and prone to broad gestures - she is stingy. In short, there was no

point in the material world about which their views were not opposed, and no force existed that could reconcile them.

To be fair, the blow that Tolstoy received in the marriage bed was an involuntary return from his wife of the blows that Tolstoy had begun to inflict on her before the wedding. He, while still a bridegroom, by the extreme narcissism and thick-skinnedness of his personality, thought of nothing more clever than to give the young Sophia Bers to read her old diaries. A greater cruelty to her 3rd Will is hard to imagine. Here are excerpts from her first diary entry with still timid words of rebuke, but no longer alien to gloomy prophecies: "... He does not understand that his past - a whole life, a life with thousands of different feelings of good and bad, which I can no longer belong ... I, too, was carried away, but by imagination, and he by women, living, pretty, with features of character, face and soul, which he loved, which he admired... I begin to feel more strongly that we have something very uncomplicated in our relationship, which will gradually separate us altogether morally." The future showed that the tactlessness with the diaries was not an accident, but the norm of Tolstoy's attitude toward himself and his wife. From the outset, he considered himself so much more significant, larger than her, that he found it unnecessary to delve into the experiences and pains of the person living next door.

However, the main conflict between them, typical of the contradiction between the 1st and 3rd Wills, was that, having placed himself on some pedestal, Tolstoy never allowed his wife to stand beside him. There was no pairing. There was a king and there was a woman appendage. Therefore, the entire life story of Sophia Tolstoy is a story of Sisyphus attempts to climb a mountain, the top of which is undivided by her husband - strict, cold-blooded Olympian, throwing down from there anyone who attempts to share his lonely greatness.

To all appearances, the conflict over the Wills in the Tolstoy family resembled a similar conflict in the Byron family. In Byron's family, too, the great poet's 3rd Will struggled for the right to exist, freedom and equality with his wife's 1st Will, and also to no avail. Through the lens of her psychotype, Anabella Byron described the family conflict as follows: "If he felt worthy of me, he would become kind.... The contrast that he thought existed between him and me made me the object of his terrible rage... Aware of the weakness of his own character, he was naturally jealous of the character of the opposite" One phrase of Anabella Byron, "if he felt worthy of me," enough to understand: how insurmountable was the gap separating the spouses Byron. The poet lacked the spirit to make his 3rd Will equal to his wife's 1st Will. And Anabella had no desire to give her husband a hand and, pulling him out of the abyss of humiliation, put him beside her as an equal partner.

Also - the Tolstoys. He did not even think it necessary to pretend to recognize the equality of his wife with himself, and, without directly pointing a finger at her, nevertheless wrote in the diary

read by his wife: "... there are people to such an extent alien, distant in the state in which they are, that they cannot be treated otherwise than as children are treated - loving, respecting, protecting, *but not becoming on the same board with them.*

One cannot say that Sophia Tolstaya at once rebelled, finding herself in the position of a slave, a subordinate. Her Third Will at first even liked to entrust herself to another, stronger Will, but as the weight of her husband's hand became more and more apparent, the more obvious became the suicidal nature of her humility. There remained the path of hopeless rebellion, the dynamics of which can be traced in such passages from her diary: "He said that I was weak in character. This may be for the best", "Levu terribly in love, but it angers me that I put myself with him in such a relationship that *we are not equal*", "... I sometimes had a passionate lover or a strict judge in the face of my husband, but I never had a friend", "I told him how he humiliated me all my life," "I am afraid to be weak ... Sometimes I want to pick on his weakness", "I sometimes have a silly but unconscious desire to test my power over him, i.e. a simple wish that he would obey me. But he always siezes me in this..." "Sometimes I would like terribly to free myself from his influence, a little heavy, not to care about him, but I can't. That's why it is heavy, that I think his thoughts, I look his eyes, I strain, **he will not do, I lose myself.**"

As Tolstoy's name grew in social importance, the struggle between him and Sophia Andreevna increasingly moved into the social sphere. Both loved show-offs, to be sure, but it was Sophia Tolstoy who had a great love for them; she cared far more about public opinion than did the hardened individualist Tolstoy. She carefully photographed next to him, did everything to her name constantly accompanied by the name of her husband, was even on what was completely contrary to its nature: charity. But most importantly, however crooked, albeit comically, she tried to play the role of influential, loving and beloved wife. On this occasion, Tolstoy himself moaned: "Not to mention the love for me, which has no trace, it does not need my love for her, I need one thing: so that people thought I loved her.

The years passed, but after the last illusions evaporated, nothing changed in the relationship of the Tolstoys. He continued to look at her like a general at a private and acted accordingly, she took offense and, having found his sore spot, retaliated by shutting the bedroom door.

Both felt the hopelessness of the situation and each was looking for a way out. Tolstoy's thoughts ran the gamut from divorce ("The Living Corpse") to the murder of his wife ("Kreutzer Sonata"). Tolstoy thought of separation ("I feel better when he is not there"), later it seemed more attractive idea to have an extraneous affair ("I want to kill myself, run somewhere, to love someone ..."). Of course, when the need for love has already been so clearly formed, love does not make itself wait long. Sophia Tolstaya falls in love, falls in love with Taneyev - a nice man and a beautiful composer. It almost comes to a sin, it was probably her age (she was in her sixth decade) and fear of Tolstoy's mad temper that stopped Sofia Andreyevna.

After the affair with Taneyev is safely resolved by nothing and it becomes clear that the change of fate is no longer possible, Sophia Tolstaya abruptly changes her priorities, she seems to fall in love with her husband anew and, having previously lived with him almost apart, begins to literally pursue him. However, as it turns

out, here, too, Tolstaya is too late. The leash of sensuality, on which she led Tolstoy all her life, as she grew older, became longer and thinner, and by his 80 years broke off completely. In addition, the place next to Tolstoy now, in addition to herself, claimed a lot of people: grown children, like-minded Tolstoyites. It turned out that before you start another hopeless and previously lonely attempt to ascend the pedestal to her husband, you need to elbow out a crowd of competitors. So she spent the rest of her life not fighting Tolstoy himself, he became only a tool for her, but with her main rivals: her daughter Alexandra and Tolstovite Chertkov.

To what humiliation is capable of constant incitement, but never satiated ambition of the 3rd Will, can be seen in the behavior of Sophia Tolstoy shortly before the flight of her husband from Yasnaya Polyana. Here is written in her own hand: "I went out, climbing some ravines, where I would have been hard to ever find if I had felt ill. Then I went out into the field and from there I almost ran to Telyatniki, with binoculars to see everything far around. At Telyatniki I lay down in a ditch not far from the gate leading to the Chertkovs' house and waited for Lev N. I don't know what I would have done if he had come; I kept imagining that I would have laid down on the bridge over the ditch and Lev N's horse would have trampled me..."

My God! The old woman, who has time to think about death, is jealous, jealous as a girl, of his comrade's shabby but glorified husband, whose entire guilt lies in his partaking of that grace which she considered her exclusive property.

Tolstoy paid off his tormentor in the most ruthless way, winning once and for all a long battle with her by fleeing from Yasnaya Polyana and dying at the train station, not in her bed or in her arms. Sophia Tolstaya, of course, would not be herself if she did not try to win back at least a few points in this hopelessly lost game. First she imitated suicide, then went to the station to her dying husband and there tried to process the journalists. Her son, Sergei Lvovich painfully wrote: "Mom became calmer, but her views and thoughts have not changed. The same selfishness and constant thinking only about herself. She constantly talks and loves to talk at the station, where all the correspondents are eager to listen to her, and we are sitting on pins and needles. Hence all the filth that has appeared in the newspapers."

Even the proximity to her husband's corpse did not stop Tolstoy in her latest propaganda campaign. Boris Pasternak, as a very young child, accompanied his father, a famous painter, who was to make a drawing of the dead Tolstoy, and remembered the following picture: "...the farewells were removed from the room. When we entered, it was empty. From the back corner to meet her father quickly stepped weeping Sophia Andreyevna, grabbing his hands, frantically and intermittently mumbled through her tears: "Oh, Leonid Osipovich, what I have suffered! You know how much I loved him!"...she justified herself and called her

father to witness that her loyalty and ideological understanding surpassed her rivals and would have protected the deceased better than they."

Thus, now in absentia, the Countess Tolstaya ended her years-long struggle with her husband's freezing corpse.

* * *

Obviously, in my account, the life of the Tolstoys looks like a nightmare. And in fact, it was. To the above, to be fair, we should add only a few details that can partially soften the overall bleak picture. First, the crossover from the First to the Third function not only mutually traumatized the spouses, but also gave them some form of protection. The husband's position in society served as a mighty shield to the sick, very vulnerable spirit of the daughter of the unknown Moscow doctor. In turn, she, having plucked the reins of management of the economic and financial sphere from Tolstoy's hands, made life very easy, simplified and comfortable for her not too practical husband.

The identity of the 2nd Emotion and the 4th Logic also brightened up their coexistence noticeably. This identity made life easier for them even when they were quarreling, because their quarrels were a series of senseless (4th Logic) shouts directed at each other, ending in torrents of mutual tears (2nd Emotion).

A special peacemaking role in the Tolstoy family was played by the 2nd Emotion. It endowed Tolstoy with a great artistic talent and his wife with a remarkable artistic flair, so their joint studies in literature for many years firmly cemented their relationship. But the most luminous by virtue of the identity of the 2nd Emotion episodes of their lives were those when they played the piano in four hands. These moments not only brought out the best side of their natures most fully, but each found in the other an equal, an ideal partner. And, most importantly, the hours spent together at the piano were almost the only times in their lives when they were equals, which meant a great deal to Sophia Andreevna, who keenly felt her inequality with her husband.

Unfortunately, in recent years, when he considered himself a prophet, Tolstoy considered literature and music too vain for his new ministry and the power of his first will crushed the desire for them in him, broke the last thread that bound and reconciled him with his wife, and in their lives there was nothing on which the interests and views of the spouses could converge. The final and complete breakdown of the family had begun.

* * *

In deducing certain regularities of eros as such, we can say that what is common to eros is that it never justifies the enormous hopes usually associated with it, never contributes to the harmonization of man's inner world, and never removes the

original conflict inherent in it. That is for sure. As for everything else, there are variations.

For example, the conflict in "eros" is never removed. But it may deepen, as in the case of the Tolstoys, or it may soften. The "noble half-eros" is such a variant that softens the conflict over time. It is labeled "noble" because it combines any combination of the crossing of the First Function into the Third with an identity according to the "noble" Second Will. I will take the life of a couple I know well as an illustration of this situation. Their psychotypes were combined as follows:

"lao-tzu" (he) "goethe" (she)

1) Logic 1) Physics

-

2) The Will 2) The Will

3) Physics 3) Logic

-

4) Emotion 4) Emotion

Since it has already been discussed quite a lot before about the contradiction between the 1st and 3rd Physicists, between the 1st and 3rd Logicians, the essence of the conflict in this combination, I think, should be clear to the reader. Roughly speaking, "Lao-tzu" was furious at "Goethe's" egotism, "Goethe" was furious at "Lao-tzu's" judgement and it seemed that nothing could be done about this contradiction. Everything would have gone on, at best without deepening the conflict, on the same note, until a divorce or the death of one of the spouses, if it were not for the identity of the 2nd Will.

At this point it should be recalled that the 2nd Will is a strong and flexible will. A reminder of this is not superfluous, because the "nobleman", when exercising or feeling pressure, has enough strength and flexibility both for active offensive actions and for concessions. Shifting the conversation to the marriage plane, we can say that the "nobleman" has enough stubbornness when imposing his system of values on his partner and has enough tolerance and sensitivity when someone else's system is imposed on him with the same stubbornness. This is why "nobleman's semi-erosion" has the specific feature that the conflict between the spouses is not eliminated, but, thanks to the 2nd Will, it is noticeably softened, and the partners find themselves closer to each other at the finish line than at the start.

This gradual rapprochement also took place between the spouses in the pair known to us: "lao-tzu" - "goethe. The constant mutual pressure led to the fact that Göte, having lost nothing of her inherent mercantilism, included the household in the sphere of her concerns, and Lao-tzu began to find the strength to listen in silence to most of what Göte was saying. It seemed that a little more, and their

mutual rapprochement would lead at some point to a complete identity of values and positions. But this was an illusion. Tolerance towards each other in this case did not change anything in the value systems of the spouses, but only softened the conflict, softening along the way the sharpness of mutual perception: love-hate was not replaced by hatred, but by a more neutral and rounded form of relationship - liking-disliking.

Although the picture of the "noble semi-eros" looks from the outside a kind of drama with a sour-sweet "happy ending," in it all the same never ceases to be a secret tragic note. And that's understandable. Is it easy to realize without bitterness that the giant gift of love and forgiveness is squandered on a constant positional struggle for small concessions, that the unity of the hearts that was expected at the beginning of the way never took place?

It is likely that the "serf half-eros" would be little different from the "noble half-eros," i.e. the combination where the crossing from the First to the Third function is combined with the identity of the Fourth Will. However, the usual problem of the 4th Will prevents an unequivocally positive answer to the question posed: it has no power over itself, nor is it free in its relations with its own kind. Therefore, it is not the inner contradiction and consent of the functions that often dictate the policy in the relationship between the spouses in the "serf semi-erosity," but a third outside force with a stronger character.

