

Yu.V. Kuznetsov

AESTHETICS AND THEURGY OF HISTORY IN RUSSIAN HISTORIOSOPHY

The article deals with the historiosophical concepts of P.Ya. Chaadaeva, K.N. Leontyev, Vl. Solovyova, S.N. Bulgakov, A.N. Berdyaev, which are based on the concepts of "aesthetics of history" and "theurgy of history." The article substantiates the position that in Russian historiosophy the aesthetics of history is the most important principle, which reflects the essential features of the entire Russian culture.

The historiosophical conceptions by P. Chaadaev, K. Leontjev, V. Solovjev, S. Bulgakov, A. Berdyaev basing on the notions of aesthetics of history and theurgia of history are considered in the article. The position that the aesthetics of history is the major principle in the national history reflecting the essential trends of the Russian culture in whole is substantiated.

Key words: theurgy, historiosophy, sophiology, aesthetics of history, Christianity, the concept of God-manhood.

Keywords: theurgia, historiosophy, sophiology, aesthetics of history, Christianity, conception of God-manhood.

In studying the features of the concept of God-manhood and the idea of theurgy in history, the problem (especially important for Russian historiosophy) of the aesthetics of history is touched upon. Theurgic notions of history originated in Russia, which in the 20th century influenced history in the most decisive way. At the same time, it is preferable to understand the concept of "aesthetics of history" not as the aesthetics of historical knowledge, as A.V. Gulyga [1, 2], but as an aesthetic aspect, the historical process itself, although there is no contradiction between these two interpretations of the aesthetics of history. Substantially, the "aesthetics of history" is a view of the world and history as a work of art, which has two modifications. First, it presupposes the spectacularity of history, its dramatic and even theatrical perception; Secondly,

In Russian culture, an aesthetic view of history is born almost simultaneously with historical knowledge: "Everywhere the poetic view of history was preceded by scholarly research; in our country, on the contrary, poetic insight prevented real development," [3] - wrote V. F. Odoevsky. Confirmation of his thought can also be found in P.Ya. Chaadaev, who characterizes the historical works of N. Karamzin in this way: "What sublimity there was in this soul, what warmth there was in this heart! How sensibly, how sensibly he loved his fatherland! How ingenuously he admired its enormity and how well he understood that the whole meaning of Russia lies in this enormity! .. But as a writer, what a harmonious, sonorous period, what a true aesthetic feeling! ... "[4].

P.Ya. Chaadaev believes that the main difference between Russian historical thinking and the one existing in the West is its reliance on aesthetic feeling. The historiosophy of P.Ya. Chaadaeva will later be assessed in the same way: "In the iron and at the same time free sequence of his conclusions, there is so much restrained passion, such a wonderful economy of strength that, in addition to many brilliant characteristics and artistic epithets, for this strict pathos of thought his "Philosophical Letters" should be attributed to the field of verbal creativity on a par with Pushkin's elegy or Tolstoy's story ... There are few works in world literature where the spontaneity and at the same time the harmony of human logic would be felt so clearly "[5].

Historiosophy P.Ya. Chaadaeva gave every reason to call him a "philosopher-poet." He was characterized by the universalism of the worldview, characteristic of romantics, according to which humanity achieves a state of unity, following the ideal defined by Christianity.

P.Ya. Chaadaev is respectful of reason and its decisive role in the "education of the human race", the improvement of the spiritual and material conditions of human existence. But Russia in this universal human movement towards the ideal of enlightenment is hindered by its age-old "isolation" from European history, caused by the excessive influence of Byzantism, the consequence of which is the split of the Church and the social passivity of Orthodoxy, which did not protest against serfdom and allowed the existence of the people in a state of slavery.

Hence - the state of moral indifference, the absence of living thought, characteristic of modern Russia.

