



Dmitry Leontiev*

Moscow State University and Institute
of Existential Psychology and Life Enhancement

Aleksander Lazursky's personality concept: from inclinations to relations. Problem of personality: Petersburg School of Psychology**

KEYWORDS

character, personality, inclinations, attitudes, endopsychic, exopsychic

ABSTRACT

Leontiev Dmitry, *Aleksander Lazursky's personality concept: from inclinations to relations. Problem of personality: Petersburg School of Psychology*. Culture – Society – Education no 2(16) 2019, Poznań 2019, pp. 55–69, Adam Mickiewicz University Press. ISSN 2300-0422. DOI 10.14746/kse.2019.16.4.

The article discusses the dynamics of psychological views of A.F. Lazursky (1874-1917), author of one of the first theories of personality in the world of psychology. There are two stages in Lazursky's work: the first is associated with the concept of nature as an internal individually-typological basis of personality, and the second one is determined by introduction and more intensive development of ideas about an attitude towards the world as an important component of the personality structure. The primary aim of the article is to highlight the role of Lazursky in international psychology.

When analysing the native [Russian – A.K] concepts of personality, it is impossible to avoid a standard presentation of both the Moscow and the Petersburg psycho-

* ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2252-9805>.

** Translation from Russian and compilation: Aleksandra Kondrat, Nicolaus Copernicus University, moskwa.ros@gmail.com

logical tradition. In the area of personality psychology, these traditions developed in opposition to each other. Until the 1970s, psychologists from Moscow did not make any significant progress in this area: Lev Vygotsky (1896–1934) presented a series of interesting ideas, yet failed to take a step forward in the realm of the theory of personality. Sergei Leonidovich Rubinstein (1889–1960) did not overcome the gap between innovative philosophical anthropology and the traditional and weakly-structured description of personality. Sketches of Alexei Nikolaevich Leontiev (1903–1979) from 1940 devoted to the non-classic theory of personality remained unexamined for over thirty years. Theory of relations of Vladimir Nikolaeivch Myasishchev was beyond any competition between 1950 and 1960. In the 1970s, breakthrough personality concepts of Alexei Nikolaevich Leontiev and Volf Solomonovich Merlin (1898–1982) were created. At the present moment, the research work of Merlin and in particular Leontiev is continued by their students. Myasishchev's theory of personality encountered a different fate. Originally, the concept was used for psycho-therapeutic work, and not for scientific studies, as it was not properly coordinated with the basis of empirical studies. Myasishchev's students developed the therapeutic, but not the theoretical aspects of his theory, much better.

In the 1990s, results accomplished by the founders of the Petersburg School of Psychology attracted attention once again: Vladimir Mikhailovich Bekhterev (1857–1927) and Alexander Lazursky (1874–1917).¹ This paper is devoted to Lazursky's concept of personality which, thanks to a careful analysis, may become not only the first comprehensive theory of personality in the Russian psychology, but practically the first such theory in the world. It is worth presenting the key ideas of Vladimir Mikhailovich Bekhterev, due to the fact that his works are distinguished not only the neurophysiologic, clinical and psychological dimension, but also the overall theory of behaviour (dominated by behaviourists). In order to understand personality, the researcher presented a number of revolutionary ideas, which became the object of studies of Western psychologies only after the lapse of an extended period of time. In a monographic study entitled *Objective Study of Personality* (Бехтерев, 1999), as well as in several other works, Bekhterev sets forth own views as opposed to the discussion of philosopher and psychologist William James (1842–1910). Bekhterev emphasises that the “I” is the personality, which is the onset for any psychical action, simultaneously becoming the “steward of psychical functions.” Bekhterev also claims that not only oneself is the personality.

¹ Aleksander Lazursky (1874–1917) is a Russian psychologist little known in Poland, for whom the priority research subjects were issues related to the man's personality and characterology.

