

УДК 1:21+27-528.1/8

DOI: 10.48164/2713-301X_2023_14_13

A.G. Gacheva

Moscow

A.M. Gorky Institute of World Literature of the Russian Academy of Science
the N.F. Fedorov Library No. 180 Association of Cultural Centers of the SouthwesternDistrict of Moscow
a-gacheva@yandex.ru**JUSTIFYING SUB SPECIE CULTURE OF JUSTIFYING HISTORY
IN RUSSIAN RELIGIOUS AND PHILOSOPHICAL THOUGHT**

V.F. Ern's judgments about the logos tradition of Russian thought which determines the unity of its leaders' approaches to indigenous worldview problems, open up the prospect of reconstructing ideas about the sense and tasks of culture in the line of Russian philosophy that is connected with the idea of justifying history. The author of the present study proves that, opposing historiosophical pessimism and catastrophism, Russian Christian thinkers put forward the task of Churchification all spheres and plans of life, understanding culture as an instrument for transforming the world. Philosophers contrast the processes of its secularization with the liturgization of cultural doing, which is considered in the context of the "possession of the earth" commandment. In this regard, N.F. Fedorov's doctrine, who called for the transition from culture (as a symbolic resurrection) to recreature, i.e. the actual restoration of life, is of particular importance.

Keywords: *Russian religious and philosophical thought, the idea of justifying history, culture, creativity, liturgism, recreature, N.F. Fedorov.*

One of the leading representatives of Russian religious and philosophical thought, and at the same time its researcher and theorist, V.F. Ern, characterizing Russian wisdom, noted the deep similarity of Russian thinkers in the interpretation of the main global challenges, history, and humanity. Not only those who are contemporaries and declare their kinship in culture and spirit, but *also those who are separated from each other "by large periods and ignorance of each other, echo each other and, without saying a word, pick up each other in amazing agreement"* [1, p. 98]¹. Ern emphasized that these mutual echoes testify to the existence of a certain "internal" and "underground" tradition rooted in the foundational ethos of Russian culture. This tradition, inseparable from the Word, is underscored by the idea that "all things started to exist"

[John 1:3]. The cohesive interconnection of cultural phenomena finds its roots in the "internal metaphysical unity of humanity" [1, p. 98], with God identified as its fundamental source.

The common spiritual source of philosophizing determines the similarity of the approach of Russian thinkers to the phenomenon of culture [2] in which they see the Logos as an instrument, a manifestation of His creative, affirming, and transforming power. Simultaneously, the idea of its meaning and religious mission is directly associated in the Russian philosophical tradition with the significance and purpose of the historical process. Moreover, the justification of history also serves justify of culture, since it is seen as the creative domain of a human being to whom the Creator has entrusted the world for proper cultivation and nurturing rather

¹ Italics hereinafter indicate the cited authors.

than as an optional and secondary superstructure over the economic foundation.

In the famous dispute involving F.M. Dostoevsky and K.N. Leontyev¹, the latter criticized the writer for overestimating history and asserted the illusory nature of hopes for universal harmony on earth, contending instead that humanity is ensnared in the grip of sin. The majority of Russian religious thinkers sided with Dostoevsky in this debate. Figures such as N.F. Fedorov, V.S. Soloviev, N.A. Berdyaev, S.N. Bulgakov, V.V. Zenkovsky, I.A., and V.N. Ilyins did not recognize the historiosophical pessimism of K.N. Leontyev, his view of history as an inevitable apostasy, where all creativity is secondary, nonabsolute, and ultimately lack great value, according to the prophecies of "Revelation...", is inexorably doomed to fire. These thinkers identified themselves with Dostoevsky interpretation of John's prophecy, emphasizing not the world-destroying aspect but the world-transforming significance. They affirmed the role of history to create "a great general harmony, fraternal, final agreement of all tribes according to Christ's, the Gospel law" [7, vol. 26, p. 148]. Like the writer, they contrasted Ferapont's rejection of the world with Zossim's commandment of active love, portraying the faith of Christ as illuminating and transforming earthly reality.

In his programmatic abstract "On the Decline of the Medieval Worldview" (1891), V.S. Soloviev strictly criticized historical Christianity for "false spiritualism," arrogantly trampling the earth as a vale of suffering, evil, and sin and striving to break out of the captivity of matter, instead of illuminating and transforming it. He reminded us that "the implementation of the Kingdom of God depends not only on God but also on us" [8, vol. 2, p. 340]. Figures of the Russian religious and philosophical revival of the early 20th century, who strived for a dialog between culture

and the church and affirmed the idea of a Christian community, also opposed historiosophical nihilism, which became cultural nihilism. Modern Christianity was criticized for its passivity, the church for its shameful compromise with commercial and industrial civilization, which is actively pushing it to the margins of history and insisting that it "must know its place" and not claim the right to lead spiritually, and church theological creativity for striving to settle comfortably behind the protective walls of dogma, isolating it from the spiritual and ideological challenges of the day, from the questions that were pounding the dogmatic church's closed doors regarding the role of Christianity in history, about man and his intention in the world, and whether a culture freed from Christianity could return to the embrace of the faith of Christ at a new point in time, and with the entire range of creative means developed in the process of free artistic search. "Religious dualism" leaving "culture and society" "beyond the church fence" [9, p. 191], was considered by Russian God-seekers as the main cause of the crisis state of the world, ready to explode from the inside from the pressure of the energies of mutual confrontation. "The powerlessness of the church and the death of culture" [9, p. 191] – this is how they characterized the current state of humanity, which was the result of historiosophical pessimism and catastrophism², a passive, uncreative attitude, disbelief in man, in his ability to be internally renewed, to "resurrect and rise," to overcome "spiritual fainting"³.

The dualistic gap between Christianity and the world was especially sharply criticized by representatives of the religious and philosophical emigration of the 1920s and 1930s. N.A. Berdyaev, S.N. Bulgakov, G.P. Fedotov, and V.N. Ilyin, and others considered the First World War and revolutionary upheavals in Soviet Russia to

¹ The controversy between F.M. Dostoevsky and K.N. Leontyev (3-5). The role of this polemic in the formation of the idea of justifying history (6, p. 20-21).