There is no better illustration of the problems of "serf semi-erosity" than the relationship between the spouses Teresa and Jean-Jacques Rousseau, so let us turn to their psychotypes:

"Rousseau" (J.J. Rousseau) "Epicurus" (T. Rousseau)

) EMOTION 1) PHYSICS

-

2) LOGIC 2) LOGIC

3) PHYSICS 3) EMOTION

-

4) WILL 4) WILL

Although this scheme presents two psychotypes, to be fair to them we should add another psychotype, that of Mrs. Levasseur, Rousseau's mother-in-law, since the philosopher's family was not a duo, but a trio, where the first violin was played, unfortunately for the spouses, by the mother-in-law.

The system of mutual attraction and mutual repulsion at the crossroads from the First to the Third Functions of Physics and Emotion is already partly known to the reader. Therefore, briefly outlining the situation, I will say that Rousseau, judging from "Confessions", was attracted by the whitish flesh of Teresa, and repulsed by

straightforward pragmatism and dryness ("calm temperament" in Rousseau's terminology) - defects so significant for him that he did not dare to appear in public in her society. Teresa did not leave her "Confessions" to the world, but one can guess that she liked Rousseau's sensitivity and was annoyed by his impracticality and loud-mouthedness. However, being men of the Fourth Will, both were in little mood for mutual criticism and aggravation of contradictions.

In addition to the enticing and irritating otherness, Jean-Jacques and Thérèse felt that their natures were inherently related: both were thoughtful by the 2nd Logic and easy-going by the 4th Will. And, apparently, it was this sense of real kinship of souls that gave them hope that, in time, their mutual contradictions would fall away by themselves.

The dynamics and nature of the relationship between Rousseau's spouses were best conveyed by Rousseau himself. He wrote: "The first time I saw this girl at the table, I was struck by her modest manners and still more by her lively and meek look..." "She was very shy, and so was I." "The similarity of our hearts, the congruence of our characters soon led to the usual result." "My Teresa had an angelic heart; our affection grew with our intimacy, and we felt more and more each day the extent to which we were made for each other." "The gentle character of this good girl seemed so suited to mine that I became attached to her with a feeling invulnerable to time and resentment."

In reading Rousseau's confessions, one could only rejoice for the couple if their own joy were not marred by a mutual controllability that did not allow them to fully belong either to themselves or to each other. Of himself Rousseau wrote: "All my freedom depended on chance; more than orders, I was enslaved to my own will. I never had a single day when I woke up and could say, 'I will spend this day as I please...'" "*I was able to shout, but not to act; I was left to speak, but acted in my own way.*" Rousseau described his wife in similar terms: "Devoted to her mother and her family, she belonged to them more than to me, more than to herself..."

Willingness of the spouses Rousseau took advantage of many, but most of all warmed his hands on this circumstance, the philosopher's mother-in-law. She not only shamelessly robbed both, but also diligently quarreled with them. If the spouses Rousseau had not been immune to quarrels in the 4th Will, it is difficult to say how the destructive activity of the stronger and more evil 3rd Will of Mrs. Levasseur would have ended for them. Although even their natural peacefulness eventually cracked and did not keep the spouses from mutual estrangement. Rousseau characterized the role of his mother-in-law in his family life as follows: "I surrounded this woman with attention, cares, made her little gifts, trying to earn her love, but could not get it, and she was the only source of grief, which I experienced at home ..." "In vain I tried to get together with my mother-in-law, and in the end it cracked, and did not protect the couple from each other. "In vain

I tried to merge our interests into one; it proved impossible. Mrs. Levasseur always had her own personal interests opposite to mine and even those of her daughter, which were no longer separate from mine.

Rousseau summed up his grievances about marriage and his compliant wife as follows: "Finally, if by her love for me, by her good nature she avoided total enslavement, yet she was so subservient that this in most cases prevented the effect of the good rules I tried to instill in her; and whatever measures I took, **we always remained disconnected.**"

The story of the Rousseau spouses is a good example of the specifics of "serf semi-erosity": the partners never get to each other in order to fully experience the bitterness of internal contradictions and the sweetness of mutual recognition. So many people are lined up between them that they do not have the opportunity to be face to face for any length of time. Therefore, the question of how relationships develop during "serf semi-erosity" is always a debatable one, depending more on the psychotypes of relatives and acquaintances than on the psychotypes of the spouses themselves.

As for "eros" in general, i.e. any combination where there is a crossing from the First to the Third Function, I am not afraid to repeat myself: love-"eros" is the brightest, most exciting and the most barren of feelings. It multiplies and destroys gigantic hopes, gives nothing and, at best, does not turn initial love-hate into mere hatred. What follows is silence...

Philia

A fundamentally different from "eros," which relies on attraction according to the principle of opposites, is the "love system," which is called "philia," which relies on attraction according to the principle of similarity. The "philia" was partially discussed in the previous chapter. What was formerly called "semi-eros" could just as rightly be called "semiphilia" because in this combination the crossing from the First to the Third function is accompanied by the identity of the Second and Fourth functions. However, since in "semi-eros" the crosshair plays a decisive role, and the identity plays a subsidiary role, mitigating internal contradictions, ***such a combination of psychotypes, where the identity of the function is complete, should be rightfully considered a "phylum".***

I suspect that Kuprin's words quoted at the beginning of Syntax of Love: "A good wife is like a worn boot, you can't feel her," are connected precisely with "philia. Just as the ancient Roman's words about a beautiful new shoe that invisibly presses the foot of its wearer are an obvious "eros.

Unlike "eros," love-"philia" does not begin with the words; "This is he (she)!" Although mutual sympathy between people with the same order of functions arises immediately and irrevocably. Usually "tozhdiks" (people of the same psychotype)

at first guess each other's affinity by the first two functions, and only later, as they get closer to each other, they discover complete identity in psychology, values, attitudes, etc.

The moment when the identity of the order of functions is finally clarified usually becomes the starting point of the nascent romance. The complete coincidence of principles, values, and attitudes is the starter of love—"filiality," fostering hopes that are also not destined to come true. However, illusions awakened by "phylia" have their own, different logic from the logic of "eros" illusions. If in "eros," upon seeing the excess of the foreign first function, the individual in vain dreams of filling up with this excess the "hole" of his third function, then in "phylia" the partners proceed from the idea that a simple addition of their equally defective personalities, by a purely quantitative increase instead of a qualitative one, is also able to make their lot easier and to effectively protect the vulnerable side of their nature.

However, as we know, multiplying one by one results in one, no more. That is why illusions remain illusions even with "phylum". Of course, no one will be as sympathetic to a spouse with the 3rd Logic if a "fool" is uttered to him as a spouse with the same 3rd Logic, but she is not able to answer "you fool yourself!" and confidently prove it to the offender. In a word, "philia" not only does not contribute to inner growth, but also does not provide real protection. It is a pity this fact usually comes to light too late.

At the same time, it would be wrong to think that "philia" is completely barren and that its passion is nourished by delusions alone. The identity of the processional functions, Second and Third (the position of the resultant functions does not play an essential role here), brings something original and necessary to this "system of love" for both parties.

The fact is that the identity of the processional functions at first creates the appearance of a tumultuous process, i.e., exactly what the partners need most. Isn't that a cause for euphoria? However, in reality, it is **not a process but an exchange** between the spouses: the Second Functions exchange the experience gained by the strong side of their natures, the Third Functions share their weaknesses. And such an exchange, under all conditions, cannot be called useless. Partners bring together in one place all that they have gained, all that they want to share, multiply the two contributions by each other and divide the sum in half. As a result, both parties win.

There are, however, negative sides to the "phylum. A person, who is generally inclined to objectify his highly subjective notions, finds a kindred soul in "phylum," which further confirms his alleged rightness. This is why it is more difficult to convince a person who is strong in his hundred percent incrementalism of the right to the existence of other, different points of view than it is to convince

a lonely person of the right to the existence of other, different points of view. The exchange at "phylum" has a particularly bad effect on the Third Functions, because, whatever one may say, they exchange not strength, but weakness, and in this case the wound on the Third Functions is deeper rather than healed: skeptics with the 3rd Logic become even more skeptical than they were, prudes with the 3rd Physics become even more prudes, etc. Moreover, there is also a mutual traumatization of each other. The identity of partners' complexes is as comfortable and painful as the cohabitation of two Napoleons in one madhouse.

Finally, the Achilles' heel of any "phylum" is the fact that the exchange is a rather short-term phenomenon. When the exchange is over, people, sensing nothing in each other that even remotely resembles otherness, simply lose mutual interest. They look at each other like in a mirror, knowing in advance all the advantages and disadvantages of the reflection, knowing that as soon as they make a move, the reflection will exactly repeat it. Marriage in "phylum" is a copy of the relationship of Siamese twins, where the opposite sides are so connected and similar that they do not feel each other, but also do not traumatize. The twins together may not be too interesting, but it is comfortable. That is why I would advise individuals who are tired of life and expect only peace from marriage to look for a couple among toddlers, because no marriage is more peaceful than a phylum.

Although even here a caveat is required that long-term peace is ensured by "Philia" only when the 2nd and 4th wills are identical. The relationship is more complicated in the case of identity of the 1st and 3rd Will.

One does not need to be a prophet to predict the malaise in the life of the "bourgeois Philia. Common sense itself suggests that the "bourgeois," a person who is in initial discord with himself, is least able to find peace in a pair with his own kind. Of course, it is possible to assume that there is something that redeems this kind of intimacy, if only by virtue of the identity of the psyches. However, one thing is clear: the resentful, mistrustful, angry at themselves and at the world owners of the 3rd Will are less able, ready and eager, than anyone else, to look into the mirror that "phylum" sets up for them without horror or dislike.

The issue of power is particularly painful in the identity of the three Wills. The struggle for power in "bourgeois" families is reminiscent of a bald man fighting over a comb. The gigantic thirst for command is combined with the 3rd Will's proportional insecurity and irresponsibility, so the relationship takes the form of a chronic, petty and uncommitted front, where neither of the warring parties, despite the fierce struggle, is able and deep down in their hearts does not want to win.

The relationship between people in the identity of the 3 Vols in general is a bitter, strange, and funny picture. It resembles a picture of an aquarium in which two male stickleback fish are launched. These fish are remarkable in that, having taken one side, begin to test the enemy, as we say, lice, alternately driving each other into a corner. Mutual harassment in stickleback is a long process, but in the end, having put their minds to it, they come to a consensus, establishing an invisible

and not always equitable boundary between them, which then none of the parties breaks.

It is very similar, only with inverse dynamics, to the relationship under the identity of the three Wills. The boundary of power functions between "burghers" is established at once; it is determined by the rating of both spouses, scrupulously calculated long before the wedding. The rating of partners of the 3rd Will is influenced by a great many factors: gender, origin, age, appearance, education, wealth, profession, skills, and many more things that are generally inaccessible to the eye of a person with a different order of functions.

Thus, the boundary in the "petty bourgeoisie" is established immediately. The history of further relations is a history of mutual attempts to break this boundary. Usually the man is the first to try to move the boundary of power functions in his favor. Having discovered, to his delight and surprise, that resistance to him is quite timid, the man, to his own head, usually tries to develop success, not knowing that he is not winning in this, but simply compressing the spring. In the end, the cornered wife cannot stand it, shows her teeth, and launches a counterattack. Since the aggressor himself is not a fortress of spirit, the counterattack is quite successful. Moreover, sensing the weakness of her husband, the wife is tempted by the ambitious idea not only to return what was taken, but also to gain at someone else's expense. Therefore, following this thought, she drives him beyond the predetermined line and on the shoulders of the enemy breaks into his zone of power functions. There is cornered spouse, so as not to turn into a henchman and the rag, pulls together, showing his teeth and begins a successful counterattack ... And so on without end.

If we add to the above that time constantly makes adjustments to the rating of the spouses, then the complexity, infinity and futility of the struggle in the identity of the 3 Vols will appear with the utmost clarity.

We would like to pay special attention to the fact that the identity of the three Wills complicates life not only in the "husband-wife" line, but also in the "father-child" line. As already mentioned, children often inherit exactly the psychotypes of their parents, and this circumstance, in turn, can seriously affect the direction of "bourgeois" battles. In contrast to spousal battles, the specifics of the fight on the child-father front under the 3rd Will is that the parent, more often raped by his partner than the rapist, is inclined to compensate for the weakness of his position at the expense of the child, taking it out on him and asserting himself. Which the parent succeeds quite well, but for the time being.

The parent succeeds in overpowering the child for two reasons: due to the child's natural docility and the recognition by both parties of the reality of the family hierarchy. However, I should warn you here: the arbitrariness of a child with the 3rd Will always has a certain time limit, he/she is allowed to push himself/herself

only until a specific moment: until he/she comes of age or until he/she achieves economic independence. From that moment, the recent angelic, plasticine child becomes an insolent, uncontrollable, constantly fronting demon. The "bourgeois" child in this case has an explosion-expulsion of the previously suppressed will, and the force of the explosion is proportional to the imaginary and real offenses accumulated during the years of forced obedience. Therefore parents with the third will have to be ready, if they are not able to respect the child and recognize him as an equal, at any rate, for a sudden and all-destroying rebellion to happen when the child comes of age.

There are serious reasons to suspect that what was described above took place in the Dostoevsky family. All three (he-she-son) were "Pushkins," therefore the history of relations in this triangle could confirm, refute, or supplement what was said above about "bourgeois philia. But that is the peculiarity of the psyche of the 3rd Will, which is secretive; therefore, after Dostoevsky's death, Anna Grigorievna subjected to a total purge everything indicating cloudy relations in the family, and the son, according to Paustovsky's memoirs, simply closed his mouth and simply refused to talk about his parents to the end of his days.