For P. Ya. Chaadaeva, Christianity should not exist in the form of a doctrine of salvation beyond the grave, divorced from worldly concerns. As for Orthodoxy, as the heir to Byzantine Christianity, according to P.Ya. Chaadaev, moves away from solving any social issues: "In religious life, everything is now based on the letter, and the true voice of the embodied mind is dumb. ... Preaching has become just an accidental phenomenon in the building of good. And yet - we must finally admit this frankly - the sermon transmitted to us in Scripture was, of course, addressed to some of the audience present. It cannot be equally understood by people of all times and all countries. Shouldn't a new voice be heard in the world, connected with the course of history, such that its calls would not be alien to anyone, so that they thundered equally in all ends of the earth, and so that echoes in the present century would vying with each other to seize it and carry it from end to end of the universe" [6]. Let's pay attention to the fact that P.Ya. Chaadaev in his intentions actually asserts that anyone who believes that the entire content of Christianity is contained in the pages of Holy Scripture is deeply mistaken. The truths of Christianity should be embodied not only in word, but also in deed, since the main thing in the words of Christ: "after him there will be people who will so deeply delve into the contemplation and study of his perfections, who will be so filled with his teachings and the example of his life that morally they will make one whole with him, that these people, following each other from generation to generation, will pass from hand to hand his entire thought, his entire being" [7]. that the entire content of Christianity is contained in the pages of Holy Scripture, he is deeply mistaken. The truths of Christianity should be embodied not only in word, but also in deed, since the main thing in the words of Christ: "after him there will be people who will so deeply delve into the contemplation and study of his perfections, who will be so filled with his teachings and the example of his life that morally they will make one whole with him, that these people, following each other from generation to generation, will pass from hand to hand his entire thought, his entire being" [7]. that the entire content of Christianity is contained in the pages of Holy Scripture, he is deeply mistaken. The truths of Christianity should be embodied not only in word, but also in deed, since the main thing in the words of Christ: "after him there will be people who will so deeply delve into the contemplation and study of his perfections, who will be so filled with his teachings and the example of his life that morally they will make one whole with him, that these people, following each other from generation to generation, will pass from hand to hand his entire thought, his entire being" [7].

The objective course of history, according to P.Ya. Chaadaev, highlights the need for new people who are ready to lead mankind to Golgotha "destruction of their personal being", to the total unity of all mankind at the end of history. These people must be selfless, must be capable of self-sacrifice. For P. Ya. Chaadaev's asceticism and heroism of historical action are not a semblance of Christian asceticism and heroism, but an expression of its very essence. Thus, the categories of the heroic, the sublime, the tragic are equally characteristic of history itself and historical knowledge.

Nevertheless, the first Russian in the true sense of the "aesthetics of history" is K.N. Leontiev. His entire worldview is based on aristocratic historical aestheticism, heroism, which P.Ya. Chaadaev expected to meet in the future, K.N. Leontiev found in the past. Therefore, the European bourgeois standards of life, the desire to average the qualities of a person, caused K.N. Leont'ev's sense of aesthetic rejection is similar to an aristocrat's aversion to the habits and manners of people of the third estate. Economic and social progress for K.N.

Leont'ev is embodied in the assertion of the ideas of equality in society, from which follows the displacement of everything outstanding and genius from life. These negative consequences of K.N. Leontyev evaluates not from the standpoint of public benefit or harm, not from a religious and moral point of view, but aesthetically, noting the decline of European culture. It is known that the very idea of continuous progress by K.N. Leont'ev resolutely rejected, believing that history is an intermittent change of closed civilizations, changing, rather, according to the laws of nature, and therefore inevitably passing through the stages of birth, flowering, decrepitude and death.

K.N. Leont'ev not only fixes the aesthetic value of cultural forms, but also connects with them "vitality" and power, creativity. The philosopher is not interested in the inner meaning of aesthetic phenomena and their role in history, but the fact that they are carriers of the creative force justifies their existence for him (even despite their moral significance). The principle of history aesthetics

K.N. Leont'ev is as follows: "What is form? In general, form is an expression of the idea contained in matter (content). It is a negative aspect of a phenomenon, matter is a positive one. In what sense is that? Matter, for example, given to us, is glass, the form of the phenomenon is a glass, a cylindrical vessel, hollow inside; where the glass ends, where it no longer exists, air begins around or liquid inside the vessel; the matter of glass cannot go further, does not dare, if it wants to remain faithful to the basic idea of its hollow cylinder, if it does not want to stop being a glass. Form is the despotism of the inner idea, which does not allow matter to scatter. Breaking the bonds of this natural despotism, the phenomenon perishes "[8]. The word "despotism" in this definition has an aesthetic meaning, indicating the ability of a form to create tension, to hold boundaries, and the moral and political meaning of this term for K.N. Leontyev is derived from the aesthetic.