² In such terms, philosopher N. A. Setnitsky defined the "Leontiev" type of Christian thinking [10, p. 82, 84].

³ F.I. Tyutchev, "I don't know if grace will touch...", complete collection of poems, Sovetskii pisatel, Leningrad, 177 (1987).

be a natural consequence of the fact that Christianity never became the guiding, organizing force of development, finally gave way to secular models of life, and maximally reduced its responsibility for what was happening. In apparent continuity with Dostoevsky's perspective, who perceived "something reckless and wicked" [7, vol. 27, p. 51] in Leontiev's stance and connected his historiosophical pessimism with egoism, I.A. Ilyin, in his work "Fundamentals of Christian Culture," argued with the "world-denying bias" within the Christian worldview. He challenged the passive and disempowering notion that "a true Christian does not have a creative mission and a creative goal on earth" [11, p. 315], emphasizing that it was the world-rejecting attitude that Christianity still cannot overcome within itself that became the reason for the rapid secularization of culture and life in the era of New and Contemporary times. According to Ilyin, Christianity, which "teaches to leave the world and from the world repentantly, but does not teach to enter the world responsibly and create joyfully in it for the glory of God" [11, p. 316], cannot serve as the driving force for cultural activity throughout history. For it to become different, it is essential to overcome the point of view according to which the gap between the church and the extra-church, right up to their final separation and even mutual struggle, is the norm for Christian humanity and there is nothing left for Christians in history but the salvation of the soul and patient anticipation of the last days.

In contrast to the position of historiosophical pessimism, Russian thought advocates the concept of history as a "work of salvation," a divine-human action resulting in a world transformed and liberated from the grip of sin and death. Solovyov emphasizes this perspective, stating, "The essence of true Christianity is the rebirth of humanity and the world in the spirit of Christ, the transformation of the worldly kingdom into the Kingdom of God [which is not of this world]. This rebirth is a complex

and long process, and it is not for nothing that in the Gospel itself it is compared with the growth of a tree, the ripening of a harvest, the leavening of dough, etc." [8, vol. 2, p. 339]. Aksakov employed a similar image of leaven fermenting the dough of history in his work, "On the Leap Thrown into the World by Christ" [12, p. 350], suggesting that the earthly world undergoes renewal and transformation into the Kingdom of God through Christ's intervention. Half a century later, G.P. Fedotov, a prominent figure in "Novogradstvo," in his article "Eschatology and Culture," revisits the concept of "leaven" from Christ's parable. Simultaneously, he updates the ideas of his spiritual predecessors in Russian thought, Fedotov challenges the traditional interpretation of the end of history as a world-destroying catastrophe preceding the advent of "a new heaven and a new earth." He emphasizes that the maturation of the world toward transformation is not an automatic process but hinges directly on human agency, being on his conscious and free choice to be or not to be among the disciples and apostles called to bring the light of the Gospel to the world, to establish the law of love and freedom in it, rebuilding all social institutions, all levels of private and general life based on the Gospel, and enlightening and transforming the economy and culture. Fedotov states, "The Kingdom of God does not come regardless of human effort, achievement, or struggle. The Kingdom of God is a divine and human affair. In the heavenly Jerusalem, which (Rev., ch. 21) completes the eschatological drama, humanity must witness the fruits of its labors and inspiration purified and transformed. This city, although descending from heaven, is built on earth through the cooperation of all generations" [13, p. 48].

The belief that history is not "an empty corridor that must somehow be passed through to be freed from this world into the other world," but "a divine-human affair on earth" [14, p. 464], directly affects Russian thinkers' understanding of culture and cultural activity. In the con-

text of “active apocalypticism,” culture, alongside other areas of human labor and creativity (economics, politics, pedagogy, medicine), is presented as an instrument of Christian service, interpreted in the light of the eschatology of salvation¹ and is included in the “extra-church liturgy.” The last concept, like the concept of history as a “work of salvation,” was introduced by N. F. Fedorov and adopted by the Russian Christian thinkers of the 20th century. “Liturgy” when translated from Greek, means “common cause” and, from the standpoint of supporters of the idea of justifying history, cannot in any way be limited to only church action. It must expand beyond the church wall and extend to history and culture, as well as embrace all spheres of human thought and practice with the Christian task.

The call for extra-church liturgy embodied the trajectory of religiosity of life, championed by Russian religious and philosophical thought in contrast to the secular trends of the New and Contemporary eras. Figures such as Dostoevsky, Fedorov, Solovyov, and Bulgakov viewed this movement beyond the confines of the church not as a process leading to secularization and the erosion of faith, but rather as an opportunity for the full expression of grace in the world. Humanity, like the Bride of the Lamb, must prepare itself for eschatological fulfillment, both internally through the work of self-education, asceticism, and “active love,” and externally through the enlightenment of the entire system of relationships, connections, and actions that arise between humans, human and nature, and the Universe, included in that main defining system of interactions that arises between humans and God, considering the idea of justifying history, asceticism and culture, separated in a secularized world on opposite sides of the barricades, become two sides of a single

process of salvation; moreover, they support and strengthen each other [16, vol. 2, p. 640]

In his article “Fundamentals of Christian Culture” already cited above, I.A. Ilyin argued, “*Science, art, state, and economy are, as it were, the spiritual hands with which humanity takes the world.*” Christianity’s task is not to cut off these hands savagely but to permeate their work from the inside with a living spirit received from Christ. Christianity exhibits a great volitional task in the world, which many people do not understand. This task can be designated as the creation of *Christian culture*” [11, p. 322]. In this context, the concept of culture includes all spheres of human creative action, ranging from politics to economics. This expansive interpretation of culture aligns with the views of those who advocate the Christian justification of history. They perceive human cultural creativity as a manifestation of the original commandment bestowed upon humanity by the Creator from the beginning of time, specifically, the directive to cultivate and preserve God’s garden. Following the redemptive act of Jesus Christ, this commandment was transformed into an imperative “to restore the world to the splendor of incorruptibility in which it was before the Fall” [17, vol. 1, p. 401]. In a lecture “Dogmatic Justification of Culture,” delivered in May 1930 at the Congress of the League of Orthodox Culture, S.N. Bulgakov outlined the objectives of cultural activities. He stated, “The task of culture is the work of God-Manhood, i.e., the humanization of the world and the deification of man. In this sense, the task of culture is completely limitless” [16, vol. 2, p. 643].

