STRUCTURALISM IN THE WORK OF NIKOLAI TRUBETSKOY AND PETER SAVICKY

Liubov Stepanova[1]

Abstract: The Prague Linguistic Circle became one of the most significant centers of intellectual activity in the first half of the 20th century. It included prominent researchers in exile, such as Peter Savitsky and Nikolai Trubetskoy, whose concepts significantly impacted the development of linguistic and cultural studies. The article analyses the key aspects of structuralism in the work of these scholars and highlights the main ideas and concepts they developed in the context of the Prague Linguistic Circle. Their writings, methods, and influence on the modern understanding of language, culture, and society are analyzed and their legacy in contemporary scientific research.

UDC Classification: 316.7, **DOI**: https://doi.org/10.12955/pss.v4.398

Keywords: structuralism, cultural studies, historical sociology, Eurasianism, Peter Savitsky, Nikolaj Trubeckoy

Introduction

The interwar period became fertile ground for the development of a new approach to scientific thinking: structuralism. Most often, structuralism is analyzed in the context of philosophical history as a method or approach rather than as an independent philosophical doctrine. The study of structuralism's intellectual origins in Eastern Europe implies an appeal to the broad cultural and historical context of the early twentieth century.

In 1926, the Linguistic Circle was founded in Prague, encompassing prominent researchers of the structuralist approach in Eastern Europe. Prague structuralism primarily influenced linguistic research (morphology, language system, the concept of opposition). However, its bright trace remained in cultural studies, particularly in the formation of the ideological concept of Eurasianism in the circles of Russian émigré intellectuals. The founders of this concept were the geographer Peter Savitsky and the linguist Nikolai Trubetskoy, members of the Prague Linguistic Circle and supporters of the structural approach.

The concept of Eurasianism emerged as an ideological response in the intellectual space of migrants from the former Russian Empire to the upheavals of the early 20th century. This concept was an attempt to synthesize various aspects of Russian culture, Orthodoxy, and Eastern traditions, taking into account Russia's geopolitical position using a structural approach. The main methodology of Eurasian studies was ontological structuralism, formed within the Prague Linguistic Circle.

After the collapse of the Russian Empire, Nikolai Trubetskoy emigrated to Bulgaria, where he taught linguistics at Sofia University. In his works on cultural studies, the researcher came close to the theme of the relationship between the development of language under cultural and regional influence. Discussion of Trubetskoy‘s work at seminars in Sofia later led him to meet Peter Savitsky and other representatives of the nascent Eurasian movement. Later, in 1921, in Sofia, in co-authorship with other Russian émigré researchers, Trubetskoy presented the manifesto of the Eurasian movement (Loginov, 2013).

Nikolai Trubetskoy‘s further work, in close co-authorship with Peter Savitsky, was primarily on cultural studies of the people of Eurasia in the context of the Eurasian linguistic union concept. Trubetskoy and Savitsky, in co-authorship with Roman Jakobson, continued to develop the Eurasian doctrine of language and its relationship with the landscape and culture of the region, the concepts of a multipolar world, Slavic-Turanic cultural interactions, Mongolian influence on Russian political history and culture, ideocracy and the doctrine of ruling selection in the state.

In many ways, Trubetskoy's work was linked to the geographical approach of Peter Savitsky, with whom he continued to co-operate until his death. Peter Savitsky, on the other hand, utilized Trubetskoy‘s research in linguistics and linguocultural studies, as well as his structural approach to his concept of Eurasianism and religious philosophy. Savitsky‘s writings were primarily concerned with the assumption that all levels of being are connected by structural links and ideas, and on the basis of this, he assumed the existence of a certain periodic law common to the region (1931).

[1] Charles Univerity, Faculty of Humanities, lillianstefans@gmail.com

The article examines the role of structuralism in the formation and development of the Eurasianism concept, focusing on Peter Savitskys‘ and Nikolai Trubetskoys‘ views. In the modern research context, a deep understanding of cultural identities and social processes is needed. Therefore, the article's relevance is primarily manifested in the scientific perspective of today‘s discussions on cultural and geopolitical identities, as well as the influence of language on the formation of social and cultural structures.

