

Philosophical Letters. Russian and European Dialogue. 2024. Vol. 7, no. 1. P. 126–140.

Философические письма. Русско-европейский диалог. 2024. Т. 7, № 1. С. 126–140.

Original article / Научная статья

УДК 008

doi:10.17323/2658-5413-2024-7-1-126-140

CHRISTIAN MYTHOLOGY AND PHILOSOPHY OF MIND



Gregory S. Kiselev

Independent researcher,
Urbana-Champaign, IL, USA,
kiselev@illinois.edu

 **Abstract.** Myth, the Christian one, is a means of self-creation of man. Does it work in a scientific worldview? To answer this question, the author substantiates the possibility of interpreting and rethinking some of the essential mythologems of Christianity. He proposes to consider them in the light of the modern philosophy of consciousness. According to this philosophy, a person cognizes the world being inside it. Thus, he is ontologically rooted in it. Therefore, our world contains certain conditions for its cognition, which themselves have no conditions. Their existence is evidenced only by their effects; they appear simply as a supernatural reality. Without the concept of the supernatural, there can be no adequate understanding of the phenomenon of “man”, since his being is not limited to its natural side. Religion in the modern world is supposed to have a renewed mythology. However, there is a problem. The traditional Christian mythology emerged spontaneously. The mythology of our time cannot but have an artificial origin. It must be rationally understood as mythology. The author believes that a possible interpretation of the mythologems of Christianity

that is adequate to the time gives reason to disagree with the idea of the historical failure of Christianity. At the same time, he argues that this religion can claim the status of a supra-confessional, universal world outlook. This is tantamount to claiming its trinitarian meanings, which have so far remained largely undiscovered. The supra-confessional worldview implies that sociality should also be based on Christian moral values and that a person should not be limited to the task of personal salvation. This also means participation in the preservation and reproduction of civilization.



Keywords: Christianity, mythology, historiography, Mamardashvili, philosophy of consciousness, civilization



For citation: Kiselev, G.S. (2024) "Christian Mythology and Philosophy of Mind", *Philosophical Letters. Russian and European Dialogue*, 7(1), pp. 126–140. doi:10.17323/2658-5413-2024-7-1-126-140.

Литература. Философия. Религия

МИФОЛОГЕМЫ ХРИСТИАНСТВА И ФИЛОСОФИЯ СОЗНАНИЯ

Григорий Сергеевич Киселев

Независимый исследователь, Урбана-Шампейн,
штат Иллинойс, США, kiselev@illinois.edu



Аннотация. В статье автор обосновывает возможность интерпретации и переосмысления некоторых существенных мифологем христианства. Для этого он предлагает рассматривать их в свете современной философии сознания, согласно которой человек сознает и познает мир, находясь внутри него, в его составе, и следовательно, онтологически укоренен в нем и как бы «распят» между миром эмпирическим и миром трансцендентальным. Сам наш мир содержит некоторые условия для своего познания, которые сами условий не имеют. Об их существовании свидетельствуют только их воздействия; они выступают просто как сверхприродная данность. Поэтому без представления о сверхъестественном не может быть адекватного осмысления феномена «человек», так как это говорящее существо очевидно не исчерпывается своей природной стороной. Традиционная христианская мифология, основанная на представлениях о сверхъестественном, возникла стихийно. Мифология же нашего времени не может не иметь искусственное происхождение. Она должна быть рациональ-

но осознана именно как мифология. Предлагая возможное адекватное времени толкование мифологием христианства, автор считает, что вместе с тем оно способно претендовать на статус надконфессионального, универсального мирозерцания. Это равнозначно востребованию его тринитарных смыслов, которые до сих пор оставались в целом нераскрытыми. Надконфессиональность мирозерцания подразумевает, что на христианских нравственных ценностях должна основываться и социальность, что человек не должен ограничиваться задачей личного спасения. А это также означает участие в сохранении и воспроизведении свободной социальности — цивилизации.



Ключевые слова: христианство, мифология, историография, Мамардашвили, философия сознания, цивилизация



Ссылка для цитирования: Киселев Г. С. Мифологемы христианства и философия сознания // Философические письма. Русско-европейский диалог. 2024. Т. 7, № 1. С. 126–140. (На английском языке).
doi:10.17323/2658-5413-2024-7-1-126-140.

Myth constructs the Being, not reflects it.