The situation is no better with the identity of the three Physicists. I know a couple of "underdogs," charming, sweet people who broke their marital ties a long time ago. The center of the conflict in this case was, of course, sex. The usual bifurcation for the 3 Physicists, where greed organically combines with timidity, made, in the words of the drama participant, "behave in bed like your smelt in a fishbowl."

I also have a similar example for the 3rd Emotion. An outwardly amazingly suited couple of beautiful, decent, educated people, getting together, spending a vacation together in nature. Everything is fine. Two days later, without saying a word, he leaves. She is shocked: "I did not do or say anything that could push him away. I loved and love him." There is silence in response. Although the answer could have been formulated with all certainty: the thirst for feeling was combined with the mutual impenetrability of "dryness." Not only did both not receive the coveted display of feeling, but, by the emotional tightness of their mouths, they did not even know how to relate to their partner by someone so close and so distant.

The identity of the 1st Wills also poses its own difficulties in the "phylum. In order to give some idea of the specifics of the relationship between the "kings," I will give an example, not of marriage, but of politics. It was fate's will that at one time and at one point, two First Wills, two "Socrates" - Maximilien Robespierre and Joseph Fouchet - came together. And the story of their relationship in the context of the "Philia" looks very instructive.

"SOCRATES (J.FOUCHÉ) SOCRATES (M.ROBESPIERRE)

1) WILL 1) WILL

2) LOGIC 2) LOGIC

3) EMOTION 3) EMOTION

4) PHYSICS 4) PHYSICS

The story goes that while both were living in the province, in Arras, Maximilian and Joseph were not watered down. Robespierre even almost married his sister to Fouché. One would certainly believe such reports. In the province power for both did not shine, the throne, designed for one, did not loom even in the most distant future, and therefore there was nothing to divide, the subject of rivalry was absent. At their first meeting, when they looked at each other like in a mirror, Robespierre and Fouché discovered their psychological identicality and, delighted by this fact, they were never separated. They found in each other's society not only comfort and pleasantness, but also considerable benefit, since in love- "phily," as we remember, there is, among other things, an exchange, extracted separately, of experience, and at the end of this exchange there is an identity of a special order. Where not only the psyches are identical, but also the baggage.

Robespierre was the first to go to Paris, and practically only this circumstance determined his leadership in the career marathon, which began for Fouché with some delay. It was only by chance, a handicap in time, that Robespierre was the first to reach the pinnacle of power, for otherwise his chances, like his identical twin, would have been halved. The same time advantage and mental identity made Robespierre the strongest of Fouché's enemies, because the former knew all too well what the latter wanted and was capable of doing.

When Robespierre's chair swung beneath him, he knew at once **who** was the soul of the plot: he is a reflection in water - a twin. Two weeks before his death, Robespierre makes a thunderous speech against Fouché, repeating it the day before the coup. By the standards of the time, such speeches were tantamount to a death sentence. But, to the bewilderment of contemporaries and historians, Robespierre delays, delays, delays... And not for humane reasons. By that time he had already so broken his hand that the execution of a man meant no more to the dictator than the execution of a cockroach. There was only one creature in the world on which his hand was not raised - Fouché. A mystical weakness overwhelmed Maximilian when he thought of Joseph. Friends he killed without hesitation, but the murder of the twin - a special, requiring inhuman effort, almost suicide. As if it were a sin, in those same days Fouché's little child, **THEIR** child, dies...

The dictator finally collapses, the plot matures and Robespierre dies. At the same time, his death does not elevate Fouché to the pinnacle of power, but places him in the very important chair of chief of the secret police. And formally he remains in this capacity until the end of his career. But... Difficult relations develop in a triangle: Napoleon - Fouché - Talleyrand. As in the scheme:

"Napoleon" "Socrates" "Aristippus"

(Napoleon) (Foucher) (Talleyrand)

1) will 1) physics

2) physics 2) logic

3) logic 3) emotion 3) will

4) emotion 4) physics 4) emotion

Fouché is equal to Napoleon in strength of mind, but smarter than the emperor, Talleyrand is equal in mind, but much more self-confident. The struggle within this triangle is devoted to Fouché's forces until Napoleon's first abdication.

With Napoleon's return to France, a new and most important period of life begins for Fouché. Power, abandoned by the Bourbons and not yet raised by Napoleon, finds itself in the hands of Fouché. Historians do not even seem to argue when the question of the master of France during the famous "hundred days" is raised. Especially during the period when, having left Paris, Napoleon directed his footsteps toward Waterloo. Fouchet was the undisputed master of the country.

The rest is of no interest. Fouché has achieved more than what his soul at first yearned for, more than the mere supremacy in France - the object of lust of all the French 1st Vols. He brought back the symmetry that had once been broken by Maximilian's dizzying career. After the Hundred Days, Joseph could again, as in a mirror, look into his brother's grave. As in his youth, in Arras, they were again Siamese twins - "Socrates.

* * *

Speaking of "philia," we cannot ignore the kind of relationship that is best described as "pseudophilia. It may sound paradoxical, but there is a system of relationships that outwardly looks like "philia" (love on the principle of identity), but is actually "eros" (love on the principle of opposition). The essence of "pseudophilia" consists of crossings from the First function to the Second and the Third function to the Fourth. In the form of a diagram, "pseudophilia" can be depicted as follows:

HE HAS

- 1) 1)
- 2) 2)
- 3) 3)
- 4) 4)

The specifics of "pseudophilia" are easy to read even in a crude scheme. Two people meet and see the sameness of the Top and the Bottom, which at first approximation is easily mistaken for identity, which naturally arouses mutual interest. People usually lack the time, conditions, and patience to clarify whether their similarity is absolute, and having satisfied themselves with the superficial, approximate identity of "pseudophilia," they hurry to convince themselves that they have found what they seek and are fired up.

However, as the partners become more and more convinced of their mistake, and the roses of imaginary "phyllia" increasingly begin to lavish them with the thorns of genuine "eros. The difference is that, unlike ordinary "eros," where feelings are aggravated to love-hate, "pseudophilia" is characterized by a more subdued form of feelings: liking-disliking. The complexity of feelings is connected with the fact that though the partners have the same strong and the same weak functions, there is no identification because of differently directed functions - not strength and weakness together with effectiveness and processibility, but only effectiveness and processibility collide head-on. This is why love-"pseudophilia" always has a strange, chimerical appearance: **values are the same, but there is no mutual understanding.** Thus, spouses usually remain in a state of incomprehensible, paradoxical identity- alienation until the end of their relationship.

Usually these relationships quickly enter a phase of chronic struggle, where the spouses, not getting tired of being amazed at themselves and each other, begin to hammer the strong sides of their nature at the strong sides of their partner, weak sides at the weak, not realizing either the origins or the meaning, or the hopelessness of this struggle. Since the opponents are worthy of each other, this duel may last for decades, not only without any visible success, but even without serious mutual injuries. And by tattling on one's own half, no one in the struggle can show the sympathizer any sign of serious injury. It does not follow, however, that a duel of "pseudophilia" costs nothing to opponents who have stood against each other for years. It is terribly debilitating. But, unlike "eros," when partners come to the finish line even more developed and disharmonious than they were at the start, in "pseudophilia" they come equal to their former selves, only badly worn out.

To give the reader a clearer picture of the mechanism of "pseudophilia," I will give the story of Boris Pasternak's first marriage as an example. Schematically, the relationship between Boris and Evgenia Pasternak can be depicted as follows:

"pasternak" "akhmatova"

(B.Pasternak) (E.Pasternak)

- 1) Emotion 1) Will
- 2) Will 2) Emotion
- 3) Physics 3) Logic
- 4) Logic 4) Physics

Judging by the few descriptions of the young Yevgenia Pasternak, she really both externally and internally resembled Akhmatova. Here is one of her early portraits: "What can I say about Zhenya? A proud face with rather large bold features, a thin nose with a peculiar nostril notch, a huge, open, intelligent forehead. Zhenya one of the most intelligent, subtle and charming women I had to meet. If you recall that, according to Akhmatova, Pasternak once under the veil of talking about one novice poet, and tried to embrace her, we can guess that the attraction to women of this type has not left him even after his divorce from Yevgenia Pasternak. Pasternak's special affection for the "Akhmatova" type is evidenced, among other things, by his secret love for a long-dead woman, which the poet carried through his life. Love for Larissa Reisner, the famous Bolshevik warrior. That Reisner was "Akhmatova" is not to be doubted. But in this case it is not that, but the fact that Pasternak, who buried many relatives during his life, seems to have mourned only the death of Larissa Reisner in 1926 in poems specially written on this occasion, is interesting.

"Larissa, this is when I'm sorry,

That I am not death and I am nothing compared to her.

Twenty years have passed, a lot of water has flowed, but when Pasternak came time to name the main heroine of his novel, he called her - Lara. And about whose honor he named her, Pasternak wrote directly to Varlaam Shalamov, once also secretly in love with Reisner: "I gave the name of the main character in memory of Larisa Mikhailovna. So there is a certain consistency in Pasternak's attraction to Akhmatova.

* * *

When Boris Pasternak and Eugenia Lurie first met, a current of mutual recognition ran through their similarly resonant orders of function. Both in the high Will are personalities, aristocrats, filled with self-esteem and self-belief. Both of them, according to the high ranking Emotion, are sensitive, artistic, which was confirmed

by their occupations: he is a poet, and she is an artist. Both, according to the low-level Logic, are prone to skepticism, and both, according to the low-level Physics, are not of this world, impractical, neglecting the contemptible usefulness of people. What a pair...?

At first, the common scale of values really gave their relationship the tone and color of a honeymoon. However, time passed and the previously hidden but genetically predetermined thorns of "pseudophilia" came to light. It turned out that her Emotion and Logic are processional, so she is a very sociable person. On the contrary, he is withdrawn, and of all forms of communication, he prefers communication with himself and, if he enters into a conversation, his speech looks like an enthusiastic, violent, waterfall-monologue (the 1st Emotion), not attached to the interlocutor in any way.

Eugenia Pasternak's 1st Will, in turn, did just as little to beautify her husband's life. Not only was Eugenia inclined to chronically assert her independence when no one was attempting to do so, but she also made attempts, which surprised rather than frightened Pasternak, to subordinate him to herself. Visible even from the outside, his wife's jealousy, wounding and humiliating the poet, was only one manifestation of her ambitious ambitions. In one of his letters to his wife Pasternak formulated part of his claims to her as follows: "... You overestimate your age, your strength and your knowledge and require me to submit to you, bossy, irascible, jealous-suspicious and intolerant, while this is the only obstacle to our happiness ..."

The birth of a child especially aggravated relations between the spouses. It turned out that the asceticism of Evgenia Pasternak's 4th Physicist was much more sincere than the asceticism of Pasternak's 3rd Physicist. She really did not care about everyday life, and the birth of a child, which added to her worries, divided the feelings of a young mother. Pasternak himself was unspeakably happy about his son as an extremely important confirmation of his masculinity, but the young father's chronic lack of money and economic helplessness could not, understandably, make life easier for the family. Aggravating the situation was the fact that the birth of a child required from Eugenia Pasternak a break in her artistic pursuits, and this was tantamount to a complete personal collapse, as by her 1st Will and 2nd Emotion it was in the artistic career she saw her true interest and the possibility of self-realization.

In a word, the birth of the child led to the fact that the discord between the spouses went through all the functions: upper and lower. And here for the first time to the end revealed what a terrible self-deception was their marriage, how far apart they really are from each other, they, at first imagined themselves Siamese twins. Later Pasternak wrote:

"By faith in the future I am not afraid.

To appear to you an eloquent talker,

We are not life, not a soul union, -

The mutual deception is cut off."

These lines were written after the divorce, but they reflect the poet's long-standing sense of the falsity of the "pseudophilia" that bound them together.

As for the immediate reasons that led to the breakup, they were, of course, based on the processionality of Pasternak's Will and Physique, the order of functions of the woman who took Yevgenia Pasternak's place is a further confirmation of this. But how and why the poet's second marriage developed will be discussed in the next chapter.

Agape

"Agape" is the most complex of feelings, especially as it relates to the dynamics of the relationship. After all, "agape" is love-evolution, where partners move from the opposite to the identity. The principle of "agape," if you look at it through the prism of psychosophy, is the intersection of the Second and Third Functions, as in the diagram:

HE HAS

- 1) 1)
- 2) 2)
- 3) 3)
- 4) 4)

On the surface, "agape" is very similar to "eros," primarily because the strengths and weaknesses of the natures are crossed. However, there are fundamental differences between them as well.

"Agape" is not as sudden and dazzling as "eros. After all, in this case, the Third Function falls not on the First Function, but on the Second Function, which is not a person's calling card and is not redundant, but normative, i.e., less noticeable and attractive. Therefore, having met a person with the same Second Function as your Third, you do not get inflamed, do not get blinded, do not flinch "It's him (her)!" and generally do not immediately notice those virtues that will become most attractive to you later. In short, the first difference between love-"agape" and "eros"-is that you don't rush into it immediately and headlong, but slowly and gradually enter.

The specifics of "agape" can already be seen in the diagram. Two people meet and, not at once, they discover that the other has something strong that they themselves do not have. In and of itself, this kind of knowledge does not necessarily provoke love, but it certainly awakens mutual interest. Further, as one grows closer, a paradoxical picture opens up, just the opposite of "pseudophilia": **values and**

priorities are very different, but interests are the same. Partners feel as if they are incompletely identical to each other, something mutually attractive and at the same time repulsive. Therefore, aware of the discrepancy between their feelings and love stereotypes, they are cautious and reserved at first. Enough time passes before it turns out that something more than simple flirting is going on between them. However, the further into their relationship, the stronger is the need for each other, the more powerful is the desire to make them even closer. The love process becomes irreversible. New layers of partners' personalities, hungry for interaction, open up. New stages and shades of intimacy emerge, not anticipated before. The process of mutual discovery, rapprochement, merging becomes not an episode, but a norm of life. And it continues until all the resources of the partners' personalities are exhausted.