Ontological structuralism in the paradigm of the Eurasianism concept

The period between the two world wars witnessed the development of a new intellectual space characterized by a diversity of ideas ranging from radical political protest to abstract philosophical thinking. In this context, the concept of Eurasianism is one of the intriguing historical debates permeating various spheres of culture, politics, and intellectual discourse. Its essence goes beyond mere ideological abstraction and encompasses a response to the complex socio-cultural and geopolitical challenges faced by contemporaries in the early twentieth century.

Some aspects of Eurasianism find their explanation exclusively in Russian intellectual history, while others are closely linked to the pan-European discourse that emerged after the First World War. The historical background of Eurasianism can be traced back to the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, when the Russian Empire faced serious challenges, including political upheaval and cultural and social change. Russia‘s complex geopolitical position, its multinational character and the desire to define its new place in the world after the empire's collapse served as the basis for the emergence of Eurasianism.

This concept grew out of the people of the former Russian Empire's search for identity and self-determination and their desire to understand their new role in world politics and culture (Laurelle, 2004, s. 33). The idea of Eurasianism received a new impetus after the 1917 revolution in Russia, when emigrants fleeing the Bolsheviks began to form variants of an alternative Russian identity and statehood.

Important figures in this movement were geographer Peter Savitsky and linguist Nikolai Trubetskoy, who founded the structural concept of Eurasianism, which combined elements of Slavic, Turkic and Mongolian cultures. Eurasianism as a new philosophy and ideology attracted many Russian émigré intellectuals, such as Georgy Vernadsky, Nikolai Alekseev, and Roman Jakobson (Bassin et al., 2015).

It is also important to consider the temporal context of the emergence of this concept: when society was immersed in the search for new ways to achieve a harmonious social order for the whole of Europe. According to Peter Savitsky and Nikolai Trubetskoy, Eurasianism represented a kind of third way between the Western ideas of liberalism and socialism, moving away from Eurasia‘s imperial past (Savitsky, 2002).

The researchers presented the concept of Eurasianism to the public as a proposal for a new understanding of Russia‘s historical and cultural development. At the same time, the Eurasian perspective shared common features with alternative nationalist movements of its time. Due to the ambiguous and vague interpretation of the concept, the idea of the third way was not always unambiguously perceived by the international community (Kantor, 2015).

According to Savitsky, the idea of Eurasianism put forward the concept of rethinking cultural and ideological norms in order to achieve the spiritual autonomy of the former Russian Empire from European cultural discourse. The founders of the Eurasian movement assumed that this should open Russia and its neighbors to their own path to spiritual and socio-political progress (Savitsky, 1927). The concept of Eurasia was a radical assumption of the existence of a distinctive civilization, combining features of East and West but remaining unique in its own way.

Amid the crisis and turmoil of the early 20th century, the Eurasian idea offered a peculiar interpretation of the historical heritage, geographical location and cultural peculiarities of the region. It was an attempt to synthesize various aspects of Russian culture, Orthodoxy, and Eastern traditions, considering Russia's geopolitical position between Europe and Asia. Eurasia was presented as a separate geographical and historical world located between the two continents, but significantly different from them both geopolitically and culturally (Savitsky, 1927). Eurasia was seen as the crossroad of the East European, West Siberian and Turkestan plains. It was also geographically close to the territories of the Soviet Union.

This synthesis was not only a search for historical roots and cultural unity but also a strategic justification of the Russian Empire as a unique civilizational force capable of influencing the course of world history. Structuralism had a certain influence on the concept of Eurasianism, especially in the context of analyzing the cultural and geopolitical aspects of this ideology. Under the influence of structuralism, Eurasian concepts began to be seen as a system consisting of various cultural, social, and geopolitical elements interacting with each other. The structuralist approach revealed Eurasia as a system of interrelated elements, including cultural traditions, historical contexts, and geopolitical factors.

The structuralism of the early 20th century was based on the principles of objectivism and holism and was often oriented towards analyzing society and culture through linguistic models (Sériot, 2002).

In 1926, the first linguistic circle, which later became known as the Prague Linguistic School, emerged in Prague under the leadership of the Czech linguist Vilém Matesius. The Prague Linguistic Circle represents a special area of intersection, or perhaps collision, between Russian and European intellectual traditions. The Prague Circle is often overlooked in the history of European structuralism, as Patrick Sériot writes (Sériot, 2002).