M. Mamardashvili

Although Christian ideas on the ontological dignity of man — albeit obscured by historical confessions — crystallized and formed the basis of the culture and social institutions of the Euro-Atlantic world, this religion does not play a noticeable role. One often speaks even of the “historical failure” of Christianity. But the grandeur, depth, and beauty of the whole Christian building make us doubt that it is no longer needed. Perhaps this opinion does not quite reflect the situation. Maybe some of his ideas are unsatisfactorily interpreted or need to be updated, and developed. And the failure is not so much real as imaginary?

In trying to find an answer to these questions (without claiming to talk about Christianity as a whole), it would be worthwhile to touch upon the problem of interpretation of some of the essential mythologems of the Christian tradition. After all, this religion, like any other, has a mythological basis. Keeping in mind the problematic nature of such an interpretation and being aware of all its riskiness, let us try to approach it from the point of view of the modern philosophy of consciousness. Of course, a journal article can only outline the contours of the task. However, if the experiment turns out to be successful, the way will be open for further reflection.

* * *

Man's awareness of his place in the world began with a myth.

It is known that myths are illusory representations, based on which a person in ancient times explained the world to himself. He didn't have any other knowledge. Something that does not exist, the supernatural, was perceived as a true reality, and concerning it, a person built his life. "Myth," I will refer to M. Mamardashvili, "...transcendentally constructs human existence, human beings are born inside the myth, and they have never been born outside of it" (Mamardashvili, 2009, p. 30–31).

Christianity, this great soteriological doctrine, began to interpret the world through very complex ideas about the unworldly supernatural God. This religion gives him the status of a shrine and recognizes it as a moral absolute, a legislator. The difficulty mentioned lies in the idea of the trinity of the Divine. At the center of Christianity is the idea that God, this highest shrine, is not only the creator but the transcendent and unknowable ruler of the world. It is proclaimed that God is one in three persons and therefore co-natural, immanent to man. In this case, "the shrine," noted S. Frank, "is recognized as something organically internally akin to the mysterious supra-mundane essence of what we call 'I,' our personality" (Frank, 1949, p. 79–80). Christianity proclaimed that God can reveal himself to a moral person from within, through his conscience. By his effort, going towards God from "the depths of his darkness," a person is capable of communion with God; in this way, he can approach the Divine, and ideally merge with it. Therefore, Christianity plays a constructive, human-forming role: it announces the possibility of getting closer to the supernatural, and thus gives a person a chance to become a new, moral being, capable of resisting the evil of the world and thus saving his soul.

Kant considered true Christianity to be a "religion of reason," which has a purely moral nature (Kant, 1980, p. 81–82).¹ Such an understanding implies, on the one hand, a moral legislator outside of man, and on the other hand, the ability of man himself to transcend. Therefore, he is endowed with special dignity and personal responsibility. Christianity, therefore, declares, on the one hand, the unconditional value and uniqueness of each life, and, on the other hand, the freedom of man (that is, his ontological non-conditionality) in a fallen world.

The Reformation rejected the ritual beliefs and superstitions of the historical forms of Christianity. The latter led to the fact that "the central mystery of the Gospel — the mystery of God-manhood — was lost in the Christian consciousness" (Men,

¹ The clergy, Kant noted, "are not striving to instill in their parishioners' moral principles leading to virtue, but they charge them with the historical faith and strict observance of the rules, which, although they indirectly contribute to a mechanical unanimity ... do not lead to unity in the moral way of thinking" (Kant, 1994, p. 97).

2016, p. 6). Not surprisingly, Christian mythology required a rethink. In addition, in modern times, the mythological picture of the world began to gradually give way to scientific ideas. All this led to the emergence of various attempts at a new understanding of Christianity, both by theology and philosophy. Thus, Protestantism contains ideas of renewing Christianity through an “anthropological turn” or “anthropological revolution.” Russian religious philosophy did not fit into the framework of official Orthodoxy either.² Such an evolution of Christianity led to the idea that the differences between Christianity and philosophy, as well as the very idea of their incompatibility or opposition (“reason versus faith”), are not absolute. This idea, which gave religion the status of some kind of pre- and anti-scientific worldview, was to a certain extent removed.

The spiritual and intellectual pursuits of the Renaissance and Enlightenment marked the beginning of the secular era. Worldview pluralism, justified in other spheres of life, eventually turned out — regardless of the intentions of the critics of Christianity — into the basis for moral relativism. Christianity has ceased to be the absolute authority in matters of morality.³

Having largely lost moral guidelines, and at the same time feeling less and less dependent on nature, a person came to the idea of his unlimited power, of the possibility of recreating the world on his own. There was no need for a supernatural moral legislator anymore. But if supernatural authority is deprived of its role, then “everything is allowed,” as Dostoevsky had put it. The way, which eventually led to the so-called crisis of humanism, opened from here.