The source of all these metamorphoses also lies on the surface: the decisive Second and Third functions in this "love system" have different characteristics, but one direction - toward **PROCESS**. Let me remind you that it is the processional functions that aspire to partnership and are fully realized only through it; while the resultative functions can achieve their goals alone.

As for the special sweetness of the relationship in the crossing of processional functions, it is explained by the fact that only the crossing (as opposed to the identity) is capable of providing a genuine and lasting process.

A pair crossed by processional resembles mountain climbers going in a bind. Partners cross-guard with the strengths of their natures against the weak ones. At the same time, there is no substitution, when each of the parties, having taken upon itself from the common burden, even if double, but convenient for itself, is moving parallel and independent, but exactly insurance, and each in a bundle passes its part of a single way, only, depending on a site, changing the role of the leader and the slave. Thus, in a bundle, constantly leading and supporting each other, a pair of worldly climbers ascends the mountain called love—"agape". This ascent is a long one, and it practically ends only when both of them reach the maximum of their abilities in processional functions.

I am afraid that the image of mountain climbers has created an overly idyllic picture of "agape" relationships. It is a complicated feeling, and there is as much hatred as there is love. Second functions are not at all happy about having to go along with a knowingly weak partner. The Third Functions are irritated at the presumptuousness and directness of the Second Functions, and, besides, it is rather painful for the Third Functions to part with the "fig leaf" (irony, sanctimony, hypocrisy, skepticism), which, for better or worse, protects the sore spot, attached to the body. In short, there are more than enough reasons for mutual dislike in "agape" and the euphoria with which one usually confuses love in this "love system" evaporates after a certain period, just as in other cases.

The signs and results of "agape" are another matter. They are unique. The main example of "agape" is dynamism. The "eros" is characterized by the statics of confrontation, the "philia" by the statics of identification. And only "agape" moves, moves from confrontation to identity. At the end of a long evolutionary process, the partners come to an identity, but not to that sterile identity that is observed in "philia," but to an identity of a higher order, in which there is no longer a division into strengths and weaknesses of personality, both processional functions are extremely powerful and sensitive.

The dynamism of "agape" manifests itself not only in the relationship between people, but also in the being of the person seized by this feeling. The main characteristic of "agape" is that the person in love **CHANGES**. The very mechanism of change lies in the beneficial influence of the partner's second function on the individual's third function. This influence straightens the person, bringing the state of the Third to the norm; the ulcer on the Third gradually disappears and along with its disappearance, the person becomes more self-confident, calm and harmonious.

This harmonization of personality is conditioned not only by the fact that the Third begins to function normatively, but also by the fact that a person freed from the Third ulcer no longer clings to the power of his First Function and softens it, humbles its aggressiveness. The 1st Emotion becomes less hysterical, the 1st Physics becomes less stingy, the 1st Logic becomes less dogmatic, and the 1st Will agrees to be less tyrannical. The fact is that the redundancy of the First Function exists only in the context of the deficiency of the Third, and the size of the redundancy is directly proportional to the size of the ulcer. The superpower of the First is completely covered by the weakness of the Third, so the inferiority of the latter can be judged very accurately by the scale of the manifestation of the First. Accordingly, harmonization of the Third function makes normative not only it, but also the First, which directly depends on it.

This is not enough. If along with the processional functions the partners have a good result on the First function, the previously mentioned "fullness of life" (adequacy of the first three functions to themselves) comes, which makes the Fourth function, which was sleeping before, speak with all its might. This, in turn, leads to the situation when the adequacy of all functions to themselves will eliminate their hierarchy, transferring functions **from the vertical position to the horizontal**. The horizontal position of functions, i.e. the position in which all functions are equal, are Second and work with maximum efficiency, is the limit of human desires, the full self-realization of personality.

In general, according to my observations, the main problem of an individual, the problem of contact, sociability, good-naturedness, etc., is not so much in the luck or unluckiness of a psychotype given by nature, **they are all good**, as in the degree of personality harmonization (I have known very unpleasant "pasternaks" and the nicest "aristippe"). Therefore, the question of harmony, horizontal

functionality is the main question of human life. Horizontal functionality is a transition to **the 25th, unnamed psychotype** - the only possible way of human character evolution not for the worse, but for the better. Belonging to the 25th type is the maximum and the ceiling of a person's mental capabilities.

It's not hard to describe **25**. He is industrious, sensual, sensitive, thoughtful, caring, responsible, sensitive, decent, in a word, he is the ideal man, and no matter which way you turn him to you, his behavior will always be the standard. **The 25th** is the dream man, the center of all virtues, the husband of all wives, the wife of all husbands. He has one flaw: **HE IS NOT IN LOVE**. **The 25th** is self-sufficient and would live as an anachorete if his functions, which have become Seconds en masse, did not require constant process and dialogue. It can be caught on this. But you can't hold on to it. **The 25th** is not in love, but pity, but pity, unlike love, has its limits. This is why romance with **the 25th** has the peculiarity that there is no equality in it, and genuine passion is shown by only one of the parties, agonizing over the combination of intimacy with what she believes to be an inadequate reaction to genuine feeling.

But most importantly, **the 25th** is extremely, fatally rare, given often late and for a short period of time. Suffice it to say that Goethe reached **the 25th** by the age of 60 and lost it almost immediately, when wine and time in their diabolical work quickly and forever destroyed in him the inner harmony...

The question that usually arises in connection with the 25th is formulated simply: how to achieve it? In what ways to harmonize one's personality? But there is no simple answer. There are several techniques that can move an individual toward the 25th type. First and most important: Conscious and consistent work on healing the Third Function ulcer. For the 3rd Logic, this means engaging in rhetoric, chess, the sciences, and participating in discussions of a purely intellectual nature. For the 3rd Emotion, it is theater, literature, the arts, and religion in its emotional, ritualistic hypostasis. For the 3rd Physics - everything related to the physical layer of life: fertility, childbearing, economic independence, arranged life, health, beauty, etc. For the 3rd Will - full independence in all functional layers and freedom in decision making.

Second, an excellent complement to the work on the Third Function can be conscious and consistent work on one's First Function in the sense of removing excess, transferring efficiency and monologue to the rails of processivity and dialogicity. This path was suggested to me by one of my students of the 1st Will and the 3rd Emotion. One day he told me how, after consciously suppressing his 1st Will, he suddenly opened the floodgates of absolutely unknown and strong feelings in himself. I think this move is very possible and promising, at least for the high Will. But parallel work on the First and Third Functions seems to be the most effective, since they are the main scales that rock the human psyche, and bringing them into balance is a prerequisite for harmonization of the personality.

Third, once again I will express heresy, but sex is a practically universal, independent of the order of functions as a means of harmonization of personality. Not being a fan of the Freudian theory of pansexualism, I still cannot but note the strength and depth of Freud's approach (not interpretation) to the role of sex in the

human psyche. Contrary to widespread opinion, sex is not only physiology, hence Physics, although one cannot deny the weight of physiology in the sexual act. Sex is an action in which the entire personality of the person, the entire order of functions, is involved.

The Will determines: with whom, when, how much, how, etc., to have sex. Particularly in rape, in addition to the Will, other functions have little or no involvement in the act. The rapist in this case pleases not the body, not the soul, but satisfies his thirst for power, which is not realized in ordinary life. The thirst to humiliate, to see the fear, the submission, the stupor of the victim is the most precious thing that the rapist craves and goes to the crime. Therefore, although rape is called a "sexual crime," there is very little sexuality in it, or rather, of all that is given to a person, a sick, mutilated Will is realized.

The emotional component of sex has been discussed a lot before, and, of course, emotion is an indispensable participant in intimate relationships, if we are not talking about corrupt love. Although even in the latter case there are exceptions. An acquaintance of mine, who has traveled around the world a lot and tried many things there, noted as a great virtue of Russian prostitutes is their seemingly sincere emotionality. "In this moment they love you!" - he exclaimed.

It is banal to talk about Physique as a component of sex, but it is impossible not to mention it, just as it is impossible not to say that it is the most vulnerable link in the personality in this context. Especially when it comes to men, whose sexual sphere is at least an order of magnitude thinner and more vulnerable than that of women. Therefore, the slogan: "Take care of men!" is not as ridiculous and wild as it looks at first glance.

Probably the strangest thing would seem to be that Logic participates in intimacy as well. But it is. Human sex, especially in recent centuries, is necessarily speculative. "The Kama Sutra," Taoist theory, the orthodox essay "A Se Sin," which regulates positions in bed, recommendations from authoritative friends and relatives, and a host of other purely mental injections largely determine the kind and content of human sex. So even Logic is an indispensable participant in our intimate lives.

Thus, sex is one of the few, if not the only, spheres of human life in which the entire human personality, without exception, the entire order of functions, participates. And may you pardon my cynicism, the bed is the best, the ideal testing ground in which human nature is tested and perfected.

True, there is another activity that could be called "protosex" or "abbreviated sex" - it is dancing and dancing necessarily in pairs (first of all, Latin American dancing). In dancing a consensus on the Will (where and how to move together) is constantly being searched for, an adequacy is being searched for in terms of Emotion, both in relation to the partner and to the music, a measure of bodily closeness and the

strength of touch is determined in terms of Physics. Only there is no Logic in dancing, so it is better to call it "shortened sex."

Finally, going back to where we started, in addition to sex and dancing, I will name the third and most effective way to harmonize the personality - love "agape" and about it our next story.

* * *

To get a concrete idea of what "agape" looks like and what it provides, let us turn to the history of the relationship between Anton Chekhov and Lidia (Lika) Mizinova. In the form of a diagram, this relationship can be represented as follows:

"Chekhov (A. Chekhov) Dumas (L. Mizinova)

1) Physics 1) Physics

2) Will 2) Emotion

3) Emotion 3) Will

4) Logic 4) Logic

Some of Chekhov's contemporaries thought that there was no great love in his life, and they were wrong. Chekhov loved and was loved, only his romance with Lika Mizinova proceeded in a form specific to their "agape" psychotypes.

They met under unusual and at the same time characteristic circumstances. When Lika Mizinova first came to the Chekhovs' house, and Chekhov was taken to get acquainted with her, it suddenly turned out that the guest had disappeared, and she was only accidentally found hiding behind a coat rack. It seemed that something to be afraid of this unusually beautiful girl at a meeting with a still at that time, a young and just beginning to gain fame writer? And the secret was Lika's 3rd Will.

A "philistine," who generally does not feel very confident in any environment, is lost in strange, unfamiliar territory. In the presence of a large number of new people, especially if they have a noticeable social weight. The initial sense of the hostility of the world in such a situation aggravates the sense of danger in the 3rd Will, sowing panic and thoughts of flight as the most convenient solution to the problem in the cowardly soul of the "petty bourgeois. Parallel to the confusion with Lika Mizinova is the example of the embarrassment of Peter the Great, who, on arriving at the reception of the Elector of Brandenburg and finding that she was greeting him with his entire family, covered his face with his hands and fled.

However, however, Chekhov and Mizinova got to know each other, time made their relationship closer and closer, but the romance itself began only three years

after they met. The correspondence between Mizinova and Chekhov is the only full-fledged evidence of their love, and anyone who would like to trace its history in all its subtleties and nuances must turn directly to it. We will confine ourselves to a few quotations.

The novel between Chekhov and Mizinova, or, to interpret the situation broadly, the novel between "Chekhov" and "Dumas," can best be characterized as a giggle novel. Both in their 1st Physique are cheerful, jovial people; Chekhov in his 2nd Will and 3rd Emotion was prone to good-natured irony, Lika in her 2nd Emotion and 3rd Will was just as no stranger to jokes, though with a certain amount of venom. So the general jocular tone with which they colored their relationship was comfortable enough for both of them. A different thing is that when the relationship entered that phase which requires open speech, they were never able to overcome this giggling intonation and the direct word "I love" with full openness was never uttered.

The tragedy of "agape," where, as in this case, the processional Will and Emotion intersect, is that one has the spirit (2nd Will) to utter the cherished word, but it is absent from his vocabulary (3rd Emotion). Whereas another knows the word (2nd Emotion), but lacks the nerve to utter it (3rd Will). Thus, chuckling, they usually move towards each other, "Czechs" and "Dumas", painfully enlarging their vocabulary and gathering their spirits on the way. And the question of whether they will manage to get so close that it is time for them to openly express their feelings cannot be answered unequivocally.

The dynamics and specificity of "agape" in this combination can be well seen in the correspondence between Chekhov and Mizinova. First, she wrote to him in her somewhat mannerly, but emotionally open style. He responded in his own manner: calmly, dryly, ironically. She took offense and wrote: "Your letters, Anton Pavlovich, outrageous. You will write a whole page, and there will appear only three words, and moreover, the silliest. Having reproached Chekhov for his emotional inadequacy, Mizinova, due to her lack of character, nevertheless, did not dare to insist on her style of expression, and lowered her tone a little, although she did not make it identical to Chekhov's giggling. This is how they corresponded, speaking of their love only in a joking, snide manner, though not without flinching on her part: "Really, I deserve a little more from your side than the joking and mocking attitude I receive. If you only knew how much I sometimes have trouble with jokes.