The Prague Circle also included committed Eurasians such as Nikolai Trubetskoy and Roman Jakobson, who continued to work closely with Peter Savitsky. One of the discoveries of the Prague Circle was the understanding of language through a system of oppositions, and ontological structuralism also emerged in the ideological space of the Prague linguists. It was ontological structuralism that in many ways became the basis for the concept of Eurasianism. In the interwar period, few researchers paid attention to the East-West variant of structuralism that emerged in Prague, especially in light of the Prague linguists' desire to separate themselves from some structuralist schools.

In 1929, a turning point in the history of Eurasianism occurred in the form of an ideological split between the mainstream of Eurasian thought (classical Eurasianism) and the leftist movement inspired by Marxist ideals (the Klamarists). During this period, Peter Savitsky and Nikolai Trubetskoy actively defended the view that the Eurasianists on the left had departed from the basic principles of the movement (Loginov, 2013). Lev Karsavin, who had been the official philosopher of the movement, was considered the leader of Left Eurasianism. After the split, Savitsky rejected his concept of a philosophy of collective symphonic personality, and he began to look for new perspectives to revise the philosophical basis of Eurasianism (Logovikov, 1931).

After the movement split, the Eurasianist theorists Nikolai Trubetskoy and Roman Jakobson developed a new approach to linguistics that saw the structural method as universal and applicable to various fields of science, including philosophy. Trubetskoy and Jakobson's ontological structuralism has its roots in the Platonic and Hegelian philosophical tradition (Sériot, 2002). Savitsky, always sensitive to and developing his colleagues' ideas in the Eurasian movement, was particularly attentive to this new line of research (Logovikov, 1931).

Peter Savitsky's concept of the periodic system of being

The concept of Eurasia emerged due to the collective work of scholars from various fields of knowledge, including history, music, geography, linguistics, religious and philosophical doctrines, cultural studies, economics, and civilizational analysis. Important sources for the development of this concept were the works of historians Sergei Soloviev, Afanasy Shchapov and Vasily Klyuchevsky, who emphasised the role of landscape and geographical factors in Russian history, as well as Nikolai Danilevsky's theory of cultural-historical types and the ideas of the Slavophiles of the early 19th century. The founders of the Eurasian concept also looked to classical European scholarship, including the works of Sir Mackinder, French linguistics, and a civilizational approach close to the views of Oswald Spengler.

The concept is an example of a scientific approach in which researchers initially assumed the existence of Eurasia as a unique region, with its cultural and historical interconnectedness, and sought to discover hidden evidence of this fact in various fields of research (Sériot, 2002). The initial assumption of the existence of Eurasia as a distinct region in various aspects became the basis for forming a discourse in which different studies were united within the given research boundaries.

From the very beginning, Eurasian thought had certain structural features that determined its overall systematicity. It was based on the idea of a *collective symphonic personality,* developed by the main theorist of Eurasian philosophy, Lev Karsavin. His views remained dominant until the split of the Eurasian movement and played a central role in the development of the concept.

For Karsavin, the relationship to the personality concept was a key aspect of his philosophy. Karsavin endeavored to show that the true individuality of man is manifested only in the context of his belonging to a common whole. He regarded the totality of people striving for God as a collective symphonic personality. In his opinion, true individuality is achieved through striving for a state of *symphonicity*, when people merge with each other and with the surrounding world in an act of spiritual cognition of some divine Absolute (Logovikov, 1931). According to the philosopher, all Eurasian people form a single collective symphonic personality, which represents the highest symphonic unity and has its own independent life.

After the split of the Eurasian movement, Lev Karsavin withdrew from the main branch of Eurasianism, while Pyotr Savitsky, in co-authorship with Nikolai Trubetskoy and Roman Jakobson, began to develop the concept of *structural theological geosophy* or *periodic system of being* on the basis of ontological structuralism. The main idea of Savitsky's concept was the notion that all levels of being are permeated by organisational ideas, or eidos, which makes it possible to consider the action in the universe as a manifestation of the general periodic law (Logovikov, 1931a). Savitsky‘s ideas were deeply developed in the context of ontological structuralism and under the influence of the ideas of Lev Bergs‘ nomogenesis, which was consonant with Eurasian views on the relationship between landscape and culture.