This is how the drama of freedom began to come to light: having the opportunity to move towards transformation, humanity, on the contrary, drowns in the vain everyday life. This is the dream of the mind — the inability and unwillingness to think adequately — which gives rise to irrationalism, chimeras, and the undivided dominance of various passions. Hence the constant return to one’s delusions and crimes, the inability to break out of the vicious circle of one’s infirmity. Thus, people become the object of various manipulations. The illusory consciousness, in particular, the incorrect understanding of one’s needs and capabilities, is the main obstacle that lies on the way to the emergence of a moral being, a personality. In the

² Nietzsche, not without reason, foresaw the crisis of Christianity, since his “morality turns against the Christian God (the sense of truthfulness, highly developed by Christianity, begins to be disgusted by the falsity and deceitfulness of all Christian interpretations of the world and history)” (Nietzsche, 1910, p. IX, 7).

³ Mamardashvili spoke of evangelical religiosity, “which in no way depends on whether a person goes to church, whether he regards the church as a social, historical constitution, and what he thinks about it And maybe someone, one who does not go to church is more a Christian than one who goes to church” (Mamardashvili, 1996a, p. 370). Father Sergiy Zheludkov distinguished between “Christianity of faith” and “Christianity of will” (Zheludkov, Lyubarsky, 1982, p. 10 et seq.).

end, the consequences of moral nihilism, as we now see, begin to threaten life itself on earth.

Christianity uses a symbol rich in meanings to designate the forces of evil — the concept of “devil” or “antichrist.” The idea of the antichrist warns man that he is the only creature on earth capable of endangering life itself. Therefore, the illusory consciousness is the “diabolism” of self-destruction.

* * *

Any religion, as already mentioned, by its very nature is unimaginable without mythology: science is not able to generate moral values and guidelines. Therefore, the renewal of religion cannot but mean some change in its mythologems. We are talking about such an interpretation of them that would be acceptable for our era with its generally recognized scientific picture of the world.

Such an interpretation, in my opinion, is possible based on the philosophy of Consciousness. The concept of “Consciousness” is understood here not in the way it is interpreted by natural-scientific ideas (hence the capital letter). A person is created by the occasion of the Consciousness itself, and not by its various contents. Therefore, the supernatural nature of such an “event” is assumed. Today, few people will dare to dispute that without the idea of the supernatural, there can be no adequate understanding of the phenomenon of “man”, since this creature with its ability to speak is not exhausted by its natural side.

Indeed, man is paradoxical: “The human soul ... must already in this life be considered as simultaneously connected with two worlds” (Kant, 1994, p. 266). Although biologically man is created by nature, in the human that is in him, he is “not a natural being, and in this sense, he did not originate from an ape. ... The very relation of man to the supernatural is ... his formation as a man” (Mamardashvili, 2002, p. 16, 123). According to Mamardashvili, man is “an artificial being that gives birth to itself by the process called history and culture and gives birth in such a way that it cannot answer the question of its origin” (Mamardashvili, 2009, p. 16). In other words, a person is self-created, as if born again and again. What is meant by such a “second birth”? Here we are directly confronted with the problem of Consciousness — one of the deepest mysteries of our world.

Thinking about this problem, one must first pay attention to the fact that a person is aware of and cognizes the world, being inside it. It is ontologically rooted in it, and therefore our world itself contains certain conditions for its cognition. However, they do not have conditions. Their existence is evidenced only by their effects; they just appear as a given. An individual cannot gain knowledge about them from experience; his psychophysical properties do not provide this. Therefore, these con-

ditions have to be accepted without any causal connection. This is the core of Kant's teaching.

We are talking about what is called a phenomenological shift: the attraction of some artificial (ideal, not visual) logical constructions, ordered mental structures that form a mysterious sphere of baseless (ultimate) ontological abstractions. Mamardashvili, who followed Kant here, said that we are dealing with pre-established "harmonies that already exist and determine the initial conditions (that is ... something else in the initial conditions themselves)" (Mamardashvili, 2009, p. 159). The "occasion" of Consciousness is groundless and, therefore, acts as a prerequisite with concerning its contents, paradoxically preceding cognition.