Personality integrates and coordinates psychical functioning, managing specific activities. In other words, it is a “controlling principle, directing man’s thoughts, actions and deeds”. (Бехтерев, 1999: 231) The main feature of personality is its ability for independent action, taking an active stance towards the surrounding world: “From the objective point of view, personality is nothing else but an independent entity, having its own psychical system, as well as individual ties with the surrounding reality.” (Бехтерев, 1999: 232) The status of (self)activity as the defining feature of personality was formulated by Bekhterev in 1905 in a work entitled *Personality and the Conditions of Its Development and Health*. This status came into being fifteen years before Rubinstein’s well-known work about creative activity and a quarter of a century before the formation of self-determination of Alfred Adler, Jung’s idea of orientation of the personality in line with the inner law or Gordon Allport’s principle of pro-active behaviour of personality.

Bekhterev calls (self)activity a valuable gift of personality (Бехтерев, 1999: 151). Among other theories worthy of attention, it is necessary to mention significant analysis of the social impact on personality (Бехтерев, 1999: 95–97), personality on social life (Бехтерев, 1999: 232–235) and noteworthy interpretation of the role of social action on the formation of healthy development of personality (Бехтерев, 1999: 253). In the modern times, Bekhterev’s views on the fundamental impact of the racial factor on the condition and development of personality would not have been accepted (Бехтерев, 1999: 239–240).

Alexander Lazursky’s first research programme and its realisation in the study on characters

This paper is devoted to the personality concept prepared by Bekhterev’s student, Alexander Fyedorovich Lazursky (1874–1917). In the course of his rather brief life, Lazursky made a number of discoveries in psychology. His specific theory of personality is not only the first native [Russian – A.K.] concept, but it also aspires to the role of the first comprehensive theory of personality in the international academic psychology (not including the accomplishments of James, who presented a series of important ideas which did not, however, capture the entire range of issues with respect to personality and Sigmund Freud, whose discussions will not be challenged by other theories of personality any time soon). Whilst working on the general theory of personality, Lazursky moved slightly further than his colleagues from the West. However, it must be noted that the partially utopian research programme of Lazursky was not continued after his death and due to

this, it has lost its significance (except for the historical aspects). Eventually, the constructive potential of the Russian researcher's theory should not be challenged; it influenced a number of important cases in modern psychology (Брушлинский, Кольцова, Олейник, 1997: 432–439).

Lazursky, holding a number of talks with his teacher, concluded that it is impossible to be limited exclusively to the objective path of science. His work may be divided into two stages: the first one is the character-related stage, the second one is psycho-social. Lazursky did not introduce such division independently, due to the fact that every author accepts own work in the form of an integral system. The division introduced by the author of this paper refers to Lazursky's statements. Until 1912, he was mainly interested in two concepts: character and characterology, which were later marginalised, due to the fact that Lazursky focused on personality, claiming that it was not exclusively made up of characterology, but also contained a psycho-social aspect.

Thus, Lazursky started his analyses with the studies of character and will. In 1904, he published the first personality research programme, indicating its general directives (Лазурский, 2001: 93–123). Thus, he was trying to create a comprehensive classification of personality, starting with determination and analysis of a number of its individual features. In the initial part of the programme, he claimed: "An outline is necessary with a couple of precise and characteristic features that would allow for a direct mode of transferring the observed person to one or the other group, of assigning him/ her to one of the character types." (Лазурский, 2001: 93). However, many problems emerged. Lazursky used the traditional path of classification, wishing to distinguish features, building the basis for their classification and taking all of them into account. He understood the emerging problems: complexity of character or mutual relations of features, yet was also hoping that it would be possible to solve them. "It is necessary to collect features on the basis of an extended, systematic observation. This is possible and actually justified, yet initially in a quite limited manner. At the moment when a sufficient number of features has been collected, they can be gradually grouped and classification of characters may be prepared." (Лазурский, 2001: 94). This is a utopian task, as its basic goal is to recover personality from various, elementary features.

Lazursky's programme encompasses 72 characteristics, grouped according to the following types: 1) feeling, 2) perception, 3) memory, 4) imagination, 5) thought, 6) speech, 7) overall properties of the mental sphere, 8) mood and emotions, 9) feelings directed at own personality, 10) feelings to others, 11) higher ideas: intellectual, aesthetic, moral, religious, 12) overall properties of the emo-

tional sphere, 13) movement, 14) physical activity and effort of will, 15) acceptance of decisions and selection process.