Three years had passed since they had met before Chekhov tried to unclench the mouth of the third Emotion and speak directly about his feelings. He wrote: "Alas, I am already an old young man, my love is not the sun and makes no spring either for me or for the bird I love. However, Chekhov would not have been himself if, frightened by his alien straightforwardness of speech, he had not crossed out the

above lines with a sarcastic quotation from a romance: "Lika, it's not you I love so ardently! I love in you my past suffering and my lost youth.

Not having found at once what to say to this strange half-recognition, Mizinova did not respond adequately until SIX YEARS later. She began by mirroring a quote from a romance:

"Shall my days be clear, dull,
Will I soon perish, ruining my life,
One thing I know is that until the grave
Thoughts, feelings, and songs, and strength
All for you!!!" -

She went on to write: "I could have written this eight years ago, but I am writing it now, and I will write it in ten years. Unfortunately, Mizinova's response was so hopelessly late that continuing the dialogue was out of the question by then.

As on the emotional line, the relationship between Chekhov and Mizinova on the Will line was difficult. "Weak-willed" (according to the observations of those around her) Lika took Chekhov's jokes painfully at her expense. "I know very well that if you say or do anything offensive, it is not at all out of a desire to do it on purpose, but simply because you do not really care how they accept what you do," wrote Mizinova, retrospectively aware of the spitelessness of Chekhov's jokes. But in hindsight. At first, it seemed to her, mistrustful, that the constant jokes, doled out to her by the unsuspecting, mentally healthy Chekhov, carried insulting overtones. She exploded in response and began to say mean things. He was puzzled and started talking about her "bad character", which was pure truth. Complicating the situation was the fact that Mizinova, being herself a distrustful and fickle person, doubted the seriousness and depth of Chekhov's feelings, and his outward coldness unwittingly fed her suspicions.

Here, taking a break from the correspondence for a while, it should be noted that in addition to it there is another monument of this love - the story "Ariadne", which, however, presents only Chekhov's view of the problems of their relationship. However, by signing one of her letters to Chekhov as Ariadne, Mizinova attested to the authenticity of the story and apparently recognized the fairness of the unflattering characterization Chekhov gave her in the story. Judging from "Ariadne", the essence of Chekhov's claims to Lika were as follows: "By the beautiful face and beautiful forms I judged the mental organization, and every, word of Ariadne, every smile delighted me, bribed me and made me assume in her a sublime soul. She was affectionate, talkative, cheerful, easy to handle, poetically believed in God, poetically talked about death, and in ***her mental structure was such a wealth of shades***, that even its shortcomings, she could give some special, nice properties ...

My love, my adoration, touched Ariadne, moved her, and she longed to be as enchanted as I was, and to respond to my love as well. After all, it is so poetic!

But she could not really love like I did, because she was cold and already spoiled enough. There was already a demon in her, whispering to her day and night that she was charming and divine, and she, who certainly did not know what she was made for and what she had been given life for, imagined herself in the future no differently, she imagined herself to be very rich and noble; she dreamed of balls, races, livery, a sumptuous drawing-room, her own salon, and a whole swarm of counts, princes, envoys, famous artists and entertainers, all worshipping her and admiring her beauty and dressing gowns... This thirst for power and personal success, and these constant thoughts all in the same direction, dishearten people, and Ariadne was cold: to me, and to nature, and to music...

She dreamed of a title, of brilliance, but at the same time she didn't want to miss me. No matter how much you dream of envoys, your heart is not made of stone, and you can feel sorry for your youth. Ariadne tried to fall in love, pretended to love me, and even swore her love. ***But I am a nervous, sensitive man; when I am loved, I feel it even at a distance, without assurances or oaths***, there was a coldness about me, and when she spoke to me of love, it seemed to me that I could hear a metallic nightingale singing. Ariadne herself felt that she was short of powder, she was vexed, and more than once I saw her crying...

Then my love entered its last phase, its last quarter.

"Be the old fool, love me a little," said Ariadne, leaning toward me, "You are sullen and sensible, ***afraid to give in to the impulse and*** think all about the consequences, and this is boring. Well, I beg you, I beg you, be gentle! My pure, my holy, my dear, I love you so much!"

I became her lover. For at least a month I was like a madman, experiencing nothing but rapture. Holding her young, beautiful body in my arms, enjoying it, feeling her warmth every time I woke up from sleep, and remembering that she was here, she, my Ariadne-oh, this was not easy to get used to! But I got used to it, and little by little I became conscious of my new position. First of all, I realized that Ariadne did not love me, as before. But she wanted to love seriously, she was afraid of loneliness, and the main thing was that I was young and healthy and strong, while she was sensual, like all cold people in general-and we both pretended that we came together out of mutual passionate love. Then I realized something else as well...

The main, so to speak, the main characteristic of this woman was an amazing guile. She was cunning all the time, every minute, apparently without any need for it, but as if by instinct, by the way a sparrow chirps or a cockroach moves its whiskers. She was sly with me, with the footmen, with the porter, with the shopkeepers, with acquaintances; no conversation, no meeting, could be avoided without a little

mockery and deception. It was necessary for a man-whether he was a Gardon or a Baron-to enter our room, and she would change her gaze, her expression, her voice, and even the contours of her figure...

And all this in order to be liked, to have success, to be charming! She woke up every morning with one thought: "To be liked!" And that was the purpose and meaning of her life. If I had told her that there was a man who didn't like her on such and such a street in such and such a house, it would have made her seriously suffer...

Often, watching her sleep, or eat, or try to give her eyes a naïve expression, I wondered: why was she given this extraordinary beauty, grace, intelligence? Was it only to lie in bed, to eat and lie, to lie endlessly? And was she clever? She was afraid of three candles, of the thirteenth, she was terrified of the evil eye and bad dreams, she talked about free love, and in general, about freedom, like an old mantis, she assured me that Boleslav Markevitch was better than Turgenev. But she was devilishly cunning and witty, and in society she knew how to appear a very educated, advanced person.

It cost her nothing even to insult a servant or kill an insect, even in a jolly minute; she loved bullfighting, loved reading about murders, and got angry when defendants were acquitted.

I was in the position of that greedy, passionate self-serving man who would suddenly discover that all his dimes were false. The pure, graceful images that my love-fueled imagination had cherished for so long, my plans, my hopes, my memories, my views on love and woman-all these now laughed at me and showed me their tongue."

As we know, Mizinova did not begin to swear in love with Chekhov until many years after their affair, but otherwise the story "Ariadne" is impeccably accurate, and it reproduces with striking completeness not just an individual personality, but the "Dumas" in his female incarnation, the charming predatory woman. It is also true that, while sensual and sensitive, women of this type are, in the depths of their being, completely cold and, by virtue of their 3rd Will, more eager for love than capable of feeling it. However, their game of love is impeccable, and, as the story says, only the "nervousness", the "sensitivity" of Chekhov's refined 3rd Emotion allowed him to feel the well temperature of the lining of the supposedly hot feelings directed at him.

But let us return to the chronology. Not having waited for Chekhov's open and direct declaration of love, Lika, "with annoyance" and in order to push things along, began to flirt defiantly with Levitan. Chekhov, for whom such a style of relationship was completely unacceptable, was mortally offended and became even colder. However, after a while, apparently, there was an explanation and their relations were restored. They even went on a trip together to the Caucasus, but the

trip was disrupted. And from that moment the sunset of their love began, they gave each other everything they could. Having suffered enough, tired and devastated, they exchanged half-fond farewell confessions. Chekhov wrote: "In you, Lika, sits a big crocodile, and, in fact, I do well to listen to common sense, rather than the heart, which you bit. Further, further from me! Or no, Lika, that's as far as it goes: let my head whirl with your spirits and help me tighten the harness you've already thrown around my neck.

I can imagine your gloating and demonic laughter as you read these lines... Ah, I seem to be writing nonsense. Tear up this letter. Sorry the letter is so illegible, and don't show it to anyone. Ah, ah!" Lika replied: "And how I would (if I could) tighten the harness tighter! But the wrong man's hat! For the first time in my life so unlucky!" From there on their paths were finally parted. But both of them kept both grateful memories of each other and sorrow for the separation until the end of their days.

It might seem that the romance between Chekhov and Mizinova should be classified as a failure. So thought everyone: the people who knew them well, researchers of Chekhov's work - argued only about who was to blame, who loved and who did not respond to the feeling. And they were wrong. The mistake is that it is customary to classify as successful only those novels that end in a legal marriage, safely stretching to the grave. But this is a fallacy. Love is lucky when it is fruitful, when it enriches, everything else is from the evil one. And the romance between Chekhov and Mizinova is a clear example of this.

Unfortunately, history has not preserved for us any evidence of significant changes that took place under Chekhov's influence in Lika Mizinova's inner world. But the very fact of her, albeit belated, open declaration of love to Chekhov speaks volumes, that their acquaintance was not a gift for Mizinova, it gave her the resolve she lacked before, strengthened the spirit of the Third Will that was wavering.

As for the evidence of the profound changes in Chekhov's soul caused by Lika, there are a great many of them, not less than a volume. Specialists have noted that by the mid-1990s, i.e., by the time of the twilight of their novel, Chekhov was in a qualitatively new period of creativity, a new voice had emerged. But in this case we are interested not so much in the fact that this period is blessed with unusually deep and strong works, but, above all, in the fact that under the pen of the writer a **theme of love**, almost **forbidden for the third Emotion**, rang loudly and widely. Once Chekhov so overcame his emotional stiffness that he even put the word "love" in the title ("About Love"). Such a title for the 3rd Emotion is the height of freedom of feeling, and if Chekhov had put an exclamation mark after the word "love", he could have been credited with the 1st Emotion. During this period, in addition to About Love, he wrote The House with the Mezzanine, Ariadne, The Lady with the Dog, and The Seagull. Chekhov even radically reworked his almost

written "Three Years" for a new theme, filling with love problems the work, previously entirely devoted to scenes from merchant life.

Researchers have usually correlated with Mizinova in Chekhov's work only those things in The Seagull or Ariadne that were directly associated with her biography or character traits. But in reality her influence was immeasurably greater. Lika didn't just open the subject of love to Chekhov; she "solved" it for him. It was thanks to Lika that he was able to talk not only about the feelings aroused directly by her, but also about his hobbies that preceded and followed their romance (Chekhov's letters to his wife - a vivid confirmation of this). Of course, Mizinova did not teach Chekhov to feel, but she unclenched the mouth of the third Emotion and taught him to speak openly, naturally and loudly about his experiences. And for the owner of the 3rd Emotion, this is the greatest and most precious gift.

* * *

Hopefully, having grasped exactly why "agape" is the most promising and fruitful kind of love, the reader must obviously ask himself the question: How, in the crossroads of the processional functions, should the resultant functions stand so that "agape" can produce the greatest effect? This question is not idle, because in order to achieve true harmony, it is not enough to heal the ulcer according to the Third Function; it is necessary for the resultant functions to be realized as much as possible.

To understand which position of the resultant functions is most favorable in "agape," let us turn to the story of Boris Pasternak's second marriage. The experience of this marriage yielded a partly negative result, but, as it happens in science, the negative result in this case was no less pronounced than the positive one. What makes Pasternak's second marriage even more interesting is that some psychotypical patterns of partner change can be traced.

I hope that what was said before about Pasternak's first marriage has not yet been forgotten, so I will immediately give a diagram of the relationship between the spouses, only this time not as a couple, but in a triangle made up of the relations of the poet himself, his first (Evgenia Pasternak) and second (Zinaida Pasternak) wife:

"Akhmatova" "Pasternak" "Pushkin"

(E.Pasternak) (B.Pasternak) (Z.Pasternak)

- 1) Will 1) Emotion
- 2) Emotion 2) Will 2) Physics
- 3) Logic 3) Physics 3) Will

- 4) Physics 4) Logic 4) Logic

Even a passing glance at the scheme suggests what and for what Pasternak was changing, divorcing in one case and marrying in the other. Low-ranking Logic and high-ranking Emotion remained attractive to the poet even after his first marriage. His attitude to the problem of interaction by processional functions was radically changed: Physics and Will. In a word, Pasternak's "pseudophilia" of his first marriage was replaced by "agape" with identity according to the resultant functions. And it is difficult not to suspect that there was a pattern to this change.

Explaining the origins of his attachment to Zina, the poet once wrote: "She is as stupid, ridiculous and primal as I am. Just as pure and holy with perfect depravity, just as joyful and gloomy." Pasternak seemed to perceive his second wife as being psychologically identical with himself and was, it must be said, not far from the truth. The resultant functions were indeed the same, and the crosshairs on the processional ones, while differing in values, gave a long-term commonality of interests. It was this crossover that attracted them to each other and kept them together to the grave.

No matter who wrote about this marriage, everyone agreed that Pasternak was attracted to Zinaida Nikolayevna by her 2nd Physics. Anna Akhmatova remarked venomously on this subject: "All around saw from the very beginning that she was rude and vulgar, but he did not see, he was blindly in love. Since there was absolutely nothing to admire, he admired the fact that she herself washed the floors ..." Other tone, but about the same Pasternak's son wrote in the "Materials for the biography" of his father: "Zinaida Nikolayevna Neuhaus was verbose. She took care of the family, the two sons, the oldest of which was the fifth, and the youngest was three years old. Heinrich Gustavovich (Neuhaus - first husband of Z. Pasternak, a famous musician - AA) with a strange pride repeated that his practical skills are limited to the ability to fasten an English pin - everything else does Zina. It was said that in long-suffering Civil War Kiev she got firewood, heated the conservatory hall, cleaned it, and brought a grand piano to put on a Neuhaus concert, which was a huge success.