"There is," the thinker believed, "some other life, more real than our ordinary one. There is something else that also lives, but lives differently, more meaningfully — this is a higher life, and you can apply words to it: sacred, holy, in a different time, in a different space, etc." (Mamardashvili, 1999, p. 23). In other words, we are talking about transcendence — about a breakthrough in everyday life with its natural connections and clutches, about an attempt to reach the limits of the world. As a result of such a breakthrough, "history arises as a field of human forces and as an organ of human existence and development; ... the field of personal responsibility and work of the soul as a kind of adventure and drama, only by going through which a person can become and be all the time in a state of rebirth" (Mamardashvili, 1991, p. 19).

Transcendence, which Kant called "supernatural inner action," is a correlation with such another life, another "dimension." And although it is impossible to present this dimension objectively, for those who belong to humanity, its constituent "things" are obvious: it is goodness, conscience, dignity, fidelity, duty, etc.

It is necessary to be aware that the state of Consciousness, in which a person creates himself, should not be considered an individual. It is about co-existence and co-communication. Arising from time to time in separate individuals, it is indivisible and connected, as it were, "above" the natural state of the community of people. This refers to a kind of super-empirical formation, assuming the all-connectedness of conscious acts. Mamardashvili spoke about such a paradoxical all-connectivity, continuity of thinking, communication through time and about "all-penetrating ether", as about "eternal present." This can be assumed since humanity is characterized by universal communication. After all, only a person exists exclusively in the mode of relations with other people. "This is a kind of collective 'body' of history and man, ... which is an anthropogenic space, a whole sphere" (Mamardashvili, 1992b, p. 185). Hence, by the way, the very word "consciousness" — i.e., co-knowledge, or co-existence, co-communication in thought. In other words, individual discrete conscious

acts give rise to the following similar acts, and therefore they act as generative (generating) structures in which the thinker himself is reproduced.

Thus, if Christianity understands the supernatural reality of God, in whom one can only believe⁴ the philosophy of Consciousness speaks of such a reality because of a transcendental breakthrough. Transcending generates a certain specific state — Being (or Consciousness-Being): a truly human existence, the fullness of life, called “existence” in the philosophy of the twentieth century. A person is formed only by Being. Such an interpretation of the concept of “Being” implies its identity with thinking: by thinking intensively and developing all their potentialities to the maximum, people do not just live, but create their own unique life. Here it is appropriate to recall the concept of “enlightenment” — in the sense that Kant put into it (who in no way meant that enlightenment is a certain body of knowledge): enlightenment is an adult, mature state of man and mankind.

* * *

Since a person cannot automatically maintain a state of constant tension, spiritual and intellectual efforts must be made continuously. Each new conscious act freely arises and is held by the will, the effort of thought, and the preservation of oneself in it: otherwise the ordered structures of consciousness disintegrate. To develop personally, not to degrade, a person must constantly seek answers to questions about the mysteries of Being. The very concept of “man” therefore makes sense only in dynamics. It is impossible to operate with it statically: it is conceivable only as a subject of a constant process of self-change, self-construction. Therefore, strictly speaking, one can only become a man.

It is important to note here: being able to “fall” into Being, a person may not do it. If there is no effort before us is a creature that can only move on two legs and has the gift of speech. Any life is therefore a dramatic test: the individual is free and free to become a Man or remain just a talking two-legged.⁵

Therefore, the state of Consciousness-Being, as it were, flickers; his glimpses, or moments, Mamardashvili called “privileged.” He believed that human existence goes, as it were, in two streams: “In one is our life, and inside it in pieces, another mode, when we touch Being. ... To what already exists, indestructible, motionless, eternal ... This is the rhythm of life, we do not stay ... all the time in Being, we are in contact with it” (Mamardashvili, 1999, p. 46). In Frank’s terms, one could say that the darkness is

⁴ Direct religious experience, living faith should not and cannot be the subject of rational reasoning, and therefore one should recognize its unconditional right to exist and respectfully stop there.

⁵ It is no coincidence that Ortega-y-Gasset noted that “man is not a thing, but a drama, which is his life” (Ortega-y-Gasset, 1997, p. 457).

constantly crowding out the light, which now shines brighter, then dimmer, but does not disappear at all.

Recognizing the constructive role of myth in the self-construction of man and believing that in the modern world traditional Christian mythology no longer satisfies him, we have to admit that he needs a different mythology. But here difficulties arise in the way of our reasoning. The fact is that Christian mythology arose spontaneously. The mythology of our time cannot but have an artificial origin. Therefore, it must be rationally understood precisely as mythology. How to resolve this conflict?