Many of the above characteristics may be incorrectly interpreted, due to the fact that they do not have precise equivalents. When measurement problems appear, they are not taken into account, as they had not yet been methodologically refined.

The actual result of the first programme was expressed in a publication entitled *Outline of a Science of Character* of 1909 (Лазурский, 1995). The monograph consists of three parts: the first one presents the general theory, describes the methodology, approaches to personality and character, whereas the second one with respect to the size is slightly larger than the first, and it offers a detailed description of specific parameters, characteristics and features. Lazursky writes in the introduction to the study:

For a long period of time, personality and character were considered something intimate and elusive and only direct and artistic intuition could, to a certain degree, clarify this ephemeral sphere. Works from the last decades contain doubts as to the validity of this view. Only a concerted effort may provide the beginning for a new science, which would constitute individual psychology or scientific characterology. (Лазурский, 1995: 3)

He sets the general psychology against the individual psychology (Lazursky introduced this term slightly earlier than Alfred Adler). If general psychology attempts to "clarify various key issues of psychical life", than individual psychology is an "examination of individual properties and their combinations" (Лазурский, 1995 3). Lazursky claims that individual psychology should "continue the tasks of a purely theoretical science, not being subjected to the impact of some marginal goals" (Лазурский, 1995: 3–4). It is only thanks to such perspective that the examination of characters may put the daily understanding of people on a higher level: "An attempt at building a man from his own inclinations is a goal for which we should be heading in every individual case." (Лазурский, 1995: 4).

Inclinations or features of character constitute, at the first stage of Lazursky's work, the basic unit of analysis. "Individual psychology or characterology is a science analysing psychical features thanks to which people differ from one another and scrutinising relations among them. The final goal of the analysis is to sketch a potentially full and natural classification of characters." (Лазурский, 1995 26–27). Lazursky understands an inclination as "a possibility of multiple repetitions, in the observed person, of specific known behaviour or a psychical process." (Лазурский, 1995: 28). This concept clearly indicates the later date of the feature, which also expressed a recurring stance, certain special proper-

ties of man's behaviour (Олпорт, 2002, see: Allport, 1988). Inclinations may be simple or complex, even though it is not easy to capture a border between the two of them, as Lazursky's criterion is clearly descriptive. Inclinations develop in specific people in various modes; this situation was pictured on the basis of the parameters presented below. Initially, manifestation of an inclination requires awakening of a stimulus of varied intensity. In one case, the inclination reflects what is called a "half-turn." For the inclination to be born in another man, its stronger influence is required. Another important parameter of the degree of development of inclination is the intensity of manifestations, whereas the third one is the mutual dependency of various inclinations, in particular in case of their conflict.

Inclinations are not identical. Even basic features of character may be completely changed. However, one has to differentiate the level of development of inclinations and the degree of their tension: an inclination may be manifested in a stronger degree because it is more developed. This happens on account of the fact that such inclination appears in a man more intensely in a given situation. A strongly developed inclination may be manifested spontaneously, which is caused by a feature of character. However, an inclination is not proper for man, it may also be manifested at the cost of his tension. Lazursky defines character as "overall inclinations proper for a given person, primarily basic. Each of these inclinations is to be captured with the greatest intensity which is attainable by a specific man." (Лазурский, 1995: 40). Lazursky believed the concept of *temperament* to be practically obsolete. The issue of temperament is currently "merged" with the concept of character, its components, owing to the fact that its separate analysis has not made any constructive contribution to science. Even though a man has many various features, if one wishes to analyse the meanders of character, all of them should be reduced to a few basic types of inclinations. Inclinations do not exist on their own. "Every man is a complex whole, composed of more or fewer connections, indispensable or accidental. Every connection is juxtaposed with several basic inclinations. In turn, these inclinations may be narrowly bound to each other, become independent from one another and mutually contradictory." (Лазурский, 1995: 69). Sometimes, bonds of uniform character appear, with contradictory inclinations or groups of inclinations. This is usually called the flexibility of character. "Greater flexibility of character allows more ways of enriching it and making it complex; yet first and foremost, it allows for expanding its capaciousness" (Лазурский, 1995: 69).

