

UDC 129

GEORGYI KHLIEBNIKOV

*Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Head of the Department of
philosophy center
for Humanities Scientific and Information Studies INION Sciences
(Moscow, Russia)
ORCID 0000-0001-5410-4807*

VIACHESLAV STEPANOV

*PhD in Philosophy, Associate Professor of the
Department of Philosophy, History and Socio-Humanitarian
disciplines,
Donbas State Pedagogical University
(Sloviansk, Ukraine)
e-mail: philosophy.kafedra@ukr.net ORCID 0000-0002-2616-1462*

YULIA TARASENKO

*Postgraduate student of the third year of the
Department of Philosophy, History and
Socio-Humanitarian disciplines,
Donbas State Pedagogical University
(Sloviansk, Ukraine)*

THE IDEA OF GODMAN IN THE CONTEXT OF MODERN RESEARCH

As a research task, authors identified an attempt to evaluate and analyze the principles of philosophy of Russian philosophers E.N. Trubetskoy and V.S. Solovyov. The main content of the study is an analysis of the theories of these philosophers regarding to the relationship between the divine principle and intuitive knowledge in human existence. The authors reveal the views of E.N. Trubetskoy on this problem, which consists in the fact that in natural knowledge the

unconditional is assumed not as the essence of all that is knowable, but as a universal thought and consciousness. Philosophy of V.S. Soloviev is the conceptually opposite to philosophy of E.N. Trubetskoy and contains the ideas of an inseparable and non-merged unity of the divine and human. The article provides a detailed analysis of the comments on this topic by such prominent Russian philosophers as N.K. Gavryushin, P. Florensky, I.I. Evlampiev, and based on their opinion, the authors come to the conclusion that Trubetskoy's criticism towards Solovyov is due to manifestation of feelings of a friend.

Key words: Trubetskoy; Solovyov; Godman; divine beginning; intuitive knowledge; science; religion; philosophy; synthesis

Introduction. Despite the similarities of the basic principles of philosophizing both great Russian philosophers, there were significant differences in their methods and approaches that it makes sense to specifically thematize.

Statement of the main material. Probably the first and significant difference is that Yevgeny Konstantinovich, unlike Solovyov, recognized greater, in comparison with the latter, autonomy of a purely rational principle in the field of natural knowledge (Трубецкой, 1913, v. I, p. 259–260).

E.N. Trubetskoy also claimed that the being of God is *unprovably discursive*; since there is also *intuitive* knowledge that is not proved, but directly given to internal discretion; in addition, there is also knowledge in revelation, which differs from cognition in that knowledge is *one-sided* self-determination of the knower, while revelation is a *two-way act*: it assumes an active relationship between the Absolute, which opens, and the finite, limited being, to which it opens” (ibid, p. 314).

However, Prince Trubetskoy sees his main task in a more consistent way than Vladimir Sergeevich, his own, Solovyov’s principle - the *inseparable and unfused unity of the divine and human*, and in this case, the mystical and rational element in the knowledge

of God. Although one can agree with A.A. Nosov, that from the rejection and criticism of the “Soloviev’s idea of theocracy as the Divine kingdom established on the earth as a result of various social transformations” the whole work grew and developed: “Vl. S. Soloviev's contemplation of the world” (Носов, 2014, p. 83-84).

In the doctrine of the Absolute, Evgeny Nikolaevich follows mainly Soloviev, emphasizing that: “The first and main hypothesis of all thought, without which all judgments and statements turn into nothing, is the *real Absolute*” (Трубецкой, 1913, v. I, p. 107). Thus, showing that the assumption of the real absolute for thought is not *arbitrary, but necessary*.

At the same time, Prince Trubetskoy carefully distinguishes, firstly, the necessary logical assumptions of our consciousness with the act of reflection with which we are *aware* and *accept* these assumptions; secondly, a rational belief in the Absolute with a mystical, religious faith in God, which, of course, is not the same thing.