In the Russian philosophical tradition, culture assumes not only soteriological but also ontological significance. Russian thinkers engage in debates against a pessimistic portrayal of the future of the earth and humanity, driven by the hypothesis of the thermal death of the Universe proposed by R. Clausius in 1865, and where a man seen as a thinker, feeling, creat-

¹ The concept of “active apocalypticism” was introduced by A.K. Gorskiy, N.A. Setnitsky, and V.N. Muravyov, philosophical friends of the 1920s. They invoked, following N.F. Fedorov, to proceed from passive expectation of the end of the world to creative action aimed “to lead the world to a final and complete transformation” [15, book. 1, p. 460].

ing being, had no place. They put forward the idea of the antientropic essence of life and culture, placing it at the basis of a "future integral worldview," where the justification of man, history, and the cosmos are inextricably linked. Consequently, P. A. Florensky defines this worldview in the "Author's Abstract" created for the encyclopedic dictionary "Pomegranate": "Florensky considers the second principle of thermodynamics to be the fundamental law of the world, the law of entropy, broadly taken as the law of chaos in all areas of the universe. The world is opposed by Logos as the beginning of the ectopic. Culture is a conscious struggle against world equalization, as culture consists of isolation, as a delay in the equalizing process of the Universe, and in increasing the difference in potentials in all fields, as a condition of life, as opposed to equality, death" [18, p. 114].

Culture, as interpreted by P.A. Florensky, philosophers, and cosmists such as N.A. Umov, V.I. Vernadsky, V.N. Muravyov, and V.N. Ilyin, as well as the French philosopher and scientist P. Teilhard de Chardin, emerged as the fundamental force shaping the world. Alongside the phenomena of life and thought, culture constitutes the "third law of thermodynamics," countering entropy, and promoting an increase in "harmony." It plays a leading role among the generative and creative forces of existence. This interpretation of cultural activity forms a bridge between natural science and religious worldviews. The creativity of culture is understood as the evolutionary destiny of humanity and a religious duty imposed since creation. P. A. Florensky, a religious philosopher and priest, defined the essence of the active, creative task assigned to humankind as a microcosm in front of the macrocosm, the Universe. He stated, "A Man-Husband must love the World-Wife, be in unity with it, cultivate it, care of it, control it, leading it to enlightenment and spirituality and directing its elemental power and chaotic impulses toward creativity so that its original cos-

mos appears in the creature" [19, vol. 3(1), p. 440]. The key properties of a person's relationship to the world are love and cultivation, striving for beauty and perfection, and the concept of cultivation is enclosed at the very foundation, at the very root of the word "culture," revealing itself most profoundly in a cosmic and religious-creative perspective.

N.F. Fedorov, characterizing the existential and creative status of man, emphasizes that nature in itself comes "to self-awareness and self-government" [17, vol. 2, p. 77]. A conscious and sentient being introduces a moral vector into the evolution of life. V.S. Soloviev, while substantiating the notion of the ascending development of the world and the internally purposeful improvement of natural forms leading to the emergence of man, whom he describes as "the most beautiful and conscious natural being" [8, vol. 2, p. 390], emphasizes that in cultural creativity, humans continue the work of nature, promoting the perfect interpenetration of idea and form, which according to him "is the essence of beauty." V.N. Ilyin, who, like his fellowmen in culture and spirit, sought to build a bridge between the Hexaemeron and evolution, argued, "The Bible and science cannot be at enmity, they argue about the same thing but often in different ways, incommensurable... languages" [20, p. 9]. He reconciled materialism and idealism in the concept of "matteriologism" and "Logos acting in the matter" [21] and moved it toward transformation. Man, the bearer and instrument of the Logos, appears in his works as the cosmine of creation, the cultivator of being, and the gardener of Eden, the amount of which is equal to the Universe.

S.N. Bulgakov articulates a similar perspective by expressing the concept of "the world as an economy" [16, vol. 1, p. 47]. According to the Creator's plan, Bulgakov sees a man as a "cosmiurge" someone who imprints the "seal of his spirit" on the fruits of his labor and creativity [16, vol. 2, p. 640, 638]. This encapsulates the essence of culture, which, unlike civiliza-

tion, is more than just the creation of a tool to adapt humans to nature and facilitate survival. Instead, culture represents a creative increment, "the revelation of the Divine plan for the world" [16, vol. 1, p. 637]. In a parallel vein, P.A. Florensky emphasized the pneumatology, purposefulness, and axiology inherent in human cultural activity. He states, "The will of a man transforms an object of culture from an object of nature," asserting that "culture is *not in things as such*, but in the will of man freely refracted about them, in man's feelings, and his <illegible> goals" [19, vol. 3(2), p. 22].

The volitional effort of an individual, which drives cultural creativity, from the viewpoint of Russian religious thinkers, cannot be autonomous and painless for the individual and the world where this creativity occurs. The human soul is a battlefield between good and evil, and the spiritual content embodied in cultural forms depends on the side of the heart, although for most Russian religious thinkers. A.S. Pushkin states, "Genius and villainy are two incompatible things." Because true genius is always inspired by God and directed toward good, they warn creators of culture against the temptation of aesthetic demonism, from dalliance with chaos and death, emphasizing that this temptation is destructive not only for creativity but also for life and that only by correlating his will internally with the goodwill of the Creator, can a person fulfill the "highest task of Culture" [19, vol. 3(2), p. 22].