Lazursky believes that both the degree of unity, as well as the degree of integration may be varied. Few people have a good, complete and sufficient integra-

tion, where the whole character is a uniform, holistic bond, which is difficult to disassemble into some relatively independent elements: “[In] the majority of people, character is divided into slightly less complex bonds, completely independent from one another” (Лазурский, 1995: 68). An active role in such unity is played by our consciousness, the active and feeling “I”. The aforementioned impact may contribute to the unification of character; it is also conducive to the destruction of character or performs a directive function. Lazursky's concept makes references to Bekhterev's theory, its self-change, self-directing function and self-operation. An inclination as such is something potential, possible to realise and it is expressed in a stronger or weaker degree. Its direct manifestations are available for observation, where it is possible to see various inclinations and their configurations. These manifestations are usually not bound to one inclination, but a whole array of them. Lazursky emphasises that “every inner manifestation, no matter how complex, may only occur in people in whom all inclinations participating in the structure of such manifestation have been sufficiently developed.” (Лазурский, 1995: 77).

The shift from the general, theoretical model to the implementation of a research programme aimed at the “specification of natural classification of characters” is divided into four sections of individual psychology or four steps which are described by Lazursky. The first step is the description and analysis of individual psychical processes and separation of inclinations, i.e. analysis of elements. The second step is related to the selection of these inclinations that are particularly important; here, primary inclinations are separated from secondary ones. The third step is observation of specific individuals, determination of characteristics and adoption of observation methods. The last, fourth step consists in comparison and grouping of the procured characteristics and explanation of internal structure of character of people who belong to various groups, i.e. actual inclusion of the tasks of typology (Лазурский, 1995: 92). The first type is of preparatory nature, it is not specific and draws information from general psychology. Lazursky devotes much more attention to the second type. With the aim of separating most important inclinations, he proposes the following four criteria:

1. Comparative simplicity of inclinations. Here, inclinations have a complex nature, therefore they turn out to be of little use.
2. Existence of significant individual variations and divergences among inclinations.
Significant frequency of inclination occurrence.
3. Relations with other inclinations.

In this case, a methodological remark emerges pertaining to the analogy between the concept of inclinations and the concept of personality features.

In the second part of the study entitled *Outline of a Science of Characters* Lazursky describes inclinations, yet not all of them; they are presented in fifteen chapters and subsequently specified in the first *Programme*. Four chapters were systematically ordered and are devoted to: attention, actual aspect of feeling, movement and volitional processes. The chapter devoted to volitional processes is the most interesting as far as content is concerned. In Lazursky's works, problems of will and choice have always occupied a prominent place, starting with the early popular brochure about the development of will and character in children. The problem of will and choice retains its validity.

The general structure of the conscious volitional process contains the following elements:

more or less conscious desires or urges which, in the case of absence of other, contradictory desires, may directly cause proper activities. Emergence of other, contradictory desires (or motives) is possible, as well as ongoing struggle between them. Suppression of all other motives by one motive and subsequently acceptance of specific decisions. Tension of the effort of the will is meant to retain a resolution that was once made and to suppress desires that cause contradictions. It is also necessary to discuss the adopted conclusion, i.e. to explain its details and modes of realisation. Eventually, we encounter a set of arbitrary external or internal activities, aimed at execution of a decision that was made. (Лазурский, 1995: 188)

The following inclinations participate in this process: strength or weakness of desires and drives; inclination of motives to fight (it is necessary to think whether without fight, a man is subject to own impulses or whether he debates and makes a decision), quickness of choices (length of hesitation), ability or inability to make decisions (determination or hesitancy), stability of decisions (firmness or uncertainty), clarity and specificity of desires and decisions, degree of development of leading ideas and desires (ideological, religious, social, ethical, etc.), ability for internal (psychical) and physical (psychomotor) suspension, ability for constructive effort of the will, durability of effort of the will (determination), sense of own personality (voluntary emergence of psychic processes), degree of resistance to external influences (independence as the opposite of susceptibility), ability to interpret motives (well-judged nature of deeds). Lazursky describes each of the above-listed features of character referring to the volitional processes in detail. The above-listed analyses have not lost their scientific value.