According to Trubetskoy. "In natural cognition, the unconditional is assumed not as the essence of all that is knowable, but as *a universal thought and consciousness about everything ...* this universal consciousness is a necessary act of our thought, without which our knowledge cannot take a single step." At the same time, people may not be aware, and in most cases they are not aware of the logical assumptions of their thoughts. So, philosophers of a new formation who confidently deny the laws of logic, but at the same time unconsciously *assume* them, as they strive to give their negation a *logical* justification (Евгений Трубецкой).

Therefore, it can be argued, for example, at the same time that the Unconditional, as conscious, is necessarily assumed by our thought, and that this assumption remains hidden from people's consciousness until it is revealed by transcendental research. If this rational faith has the character of *necessity*, (in the sense of *logical obligation*), in that sense, the prince believed that a person who

thinks correctly *should be aware of* the necessary assumptions of his thoughts and believe in them; but in fact, he retains his freedom to be illogical. Moreover, the logically necessary faith in the Absolute, as a transcendental subject of consciousness, and religious faith in God are not the same thing, Trubetskoy believed, the latter also supposes “a certain moral attitude towards the Absolute, an element of trust in it, recognition of its *goodness* - in general, intimate *personal* relation to him; all this necessary content of the *religious* attitude to the Absolute does not at all lie in a *rational* attitude towards the knowable: it is not supposed to be an act of cognition, and therefore it is not imposed on us with logical necessity” (Евгений Трубецкой).

Thus, the freedom of religious faith in God is not undermined or excluded by the logical necessity of the postulates of human thought. And the discovery of the logical need to assume the Absolute is not yet proof of the existence of God's being. Because *the recognition of the Absolute as God*, believed E.N. Trubetskoy introduces into it such a *content* that cannot be a priori extracted from the necessary logical postulates: "experience is required here, that *the real contact* of the human soul with the Divine, which no logical arguments can give or put forward." Such, in his own words, is *the very essence* of the prince's thought. And the prince wrote about his contemporary friend, that: “All attempts to separate the philosopher from the religious thinker in Solovyov are futile and can only be considered as evidence of a certain tastelessness” (Евгений Трубецкой). Indeed, Soloviev, following in this respect the example of the Slavophiles and Schelling, declared at the very beginning of his literary field that "philosophy in the sense of abstract, *exclusively* theoretical cognition has completed its development and has gone irretrievably into the world of the past" (Трубецкой, 1913, v. I, p. 62). In connection with this disappointment in the abstract, that is, purely rationalistic, philosophy which was constructed by one mind, Soloviev came to the idea of a *universal organic synthesis* of science, philosophy and religion (ibid, p. 58). Trubetskoy sets out a plan for this synthesis in a

separate section specially devoted to this topic (ibid, p. 110 and p. 113), generally relating positively towards this project (Трубецкой, 1913, v. II, 291–293). And the prince shows in his entire book that “the unifying principle of this organic synthesis in the teachings of Solovyov is *the idea of God-manhood*, and, from the point of view of Solovyov, this religious principle should not only be a corner in our worldview, but *completely define it*, become everything in it in everything.” That is, if E.N. Trubetsky considered that the idea of *organic synthesis* is necessary for Solovyov, then, of course, he would have recognized religion and philosophy as essential elements of his worldview (Евгений Трубецкой).

As for the attempts to “justify the faith of the fathers,” Evgeni Nikolaevich in it not only sympathizes with Soloviev, but also tries to complete him¹. Probably, the prince considered as especially valuable the fact that religion and philosophy in Solovyov’s teachings are an *inseparable and unfused whole* (Solovyov himself looked at his teachings in this way), *so that* a religious thinker and a philosopher in this thinker could not be separated.