In my opinion, here one can find some similarities with the situation described by E. Solovyov. He noted that “the development of law in Western Europe ... remained a spontaneous and objective process, the driving forces of which lay in independent of legal understanding (largely simply unconscious) reformist changes in religion. In the modern, deeply secularized world, such a mechanism of legal generation is simply impossible. Therefore ... it is necessary to repeat the genesis at a new level of rationality and idealism, at the level of pure legal intentionality” (Soloviev, 1992, p. 24, 31–32 et seq.).

It seems that in our case, it is the intentionality of the transcendental effort that could play its role. In this sense, one could say, greatly simplifying, that the supernatural moral legislator, or God, is created by man himself. But, as we shall see, this is still not the case. Who could be the subject of such an effort? The Holy Scripture states that “from everyone to whom much has been given, much will be required, and to whom much has been entrusted, more will be required” (Lk 12:48). Highly developed people who are aware of their destiny and capabilities could be capable of such an extraordinary effort. A new spiritual community could be made up of believers who are looking for the renewal of Christianity, and non-religious people, whose break with this religion was historically conditioned and can be overcome.

On the one hand, free self-lawful thought is necessary, and, speaking of it, we do not mean simply the ability to think logically, but the concentration of all spiritual and intellectual forces and intuitions of a person. On the other hand, what is needed is goodwill, the will of man to do good. Only in this way could a myth be actualized that does not contradict the scientific picture of the world.

Of course, all this would require, among other things, a serious reform of the systems of upbringing and education. The process of socialization should be based on such a humanistic upbringing, which would take as its basis the idea of a person as an artificial creature, self-generated through culturally invented symbols and devices. In other words, education could be based on “human science” as the justification and implementation of an absolute moral law.

* * *

Let me remind you of what I have already written: what can be the interpretation of Christian mythologems in the light of modern philosophy of consciousness (see: Kiselev, 2021)?

Of course, we will be dealing with symbols.⁶ The existence of an “unmixed and inseparable” unity of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit is unprovable and irrefutable, but the symbol of God is nevertheless obviously a postulate of the moral life. In other words, God is as real, as real is the sphere of Consciousness-Being. Thus, this symbol can be interpreted as a universal transcendental. Since with the help of this symbol, a person creates himself as a personality, a moral being, we are essentially talking about the generative (generative) structure of existential thinking. We look at God as the Creator precisely in the light of the concept of “second birth.”⁷ Therefore, it makes no sense to discuss in the same context the questions of whether God exists and whether man descended from an ape.

The idea of providentiality, of Divine Providence, expresses the intuition about supernatural reality as eternally accompanying the human race (the “eternal present” immanent to it). Mamardashvili understood such a reality as an “all-pervading ether,” as in a special way — vertically with concerning historical time — an organized structure of acts of consciousness. Such a vertical cut exists due to universal communication — the most important property of humanity. With this approach, the thinker said, “We get a completely different space and time, not a chronological sequence, but some kind of vertical ... in which we can intelligibly connect things or thoughts that do not chronologically pass one to another, ... since this is not linear time, not an elusive, sliding point of simultaneity, but something else — some kind of vertical or fan-shaped section” (Mamardashvili, 1992b, p. 97).⁸ This, of course, is a kind of determinism. However, unlike flat natural determinism, to which any other

⁶ Symbolic concepts are those “where our very personal existence is formed in one way or another depending on our ability to apply and decipher these concepts” (Mamardashvili, 1994, p. 5–19).

⁷ “The idea of God,” said Mamardashvili, “... may be an illusion, but it exists. [We] cannot deduce the idea of God (where the fact of its existence is not the subject in the empirical sense). ... Where are they from? ... we will never know. But they distinguish us as human beings” (Mamardashvili, 1996b, p. 222, 224–225).

⁸ The idea of the “eternal present,” or of the “vertical cut” could be retold in the language of Christianity by the words of Augustine: “You were before time in time. ... Before all the past, You were on the heights of always abiding eternity, and You are exalted above all things to come: it will be, and when it comes, it will pass away. ... Your years do not come and do not go, but ours, to come to them all, come and go. All Your years are simultaneous and motionless: they stand; those who come do not crowd out those who go, for they do not pass ... ‘Thy years are like one day,’ and this day does not come daily, but today, for Your today does not give way to tomorrow and does not replace yesterday. Your today is eternity; therefore, your Son is eternal, like You. ... You created every time, and before every time you were, and there was no time when there was no time at all” (Augustin, 1997, p. 216).

interpretation of the idea of providence, or providence, is reduced, this “eternal present” is based on a free person, and this changes things.