Lazursky's second programme and development of psychology of relations

In 1912, together with the well-known philosopher Semyon Ludvigovich Frank (1877–195), Lazursky published the second research programme, which marks the beginning of the next stage of his work (Лазурский, Франк, 2001: 124–160). The name of this programme seems special: *Programme of Study of Personality in Its Interconnection with Environment*. “It is obvious,” Frank and Lazursky emphasise,

that a man's individuality is shaped not only thanks to the particular nature of internal psychical functions, thanks to the properties of memory, imagination, attention, etc.; the *relations* of man with the phenomena surrounding him, his reactions to various events exert a significant impact. What man loves and hates, what man takes interest in and what he is indifferent to is of vital importance. (Лазурский, Франк, 2001: 125)

Lazursky and Frank called the manifestations denoting the orientation to the world, relation of personality with external objects and the surrounding environment *exopsychic* features, as opposed to *endopsychic* features, which symbolise internal structure of the character, psycho-physiological elements, through their mutual collaboration and connection. The attitude of personality to various external stimuli may be positive, negative or neutral. Lazursky and Frank distinguish four aspects of man's relations with all categories of phenomena: 1) does the relation exist at all; 2) its specific qualitative properties; 3) level of development or diversification of interest; 4) capaciousness or scope. In his detailed analysis of the second programme, Lazursky does not make references to the first programme, to the internal endopsychic symptoms, related to the traditional psychological processes. In this context, a specific exopsyche was described, namely fifteen different categories of relations: 1) relation with items, 2) relation with nature and animals, 3) general relation with individual people, 4) sexual love, 5) general relation with a social group, 6) relation with family, 7) relation with the state, 8) relation with work, 9) relation with material security and property, 10) relation with external standards (standards of life), 11) relation with morality, 12) relation with world-view and religion, 13) relation with knowledge and science, 14) relation with art (aesthetic interests), 15) relation with oneself.

Lazursky presented mutual relations between the endopsychic and exopsychic side of personality in a treatise entitled “*General and Experimental Psychology*” published in 1915 (Лазурский, 2001). This is a general psychology textbook. Lazursky writes about psychology as a science, as well as about psychical phenomena and adjusting regularities (Лазурский, 2001: 39). This area of psychology tries

to develop thanks to the path already taken by natural sciences. Lazursky introduced new, basic aspects, combined with the understanding of personality. He calls personality a “stable and durable unity”, which forms a basis for everything that takes place in the psychological life of man. Temperament and character are related to personality: these are two basic and vital personality cores: temperament pertains to physiological process, whereas character to volitional ones, driven by the principles of reason. In a further part, Lazursky goes beyond the borders of character analysis and inner, individual properties, claiming that in the life of man, a particularly important role is played not only by the inborn elements, but also the ones acquired under the impact of the environment; therefore, he introduces the concepts of endopsyché and exopsyché. “The core of personality,” Lazursky emphasises “is connected with the endopsychic part. Temperament and character are revealed as inborn and inherited, to a great extent.” (Лазурский, 2001: 84). Education may, in a various degree, correspond to individuality, yet endopsychic, inner properties play a dominant role in every case. When the core of our personality, our “I”, i.e. what is related to the temperament and character, participates in psychological programmes, we may speak about *aperception*. The process in which personality participates becomes more precise and intense (Лазурский, 2001: 88). *Aperception* means unity of personality, subordination of processes which are flowing, at a given moment, through the core of personality.