The main idea of Savitsky‘s concept is that all levels of being are permeated by similar organisational ideas. This allows us to consider action in the universe as a manifestation of the general periodic system of being. Savitsky takes Trubetskoy's concept of structure within culture, expressed by him in his article „On the Turanian Element in Russian Culture“ (1998), and applies it to nature. Savitsky continued the development of Karsavin‘s concept of collective symphonic personality, but the main idea shifted to the question of Eurasian harmonious existence as a single structure — the periodic system of being.

Savitsky observed that biological, chemical, and physical factors have a common organization and proposed transferring the idea of this harmony to nature and the surrounding world as a whole. He believed that the structure of the world was not random and independent but governed by the mind of God (Savitsky, 1997).

Structural theological geosophy, according to Savitsky, does not allow the possibility of existence of the universe without an immaterial supreme essence. He juxtaposes organisation with structure in its ontological sense, identifying it with eidos or soul. Savitsky summarised that „in every manifestation of the organisational idea we discover its eidos, we come to the eidocratic concept of being“ (Logovikov, 1931, s. 135).

Savitsky considered *place-development*, a concept that unites the landscape and cultural components of Eurasia, to be the basis of the structural approach. This phenomenon, according to Savitsky, includes the geographical plane in the basis of its historical and social development in the context of human culture living on this plane. Since Savitsky relied primarily on a structural approach, the author viewed place as an organic whole, the parts of which (landscape and geographical conditions, human societies and their culture, climate and geology, historical events) should be considered in a unified discourse. Although place-development may change over time, its structural component, according to the author, is unchanging (Savicky, 1997).

In his vision, Savitsky creates a kind of structural pyramid of various organizational parts, and systems, which together form a kind of organizational universe. The researcher closes the circle with a secret divine plan, the mystery of place development in the form of eidos, some higher essence, and natural and organic order. Place development becomes the intersection of each other‘s structures, geographical (material) and cultural (spiritual). For Savitsky, the material world is a symbolic message of some higher divine order, which is understood exclusively by the collective symphonic personality living within. All of this, according to the researcher, embodied a unified structure, which man could endow with a certain meaning (Vakhitov, 2013).

Trubetskoy and Savitsky often turned to Russian literature in search of patterns and spiritual parallels. Trubetskoy approached the analysis of the text primarily from a linguistic point of view, considering general characteristics of the development of the Russian language in a historical perspective. Savitsky, on the other hand, looked primarily at literary landscape imagery in search of a spiritual ideal of the Eurasian space. Savitsky saw the task of intellectuals in contrasting the false subjective image with the

correct objective image of their space, according to the divine plan, and in building politics and economy on the basis of understanding the nature of their world and its true essence. (Vakhitov, 2013).

Nikolai Trubetskoy's theory of linguistic unions and the concept of integrity

Savitsky's general structural approach is to study the cultural, religious, historical, economic and geographical characteristics of Eurasia in search of common systemic features. Nikolai Trubetskoy primarily developed the direction of geolinguistics and *the areal concept of culture* and studied Eurasiam languages from the point of view that each language is a structured object.

In 1929, at the International Congress of Slavists, Nikolai Trubetskoy, Roman Jakobson and other representatives of the Prague linguistic circle presented the theory of linguistic unions. The key idea was to understand language as a functional system. The theory of linguistic unions made it possible to compare unrelated languages and identify common features in the process of their development. The idea of a systemic organisation of language removed the opposition between synchronicity and diachrony and opened up the possibility of an evolutionary approach to the synchronic description of languages.

In his work „The Tower of Babel and the Mixture of Languages"[2] (1923), Nikolai Trubetskoy put forward the sociolinguistic principle that the languages of people who have been neighbouring each other for a long time begin to acquire common features. This principle, developing, led to the formulation of the morphological concept, according to which all languages are structured not only genetically, but also non-genetically, by unions.