When he visited his brother on the same property, Pasternak would catch her doing housework - washing laundry, which she then starched and ironed, scrubbing floors, and cooking. **He would rush to help** - to fetch water from the well, to gather and fetch wood for the stove. She refused, saying she was used to doing everything herself.

The departure was approaching. They did not leave at once. According to Zinaida Nikolayevna's recollections, two families - hers and Boris Pasternak's - were left at the end. Horses to go to the station had to be served early in the morning. They were getting ready at night. She already had everything stowed away when she went to see if the Pasternaks were ready. Yevgenia carefully packed the summer works and Pasternak carefully packed the suitcases, with the neatness she had learned as a child. Time was running out. She rushed to help and without unnecessary thoughts and precautions resolutely and quickly finished packing. Pasternak was delighted.

"Did I want a sweeter life?

No, not at all; I wanted to

Only to escape from the thicket

Polusnov and half-deal.

But where would I get my strength from?

If it were the night of the gathering for me

A whole life has not been displaced

Dreaming in Irpin?"

Pasternak's admiration for the "night of assembly" is easily explained. The plasticity of the 2nd Physique is very attractive in general; one cannot help but delight the eye with her quick, precise, dexterous movements. It is doubly attractive when you yourself are painfully experiencing your own helplessness, lack of movement and when next to irritate slow careless swarming wife with the 4th Physika. I think, too, Zinaida Nikolayevna, against the background of her husband's quiet consumerism, appreciated Pasternak's desire, albeit without much skill, but to help her. In short, it is on the domestic soil tied the first knot of their future strong connection. Further life together only strengthened this formed on the basis of everyday life, and almost thirty years after the "night of packing" Pasternak wrote "...The passionate diligence of my wife, her ardent dexterity in everything, in laundry, cooking, cleaning, raising children created a home comfort, garden, lifestyle and daily routine, the quietness and peace necessary for work."

Since physics became one of the two main components of the Pasternaks' mutual attraction, it is natural that sex played a prominent role in their relationship along with domesticity. Pasternak was struck by Zinaida's story of how, when she was still a gymnasium student, she cohabited for three years with her forty-five-year-old cousin. He later described this affair in Doctor Zhivago as the story of Lara and Komarovsky. To understand the nature of Pasternak's strange attention to a long-ago episode in Zinaida Nikolayevna's life, it must be noted that the 3rd Physicist, with outward squeamishness, harbors a secret constant and painful

interest in "vice," that is, simply put, in the open, natural expression of sexuality. It attracts and frightens the 3rd Physique. The attraction in this case prevailed, and life eventually confirmed Pasternak's correct choice. Zinaida Nikolayevna easily, without affectation and with pleasure satisfied his eternal sexual hunger, and with her simple-hearted attitude to eroticism, made his previously painful attitude to this sphere healthier, which, however, later turned into numerous infidelities of her husband.

At the same time, the interaction in Physics gave the Pasternaks not only flowers. Zinaida was too serious about money to allow her husband to work on the desk, so Pasternak had to sit down to translations, and it is not hard to guess that this was not done without gnashing his teeth.

Adding to the tension in Physics was the fact that Zinaida Nikolayevna, like all "Pushkins," had a penchant for salty language. The fact is that the 2nd Physique does not assume censorship in what concerns human physiology, easily and directly expressed in terms of the most intimate aspects of life. This mode of expression was completely alien to Pasternak's 3rd Physique and brought him to the point where he began to roof his wife with "a parquet storm, having been to the hairdresser and having gained vulgarity."

However, no matter how much Pasternak rebelled against literary day labor and salty words, everything he received from Zinaida Nikolayevna certainly more than compensated for the inconvenience. She satiated his irrepressible sexuality, provided a maximum of household amenities, accustomed him to the much-needed physical labor. Fellow authors were puzzled and dumbfounded to often catch the big poet digging with his wife in the garden or pickling cucumbers in her company. But in fact, there was no posturing in the behavior of the spouses; physical interaction was a sincere and urgent need of their natures.

Relations in the sphere of volitional interaction were not simple either. Testimonies of the immediate participants in the drama have not survived and, perhaps, there were none at all. So I will risk illustrating the relationships in Pasternak's family with quotations from the lives of people who lived long before him.

A very similar situation happened in the family of Alexander Herzen: his wife Natalia, with her 2nd Will, fell out of love with Herzen's own 1st Will and fell in love with the 3rd Will of the poet Herve. When it came to figuring out the relationship between the spouses, Natalia tried to convey her feelings to her husband as follows: "You have a slack corner, and it suits your character very well; you don't understand the longing for the tender attention of your mother, your friend, your sister, which so torments Gerweg. I understand him, because I feel it myself... He's a big child, and you're an adult, he can be made happy by a trifle. He will die of a cold word, he must be spared... but with what infinite gratitude he thanks for the slightest attention, for warmth, for participation." That is, having

suffered enough from the pure individualism, aloofness ("detachment") and deafness of Herzen's 1st Will, Natalia's 2nd Will saw in the manifestations of Herveg's 3rd Will the possibility of interaction. Simply put, Natalia **piti**ed and pitied someone who needed pity. Not without reason, in the olden days the words "to love" and "to pity" were almost synonyms in Russian language. Pasternak "pitied" the childish 3rd Will of Zinaida Neuhaus with his parental, adult 2nd Will and found in this pity, in this feeling a kind of comfort.

Zinaida Neuhaus's consolation was in the fact that she was not beaten up, but pitied and corrected in the twists and turns of her soul. Between her and Pasternak happened what happened between the young Pushkin and his first friend Pushchin. Pushchin said: "Pushkin, from the very beginning, was more irritable than most, and therefore did not excite general sympathy: it is the lot of an eccentric being among people. Not that he played any role between us or afflicted by any particular strangeness, as it was in others; but sometimes inappropriate jokes, awkward taunts himself put in a difficult situation, not being able then to get out of it. This led him to new lapses, which never escape in school relations. I, as a neighbor (he had a blank wall on the other side of the room), often, when everyone was asleep, would talk to him in a low voice through the partition about some of the silliness of the day; here I could see clearly that he ascribed some importance to all the silliness, and it worried him. Together we smoothed out some of the rough stuff as best we could, though we did not always succeed. There was a mixture of excessive courage and shyness in him, both of which were out of place, which thus harmed him... To love him in this way, it was necessary to look at him with that full disposition, which knows and sees all the irregularities of character and other shortcomings, put up with them and ends up loving even them in a friend-companion." If we remember that Zinaida Neuhaus belonged to the "Pushkin family", then the picture given by Pushchin can be easily and confidently transferred to her relationship with Pasternak.

Zinaida Nikolayevna was certainly impressed by Pasternak's calm faith in himself, his determination. She was especially pleased and at the same time frightened by the decisiveness with which, after a mutual declaration of love, the poet decided their future fate. First, he came to her husband, his friend Heinrich Neuhaus and openly said everything, then completely opened up to his wife. What such explanations are worth, only those who have experienced them know. What about her? She, as usual 3rd Will, quick with words but not deeds, began to wiggle; she lied, retracted her words, came up with various options for living together, in which it would be possible to exist without changing anything. He brought everything he had to the altar of love, she was not that she didn't want it, but she was afraid to lay anything on it. A stalemate was forming, in which Pasternak, by his 2nd Will, having quickly passed his share of the way, did not undertake to force Zinaida to pass her share, while she herself, by her 3rd Will, did not dare to do so. The matter was heading for disaster. Having destroyed his family, having lost faith in the love

of his new girlfriend, Pasternak tried to commit suicide. Fortunately, the attempt failed. The period of staggering took almost a year and ended with a joint departure for the Caucasus. But even in this relatively short period, much in the poet's soul was forever buried, and the subsequent betrayals, open dislike to his wife were largely due to the fact that he did not understand and have not forgiven her the staggered initial period of their love.

Pasternak's letters from this period give a vivid picture of the way of thinking of the Second Will in such a critical situation. Here is an excerpt from one letter: "If you are strongly drawn back to Garrigue (Neuhaus - A.A.), trust your feeling. Bravely speaking for you: it will pull you forward to him, everything between you will go its great life, behind which you will forget whether or not what happened is correctable ... ". There is no posturing in these lines; they accurately reflect the poet's mood. The freedom and good of the woman he loved was indeed more precious to him than anything else. He wanted one thing - clarity in the relationship, but it is clarity could not make a weak-kneed, restless 3rd Will Zinaida Nikolayevna. It is good that the period of hesitation lasted a relatively short time, less than a year, otherwise the consequences could have been most awful.

I speak with confidence of Pasternak's comparative luck, because I know exactly the same combination, where the hesitation lasted not a year, but three years (!). I think the Pasternaks' relationship was largely saved by the fact that Neuhaus, who already had a second family at the time, did not cling too tightly to his wife and did not intimidate her with the impending uncertainty. In the case I know, this was not the case.

Briefly, the essence of the familiar case is as follows: as in the case described above, an affair between a married "Pasternak" and a married "Pushkina" spun up. The reasons of mutual attraction of these psychotypes were described above, so we will not repeat them. "Pasternak" with his 2nd Will had enough of his character to realize the seriousness of his feelings and divorce as soon as possible. And then - stop. "Pushkin" is not married and is not quick to make decisions and take actions, but in this case, there was a spouse with the same 3rd Will, whose feeble character made indecisiveness of "Pushkin" square. There was everything between the spouses "burghers": tears, cries, insults, threats, entreaties - there was only no action. Both took a wait-and-see position, shifting the weight of the decision on the other side, expecting from himself what he himself was not capable of. As for "Pasternak", his 2nd Will was only enough to put his affairs in order, but he could not, by definition, force the will of his girlfriend. There was a stalemate situation, which seemed to be resolved only by the death of one of the participants in the drama; it came to the point that one of them would risk to alleviate the common fate by laying hands on himself, and only by chance saved the situation: the divorce after three years took place. However, none of the participants in the drama, exhausted and devastated, was happy about it; each had received a once desired but by then hopelessly depreciated gift, with which it was not clear what to do and where to apply it.

I tell you this story not out of tendency to idle talk, but as an admonition: no matter how attractive the possessor of the 3rd Will is to you, do not have an affair with him if he is married. If you are not sure of the fact that you have a third will, you should not have an affair with him if he is a married man.

However, let us return to Boris and Zinaida Pasternak. As is always the case with "agape", the most difficult in their relationship was the initial period of their life together. But in time their relationship leveled off, and twenty years after they met, Pasternak wrote: "... my life with Zina is real." Few people are capable of such a confession after so many years of life together. The culprit for this stability of the relationship was obviously "agape" love. But the question arises: what effect did the identity of the 1st Emotion have on the spouses? Did it contribute to the harmonization of their personalities?

There is no doubt that Boris Pasternak achieved a high degree of harmony after his second marriage - his poems of the last decades are a vivid testimony to this. But the same cannot be said of Zinaida Pasternak. Quite the contrary. A second marriage strangely impoverished her inner world. Before, being married to Neuhaus, she was keenly interested in artistic life and showed promise as a pianist herself. In her second marriage all this gradually disappeared, her books and the piano were neglected. The circle of interests of Zinaida Pasternak narrowed to everyday life and slapping greasy cards on the table.

I will try to give my own explanation to this phenomenon. Evidently, while Zinaida Nikolayevna was married to Neuhaus, the combination of the 1st Emotion and the unhealed and, therefore, frantically ambitious 3rd Will, characteristic of her psychotype, consistently tuned her to artistic activity. When she married Pasternak, he healed her ulcer with his Third Will, thereby relieving her of her ambitious itch and instilling his own attitude to fame ("It is ugly to be famous"). Thus, Zinaida's additional stimulus to artistic activity disappeared, leaving only the need that could have been dictated by the 1st Emotion alone. Even here, however, self-expression was hampered by the proximity of her husband. Since Pasternak himself had the most powerful First Emotion, he unwittingly simply blocked her, albeit also the First, but a weaker Emotion, with the trumpet voice of his experiences. What was left for Zinaida Pasternak? - Exploiting her 2nd Physics, hanging out in the kitchen, in the vegetable garden and sulking at cards.

From the outside, Zinaida Pasternak began to look like a creature to the extreme, maybe even **excessively** down-to-earth. That is, her 2nd Physics has acquired the features of the 1st Physics, including the main feature of any First Function - EXCEPTION. And there is a certain regularity in this fact, which can be formulated as follows: *the First Function, overlapped by extraneous ones, gives the Second Function features of the First, including redundancy, effectiveness, monologuing, etc., which are typical for the latter.* In general, I call for myself the phenomenon of this kind, in which with the First function blocked or unrealized, the Second function takes on its appearance, "the phenomenon of the First without

result," and it is one of the many deceptions that await any researcher on his psychognostic path.

From what has been said about Pasternak's second family as a whole two very important conclusions follow. First, if the partners' First Functions are identical, one of them overlaps the other Second, the final, ideal "love system" is "full agape," a crossing over the processional functions with a crossing over the productive functions. As in the diagram:

HE HAS

- 1) 1)
- 2) 2)
- 3) 3)
- 4) 4)

Such a combination gives both partners the opportunity for maximum self-fulfillment and makes it possible to achieve true inner and outer harmony.