Finally, Prince Trubetsky highly appreciated the idea of a brilliant Russian thinker that throughout his life that “great task for which the latter lived from the beginning to the end of his activity, for him (Solovyov) was not to contemplate, but *to implement kingdom of God*.”- So, this Solovyov’s “the deepest thought” Trubetsky did not classify as “utopian,” but, on the contrary, accepted it with reverence, sharing his observation that the first period of his creativity (engaging in philosophy) was only “preparatory”. And he called the third period “final”, “because during this period the utopian element disappears, and the main idea of the kingdom of God (or, what is also the universal God-manhood) as the real *end* of the universe receives the deepest, brightest, and for Solovyov, who after that soon died, and the *final* expression. “So, this division into periods proceeds from what was most important *for*

¹See e.g. all§ III of chapter IX of his book. (7; 1)

Solovyov *himself* and what is most important and in fact: from the *immanent* point of view, *it seems for Solovyov to be the only acceptable one*. Moreover, Trubetskoy directly wrote that the most important thing in his book is that the prince “*Did not have his own philosophical views, which are absolutely separate from Solovyov's*” (Евгений Трубецкой), so even differences between them exist only on the basis of principles that are identical to them; and that the reader may consider as his “own views” is only an organic continuation of V. S. Soloviev's thoughts. For him Solovyov's teaching is his own teaching and, therefore, *the real*, therefore, the whole task of his research about Solovyov, Evgeny Nikolaevich considered in that “to show that the doctrine *is alive and not dead*” and to reveal what “it's alive and what died in this doctrine, what should be accepted in it and what should be rejected” (ibid).

E.N. Trubetskoy criticized the utopian and gnostic, anthropocentric and pantheistic motives in Soloviev's reasoning, defending the dogmatic concept of the unconditional independence of God from the world and man, His complete freedom in relation to his creation (Трубецкой, 1913, v. I, p. 41).

In addition, with a closer acquaintance with the views of the first, a reader can't help but notice that the prince accepted all the basic concepts of the philosophy of the latter: the doctrine of the Absolute as All-united, of the second Absolute, of God-manhood, of Sofia, of the world soul, of the human soul, etc., which “are partly *entirely* Solovyov's, partly are the conversion of his doctrines. At the same time, the philosophy of the last period of this thinker is so close to the prince that here Trubetskoy sought only to finish what, as he believed, the philosopher who had died by that time could not express or think through to the end.

Solovyov's philosophy for Yevgeny Nikolaevich, as he admitted himself, is *true philosophy*. So, that some harsh expressions used by him in relation to separate Soloviev's ideas were only a manifestation of the feelings of a friend who was *ardent* in relation to the concepts

that were before and the views of the prince himself (Евгений Трубецкой).

Evgeny Nikolaevich admitted that he was lived the same mental life with Soloviev, shared his main thoughts; however, there was a time when he also lived “with him and his illusions, his utopias; worried about his dream of Russian national messianism and the third Rome, and went in for many of the romantic dreams of his metaphysics ”, which now seem to be "a temporary historical appendage to its true beginnings." Moreover, even those Soloviev’s hobbies that Trubetskoy never shared, for the latter was nevertheless “akin to him and close”. Therefore, the “well-known passion and harshness” of some of the prince’s judgments is caused by his love to that in what he saw the enduring content of Soloviev’s philosophy, and by the desire to see this content clothed in an appropriate, adequate form. Because these doctrines “are those higher creations of genius that not only Russia but also humanity has the right to be proud of”, namely: these are Soloviev’s doctrines “about total unity and God-manhood, about Sofia, his theoretical philosophy of the last period”, and finally “thoughtful aesthetics and its incomparable "philosophy of the end", in comparison with which "the transient doctrines of Soloviev are nothing", which the prince rejected, remaining, of course, the continuer of the philosophy of the latter (ibid).

However, A.F. Losev (Лосев, 1990), thoughtfully analyzing the E.N. Trubetskoy's criticism of Solovyov, considered the first in reality not so much a friend and follower of the latter, as "an active and invincible opponent" (Трубецкой, 1995, p. 579), but this position, as we have seen, diverges from repeatedly and explicitly expressed point of view of Evgeny Nikolaevich himself.