In the minds of Russian religious thinkers, the interpretation of culture as the cultivation of the world and man was associated with the understanding of culture as worship, a religious activity, in which the human Creator appears as a coworker of the Divine Creator, intended, according to N.A. Berdyaev, to "glorify" Him "with his creative dynamics in space" [22, p. 93]. "Worship is the spiritual focus of culture" [16, vol. 2, p. 643]. In its origins and highest mission, culture is religious; it is the product of the synergy between

the Divine and humans. Creativity is not isolated but implemented in the streams of Divine grace, guided by filial responsibility for the world, and given to man for beneficial and wise management. Based on this understanding of cultural making, N.F. Fedorov, V.S. Soloviev, S.N. Bulgakov, and P.A. Florensky criticize secular culture, which breaks the original ties with the cult, and enters into an egoistically independent existence, cultivating a consumer and playful attitude toward reality. Such a culture fundamentally closes the sky to itself, exists only in the space of relative values, and is therefore incapable of limitless development, inevitably striking against its ceiling. It is to such a culture, as a nonbinding game, a servant of the society of "prodigal sons," a faithful companion of an "exploiting, but not restorative" civilization that N.F. Fedorov addresses harsh, shocking words when he states, "The goal of life will be salvation from culture" [17, vol. 3, p. 481].

The thinker has a completely different perspective of religious culture, which is inseparable from the consciousness of its sacred roots, with the memory of the fathers and the God of the fathers. It is educational, forms a person's self-awareness, as well as adjusts and constructs both the moral structure of the individual and the vectors of his action in the world.

N.F. Fedorov extensively explored the educational function of religious culture, referring to it as aesthetic or *artistic theology*. He asserted that culture communicates the truths of faith not conceptually and logically, but figuratively and emotionally. It appeals not only to the isolated mind but also to the unity of heart and mind, a concept foundational to integral knowledge, as posited by A.S. Khomyakov, I.V. Kireevsky, and K.S. Aksakov. This unity serves as a remedy for destructive double-thinking and internal discord. Fedorov delved into the symbolism of church architecture, painting, and worship, highlighting that the church stands on earth as an icon of the deified universe. It represents a realm devoid of death and strife, embody-

ing “the likeness of the universe where everything that was killed is revived” and serving as a “project of the world as it should be, a new earth and sky, filled with power that is not destructive and killing but re-creating” [17, vol. 1, p. 311]. Fedorov contrasted the Nietzschean-Wagnerian synthesis of arts in musical tragedy, fueled by historiosophical pessimism and catastrophism, with the synthesis of arts in liturgy, which is based on the image of overcoming decay and death, aiming for the complete renewal of the earth, humanity, and the Universe. In the 20th century, P. A. Florensky continued Fedorov’s exploration in the article “Church Action as a Synthesis of Arts,” the word “Iconostasis,” and articles on the philosophy of cult. Florensky expanded on the symbolism of the church, painting, and church services as facets of religious culture, where the eternal with the temporary, effective internal transformation, and the divine unites with humankind.

Religious culture, being liturgical, is characterized by the desire to embody the ideal, to deify life and humanity, and to illuminate them with the “Light of Christ,” which, as proclaimed during the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts, “enlightens everyone.” When culture separates from its religious source, it loses the impulse for transformation. Instead, it confines itself to the art workshops and galleries, proudly exalts itself above life, and, as mentioned above, transforms into a shameless and irresponsible game. This serves as the apostasy choice of the modern world, contributing to a mutually destructive, fallen history. Fedorov equally criticizes the devaluation of cultural creativity in a secularized, spiritually one-dimensional world dominated by commercial and industrial civilization. In this context, culture becomes tethered to the pursuit of economic gain, expelling all idealism and transforming into a culture of advertising and “shop-sign art” [17, v. 2, p. 424]. He also denounces the casteism of cultural work and idolatry of culture, where the creation of cultural masterpieces takes

precedence over living life. This results in a sacrifice of life to artistic pursuits, echoing the sentiments expressed by Irena, the heroine of H. Ibsen’s play “When We Dead Awaken,”: “The work of art is in the foreground, the person is in the background”¹.

The thinker harshly critiques the selective principle of culture. In religious culture, which is centered around the church and church commemoration, every living individual is acknowledged, and none of the deceased are forgotten. The church prayer is offered “for everyone and everything.” In contrast, secular culture only includes the chosen few in the orbit of cultural memory, relegating the rest to what the leading researcher of Fedorov’s heritage, S.G. Semenov, described as the “pass into the impersonal and indifferent dust of existence” [23, p. 84]. V.S. Soloviev echoes Fedorov’s idea, stating that “The principle of the highest cultural mission is a cruel and untrue principle” [24, p. 9]. Soloviev contrasts the perpetuation of the few in culture with the religious principle of apocatastasis, which embraces the idea of universal restoration and salvation.

In a distorted social reality, the selectivity of cultural memory coexists with a misguided interpretation of patriotism. Instead of fostering genuine love for the native land, its history, and sacred sites, which includes a heartfelt remembrance of ancestors through memorial prayers, national pride is substitution. This warped sense of patriotism often transforms the deceased into a tool for exalting one’s nation over others, contributing to the shameful division of humanity that has forgotten its original kinship. Fedorov articulates his concern about this perspective, noting that viewing “the people as an isolated part of the disintegrated human family,” is an expression not of the collective glory of this part in the past, but of shared *vanity* and common will, i.e., the desire to persist in the present with this vanity. He emphasizes that the true cult of ancestors *is not about seeking glory but*

¹ H. Ibsen, *When We Dead Awaken*, Collected works in 4 volumes, v. 4, Iskustvo, Moscow (1958).

about engaging in meaningful deeds" [17, vol. 1, p. 135].

A culture that does not remember kinship parasitizes great names. Responding in 1899 to the celebration of Pushkin's 100th anniversary, Fedorov uttered a real philippic concerning the sudden hypertrophied passion for the poet, emphasizing that in this universal adoration, there is a lot of noise, brilliance, and crackle, but very little seriousness. "There will be Pushkin gala evenings, even Pushkin whole days (nothing is said about the nights)," "all arts will be called upon to glorify the poet," and cunning businessmen will not fail to name cigarettes, candies, and other products of industry and trade after Pushkin, turning the name of the poet on the product label, but the anniversary noise around the name of Pushkin will not bring descendants any closer to comprehending the primary idea in his creative work: "the question of the purpose and meaning of life" [17, vol. 3, p. 523].