At the same time, we would certainly like to warn that it would be a cruel mistake for someone who decides, having found himself in a situation of "full agape," that not only extremely fruitful, but also easy relationships await him. This is not the case. It is the opposite. There is nothing among the systems of human relationships more burdensome than "full agape. It requires a long-term, almost inhuman tension of all the mental, mental and physical powers of man, because in the creature standing opposite he sees practically nothing that could explain the mechanism of the invisible but irresistible force that draws them to each other. There is nothing bright, alluring, magical in "full agape," as in "eros," nothing related, as in "phylia. Everything is alien and almost faded. Confounded by the perfect strangeness of the being who is near, the man in "full agape" is inclined to consider his love affair a demonic obsession, and constant attempts to escape are almost indispensable companions of this system of relations.

The bitter truth is that the most fruitful human relationships are also the most burdensome. It can't be helped--the dialectic of life.

Now to summarize "The Syntax of Love," we can say that the entire love problematic is exhausted by four models of relationships: "eros," The "pseudophilia", where everything is bright, magically-attractive, but uncomfortable and unproductive; "filia", where everything is comfortable, but dim and unproductive; and "agape", an inconvenient, not very bright, but fruitful system of relationships. There is no other, and one's entire life goes on in this rather close but insurmountable circle of psychological rotations.

Of course, it would be good if, craving for perfection, in the manner of the bride in Gogol's "Marriage," we could put Nicanor Ivanovich's lips to Ivan Kuzmich's nose and add some of Baltasar Baltasarovitch's looseness, but, alas, this is impossible, and maybe it's good that it is. Because our personal imperfection, the imperfection of our relationships, is the only source of life and movement. The

brightest alternative to our hectic but bubbly existence today is the life of Adam and Eve in paradise, that is, the life of two perfect beings in a perfect environment-- good, comfortable, but boring, isn't it?

"Always alone, eye-to-eye, husband and maiden.

On the banks of bright rivers Eden

In tranquility led an innocent age.

The monotony of their days was boring.

Neither grove shade, nor youth, nor idleness

Nothing resurrected love in them;

Hand and hand walked, drank, ate,

Yawned during the day, and at night had no

No passionate games, no living joys..."

(Pushkin, "Gavriliada")

A LETTER

The problem of couples is not a new one. However, recent times have given it a special urgency. The fact is that in the past it was relatively rare to encounter the issue of compatibility of couples, since the paired family was a rarity until recently. In the olden days there were usually several generations living under one roof with all their many offshoots, and this could not but affect the atmosphere of the relationship. Large families, family artels and workshops, close peasant and urban communities, all this allowed a person to spend a lifetime among numerous relatives and to find individuals among them with an order of functions that would compensate for all the imperfections of marriage.

It is different now. The urbanization of society and the greater economic independence of individuals increasingly leave spouses face to face. And not all of them stand such a test. How can one not recall the brilliantly lapidary lines from a song by Vladimir Vysotsky:

"There's so much to do in a day;

You come home - there you sit..."

The book "Syntax of Love" is designed to exclude this kind of situation from life or, at the very least, to alleviate it.

A character in a famous novel by Oscar Wilde wondered, "Can psychology ever, through our efforts, become an absolutely precise science, revealing the smallest impulses, every innermost feature of our inner life?" And it seems to me that it is psychosophy that can provide a positive answer to this long-standing question. Of course, while not exhausting the whole immeasurable palette of mental reactions, it is capable of predicting the system of human values and the behavior of an individual, as well as identifying those aspects of his psyche that he carefully conceals not only from others, but also from himself.

Perhaps reading "Syntax" will give cause for concern that some spouses, having discovered retrospectively all the imperfections of their marriage, will urgently break the customary bonds and, having determined the personal order of functions, will rush in search of a cross-eyed partner on the processional and the productive. I disagree. I don't think that's going to happen, and divorce in connection with the book is not going to be a widespread phenomenon. Fear of the unknown, the habit of living together, and the community of children and possessions are enough to ensure the durability of most families today. Moreover, acquaintance of less fortunate spouses with "Syntax of Love", I am sure, on the contrary, will greatly strengthen their marriage, since ***mutual misunderstanding is the main source of family troubles.*** If spouses have an idea of the order of functions in their partners, and with it an idea of the strengths and weaknesses of their natures, an idea of what to expect from them and what not to - their life together will become incomparably easier and more comfortable. This is why the book addresses not only the future, but also the present, and its purpose is not only to predict, but also to correct couples' relationships. Although, of course, I would like to hope that over time the need for correction will disappear. And love in all its fullness will become the only form of relationship between people.

The fears of those who would suspect in "Syntax of Love" the destroyer of amorous romance, the desecrator of the purest well, free from the contamination of reason, the drier of love, would be unfounded. Not at all. According to my observations, psychosophy is absolutely ineffective when it encounters "endocrine love", i.e. love that lives only by REA hormones, when mutual attraction is conditioned exclusively by a stormy work of endocrine apparatus ripe for passion and no properties of the object of love affect the choice except the fact that it first came in sight during an uncontrolled hormonal outburst. In this case psychosophy, even for the initiated, completely loses its power.

Besides, I can tell from my own experience that the hobby of psychosophy, exciting at first, is not a way of life. Trying psychic typology on oneself, relatives, co-workers, cartoon characters is interesting, amusing, useful, but like everything else in this world, of course. Having played enough with psychosophy, a man calmly sends it to subconsciousness, to the place where there is knowledge, which is not in daily demand. As before, he can light up, get excited, flame out, get jealous,

and even go astray over his subject. A different matter is that when after glances, gestures, smiles, mutterings and other, similar pleasures of the initial stage of amorous relations circumstances begin to demand **affairs, deeds, responsible behavior**, from the depths of subconsciousness psychosophy emerges with a saving circle and puts everything in its places: reasonably approving or not approving the choice. It helps a lot, I know from my own experience. Once, psychosophy pulled me away from the edge of the abyss by my hair when I was already blazing with love fever. And now, several years later, watching his former love, and knowing about her subsequent adventures, I can not tell you how glad I am that this cup passed me by.

In general, the remarkable property of psychosophy is that it does not feed or nourish illusions and does not deceive itself on its own account - in the sense of its efficacy. Being addressed primarily to the logical function of man, it is aware of the multiplicity of intellectual reactions and does not wait for popular recognition. Another important observation concerning psychosophy is that, having left the subconscious and returned to it, it still does not return to its former place, but somewhere on the line between intuition and knowledge. I deduce this from the fact that anyone who has mastered psychosophy has an immeasurably sharper mental vision, he does not become a robot busy constantly sticking psychotypical labels, but acquires a flair for certain functional vibrations and thus provides himself with a psychological comfort unknown before in contacts with others.

Like any system that objectifies perception, psychosophy does not paint the world. Science is science; it is neither honey nor warmongering. But psychosophy allows us to look around without disappointment, because **the best way not to be disappointed in people is not to be deceived about them**. In short, with "Syntax of Love" our unhappy life is made easier, simpler, more honest, more fearless.

I think we're thankful for that, too.

APPENDIX

REALITY

(RUSSIAN SUPREME POWER IN THE LIGHT OF PSYCHOSOPHY)

It is difficult to speak in any detail about the monarchical period of Russian history in the context of psychosophy. The Russian poets described the autocrats of that time as "Tartuffe in a skirt", "a weak and deceitful ruler", "not a tsar on the throne - a pretender", and thus confirmed the diagnosis that even a cursory glance at the genealogical tree of the Russian tsars provokes:

The 3rd Will reigned unchallenged among our monarchs. Moreover, judging by the fact that in the 18th century the Russian aristocracy, repeatedly faced with the choice, with rare consistency chose a "bourgeois" to be tsar, the secret of such stability was not only in the defective gene pool of the Romanov family.

On the contrary, it was heredity, playing on genes, which sometimes interrupted the bad infinity of the tsarist genealogy and placed on the Russian throne people with a high Will: Paul I and Alexander II. But let us note: they both ended their lives in martyrdom, and their violent deaths made a rather transparent allusion to the sincere attachment of society to the tsars of the 3rd Will, who corrected the defects of the hereditary monarchy by killing Tsarevich. It was not without reason that in the 19th century people liked to say that Russia was an absolute monarchy, reconciled by Tsarevicide. In any case, purely psychological motives were behind the murder of Paul I, and people with a subtle mental organization foresaw it long before it became a fait accompli. Frederick the Great prophetically wrote of Paul: "He seemed proud, arrogant and abrupt, which made those who knew Russia fear that he would not have difficulty in retaining his throne, which, being called upon to govern a rude and savage people, spoiled by the soft rule of several empresses, he might suffer the same fate as his unhappy father (Peter III - AA).

Russian society's preference for the 3rd Will had its reasons. The **fragility of her Will spared society from drastic movements, while preserving hopes for change**. The stability of the Romanov house was well explained by one of its English biographers, explaining the stability of the throne of Queen Elizabeth of England. He wrote: "...it was not only her intellect that did her inestimable service; it was also her character that helped. In him, in this combination of masculinity and femininity, power and sinuosity, perseverance and volatility, was precisely what her vocation demanded. Some deepest instinct had always kept her from making firm decisions. If she did take a decisive step, she would immediately deny it vehemently, and then deny her own renunciation even more vehemently. It was her nature to swim in calm waters and to frantically turn from tack to tack when the wind came. If she had been different, if she had had the ability, as a strong figure should, to choose a line of conduct and stick to it, she would have been in trouble.

The same is true of the history of the "bourgeois" Romanov dynasty. Although a "bourgeois" is a tyrant by definition, he is at the same time sensitive to those invisible vibes that permeate society and never goes into open confrontation with them. The main thing that constitutes the real "strength" of the "bourgeois" ruler is his weakness: weakness of will, timidity, indecision. It is therefore not surprising that, despite unsuccessful wars, famine, tyranny and executions, the "bourgeois" Romanov dynasty existed in Russia for three centuries without any serious shocks.

From the point of view of psychosophy, the situation in the country after the October revolution was much more interesting. The communist seizure of power led to a monarchy in Russia, but not a hereditary one, but, loosely speaking, a "narrowly elected" one. Not that it was entirely unprecedented, but in its principles it was very close to the papal system. The only difference was perhaps that the Politburo of the Soviet Communist Party, which already in Soviet Russia decided the fate of the supreme power, was ten times smaller in number than the Vatican conclave. Otherwise, it was the same.

If you ask me what is for psychosophy the particular attractiveness of the system of communist enthronement, you can answer briefly - in the purity of the

experiment. In this case the gene pool did not influence the choice in any way, did not muddy the waters, and in its natural form the psychotypical aspect of the choice came to the surface, the psychology of power manifested itself most clearly. After all, a certain psychotypical mechanism had to act here, taking the individual to the top of the social pyramid or overthrowing him from there, forming the politburo and deciding the fate of the supreme power. And now it is curious to trace these regularities.

* * *

There is no doubt that after the overthrow of the monarchy, Lenin or "Lenin" should have been at the head of Russia in the end. The simple-mindedness and stupidity of the bulk of the politicians of the time, especially intolerable during the war and the revolution, almost automatically cleared a place for the most ambitious, thinking and cynical politician. "Lenin, on the other hand, is ambitious (1st Will), intellectually strong and uninhibited (2nd Logic), and sensitive to people's needs (3rd Physics), and these components of this psychotype ensured Lenin the most favorable regime for seizing and retaining power in Russia.

Naturally, after the establishment of the Communist Party, and especially after the October revolution, Lenin's psychotypical environment, from which Lenin's successor was to emerge, was intensely shaped around him. Although Lenin himself rarely asked questions of this kind, much less pointed to anyone personally, his psychotypical sympathies narrowed the range of possible candidates by themselves.

Previously, in the section on the 1st Will, it has already been said that the "king" has a very bad relationship with the holders of superior Wills. He is not afraid of them, he respects them, but he cannot get along with them. Such people are too independent, and are no more than companions, where you need not companions, but an entourage. The "king" feels that the holders of a high Will **are not his people** and, widely using their services, tries not to let them close to him, to the higher echelons of power.

The "king" is not too fond of the Fourth Will either. He appreciates the "serf's" obedience, his performance, and his sincere loyalty. However, the 4th Will gives the "tsar" plenty of reasons to be irritated. It is not searching, its performance is straightforward, not sensitive, not artistic, and, most importantly, the Fourth Will has little initiative and is inclined to burden the ruler's life with a host of minor matters, which it could well solve itself. Hence Lenin's specific attitude to the "serfs" (Bukharin, Kamenev, Lunacharsky, Molotov, Kalinin, etc.), of whom he formed a sort of second, distant circle of his entourage, the second echelon of power.

The "king" usually gives all his sympathies to the 3rd Will. Although the 1st Will probably feels that it is not she who is loved, but her place, and the "bourgeois"

will not only not blink an eye when looking at the former ruler lying in the dust, but will certainly kick him. After all, the "tsar" is too self-assured to think seriously about his downfall, and the many specific virtues of the "bourgeois" as if in advance redeems his only intuitively perceived betrayal. The main virtues of the "philistine" are: he is in love with a strong will, in love with the Power and sincerely strives in their field, strives to be useful to them; he is searching, flexible, quick-witted, artistic in performing tasks and, although he sometimes fronds and rebels, it is even a pleasure for the "Tsar" to subdue his rebellion in order to hear the next day the "burgher" baldness banging against the floor, sobs of bitter repentance, to see downcast eyes and shaky hands. It was from such people (Trotsky, Zinoviev, Stalin) that Lenin formed his first, closest circle, from which his successor was to emerge.

At the same time, one cannot say that the selection work Lenin carried out in his entourage escaped the eyes not only of his contemporaries, but also of his comrades-in-arms. Prominent Party men (Osinski, Lutovinov) wrote to Lenin that he surrounded himself with "reliable and obedient" but dishonest men, helpless men with a "flexible backbone," but heard nothing but scolding from Lenin in return.