As stated, the modern Russian philosopher N.K. Gavryushin in his doctrine, philosophical creativity of E.N. Trubetskoy unfolded in the era of influence on Russian culture of Christian Platonism, one of the stars of the first magnitude was and Vladimir Solovyov (Гаврюшин, 2014, p. 58-59), and "St. Pavel Florensky openly

equated Platonism and Christianity” (ibid, p. 66). At the same time, the study book “Worldview of Vl. S. Solovyov "(1913) became in essence "the first deeply thought-out reaction to Christian Platonism and outlined ways for ever coming it " (ibid).

Considering the problem of the relationship between the earthly and the divine, Trubetskoy fixed its incorrect solution in the philosophy of Vl. Solovyov, who extremely brought together the earthly and divine planes of being, so that in the metaphysics of the latter pantheistic motifs originating from German mysticism are evident (Гаврюшин, 2014, p. 39). Another mistake of his teacher, bringing him together to Gnosticism, the prince considered the understanding of man and his role in being. Soloviev supposed that God cannot exist without man, but then "God becomes the causer of all the evil of our reality" (Трубецкой, 1995, p. 351).

N.K. Gavryushin states/stated that the prince convincingly showed that “the Christian-Platonic synthesis on which Soloviev worked in the 1980s was actually more platonic than Christian, and was noticeably supported by the temporal political illusions of the philosopher” (Гаврюшин, 2014, p. 67). But, as we saw above, some of these philosophical illusions adhered at the time to E.N. Trubetskoy, as evidenced by N.K. Gavryushin, pointing out further in what the prince failed to overcome "Christian Platonism" [ibid].

Conclusions. Therefore, we can agree with I.I. Yevlampiev, who states even today the current situation for the modern world, that, according to E.S. Trubetskoy crisis of modern mankind occurs due to the loss of religious feeling, leading to “oblivion the unity of all people - both in sin and salvation, and then oblivion the unity of man with God.” And it can be achieved through the free self-determination of man” (Евлампиєв, 2014, p.57).

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. Гаврюшин Н.К. Христианский платонизм и религиозно-общественный идеал в трудах князя Е.Н. Трубецкого.

/В. Евгений Николаевич Трубецкой/под ред. С.М. Половинкина, Т.Г.Щедриной. М.: Политическая энциклопедия, 2014. 375 с. : ил. («философия России первой половины XX века). С.58-74.

2. Евлампиев И.И. Проблема соединения земного и божественного в философском творчестве Е.Н. Трубецкого /В: Евгений Николаевич Трубецкой/под ред. С.М. Половинкина, Т.Г. Щедриной. – М.: Политическая энциклопедия, 2014. 375 с. : ил. (философия России первой половины XX века). С.10-57.

3. Лосев А.Ф. Владимир Соловьев и его время. М., 1990. 719 с.

4. Носов А.А. История и судьба «Мирозерцания Вл. С. Соловьева». /В:Евгений Николаевич Трубецкой/под ред. С.М. Половинкина, Т.Г. Щедриной. – М.: Политическая энциклопедия, 2014. 375 с. : ил. –(философия России первой половины XX века). С. 75-113.

5. Трубецкой Е.Н. Метафизические предположения познания. Опыт преодоления Канта и кантианства. М., 1917. URL: http://www.odinblago.ru/metafiz_predp_poznania/#35

6. Евгений Трубецкой. К вопросу о мировоззрении В. С. Соловьева (По поводу статьи Л. М. Лопатина). URL: <https://www.rulit.me/author/trubeckoj-evgenij-nikolaevich/k-voprosu-o-mirovozzrenii-v-s-soloveva-download-free-396292.html>.

7. Трубецкой Е.Н. Мироззрение Вл. С. Соловьева. Т.1-2. М. 1913.

8. Трубецкой Е.Н. Мироззрение Вл. С. Соловьева. М. 1995. Т.1.