Meanwhile, it was precisely in posing the question of the meaning of existence and the purpose of humanity that Fedorov saw as the axiological nerve of secular culture, burdened by its secularity. Pushkin was a poet for whom the question "Life, why were you given to me?" was unrhetorical at all, and he did not shield himself with poetry from "life's grief and evil" [17, vol. 3, p. 523]. Neither did Lermontov, who instilled in Pechorin a desire for a genuine cause that would enable him to overcome the inner emptiness and acknowledged the impossibility of "inner happiness for anyone when there is misfortune all around" [17, vol. 3, p. 528] Gogol finally revealed the extent of society's moral decay, demonstrating that it possible to trade "the souls of fathers" "and without the slightest remorse" [17, vol. 3, pp. 530, 531], created his "Dead Souls" as a triptych, with Part 2 involving the supposed repentance of Chichikov and other heroes of the "poem" and Part 3, which never took place, they were supposed to become figures of the new Russia. For Fedorov, a necessary stage in returning culture to its

religious origins is metanoia. In addition, it is precisely as metanoia, as repentance for apostasy, as a turn from the paths of unrighteousness to God's paths that he perceives the Russian culture of the 19th century.

Fedorov placed the task of churching culture in direct connection with the task of transition from history as "mutual extermination, the extermination of each other and ourselves" [17, vol. 1, p. 138] to history as a work of resurrection, returning all victims of the past and present to a transformed immortal life. In one of the notes from the 1890s, the philosopher denoted the active Christian vector of culture as not the church that should be profaned during the transition to the secular, but "the public must rise to the level of the church" [17, vol. 3, p. 100]. For Fedorov, culture will fully manifest its educational and teaching function only when it can bring the good news of transformation to the world not only through church synthesis but also through the fullness of creative practices. V.S. Soloviev, whose philosophy of culture took shape in the field of ideological dialog with Fedorov, especially emphasized the projective function of culture, intended to reveal in earthly forms the "beauty of the future life" [8, vol. 2, p. 398], to become part of the divine-human process of salvation. Russian Christian thinkers of the 20th century, symbolically interpreting the gesture of Elder Zosima directing Alyosha Karamazov from the monastery into the world, emphasized that all spheres of human practice and all levels of culture can and should be arranged "following the highest ideal revealed to us in Christ," and this flowering of human creativity from the perspective of the movement of the world toward the Kingdom of God is "the highest synthesis of history, its limit" [9, p. 191].

It was shown above that Russian Christian thinkers, in addition to their educational, teaching, and ideal-creative functions, highlight the ontological function of culture. It is an instrument of life, one of those tools that, as P.A. Florensky noted, were given to a man to cultivate

existence (which originated from the Latin "cultivate"). However, cultivation, by definition, cannot be limited only to the creation of beautiful, but dead similarities of reality, since it must be directed toward a real, and not an imaginary, transformation of life. In Fedorov's perspective, the synthetic culture of the future, which accumulates all the essential energies of man in a transformative activity, absorbing all spheres of his knowledge and creativity, should become a recreation that goes beyond the creativity of the "second reality" into the real "creativity of life." "Recreation is the divine-human process of ascension to the prototype of the world, which did not know the Fall and harm, according to explains E.M. Titarenko Fedorov's theory. Fedorov is characterized by a liturgical understanding of culture" [25, p. 315].

V. S. Soloviev, the younger contemporary of N. F. Fedorov, also writes that the work of culture finds its completion in the act of transformation, the enlightenment of materiality. His esthetic theory is based on this postulate, according to which the development of the world follows the line of increasing spiritualization of material existence, clothing it in beauty and incorruptibility, with man being the key link in this process. The meaning of his creativity is to bring the disintegrated world into a state of unity by regulating and harmonizing blind, elemental forces and promoting the triumph of the Kingdom of God in every point of the Universe. The philosopher describes the moral meaning of human life as promoting the embodiment in existence, both physical and spiritual, of "an unconditional moral order" [8, vol. 1, p. 276], the Kingdom of God, considering culture as one of the spheres and instruments of this incarnation. The philosopher distinguishes between two stages of artistic development, projective, in which creativity creates a perfect image of the future world, thereby acting as a "transition and connecting link between the beauty of nature and the beauty of the future life" [8, vol. 2, p. 398], and the real stage, when it is

included in the process of transformation of existence, in which it strives to "spiritualize, transubstantiate our real life" [8, vol. 2, p. 404].

The concept of extra-church liturgy introduced by Fedorov was discussed above. Extra-church liturgy was understood by the author of "Philosophy of the Common Cause" as "the resurrection and transformation of the entire universe" [17, vol. 1, p. 404]. The process of educating the human race, the creativity of religious culture, collecting the memory of the departed, all this for the thinker was like an "offertory" and "liturgy of the catechumens," preparation for the main work of cause, the "liturgy of the faithful," a process of not only symbolic but also the real transformation of the world, not only spiritual but ontological renewal. Just as in the sacrament of the Eucharist, the bread and wine brought to the altar are transformed into the body and blood of Christ, so in the extra-church liturgy, the present fragmented, mortal world, in a state of "mutual destruction," is transformed into an unmerged, indivisible, fraternal, and loving unity in the image and likeness of the Trinity, and the ashes of the dead are transformed into living, resurrected flesh. Human activity here meets Divine action and is synergistically united with it.

Fedorov, the main apologist for the idea of history as a "work of salvation," expanded the boundaries of human activity. As S.G. Semenova wrote, he was "convinced that the Divine will act through man as a rationally free being, through a single conciliar totality of humanity. The main task of a man in this context is to become an active instrument of the will of God, and His will is clear: He is the God of the fathers, "not the dead, but the living," who did not create death, who wants to restore the world to a glorified immortal state, when sins are atoned for and all the sacrifices of the long-lasting history of humankind are returned after the Fall" [23, p. 230]. On the pages of his writings, Fedorov repeatedly recalled the words of Christ: "He who believes in Me, the works

that I do, he will also do, and greater works than these will he do" (John 14:12). Throughout His earthly journey, the Savior heals the sick, calms the elements, resurrects the dead, and finally, resurrects Himself, demonstrating the full power of the spirit over material nature. Humanity, according to Fedorov, is meant to fully participate in these issues. He has to not just pray, "Thy Kingdom come," but according to the will of God, to build this Kingdom, not just to look forward to "the resurrection of the dead and the life of the next century," but to fulfill this main hope of the faith of Christ.