Thus the clear preference given by the "king" to the 3rd Will stipulates a certain kind of continuity of power and determines the face of the immediate political history of the country, including the impending demise of the state system established by the 1st Will. Just as Napoleon's 1st Will chose the compliant but ineffectual Marshal Grouchy to pursue Blücher, thus condemning Napoleon to defeat at Waterloo and the destruction of the empire, so Lenin's 1st Will, by making him the successor of the "bourgeois", conditioned the slow but gradual decline of the communist empire he had founded.

It is true that shortly before his death, Lenin seems to have come to his senses and, out of an innate pest of character, smeared his closest comrades-in-arms with mud in his "will. But this demarche had no effect. The pretenders to the throne simply concealed the "will" of their beloved leader and teacher from the people, although, in truth, there was no great need for it - the belated filibustering of the "will" could not wrest the levers of power from the hands of those whom Lenin himself had attached to them.

As Rozanov angrily but aptly noted, "Tolstoy was seen off by the Dobchinskys," so Lenin was buried by them. In 1924, Lenin died, and the question of his successor, which had long been ripe, was put to the test. There were three candidates: Trotsky, Stalin and Zinoviev. Schematically, the battle of these three "Dobchinski" can be represented as follows:

"DUMA." "ARISTIPP" "DUMA."

(L. TROTSKY) (I. STALIN) (G. ZINOVIEV)

1) Physics 1) Physics

2) Emotion 2) Logic 2) Emotion

3) Will 3) Will 3) Will

4) Logic 4) Emotion 4) Logic

It can be seen from this chart that all three are too similar to each other for the battle between them to be short-lived enough. All three are violent (the combination of the 1st Physics and the 3rd Will), ambitious, unprincipled, but not very decisive (the 3rd Will). Thus, with the identity of the First and Third Functions and disconnection of the Fourth in crisis situations, the fate of the Russian throne had to be decided by the Second Functions, or rather, the difference between them.

If the three fought for the chief director's chair in any theater, Stalin's case could have been considered lost in advance. But since in this case it was about the highest political post, then here, on the contrary, Stalin's victory was secured by nature itself.

While Trotsky and Zinoviev, having switched off the 4th Logic, were rehearsing their speeches with a passion peculiar to the 2nd Emotion, choosing catchwords and trying on expressions and intonations, Stalin was THINKING (2nd Logic). He had time to think over everything: who to kill, what kind of reshuffle among nomenklatura should be conducted in order to reduce the share of enemies and increase the share of supporters, how to adjust the room during the meetings, which solved the personnel issues, so that opponents were not allowed to speak. And as a man who took seriously the process of thinking and its fruits, he achieved the goals he set for himself. When Trotsky and Zinoviev flew up to the rostrum in order to win back all their lost points at once in their native rallying element, the room prepared by Stalin shut them up with Bolshevik directness. In short, in the struggle for political office "aristippe" certainly outplayed "dumas", and Stalin's victory over Trotsky and Zinoviev was fatally predetermined.

More generally, we can deduce the following pattern: in an indefinitely narrow system of succession to power, the place of the 1st Will is inevitably inherited by the 3rd Will, but not just by the 3rd Will, but by the one with Logic at the top. Thus, just as Lenin's seizure of power in 1917 was inevitable, so was Stalin's inheritance of his position inevitable.

The ascension to the throne of the 3rd Will forms around the new ruler a new, convenient environment for this psychotype, different from the one that previously surrounded the "Tsar". First, the holders of high Will, tolerated by the 1st Will in the periphery, are sent into political oblivion, because the "bourgeois" not only dislikes them, but is also afraid of them. Second, the 3rd Will, rightly judging by itself, is suspicious of tozhdiks, unstable in its attitude to them and trying, for safety's sake, to dilute its surroundings with holders of the 4th Will. Only in the circle of "serfs" does the 3rd Will feel truly comfortable, and under its sovereign hand the 4th Will gradually flows from the second echelon of power to the first.

A similar transformation took place in Stalin's entourage with his accession to the Russian throne. The High Will under him was subjected to total extermination, and here Stalin managed to realize the long-held dream of all tyrants: to organize not an ethnic, not a social, but the first all-encompassing **psychotypic genocide** - fortunately, the Communist Party and the NKVD were up to the task of this unique task.

As for Stalin's inner circle, the 3rd Will remained in the fold, but lost the majority (Beria, Khrushchev, Kaganovich, Mikoyan), and the 4th Will (Molotov, Kalinin, Voroshilov, Malenkov, Bulganin) unexpectedly established itself in key positions. Therefore, when it was Stalin's turn to take up the harp in the heavenly choir, the reins that had fallen from his hands fell unexpectedly but naturally into the sluggish hands of Malenkov. Although, come to think of it, it was not chance, but regularity that dictated this kind of succession: the death of a "bourgeois" ruler, who was as sincerely sympathetic to the Fourth Will as possible, almost automatically shifted the unbearable burden of power onto the shoulders of the "serf".

If you believe Khrushchev, Stalin in recent years liked to lament that they were poor (Politburo members), because after his death they would surely disappear. And, admittedly, he was not far from the truth. True, this prophecy did not cost him much, because he himself spent years on breeding work in the Politburo, consistently selecting for him the individuals with the worst physical, strong-willed and mental characteristics. The crowning moment of Stalin's activities in this kind can be considered the moment when he, already dying, called to him the most helpless subordinate - Malenkov and defiantly shook hands with him alone, almost a mafia gesture confirming his choice of a successor.

Everyone in Stalin's inner circle was aware of Malenkov's weak character. Later Khrushchev and Molotov spoke openly about it. And when people, themselves not distinguished by fortitude, talk about someone's weak character, then there can be no two opinions - we are talking about the 4th Will.

It is therefore not surprising that in the peculiar conditions of the Communist uncertainty and narrow election system, two of Malenkov's colleagues, Khrushchev and Beria, began to claim the throne that had already been occupied. Again, just as after Lenin's death, three people entered the battle for leadership: but the disposition scheme of the battle looked different already:

"PUSHKIN" "EPICURUS" "DUMAS"

(N. KHRUSHCHEV) (G. MALENKOV) (L. BERIA)

- 1) Emotion 1) Physics
- 2) Physics 2) Logic 2) Emotion
- 3) Will 3) Emotion 3) Will

4) Logic 4) Will

Leaving the harmless Malenkov as an appetizer, Khrushchev and Beria clashed to the death immediately after Stalin's death. Of course, according to the custom of the three Wills, they clashed not visibly, slyly, and their fight, as Churchill aptly put it, resembled a bulldog fight under the carpet. The result is well known: Beria lost and was shot. It would be possible to devote a separate essay to an analysis of why history decided the fates of the contenders in this way and not otherwise. It is only obvious that the result was influenced by many factors: Beria's Ober-Palatsky function, his forced departure to Berlin to suppress the uprising, and so on. But there was also a purely psychotypical aspect that predetermined Khrushchev's victory.

In themselves, "Pushkin" and "Dumas" are very similar types, the difference between them is limited to the intersection from the First to the Second function, and, for example, in everyday life, the struggle between them can drag on for years without any result. But politics is not everyday life, and, moreover, in this case the preference given to this or that type by the other members of the Politburo influenced the outcome of the fight. Therefore, despite the proximity of the types, Khrushchev's victory was quite natural.

"Dumas," the type to which Beria belonged, is generally ill-suited to serious political struggle. The "Dumas" are naturally lazy and, without superior supervision, are quick to relax, which is exactly what happened to Beria. Having outlived the overlord who had held him in fear, Beria decided that the job was done and undermined Khrushchev lazily, carelessly, and devoted most of his energy to what he was more interested in: chasing women (1st Physics) and performing operatic arias (2nd Emotion).

The "Pushkin" type, to which Khrushchev belonged, looks and acts differently in politics. Being no more thoughtful or cunning than "Dumas", "Pushkin" has the advantage of having the 2nd Physics, so he is energetic, agile, industrious, and this circumstance is crucial in this scenario of the struggle for power: it causes sympathy of his colleagues and awards him a bullish grip. Having quickly propagandized his cowardly Politburo colleagues, Khrushchev, with his usual energy, formalized the technical side of the conspiracy in a few days and put Beria up against the wall.

Further removal of Malenkov was already a matter of technique. Having been persuaded by the usual lies of Communist leaders in one of Malenkov's speeches, Khrushchev openly, simply, and unceremoniously snatched the reins from his sluggish hands, and Malenkov and his 4th Will had neither the desire nor the strength to fight for power in earnest. Thus, it took Khrushchev only a year after Stalin's death to get rid of his rivals and take the Russian throne.

* * *

Ten years would pass, and Beria would tangentially get Khrushchev out of the grave. Because Khrushchev, in turn, will be dethroned by Beria's psychological token, Brezhnev ("dumas").

However, why and how it happened should be said specifically.

Maybe against the background of "Dumas" "Pushkin" engaged in politics looks preferable, but you can not classify him as a successful politician. Hystericalness and inability to behave (the combination of the 1st Emotion and the 3rd Will), aimless vanity (the combination of the 2nd Physics and the 4th Logic) day by day multiply the ranks of opponents of "Pushkin" the ruler, until the cup overflows and he is sent to political oblivion.

Another question is who inherits the "Pushkin" throne. I do not know about other countries, but in Russia "Pushkin" is inevitably replaced by "Dumas. Talk of a system in the replacement of "Pushkin" by "Dumas" in Russia allows at least two precedents in Russian history: the election of Catherine the Great and Anna Ioannovna after the death of the ridiculously troublesome Peter the Great, and the successful plot against Khrushchev led by Brezhnev.

The mechanism of this pattern is quite transparent: tired of the chronically futile vanity of "Pushkin," society craves nothing more than to relax, rest, and calls "Dumas" to the throne. "Dumas" is a celebratory man, lazy, cunning, cruel, thieving, cheerful, charming, interspersing executions with feasts, award ceremonies, and fireworks. While "Dumas" is an executioner and traitor by nature, he, after "Pushkin" who exhausted the people, suits almost everyone: he steals and lets others steal, and in general is too lazy, too dull, too indecisive to consistently and effectively rape society.

Predicting the fate of "Dumas" on the throne is hopeless. In ancient Rome, all the emperors "Dumas" ended violently, the Russian rulers "Dumas" died in their beds. But in case of nonviolent end of his political career, "Dumas", as is customary with the 3 Wills, makes his heir the holder of the 4th Will, which in our case, with a certain hitch on Andropov, happened: Chernenko, or as he was called in the higher echelons of power, "the docile Kostya", ascended the throne.

* * *

In theory, Chernenko, as the owner of the 4th Will, should have shared the fate of Malenkov, i.e., soon to part with the reins of power snatched from his hands by some quick-witted "Pushkin". But life had decided otherwise, pushing mental typology to the back burner in solving personnel issues. Firstly, Chernenko hastened to die without waiting for his overthrow. Secondly, Brezhnev's long-term somnambulism allowed a strong personality, Andropov ("shrunk": 1st Will, 2nd Logic, 3rd Emotion, 4th Physics), to gain a foothold in the Politburo. Not only did he manage to sit on the throne for a year, but, most importantly, he introduced people of his psychological type to the higher echelons of power. One of them, Gorbachev, was to take over the Russian throne, which was empty after Chernenko's death.

Without setting myself the task of investigating the Gorbachev phenomenon in its entire psychological volume, I will only note what, from the point of view of typology, lies on the surface. Gorbachev is a "Lenin" (1st Will, 2nd Logic, 3rd Physics, 4th Emotion), with all the consequences arising from this order of functions. Gorbachev is a dictator (1st Will), a chatterbox and a tactician rather than a strategist in thinking (2nd Logic), a "communist" and a "non-communist" in one person (3rd Physics).

It would seem that the reappearance of "Lenin" on the Russian throne programmed the reproduction of the entire cycle of Soviet history again. And it was about to happen. Gorbachev, in accordance with the "Leninist" tradition, threw out of his entourage people with character, the owners of superior wills (Yeltsyn, Ligachev, Shevardnadze), and made up a retinue of sly, weak-willed, slow-thinking people, which was demonstrated with stunning clarity by the failed putsch of August 1991. The only difference between Lenin and Gorbachev in the case of a successful putsch would be that Gorbachev was succeeded by the same 3rd Will, but not by Stalin-*"aristippe"*, who was not around, but by Yanayev-*"dumas"*.

However, the bad infinity of Russian history before the putsch was interrupted by two major mistakes of Gorbachev: permission for *glasnost* and elections. They gave birth to the democratic movement, Yeltsin, and, most importantly, destroyed the very system of power, in which the fate of major personnel issues was decided by a small conclave selected by the princeps himself.

* * *

Summing up the analysis of the principles of succession to power in a totalitarian indeterminate-choice system, we can state the following regularities. The 1st Will is the founder of such a system. The 3rd Will inherits it, and, if there are competitors, the one whose Logic is superior to the 3rd Will wins. The 3rd Will is inherited by someone with the 4th Will, who is soon deprived of power by the holder of the 3rd Will, most likely a *"Pushkin"*. If *"Pushkin"* comes to power, *"Dumas"* will inherit him. After *"Dumas"* the 4th Will comes to power, but soon loses it. What will be the order of functions of the person who wrests the 4th Will from the hands of the latter is a matter of guessing, but not of knowledge, although it is safe to say that it will be either the 3rd or the 1st Will.