ГЕОРГІЙ ХЛЄБНІКОВ

*кандидат філософських наук, завідувач відділом філософії
Центру гуманітарних науково-інформаційних досліджень*

ІНІОН РАН

(Москва, Росія)

ORCID 0000-0001-5410-4807

В'ЯЧЕСЛАВ СТЕПАНОВ

*кандидат філософських наук, доцент кафедри філософії,
історії та соціально-гуманітарних дисциплін,
Донбаський державний педагогічний університет
(м. Слов'янськ, Україна)*

e-mail: philosophy.kafedra@ukr.net ORCID0000-0002-2616-1462

ЮЛІЯ ТАРАСЕНКО

*аспірантка кафедри філософії,
історії та соціально-гуманітарних дисциплін
Донбаський державний педагогічний університет
(м. Слов'янськ, Україна)*

**ІДЕЯ БОГОЛЮДИНИ У КОНТЕКСТІ СУЧАСНИХ
ДОСЛІДЖЕНЬ**

У якості дослідницького завдання авторами була визначена спроба оцінити та проаналізувати принципи філософії двох великих російських філософів Е.Н. Трубецького та В.С. Соловйова, акцентуючи основну увагу саме на спільних рисах та відмінностях їх поглядів. Основний зміст дослідження становить аналіз теорій даних філософів щодо співвідношення божественного початку та інтуїтивного знання у людському існуванні. Автор розкриває основні погляди Е.Н. Трубецького на цю проблему, які полягають, перш за все, у тому, що у природному пізнанні безумовне передбачається не як сутність всього пізнаваного, а як універсальна думка і свідомість про все сутнє. Філософія В.С. Соловйова є концептуально протилежною філософії Е.Н. Трубецького та містить такі ідеї як універсальний органічний синтез науки, філософії і релігії, ідея нероздільної і неслиянної єдності божественного і людського, містичного і раціонального. Автори статті зазначають, що, незважаючи на ці фундаментальні відмінності у поглядах, князь Трубецької у своїй концепції про безумовну незалежності Бога

від світу і людини завжди опирався на ідеї Абсолютного запропоновані Соловйовим та вважав філософію останнього «істинною». На основі вивчення взаємовідносин зазначених філософів автори встановлюють, що велика кількість взаємної критики щодо окремих ідей, у тому числі критика антропоцентричних і пантеїстичних мотивів князем Трубецьким, зумовлена перш за все проявом дружніх почуттів. У статті подано докладний аналіз коментарів за зазначеною темою таких визначних російських філософів як Н.К. Гаврюшин, П. Флоренський, І.І. Євламπίєв, опираючись на їх доводи і критику, автор підходить до висновку, що криза сучасного людства відбувається саме через втрату релігійного почуття, що веде до забуття єдності всіх людей - як в гріху, так і порятунку, а потім і забутті єдності людини з Богом.

Ключові слова: Трубецький; Соловйов; Боголюдина; божественне начало; інтуїтивні знання; наука; релігія; філософія; синтез.

ГЕОРГИЙ ХЛЕБНИКОВ

*кандидат философских наук, заведующий отделом философии
Центра гуманитарных научно-информационных исследований*

ИНИОН РАН

(Москва, Россия)

ORCID 0000-0001-5410-4807

ВЯЧЕСЛАВ СТЕПАНОВ

*кандидат философских наук, доцент кафедры философии,
истории и социально-гуманитарных дисциплин*

Донбасский государственный педагогический университет

(г. Славянск, Украина)

e-mail: philosophy.kafedra@ukr.net ORCID 0000-0002-2616-1462

ЮЛИЯ ТАРАСЕНКО

аспирантка кафедры философии, истории и социально-

гуманитарных дисциплин,
Донбасский государственный педагогический университет
(г. Славянск, Украина)