Trubetskoy's ideas were supported by the historian Peter Bizzilli, who favoured the synchronicity and internal unity of the history of the Old World (Sériot, 2002). He saw the cultural task of his time in finding ways to synthesise the cultures of Eurasia, which should represent unity in diversity. Bizzilli paid special attention to Russia, seeing it as a model of synthesis of Eastern and Western cultures. Although Peter Bizzilli's co-operation with the Eurasian movement was short-lived, it contributed to the further development of Nikolai Trubetskoy's ideas and influenced the structuralist concept of Roman Jakobson. Jakobson, exploring Eurasia as a whole, noted the existence of a Eurasian linguistic union on the basis of phonological features such as the absence of polysyllables and differences in the timbre of consonants (Sériot, 2002). This allowed Jakobson to identify „central" and „peripheral" phenomena of Old World based on phonological and morphological characteristics.

If we put together Trubetskoy's areal concept of culture, his various definitions of Eurasia, and his assertions about the opposition between the Eurasian and Romano-Germanic worlds, we can see a very confusing picture. In both Eurasia and the Romano-Germanic world, peoples are seen as parts of a hierarchically complex and open system, where each person is linked to the community through common features.

On the one hand, Trubetskoy considers people in terms of contacts and neighbourhood, deducing a general rule, but the examples he gives refer only to Eurasian people (Trubetskoy, 1921). On the other hand, comparing Romano-Germanic and Eurasian cultures, he views them as hermetically closed groups. Trubetskoy defends the ideal of purity of the Eurasian cultural tradition in relation to the Romano-Germanic culture, but at the same time favours the organic fusion of steppe culture with Russian and Finno-Ugric culture (Sériot, 2002).

Trubetskoy presents the reader with a philosophy of history, but with a particular emphasis on teleology, which rejects the idea of progress. This approach opposes the dominant vision of progress and puts forward the concept of the genealogical tree of languages as a special form of the Western European idea of linear progress. The contribution of Prague Eurasian linguists to structuralism was the use of geographical interpretations in the history of languages and the anti-Darwinian doctrine in biology.

Trubetskoy investigated the languages of the local Eurasian people, including considering their common features through the philosophy of the existence of the region's special place-development. Investigating various aspects of the ancient states of the Indo-European languages and their subsequent interaction, Trubetskoy came to a definitive conclusion. In Trubetskoy's opinion, Slavic peoples are closer in value to their eastern neighbours (Turanian peoples), and similarity in the sphere of life activity with Western Europeans is determined by the material context (Shabaga, 2022).

[2] „Vavilonskaya bashnya i smeshenie yazykov" (rus.)

The Eurasian concept was significantly influenced by Trubetskoy's *concept of integrity*, which developed from the idea of the interconnection of individual linguistic units. Ferdinand de Saussure extended these connections through the concept of signifier and signified to social phenomena, which led to the notion of the mutual influence of linguistic and social phenomena. Eurasians applied this concept to socio-geographical space, emphasising three key concepts: *ideocracy, democracy* and *unions* (Sériot, 2002). It is also worth noting the parallel between the triad of Eurasian concepts and Saussure's construct, where *langage*, *langue* and *parole*[3] represented system, instrument and sign respectively (Sériot, 2002). This consonance may indicate the influence of the structural linguistic approach on the development of Eurasian concepts.

A classificatory definition of the legacy of Trubetskoy and Jakobson is offered by the Swedish researcher Patrick Sériot. According to him, the scientific practice of these researchers combines empiricism and essentialism, but has not yet realised itself as structuralism (Sériot, 2002). The main substantive points of Eurasian linguistics are related to a holistic vision of accumulation and globality, rather than a systemic view of structure in which any local change changes the system. This holistic vision of language differs from classical structuralism, and this explains the fruitfulness of Prague phonology in comparison to Saussure's general linguistics, as well as its influence on the subsequent development of linguistics and the application of structural methods in other sciences. The essence of the cultural and geopolitical foundations of Eurasianism, according to Patrick Serio, is borrowed from Western Europe, especially from Germany, where Friedrich Ratzel's theory of natural territories (Sériot, 2002) was formulated.

One of Trubetskoy's important contributions was the development of *phonology* and *morphonology*. He believed that phonology should study only those sound distinctions that simultaneously distinguish meanings (Sériot, 2002). A *phoneme*, as the minimal meaning-distinguishing unit of language, is a series of alternating sounds, not a single sound. Trubetskoy's interests as a linguist extended to various areas of language functioning, including the evolution of language and its relationship to national character. He even proposed the creation of a special science, *ethnosophy*, to investigate why each language belonging to a nation chooses its own path of evolution (Shabaga, 2022).