The centre of Lazursky’s second programme (Lazursky-Frank’s programme) is occupied by exopsyché, i.e. relations. The foundation of the second programme was the last, unfinished monograph, entitled “*Classification of Personality*. After Lazursky’s death, his students completed the work and published it. In the book, Lazursky elaborates the idea of endopsyché and exopsyché, putting even more emphasis on the external sides of liaison of personality with the world, with the external environment. He insists that: “the classification of personality should not so much be psychological, but psycho-social in the broader meaning of this term.” (Лазурский, 1997a: 8). The problems of character are shoved to the background when Lazursky introduces the “principle of active adjustment of personality to the surrounding environment” to the base of the classification. (Лазурский, 1997a: 8). Endopsyché is identified with neuro-psychical organisation, whereas exopsyché covers the reactions to external stimuli. However, Lazursky makes a reservation that “the issue of division of the psyche of personality into endo- and exopsyché should not be confused with the issue of origin of individual elements of personality” (Лазурский, 1997a: 11). Obviously, endo-characteristics are inborn and inherited to a greater degree, whereas exo-characteristics are more related to education and the external envi-

ronment. However, there are frequent cases when education and external relations are strongly conducive to the revision of endo-features. Without such impact, they would not have developed. The second reservation refers to the false impression that the exopsychic characteristics are overly superficial, whereas the most important processes take place in the endopsyché. The situation is reverse. If the external, characteristic exo-manifestations of man, for example a habit or a lack of habit to work, relation to property, social stances and world-views, are controlled by an individual man, they become equally resistant to his endopsychic characteristics.

Lazursky introduced the idea about psychical growth and development, about affiliation of people to various psychical levels. The four symptoms below allow for speaking about a higher personality level. The first one means greater or smaller wealth of personality, its diversity and complexity as opposed to poverty, monotony (boredom) and primitivism in psychical manifestations. According to Lazursky, this is related to personality development. The second symptom is the power and intensity of individual psychical manifestations. More intense life in the sphere of psyche is characteristic for a more developed personality. The third symptom is related to greater or smaller awareness and idea of its psychical manifestations. In other words, there is appropriation of consciousness, ensuring relation with higher values and horizons: "The higher the man's spiritual organisation, the richer and more intense his spiritual life. Such man is also capable of better orientation among the phenomena of the surrounding world and defines own relations in a more conscious manner." (Лазурский, 1997а: 15). The last manifestation is the growing coordination of psychical elements, their certain structural consistency. Lazursky correlates this characteristic with concentration of personality, i.e. it is "a concentration of its most important functions in the direction of a single type of activity" (Лазурский, 1997а: 17), in a moment when the personality recovers final integrity, uni-directionality and monolithic nature. However, this process does not occur in everybody. It leads to "such spiritual harmony and spiritual unity where already philosophers and moralists saw both the ideal, as well as the final goal of spiritual development." (Лазурский, 1997а: 17).

Various nature of relations is revealed on different levels between the endo- and the exopsychic manifestations. Lazursky analyses three levels of relations: lower, middle and higher. Initially, it is necessary to ask how these levels differ among each other and what the relation between endo- and exopsyché is. On the lower level of relations, the impact of the external environment and external circumstances is dominant with respect to personality characteristics. The environment subordinates a "weaker, dispersed and feeble psyche of man" and on this level, people turn out to be insufficiently adapted (Лазурский, 1997а: 18). The environ-

ment does not take into account individual properties (endo-properties) of every specific man, as they are shaped in a mode that it sees fit.

On the middle level of relations, people “are equipped with a greater capacity to become adjusted to the surrounding environment, they find their own place in it and use it for specific goals.” (Лазурский, 1997а: 18). People become more aware, they have greater initiative; therefore, they choose a specific profession, corresponding to their predisposition and inclinations. They work efficiently and with interest, becoming useful creatures for the society. They ensure material well-being for themselves, as well as physical and spiritual comfort. Lazursky calls them the *conforming ones*.