The notion of the immortality of the soul, which causes controversy in Christian theology, also looks in a new light. In our case, we should rather talk about the singularity of the soul of mankind. This can be interpreted as the possibility that towards the “eternally present,” i.e., to the sphere of Consciousness-Being, each individual who comes into the world anew can “lean against.” It is this notion that can substantiate the common human purpose for the whole race — the infinite spiritualization of the world, to which a human being finite in time is called.

Further. One of the most difficult concepts to interpret is that of the personal nature of God. One could argue as follows: going towards the supernatural force that we discover in ourselves, we change our nature, giving this force a part of ourselves, re-creating our soul. Such self-giving is possible only in love. At the same time, it is not enough to believe that we are talking about love for goodness, truth, beauty, about reverence for perfection. Christian love, uniting all hypostases of the Holy Trinity and man, binds equal (but not equal in size) persons. Personality (person) is the key limiting concept here. Only individuals are capable of such self-giving love, overcoming the evil of the world. Is God personal? This question belongs to the realm of faith. But if we generally recognize the possibility of the supernatural, the question of the immateriality of the individual has the right to be raised. Be that as it may, the supernatural, “divine” reality (power), growing in us, also gives itself to us. Otherwise, we could not be aware of its existence at all.

About the fall into sin, or about the “original evil of falling away.” In our case, this can be understood in such a way that we are talking about the acquisition by a person of the possibility of Consciousness — not realized, but because of the imperfection of a person, turned into a diabolical illusory thinking.

And, finally, about the “end of the world,” or about the Apocalypse. Let us note that the proposed approach to the mythology of Christianity does not mean a rejection of its two important ideas: about the Apocalypse and the Kingdom of God. It rethinks them. Apocalypse, or the end of the world, is indeed quite probable. It is already quite clear that humanity is capable of bringing the world — now obviously anti-Christian — to the death of not only civilization but also life on earth — with its own hands. There are hydrogen bombs and rockets, there are chemical and bacteriological weapons, mutual hatred, and the environment is being destroyed quite successfully.

As for the idea of the Kingdom of God as a new beginning, the beginning of “eternal life” predetermined by the transfiguration of the world, here we are not given to know anything. It is only known that the life path of the human race is probabilistic.

However, trinitarian thinking and reimagined mythologies offer an alternative to the forces of self-destruction. In this sense, it seems premature to speak of a “historical failure of Christianity.”

* * *

The proposed interpretation of Christianity’s mythologems allows, it seems to me, to claim the status of a supra-confessional universal worldview. This interpretation is tantamount to a demand for its trinitarian meanings, actualized, as it were, “above” (but with the indispensable participation) of historical religions, the content that has so far remained generally undisclosed. “Christianity is just beginning,” said Fr. Alexander Men...

Overconfessionalism implies, among other things, that sociality should also be based on Christian moral values, and that a person should not be limited to the task of personal salvation. And this also means participation in the preservation and reproduction of a free sociality — civilization. “There are a lot of societies in which there is no legal order, and it cannot be established in these societies from the outside,” Mamardashvili noted, “(it can be established, but it will not hold, because it does not grow out of the very development of human subjects)” (Mamardashvili, 2009, p. 30). Indeed, a highly developed person is required for civilization. We must agree with the consideration that “internal, more irrelevant, spiritual freedom is possible only if there is external freedom, and the latter is the best school for the former” (Kistyakovsky, 1991, p. 122–123).

Civilization will be reproduced only if man constantly changes himself. Without this, it will not be able to survive, it will degrade, and go back to the archaic. If there is no religion as a “moral-historical task, as a common cause of mankind” (Vl. Solovyov) — and trinitarian Christianity with its mythology is capable of playing such a role — then may happen what Mamardashvili called a situation of “eternal rest.”⁹

⁹ This is precisely what Mamardashvili warned about: “We are the people of the 20th century, and we cannot escape the global nature of its problems. And this is, first of all, the problem of modern barbarism, savagery. This is the threat of ‘eternal rest’, i.e., the possibility of eternal stay in a state of neither good nor evil, neither being nor non-being. ... Treasures of culture are not a guarantee here. ... Here we are discussing: to be or not to be a civilization on Earth. So, it may not exist even before any atomic catastrophe and completely independently of it. Irreversible destruction of consciousness, a successive series of rebirths of the structure of historical man will be enough” (Mamardashvili, 1992a, p. 189). Isn’t this what matters in today’s world, in which there is an “irrational state ... of the political process: an increase in the number of ill-considered military-political actions; the spread of ... religious intolerance, cultural exclusivity and xenophobia; the blurring of the concepts of ‘war’ and ‘international security’; escalation of global problems, risks and uncertainty of world development” (Sledzevsky, 2011, p. 144).