The theories of Trubetskoy and Jakobson combined perceptions of the existing socio-political reality in Russia and the collective perceptions of Eurasian people about themselves. These scholars used linguistic arguments as evidence, which became a common practice. In particular, they operated with the concept of linguistic relativity proposed by American linguists Edward Sepir and Benjamin Wharf, which argued that the structure of language determines the paradigm of thinking.

According to the Prague linguists, this concept corresponded to their ideas about the essential difference in the worldviews of Western Europeans and Eurasians (Trubetskoy, 1923). They believed that the language structure shapes a particular way of thinking and perceiving the world, which in turn influences the social and cultural characteristics of ethnic groups. Thus, the use of linguistic arguments in their theories can be seen as an attempt to explain a number of social phenomena and emphasise the importance of linguistic features in shaping social reality.

Conclusion

The Eurasians sought to create a system of thought and organisation of society that would reflect the peculiarities of the culture, history and geography of the Eurasian space. Their concepts of ideocracy, democracy, sobornosti and autarky, based on the principles of ontological structuralism, attempted to synthesise different aspects of society into a unified whole. They saw in the structure of language and society the key to understanding the cultural and geopolitical peculiarities of Eurasia.

According to the philosophy of Eurasianism, each nation is regarded as a collective symphonic personality. This personality, according to Eurasians, possesses a creative power from which both spiritual culture (language, literature, music, philosophy and other aspects) and material culture, including national forms of economic and political life in their historical development, emerge.

On the other hand, the eidos, or spiritual structure, is also present in the geographical world of a given culture, organising it and connecting its parts. In this context, there is a certain divine design in the region, which is mastered by man. The coincidence of these structures provides the unity of geography

[3] *linguistic activity, language, speech* (eng.)

and culture that Eurasians reflect in the idea of place-development. Creativity, according to Eurasians, is a special process in which existing cultural values are combined according to a certain pattern or structure embedded in the collective psyche of a people. This structure, although not realised by the people, is transferred to the cultural phenomena they create.

The unifying idea of Eurasia was the Eurasian concept, based on religious (Orthodoxy), linguistic (Eurasian linguistic union), geographical (unity of Eurasian space) and cultural (similarity of cultural and economic types) grounds. Eurasians imagined Eurasia (Russia) as an ideocratic state whose main principle was the Eurasian idea. According to Trubetskoy and Savitsky, this idea was to permeate all spheres of social life, including politics, culture and economy. Both the state, religion, and the people relied on this idea (Bassin et al., 2015).

Although Eurasianists did not deny the pluralism of religious beliefs, they paid special attention to Orthodoxy, considering it particularly significant for the unification of people in Eurasian expanses. In the economic sphere, they proposed a combination of planned and individual approaches to create conditions for a mixed economy (Savicky, 1997). Peter Savitsky introduced the term economic power to describe this type of organisation, which combines individual and state approaches in the economy (Savicky, 1997).

In studying the economic structure of Eurasia, Peter Savitsky identified the concept of autarky as one of its key characteristics. He explicitly linked autarky with the idea of Russia as a symphonic personality, linking geographical, historical, ethnographic and linguistic specifics into a system (Vakhitov, 2013). Autarky was understood as a striving for complete independence from external influences rather than isolation from the outside world. It also pointed to the special role of the state in the Eurasian community. At the same time, Savitsky characterised Eurasianism not only as autarkic but also as socialist, which implied an emphasis on the role of the state in ideological and social relations (Vakhitov, 2013).

Savitsky brings into his discourse not only Trubetskoy's linguistic concepts, but also geographical reflections on the role of the region. For him, the geographical world, be it Eurasia or any other region, is not just a physical reality, but a peculiar material phenomenon within which a structure operates, a kind of sign system analogous to a text created by God. This text, or message, is to be interpreted by the symphonic personality living in that space. Thus geographical nature, viewed through Savitsky's prism, becomes not only a physical environment but also a symbolic field full of potential for interpretation.