ИДЕЯ БОГОЧЕЛОВЕКА В КОНТЕКСТЕ СОВРЕМЕННЫХ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЙ

В качестве исследовательской задачи авторами была определена попытка оценить и проанализировать принципы философии российских философов Е.Н. Трубецкого и В.С. Соловьёва. Основное содержание исследования составляет анализ теорий данных философов касательно соотношения божественного начала и интуитивного знания в человеческом существовании. Автор раскрывает взгляды Е.Н. Трубецкого на эту проблему, которые заключаются в том, что в естественном познании безусловное предполагается не как сущность всего познаваемого, а как универсальная мысль и сознание обо всем. Философия В.С. Соловьёва является концептуально противоположной философии Е.Н. Трубецкого и содержит идеи нераздельного и неслиянного единства божественного и человеческого. В статье дан подробный анализ комментариев по данной теме таких выдающихся русских философов как Н.К. Гаврюшин, П. Флоренский, И.И. Евлампиев и, опираясь на их мнение, автор подходит к выводу, что критика Трубецкого в сторону Соловьёва обусловлена дружескими чувствами.

Ключевые слова: Трубецкой; Соловьёв; Богочеловек; божественное начало; интуитивные знания; наука; религия; философия; синтез

REFERENCES

1. Gavryushin N.K. (2014). Hristianskij platonizm I religiozno-obshchestvennyj ideal v trudah knyazya E.N. Trubeckogo [Christian Platonism and the religious social ideal in the works of Prince E.N. Trubetskoy] In *Evgeny Nikolaevich Trubetskoy* /Eds. S.M. Polovinkina, T.G. Shchedrinoj. Moscow: Politicheskaya

enciklopediya. (filosofiya Rossii pervoj poloviny XX veka). P. 58-74. [In Russian]

2. Evlampiev I.I. (2014). Problema soedineniya zemnogo i bozhestvennogo v filosofskom tvorchestve E.N. Trubeckogo [The problem of combining the earthly and the divine in the philosophical work of E.N. Trubetskoy] In *Evgeny Nikolaevich Trubetskoy*/ Eds. S.M. Polovinkina, T.G. Shedrinoj. Moscow: Politicheskaya enciklopediya. (filosofiya Rossii pervoj poloviny XX veka). P. 10-57. [In Russian]

3. Losev A.F. (1990). *Vladimir Solov'evi ego vremena* [*Vladimir Soloviev and his time*]. Moscow. [In Russian]

4. Nosov A.A. (2014). Istoriya i sud'ba «Mirosozercaniya Vl. S. Solov'eva» [History and fate of the "Worldview of Vl. S. Solovyov "] In *Evgeny Nikolaevich Trubetskoy*/ Eds. S.M. Polovinkina, T.G. Shedrinoj. Moscow: Politicheskaya enciklopediya. (filosofiya Rossii pervoj poloviny XX veka). P.75-113. [In Russian]

5. Trubeckoj E.N. (1917) *Metafizicheskie predpolozheniya poznaniya. Opyt preodoleniya Kanta i kantianstva* [*Metaphysical assumptions of knowledge. Experience of overcoming Kant and Kantianism*]. Moscow. Retrieved from: http://www.odinblago.ru/metafiz_predp_poznania/#35 [In Russian]

6. Evgenij Trubeckoj. *K voprosu o mirovozzrenii V. S. Solov'eva (Po povodustat'i L. M. Lopatina)* [*To the question of V.S.Soloviev's worldview (Concerning the L. M. Lopatin's article)*]. Retrieved from: <https://www.rulit.me/author/trubeckoj-evgenij-nikolaevich/k-voprosu-o-mirovozzrenii-v-s-soloveva-download-free-396292.html>. [In Russian]

7. Trubeckoj E.N. (1913). *Mirovozzrenie Vl. S. Solov'eva* [*The worldview of Vl. S. Solovyova*]. V.1-2. Moscow. [In Russian]

8. Trubeckoj E. N. (1995). *Mirovozzrenie V.S.Solov'eva* [*The worldview of Vl. S. Solovyova*]. Moscow. V.1. [In Russian]