On the higher psychological level, there are very talented people. Here, we are dealing with manifestations of creativity. Very talented people, no matter the relation they are in, intensely manifest these features that are proper to them, reveal them in adverse, new and atypical conditions; therefore, they create new manifestations, paving the path for the next ones (Лазурский, 1997а: 18–19). People who are on this higher level Lazursky characterises as adapting. This would mean that they do not conform to the surrounding environment, but try to adapt the surrounding environment to them. In consequence, the project induces a comparison of Lazursky’s outline with the binary opposition: adaptation – misadaptation, commonplace in the 20th century, where the difference between the higher and lower levels, between the non-adapted and not wishing to adapt, or between the “imposed” and “chosen” misadaptation disappears, (Калитеевская, 1997: 231–238), which gave rise to the identification of creativity and misadaptation, popular in the studies of creativity. Let us notice that as many as 90 years ago, Lazursky proposed a subtle and diversified outline, and the causes for ignoring it in our country (outside of Russia, Lazursky’s ideas are practically unknown) may only be explained thanks to the absolute ideological unacceptability of the sole idea of rebuilding personality and the social environment in line with one’s own interest.

The next part presents a detailed analysis of classification of personality which, according to Lazursky, “should not only be psychological, but also psycho-social. In other words, the division of individuals should not only be made on the basis of the frequency of occurrence of one or the other inter-related group of psychical functions (endopsyche), but also on the basis of the social situation of people, their professions, interests, etc. (exopsyche).” (Лазурский, 1997а: 21). Lazursky believes that endopsyche is more important, as it emphasises the core of personality, yet exopsyche is also significant because “it provides us with external, less or more formed manifestations of various kinds, adding solemnity, specificity and fullness” (Лазурский, 1997а: 21). However, the sole content of the classification,

which takes up a significant portion of the study, will not be discussed here. It is only necessary to note the absence of a uniform base for differentiation of types on lower, middle and higher levels. This situation not only refers to “clean” types, where exopsyche and endopsyche cooperate well, but also to combined, warped and transitional types. The main conclusions from the study include Lazursky's introduction about transformation of a “narrow, unilateral classification of characters into a much broader – with respect to its goals – classification of personality.” (Лазурский, 1997а: 33–34). The monographic study *Classification of Personality* includes a small book, published in 1913 and entitled *School Characteristics* (Лазурский, 1997b: 267–411). Thanks to its theoretical basis, an attempt at empirical analysis of uniform personality types of eleven school boys aged 12 to 15 was realised. Lazursky is aware of the fact that in reference to personality which is in the process of formation, the issue of classification may require a more complex approach than in reference to adult people.

It is true that a child's personality is simpler, more elementary than the personality of an adult person. It is not yet fully shaped, it does not have a finished form. It is not only necessary to take into account what it is in a given moment, but – first and foremost – the direction in which everything that seems existing is developing. (Лазурский, 1997b: 279)

The result of empirical, as well as theoretical analysis of the *Classification of Personality* is a detailed, descriptive characteristics of various types. In a separate chapter, Lazursky additionally presents the “characterological analysis of certain complex manifestations of personality.” Here, we are dealing with a study “that may explain features of characters (psychical) which are the basis for every such manifestation. Today, the following question may turn out to be decisive: which basic inclinations should operate with special force for a given psychical process to come into being? . (Лазурский, 1997b: 366)

Lazursky's concept and tendencies in development of personality psychology

In order to straighten the issue of defining the paradigm of personality concept, it is necessary to present three criteria: a) its object should be a personality in a broader term of the word, i.e. a fixed inner psychological structure, explaining the consistency and individual peculiarity of forms of activity (the behavioural approach or the standpoint of Jean Piaget do not correspond to this criterion); b) the concept should be uniform, encompassing numerous aspects of person-

ality and not dispersed situations or a model of individual aspects of personality (views about personality represented by William James, Lev Vygotsky or Vladimir Bekhterev do not correspond to this criterion); c) the concept should have a psychological and explanatory nature and be in a dialogue with other possible interpretations. It should not only consist in the philosophical understanding or function as a psycho-technical myth, containing a pre-determined practice, which is not in a dialogue and does assimilate other explanatory models (for example the transaction model of Eric Berne).