Savitsky argued that knowledge of one's own world is a necessary condition for cultural maturity (Bassin et al., 2015). Following Trubetskoy, he thought in a context reminiscent of transcendental philosophy. According to Sériot, Eurasianism represents the return of nineteenth-century organicism to Europe in the form of a boomerang that manifests itself in areal linguistics with geocultural tendencies (Sériot, 2002). Sériot also points out that what the Eurasians saw as a fundamental confrontation between East and West was in fact a conflict between two consistent epistemological approaches: rationalism and analyticism, and synthetic science (Sériot, 2002).

Prague structuralism recognised the complexity of the concept, but rather than seeing it as an obstacle, the school sought to use it as a necessary step in the evolution of thinking towards an understanding of structure (Sériot, 2002). Thus, Prague structuralism rose above epistemological obstacles by overcoming them through a systematical approach and by analysing structure in the language and society context.

Structuralism still plays an important role in the modern paradigm, providing theoretical and methodological tools for the analysis of complex socio-cultural phenomena. The ideas of Trubetskoy and Savitsky continue to influence contemporary research in the field of language, culture and society, opening new horizons for understanding the diversity of cultural forms and their interrelationships.

References

Bassin, M., Glebov, S., & Laruelle, M. (2015). Between Europe and Asia: The Origins, Theories, and Legacies of Russian Eurasianism [Mezhdu Evropoi i Aziej: Istoki, teorii i nasledie russkogo evraziizma]. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Kantor, M. (2015). Imperia naiznanku: When Will Putin's Russia End? [Imperia naiznanku, Kogda zakončitsja putinskaja Rossija]. Moscow, Russia: Algorithm.

Laurelle, M. (2004). Ideology of Russian Eurasianism or Thoughts on the Greatness of the Empire [Ideologija russkogo evrasijstva ili mysli o veličii imperii]. Moscow, Russia: Natalis.

Logovikov, P. V. (Savitskii, P. N.). (1931). The Power of the Organizational Idea [Vlast' organizatsionnoi idei]. In P. N. Savitsky (Ed.), Utverzhdenie evraziitsev. Kn. 7 (p. 134). Paris.

Logovikov, P. V. (Savitskii, P. N.). (1931a). Scientific Tasks of Eurasianism [Nauchnye zadachi evraziistva]. In P. N. Savitsky (Ed.), Tridtsatye gody. Utverzhdenie evraziitsev. Book 7 (pp. 54–55). Paris.

Savitsky, P. N. (1927). Russia: A Special Geographical World [Rossiya: osobyj geograficheskij mir]. Prague, Czechia: Evrazijskoe izdatel'stvo.

Savitsky, P. N. (1997). The Continent of Eurasia [Kontinent Evraziya]. Moscow, Russia: Agraf.

Sériot, P. (2002). Structure and Whole: The Intellectual Origins of Structuralism in Central and Eastern Europe [Struktura a celek: intelektuální počátky strukturalismu ve střední a východní Evropě]. Prague: Academia.

Shabaga, A. V. (2022). Eurasian Structuralism [Evraziiskii strukturalizm]. *Vestnik RUDN. Seriya: Mezhdunarodnye Otnosheniya*, 22, 43-59. DOI: 10.22363/2313-0660-2022-22-1-43-59

Trubetskoy, N. S. (1921). The Heights and Depths of Russian Culture (The Ethnic Basis of Russian Culture) [Verkhi i nizy russkoi kultury (Etnicheskaya baza russkoi kultury)]. In P. N. Savitsky, P. P. Suvchinsky, N. S. Trubetskoy, & G. V. Florovsky (Eds.), Ishod k Vostoku. Predchuvstviya i sversheniya. Utverzhdenie evraziitsev (pp. 86–103). Sofia: Izdanie evraziitsev.

Trubetskoy, N. S. (1923). The Tower of Babel and the Confusion of Languages [Vavilonskaya bashnya i smeshenie yazykov]. In N. S. Trubetskoy (Eds.), Eurasian Yearbook: Non-periodical edition (pp. 107-124). Berlin; Paris: Eurasian Publishing House.

Vakhitov, R. R. (2013). Theological Structural Geosophy of P. N. Savitsky [Teologicheskaya strukturnaya geosofiya P. N. Savitskogo]. *Vestnik Chelyabinskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*, 13(304), 145–148.