Fedorov's idea about the need for humanity's participation in the issue of resurrection and the transition from culture to recreation was not shared by all supporters of the idea of history as a work of salvation, and if they were shared, then with certain, sometimes very significant, reservations, like V.S. Soloviev, who wrapped the resurrection project in abstract theoretical and even mystical clothes [23, p. 124–131], or S.N. Bulgakov, who distanced himself from this project in "The Non-Evening Light" distanced himself from this project, and in the final part of the book "Lamb of God," the first book of the trilogy "On God-Manhood," nevertheless recognized it: "The humanization of the world, with dominion over it in the name of God, to which the man is called by creation, refers to the manifestation of man's solemn service, according to the strength of his participation in the solemn service of Christ, no matter how far man's aspirations extend in this path, even up to human participation in the general resurrection, according to the project of N.F. Fedorov" [14, p. 465]. The majority of those who followed Fedorov's idea of extra-church liturgies, such as G. P. Fedotov, K.V. Mochulsky, V. V. Zenkovsky, and Mother Maria (E.Yu. Kuzmina-Karavaeva), considered its task as the internal restructuring of human life and culture in the light of Christ's commandment of perfection ("Be perfect as your Heavenly Father is perfect" (Matthew 5:48). Concurrently,

these thinkers were in solidarity with the philosopher of the common cause to establish Christianity as a creative force of history, to animate modernity with the evangelical ideal in a new round, contributing to turn the world onto God's paths and to overcome the anti-Christian structure of life, which turns into crises and catastrophes, which, as the tools of mutual extermination are elaborated, threaten to wipe out the human race from the face of the earth. They also believed that the creativity of culture, uniting with other spheres of human action, from economics to politics, would transform life according to Christian principles, preparing humanity for the moment of general resurrection implemented by the Divine will.

However, some thinkers shared and developed Fedorov's concept of the transition from culture to recreation, from history as a symbolic resurrection to history as a real resurrection work. These were the representatives of Russian cosmism of the 1920s: A. K. Gorsky, N. A. Setnitsky, and V. N. Muravyov¹. Based on the ideas of active Christianity, they sought to discern in the present the sprouts of a new conciliar "culture of the future" [27], which, in alliance with science and inspired by religion, will become the basis for the "organization of world influence" [28, p. 711], will lead to victory over space and time, to overcome death, and the establishment of "cosmocracy and pantocracy" of the human race [15, book 2, p. 145].

The views on the meaning and purpose of culture and cultural creativity that were developed in the works of Russian intellectuals who advanced the idea of justifying history have parallels in the aesthetic theory and artistic practice of Russian symbolism and new peasant poets, as well as the creators of the Russian avant-garde, V. Khlebnikov, V. N. Chekrygin, and P.N. Filonov, which require special research.

¹ The collaboration of these thinkers and the ideas they developed are reviewed in 26, pp. 384–482, 498–516.

References

1. E`rn, V.F. (1991) Nechto o Logose, russkoj filosofii i nauchnosti [Something about Logos, Russian Philosophy and Science]. *E`rn V.F. Bor`ba za Logos* [Struggle for Logos]. Moscow: Pravda, 71-108. (In Russian).
2. Shibaeva, M.M. (2021) *Kul`tura v «zerkale» russkoj my`slj* [Culture in the “Mirror” of Russian Thought]. Moscow: Moscow State University of Culture and Arts. (In Russian).
3. Budanova, N.F. (1990) Dostoevskij, i Konstantin Leont`ev [Dostoevsky and Konstantin Leontyev]. *Dostoevskij. Materialy` i issledovaniya*. [Dostoevsky. Materials and Research]. Issue 9. Leningrad: Nauka, 199-222. (In Russian).
4. Bocharov, S.G. (1999) Leont`ev i Dostoevskij [Leontiev and Dostoevsky]. *Bocharov S.G. Syuzhety` russkoj literatury`* [Bocharov S.G. Plots of Russian Literature]. Moscow: Yazy`ki russkoj kul`tury`, 341-397. (In Russian).
5. Kasatkina, T.A. (2002) Vzaimootnosheniya cheloveka s prirodoj v xristianskom mirosozerczanii Dostoevskogo [The Relationship of Man with Nature in Dostoevsky's Christian Worldview]. *XXI vek glazami Dostoevskogo: perspektivy` chelovechestva*. [The XXIst Century through the Eyes of Dostoevsky: the Prospects of Mankind]. Moscow: Graal`, 304-313. (In Russian).
6. Gacheva, A.G. (2021) Ideya opravdaniya istorii [The Idea of Justifying History]. *Gacheva A.G. Chelovek i istoriya v zerkale russkoj filosofii i literatury`* [Gacheva A.G. Man and History in the Mirror of Russian Philosophy and Literature]. Moscow: Vodolej, 16-42. (In Russian).
7. Dostoevskij, F.M. (1972-1990) *Polnoe sobranie sochinenij: v 30 tomov* [Complete Works: in 30 vols]. Leningrad: Nauka. (In Russian).
8. Solov`ev, V.S. (1988) *Sochineniya: v 2 tomov. Tom 1* [Works: in 2 vols. Vol. 1]. Moscow: My`sl`. (In Russian).
9. Bulgakov, S.N. (1996) Oчерк о F.M. Dostoevskom. Chrez chetvert` veka (1881–1906) [Essay on F.M. Dostoevsky. Through a Quarter of a Century (1881-1906)]. *Bulgakov S.N. Tixie dumy`* [Bulgakov S.N. Quiet Thoughts]. Moscow: Respublika, 187-216. (In Russian).
10. Setniczkij, N.A. (2010) O konechnom ideale [On the Ultimate Ideal]. *Setniczkij N.A. Izbranny`e proizvedeniya* [Setniczkij N.A. Selected Works]. Moscow: ROSSPEN, 61-530. (In Russian).
11. Il`in, I.A. (1993) Osnovy` xristianskoj kul`tury` [Fundamentals of Christian Culture]. *Il`in I.A. Odinokij xudozhnik* [Ilyin I.A. A Lonely Artist]. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 291-336. (In Russian).
12. Aksakov, I.S. [1886] *Sochineniya: v 7 tomov. Tom 4* [Writings: in 7 vols. Vol. 4]. Moscow: M.G. Volchaninov Publishing House. (In Russian).
13. Fedotov, G.P. (1938) E`sxatologiya i kul`tura [Eschatology and Culture]. *Novy`j Grad* [New City], No. 13, 45-56. (In Russian).
14. Bulgakov, S. (1933) *Agnecz Bozhij* [Lamb of God]. Paris: YMCA-press. (In Russian).
15. Murav`ev, V.N. (2011) *Sochineniya: v 2 knigax. Kniga 1* [Works: in 2 books]. Compl., text preparation, commentary, preface by A.G. Gacheva. Moscow: A.M. Gorky Institute of World Literature of the Russian Academy of Science. (In Russian).
16. Bulgakov, S.N. (1993) *Sochineniya: v 2 tomov. Tom 1*. (Works: in 2 vols.) Moscow: Nauka. (In Russian).
17. Fedorov, N.F. (1995-2000) *Sochineniya: v 4 tomov. Tom 1-4* [Works: in 4 vols. Vol. 1-4]. Moscow: Progress; Tradiciya. (In Russian).
18. Florenski, P.A. (1988) Avtoreferat [Abstract]. *Voprosy` filosofii* [Questions of Philosophy], No. 12, 113-116. (In Russian).