Of course, one must realize that the likelihood of claiming Trinitarian Christianity and relying on its mythology in the conditions of the modern world is very small. Therefore, the prospects for civilization remain unclear.

References

Augustin, A. (1997) *Confessions*. Translated from the Latin by M.E. Sergeenko. Moscow: Canon+. (In Russ.).

Frank, S.L. (1949) *Light in the Darkness. Experience of Christian Ethics and Social Philosophy*. Paris: YMCA-PRESS. (In Russ.).

Kiselev, G.S. (2021) *The Illusion of Progress. Essay in Historiosophy*. Available at: <http://www.gskiselev.com>; <http://www.flibusta.is> (Accessed: 05 January 2024). (In Russ.).

Kant, I. (1980) "Religion Within the Limits of Only Reason", in Kant, I. *Treatises and Letters*. Moscow: Nauka, pp. 78–278. (In Russ.).

Kant, I. (1994) "The Contest of Faculties", in Kant, I. *Collected works: in 8 vols. Vol. 7*. Moscow: CHORO, pp. 58–135. (In Russ.).

Kistyakovsky, B.A. (1991) "In Defense of Law (Intelligentsia and Legal Consciousness)", in *Vekhi. From the depths*. Moscow: Pravda, pp. 122–149. (In Russ.).

Mamardashvili, M.K. (1991) "The Problem of Man in Philosophy", in Frolov, I.T. (ed.) *About Human in Human*. Moscow: Politizdat, pp. 8–21. (In Russ.).

Mamardashvili, M.K. (1992a) "If One Dares to Be...", in Mamardashvili, M.K. *How I Understand Philosophy*. Moscow: Progress-Kul'tura, pp. 172–200. (In Russ.).

Mamardashvili, M.K. (1992b) "The Idea of Continuity and Philosophical Tradition", in Mamardashvili, M.K. *How I Understand Philosophy*. Moscow: Progress-Kul'tura, pp. 91–99. (In Russ.).

Mamardashvili, M.K. (1994) "Philosophy and Personality", *Chelovek*, 5, pp. 5–19. (In Russ.).

Mamardashvili, M.K. (1996a) "A philosopher may not be a prophet...", in Mamardashvili, M. *The Necessity of Self: The Introduction to Philosophy. Papers, Articles, Philosophical Notes*. Moscow: Labirint, pp. 360–371. (In Russ.).

Mamardashvili, M.K. (1996b) "On consciousness", in Mamardashvili, M. *The Necessity of Self: The Introduction to Philosophy. Papers, Articles, Philosophical Notes*. Moscow: Labirint, pp. 214–228. (In Russ.).

Mamardashvili, M.K. (2002) "Introduction to Philosophy", in Mamardashvili, M.K. *Philosophical Readings*. St. Petersburg: Azbuka-Classica, pp. 7–172. (In Russ.).

Mamardashvili, M.K. (2009) *Essay on Physical Metaphysics (Vilnius Lectures on Social Philosophy)*. Moscow: Progress-Traditsiia. (In Russ.).

Men, A. (2016) *The Son of Man*. Moscow: Alexander Men Foundation. (In Russ.).

Nietzsche, F. (1910) *Complete Works. Vol. IX: Will to Power*. Moscow: Moscow Book Publishing. (In Russ.).

Ortega-y-Gasset, J. (1997) "The Revolt of Masses", in Ortega-y-Gasset, J. *Selected Works*. Moscow: Ves mir, pp. 43–162. (In Russ.).

Sledzevsky, I.V. (2011) "Dialogue of Civilizations as a Semantic Field of World Politics", *Social Sciences and Modernity*, 2, pp. 141–156. (In Russ.).

Sledzevsky, I.V. (2020) "Civilization Dimension of Modern World Development: Problems and Approaches", *World Economy and International Relations*, 64(1), pp. 82–90. (In Russ.).