Lazursky's concept fully corresponds to all of the aforementioned criteria. His works present a systematic theory of personality. It forms the first and the only full-value theory of personality prepared in the first half of the 20th century in Russian psychology; it is also one of few such theories in international psychology. Russian researchers did not ignore Lazursky's concept; they analysed it from various points of view. Andrey Vladimirovich Brushlinsky (1933–2002), Viera Alexandrovna Kolcova and Yuri Nikolaevich Olejnik (Брушлинский, Кольцова, Олейник, 1997: 432–439) emphasise the following aspects of Lazursky's concept: uniform understanding of personality, care for the principle of activity of personality, understanding of personality in development, absence of biological pre-determination, relation of theory with life. Yelena Vasilevna Levchenko considers Lazursky's concept through the prism of methodological issues, and in particular a study on the category of relations, noting an impulse to create "a variant of new psychology, subjective psychology without an introspective research position." (Левченко, 2003: 142). Making such methodological assumption, the researcher distinguishes four fundamental stages in Lazursky's work (Левченко, 2003: 107). The context determining the perspective of further studies refers to the development of representations about personality in international psychology. From this point of view, this theory is worthy of attention as in the course of a single decade, Lazursky managed to gradually develop a general psychology of personality. Lazursky's direction is a path from individuality to proper personality, from temperament and character to ultimate manifestations, from attention taking into account genetically conditioned internal, personality-related traits, connected with the neuro-psychical organisation, to the relation of personality with the world, from inner consistency to levels of development and adjustment and to proper non-adaptive activity of personality. Before the researcher's death, exopsyché was clearly starting to play a primary role. Some authors even claim that endopsyché still plays a dominant function in Lazursky's studies, yet the dynamic development of his views was expressed primarily in a sudden increase of importance of exopsyché in the second variant of his concept; meanwhile, the position of endopsyché

did not change. The author of this paper is not going to venture quite a bold hypothesis that if Lazursky had worked for a little longer, the exopsychic side of the human personality, its relations and cooperation with the world would have eventually shifted to the centre of this model. Therefore, whilst discussing Lazursky's ideas about personality, analysing its certain dynamics, it is necessary to emphasise that the vector of such dynamic leads from the "isolated individual" towards the "life-giving world."² These discussions converge with the main direction of development of the main personological thought.

Bibliography

- Allport G., (1988), *Osobowość i religia*, trans. I. Wyrzykowska, H. Bartoszewicz et al., Warszawa.
- Бехтерев В.М. (1999), *Объективное изучение личности. Избранные труды по психологии личности*, vol. 2, Санкт-Петербург.
- Брушлинский А.В., Кольцова В.А., Олейник Ю.Н. (1997), Вклад А.Ф. Лазурского в разработку проблем личности, [in:] А.Ф. Лазурский, *Избранные труды по психологии*, Москва.
- Василюк Ф.Е. (1984), *Психология переживания*, Москва.
- Калитеевская Е.Р. (1997), Психическое здоровье как способ бытия в мире: от объяснения к переживанию, [in:] Д.А. Леонтьев, В.Г. Щур (ред.), *Психология с человеческим лицом: гуманистическая перспектива в постсоветской психологии*, Москва.
- Лазурский А.Ф. (1995), *Очерк науки о характерах*, Москва.
- Лазурский А.Ф. (1997а), Классификация личностей, [in:] *Избранные труды по психологии*, Москва.
- Лазурский А.Ф. (1997б), Школьные характеристики, [in:] *Избранные труды по психологии*, Москва.
- Лазурский А.Ф. (2001), Программа исследования личности", [in:] А.Ф. Лазурский, "Избранные труды по общей психологии. К учению о психической активности. Программа исследования личности и другие работы", Санкт-Петербург.
- Лазурский А.Ф., Франк С.Л. (2001), Программа исследования личности в ее отношениях к среде, [in:] А.Ф. Лазурский, *Избранные труды по общей психологии. К учению о психической активности. Программа исследования личности и другие работы*, Санкт-Петербург.
- Левченко Е.В. (2003), *История и теория психологии отношений*, Санкт-Петербург.
- Олпорт Г. (2002), *Становление личности. Избранные труды*, Москва.

² Ф. Е. Василюк, *Психология переживания*, Москва 1984.