19. Florenskij, P. *Sochineniya: v 4 tomakh. Tom 1-4* [Works: in 4 vols. Vol. 1-4]. Moscow: My`sl`, 1994-2000. (In Russian).
20. Il`in, V.N. (1930) *Shest` dnei tvoreniya. Bibliya i nauka o tvorenii i proisxozhdenii mira* [Six Days of Creation. The Bible and the Science of Creation and the Origin of the World]. Paris: YMCA-press. (In Russian).
21. Il`in, V.N. (1928) Materializm i materiologizm [Materialism and Materiologism]. *Evraziya* [Eurasia], No. 2 (1 Dec.). (In Russian).
22. Berdyaev, N.A. (1994) *Filosofiya tvorchestva, kul`tury` i iskusstva: v 2 tomakh. Tom 1* [Philosophy of Creativity, Culture and Art: in 2 vols.]. Moscow: Iskusstvo; Liga. (In Russian).
23. Semenova, S.G. (2019) *Filosof budushhego Nikolaj Fedorov* [Philosopher of the Future Nikolai Fedorov]. Moscow: Akademicheskij proekt. (In Russian).
24. Solov`ev, V.S. (1912) *Polnoe sobranie sochinenij: v 10 tomakh. Tom 5*. [Complete Works: in 10 vols. Vol. 5]. Saint Petersburg. (In Russian).
25. Titarenko, E.M., Titarenko, S.D. (2020) "Kul`tura – kul`t otshedshix, i vechnaya pamyat` – dusha ee zhizni...": Vyacheslav Ivanov i Nikolaj Fedorov ["Culture is a Cult of the Deceased, and Eternal Memory is the Soul of its Life"...: Vyacheslav Ivanov and Nikolai Fedorov]. *Russko-Vizantijskij vestnik* [Russian-Byzantine Herald], No. 1, 308-323. (In Russian).
26. Gacheva, A.G. (2019) "Ideal ved` tozhe dejstvitel`nost`...". *Russkaya filosofiya i literature* ["The ideal is also Reality...". Russian Philosophy and Literature]. Moscow: Akademicheskij proekt. (In Russian).
27. Onosov, A.A. (2022) Vseobshhaya preobrazovatel`naya kul`tura (Iz "Evangelii vsemogushhestva" ot V.N. Murav`eva) [General Transformative Culture (From the "Gospel of Omnipotence" from V.N. Muravyov)]. *Filosof obshhego dela: Materialy` Mezhdunarodny`x nauchny`x chtenij pamyati N.F. Fedorova* [Philosopher of Universal Cause: Materials of International Scientific Readings in Memory of N.F. Fedorov]. Moscow: Centralized Library System of the Southwestern Administrative District, 410-458. (In Russian).
28. Gorskij, A.K. (2018) *Sochineniya i pis`ma: v 2 knigax. Kniga 1* [Writings and Letters: in 2 books. Book 1]. Introductory article, compiler, text preparation, commentary by A.G. Gacheva. Moscow: A.M. Gorky Institute of World Literature of the Russian Academy of Science (In Russian).

About the author:

Anastasia G. Gacheva, Doctor of Philological Sciences, Leading Researcher at A.M. Gorky Institute of World Literature of the Russian Academy of Science, Chief Librarian, Researcher at the N.F. Fedorov Library No. 180 Association of Cultural Centers of the Southwestern District of Moscow

92 Profsoyuznaya Str., Moscow, 117485
a-gacheva@yandex.ru

For citation:

Gacheva A.G. Justification of Culture sub specie Justification of History in Russian Religious and Philosophical Thought // Sphere of Culture. 2023. No. 4 (14). pp. 13-26. DOI: 10.48164/2713-301X_2023_14_13

УДК 1:21+27-528.1/8

DOI: 10.48164/2713-301X_2023_14_13

А.Г. Гачева

Москва

Институт мировой литературы имени А.М. Горького РАН
Библиотека № 180 имени Н.Ф. Федорова ОКЦ ЮЗАО г. Москвы
a-gacheva@yandex.ru

ОПРАВДАНИЕ КУЛЬТУРЫ SUB SPESIE ОПРАВДАНИЯ ИСТОРИИ В РУССКОЙ РЕЛИГИОЗНО-ФИЛОСОФСКОЙ МЫСЛИ

Суждения В.Ф. Эрн о логосной традиции русской мысли, определяющей единство подходов ее деятелей к коренным мировоззренческим проблемам, открывают перспективу реконструкции представлений о смысле и задачах культуры в той линии отечественной философии, которая связана с идеей оправдания истории. Автор настоящего исследования доказывает, что, выступая против историософского пессимизма и катастрофизма, русские христианские мыслители выдвигают задачу оцерковления всех сфер и планов жизни, понимая культуру как орудие преображения мира.