Solovyov, E.Yu. (1992) "Report at the 'Round Table'", *Voprosy Filosofii*, 2, pp. 3–49. (In Russ.).

Zheludkov, S., Fr. and Liubarsky, K. (1982) *Christianity and Atheism*. Correspondence of Fr. S. Zheludkov with K.A. Lyubarsky. Brussels: Life with God. (In Russ.).

Список источников

Августин А. Исповедь / пер. с лат. М. Е. Сергеев. М.: Канон+, 1997. 464 с.

Франк С. Л. Свет во тьме. Опыт христианской этики и социальной философии. Paris: YMCA-PRESS, 1949. 402 с.

Киселев Г. С. Иллюзия прогресса. Опыт историософии. URL: <http://www.gskiselev.com>; <http://www.flibusta.is> (дата обращения: 05.01.2024).

Кант И. Религия в пределах только разума // Кант И. Трактаты и письма. М.: Наука, 1980. С. 78–278.

Кант И. Спор факультетов // Кант И. Собрание сочинений: в 8 т. М.: Чоро, 1994. Т. 7. С. 58–135.

Кистяковский Б. А. В защиту права (Интеллигенция и правосознание) // Вехи. Из глубины. М.: Правда, 1991. С. 122–149.

Мамардашвили М. К. Проблема человека в философии // О человеческом в человеке / под общ. ред. И. Т. Фролова. М.: Политиздат, 1991. С. 8–21.

Мамардашвили М. К. Если осмелиться быть... // Мамардашвили М. К. Как я понимаю философию. М.: Прогресс-Культура, 1992а. С. 172–200.

Мамардашвили М. К. Идея преемственности и философская традиция // Мамардашвили М. К. Как я понимаю философию. М.: Прогресс-Культура, 1992б. С. 91–99.

Мамардашвили М. К. Философия и личность // Человек. 1994. № 5. С. 5–19.

Мамардашвили М. К. Философ может не быть пророком... // Мамардашвили М. К. Необходимость себя: введение в философию. Доклады, статьи, философские заметки. М.: Лабиринт, 1996а. С. 360–371.

Мамардашвили М. К. О сознании // Мамардашвили М. К. Необходимость себя: введение в философию. Доклады, статьи, философские заметки. М.: Лабиринт, 1996b. С. 214–228.

Мамардашвили М. К. Введение в философию // Мамардашвили М. К. Философские чтения. СПб.: Азбука-Классика, 2002. С. 7–172.

Мамардашвили М. К. Опыт физической метафизики (Вильнюсские лекции по социальной философии). М.: Прогресс-Традиция, 2009. 304 с.

Мень А. Сын человеческий. М.: Фонд Александра Меня, 2016.

Ницше Ф. Полное собрание сочинений. М.: Московское книгоиздательство, 1910. Т. IX: Воля к власти. XXXIV, 362 с.

Ортега-и-Гассет Х. Восстание масс // Ортега-и-Гассет Х. Избранные труды. М.: Весь мир, 1997. С. 43–162.

Следзевский И. В. Диалог цивилизаций как смысловое поле мировой политики // Общественные науки и современность. 2011. № 2. С. 141–156.

Следзевский И. В. Цивилизационное измерение современного мирового развития: проблемы и подходы // Мировая экономика и международные отношения. 2020. Т. 64, № 1. С. 82–90.

Соловьев Э. Ю. Доклад на «Круглом столе» // Вопр. философии. 1992. № 2. С. 3–49.

Желудков С., свящ., Любарский К. Христианство и атеизм. Переписка О. С. Желудкова с К. А. Любарским. Брюссель: Жизнь в Боге, 1982. 250 с.

Information about the author: Gregory S. Kiselev — PhD in History, independent researcher. Address: Urbana-Champaign, USA. Personal website: Available at: <http://www.gskiselev.com> (Accessed: 05 January 2024).

Информация об авторе: Григорий Сергеевич Киселев — кандидат исторических наук, независимый исследователь. Адрес: США, Урбана-Шампейн. Персональный сайт: URL: <http://www.gskiselev.com> (дата обращения: 05.01.2024).

Автор заявляет об отсутствии конфликта интересов.

The author declares no conflicts of interests

The article was submitted 31.10.2023;
approved after reviewing 01.03.2024;
accepted for publication 10.03.2024.

Статья поступила в редакцию 31.10.2023;
одобрена после рецензирования 01.03.2024;
принята к публикации 10.03.2024.