Процессам её секуляризации философы противопоставляют литургизацию культурного делания, которую рассматривают в контексте заповеди «обладания землей». В этом отношении особое значение приобретает учение Н.Ф. Федорова, который призывал к переходу от культуры (как символического воскрешения) к рекреатуре – действительному восстановлению жизни.

Ключевые слова: русская религиозно-философская мысль, идея оправдания истории, культура, творчество, литургизм, рекреатура, Н.Ф. Федоров.

Список литературы

1. Эрн В.Ф. Нечто о Логосе, русской философии и научности // Эрн В.Ф. Борьба за Логос. Москва: Правда, 1991. С. 71-108.
2. Шибаева М.М. Культура в «зеркале» русской мысли. Москва: МГУКИ, 2021. 249 с.
3. Буданова Н.Ф. Достоевский и Константин Леонтьев // Достоевский. Материалы и исследования. Вып. 9. Ленинград: Наука, 1990. С. 199-222.
4. Бочаров С.Г. Леонтьев и Достоевский // Бочаров С.Г. Сюжеты русской литературы. Москва: Языки рус. культуры, 1999. С. 341-397.
5. Касаткина Т.А. Взаимоотношения человека с природой в христианском мирозерцании Достоевского // XXI век глазами Достоевского: перспективы человечества. Москва: Грааль, 2002. С. 304-313.
6. Гачева А.Г. Идея оправдания истории // Гачева А.Г. Человек и история в зеркале русской философии и литературы. Москва: Водолей, 2021. С. 16-42.
7. Достоевский Ф.М. Полное собрание сочинений: в 30 т. Ленинград: Наука, 1972-1990.
8. Соловьев В.С. Сочинения: в 2 т. Т. 1. Москва: Мысль, 1988. 894 с., 1 л. портр.; Т. 2. 824 с., [2] л. портр.
9. Булгаков С.Н. Очерк о Ф.М. Достоевском. Чрез четверть века (1881-1906) // Булгаков С.Н. Тихие думы. Москва: Республика, 1996. С. 187-216.
10. Сетницкий Н.А. О конечном идеале // Сетницкий Н.А. Избранные произведения. Москва: РОССПЭН, 2010. С. 61-530.

11. Ильин И.А. Основы христианской культуры // Ильин И.А. Одинокий художник. Москва: Искусство, 1993. С. 291-336.
12. Аксаков И.С. Сочинения: в 7 т. Т. 4. Москва: Тип. М.Г. Волчанинова, 1886. 770 с.
13. Федотов Г.П. Эсхатология и культура // Новый Град. 1938. № 13. С. 45-56.
14. Булгаков С., прот. Агнец Божий. Париж: YMCA-press. 1933. 468 с.
15. Муравьев В.Н. Сочинения: в 2 кн. Кн. 1 / сост., подгот. текста, коммент., предисл. А.Г. Гачевой. Москва: ИМЛИ РАН, 2011. 704 с.; Кн. 2. 720 с.
16. Булгаков С.Н. Сочинения: в 2 т. Т. 1. Москва: Наука, 1993. 604 с.; Т. 2. 750 с.
17. Федоров Н.Ф. Сочинения: в 4 т. Т. 1-4. Москва: Прогресс; Традиция, 1995-2000.
18. Флоренский П.А. Автореферат // Вопросы философии. 1988. № 12. С. 113-116.
19. Флоренский П., свящ. Сочинения: в 4 т. Т. 1-4. Москва: Мысль, 1994-2000.
20. Ильин В.Н. Шесть дней творения. Библия и наука о творении и происхождении мира. Paris: YMCA-press, 1930. 229 с.
21. Ильин В.Н. Материализм и материологизм // Евразия. 1928. № 2 (1 дек.).
22. Бердяев Н.А. Философия творчества, культуры и искусства: в 2 т. Т. 1. Москва: Искусство; Лига, 1994. 542 с.; Т. 2. 510 с.
23. Семенова С.Г. Философ будущего Николай Федоров. Москва: Акад. проект, 2019. 638 с.
24. Соловьев В.С. Полное собрание сочинений: в 10 т. Т. 5. Санкт-Петербург, 1912. 484 с.
25. Титаренко Е.М., Титаренко С.Д. «Культура – культ отшедших, и вечная память – душа ее жизни...»: Вячеслав Иванов и Николай Федоров // Русско-Византийский вестник. 2020. № 1. С. 308-323.
26. Гачева А.Г. «Идеал ведь тоже действительность...». Русская философия и литература. Москва: Акад. проект, 2019. 734 с.
27. Оносов А.А. Всеобщая преобразовательная культура (Из «Евангелия всемогущества» от В.Н. Муравьева) // Философ общего дела: материалы Междунар. науч. чтений памяти Н.Ф. Федорова. Москва: ЦБС ЮЗАО, 2022. С. 410-458.
28. Горский А.К. Сочинения и письма: в 2 кн. Кн. 1 / вступ. ст., сост., подгот. текста, коммент. А.Г. Гачевой. Москва: ИМЛИ РАН, 2018. 1008 с.

Сведения об авторе:

Гачева Анастасия Георгиевна, доктор филологических наук, ведущий научный сотрудник Института мировой литературы имени А.М. Горького РАН, главный библиотекарь, научный сотрудник Библиотеки № 180 имени Н.Ф. Федорова Объединения культурных центров Юго-Западного округа г. Москвы

ул. Профсоюзная, 92, Москва, 117485
a-gacheva@yandex.ru

Дата поступления статьи: 25.10.2023

Одобрено: 27.10.2023

Дата публикации: 17.11.2023

Для цитирования:

Гачева А.Г. Оправдание культуры sub specie оправдания истории в русской религиозно-философской мысли // Сфера культуры. 2023. № 4 (14). С. 13–26. DOI: 10.48164/2713-301X_2023_14_13