The aesthetic criterion for assessing history is given by K.N. Leontyev concluded that modern European civilization has entered the third, final stage of its existence, when, although some elements of the former "blossoming complexity" are still preserved, signs of secondary simplification and cultural decline are already visible: "The complexity of machines, the complexity of administration, judicial orders, the complexity of needs in big cities, the complexity of actions and the influence of the newspaper and book world, the complexity of the methods of science itself ... These are all tools of mixing - this is a gigantic crowd, pushing everyone and everything in one stupa of pseudo-humane vulgarity and prose ... "[9] ...

For K.N. Leont'ev, the period of excess creativity and energy, characteristic of the Renaissance, when a person could exist relying only on his own strength, ended, and Europe approached the beginning of its decline: "This monstrous situation began to take on distinctness at the beginning of the 17th century. By that time, the era of individualism - the Middle Ages, the Renaissance, to a certain extent, the post-Renaissance - had ended. The vertical dimension of being has disappeared, which excludes death as an inevitable and final death; equality before Heaven turned into equality before people "[10]. The consciousness of Europeans, poisoned by individualism, refuses to recognize the authority of any "higher authorities". The European takes on the appearance of a short and hollow bourgeois, aesthetically capable of causing only disgust [11].

Many called this attitude K.N. Leont'ev to modernity with Nietzschean, [12] supplementing it with mysticism, which was absent in F. Nietzsche. The mystical experiences of K.N. Leont'ev, who predetermined his subsequent religious conversion, were full of fear of death: "I was not thinking about the salvation of my soul, I am usually not at all fearful, I was simply horrified by the thought of bodily death and, being already prepared in advance, I suddenly believed in the existence and power of the Mother of God ... and exclaimed: Mother of God! Early!

It's too early for me to die! " [13]. The perception of death, understood as the infinity of disappearance and as an abyss of nothingness, became an important component of K.N. Leontyev. It is obvious that against their background aesthetic criticism of European history has lost all meaning. Subsequently V.V. Rozanov took from K.N. Leont'ev not only the idea

of the triadic development of history (initial simplicity - blossoming complexity - confusion and simplification), but also his historical aestheticism [14].

In the teachings of V.I. Solov'ev on God-manhood, the extrapolation of the criteria of aesthetics to history was the result of the revival of that aesthetic ontology, which was already in Neoplatonism, which he considered it his duty to revive. If the entire cosmos is subject to the laws of aesthetics, then human history is subject to the same laws: "Due to this direct connection between art and the metaphysical world of ideal beings, we find that the same national genius who first comprehended the divine principle as an ideal cosmos is the same the most national genius was also the real ancestor of art "[15]. The combination of the aesthetics of Plato and the Neoplatonists with sophiology allowed V.I. Solov'ev to give dialectics and historiosophy a vivid artistic form. The principle of the unity of truth, goodness and beauty - the most important principle of Platonism, received the form of "all-unity".

Followers of V.I. Solov'ev, together with the concept of God-manhood, they also adopted the theurgic aesthetics of historical action. According to N.A. Berdyaev, the general plan of the world order reveals inferiority, which manifests itself in the presence of the Underworld, and this inferiority must be compensated for by the joint creativity of man and God. The initial elements, called heaven and earth in the religious and mythological language, and chaos in the language of Antiquity, are formless and represent pure potency. Man, according to N. Berdyaev, is justified by creativity and in creativity finds his salvation. Of course, a predisposition to meonic creativity is also revealed, which, being a human duty, unfolds in history: "Aestheticism marks the areas of Russian creativity, even those that do not directly belong to art:

S.N. Bulgakov's predisposition to the artistry of thought manifested itself more clearly than that of other sophiologists. The concepts of Sophia, the Wisdom of God, turned being, history, God and man into artistic "texts". Therefore sophiology is also an aesthetic cosmody and anthropody: "History is the self-creation of man in the world ... The Logos of the world is also the human Logos, and the beauty of the world is also human beauty. Therefore, one can understand the world only through a person, in his history "[17]. The aesthetic justification of space and man extends to the field of theology, where the moral dimension gives way to the aesthetic one. "Orthodoxy has a basic ideal not so much ethical as religious and aesthetic" [18]. Almost literally repeating the words of K.N. Leontyev, S.N. Bulgakov argues that this priority is also characteristic of any historical era: "The epochs of cultural flourishing are marked by the primacy not of ethics, but of aesthetics. Artistry becomes a guiding sense of life in them "[19].

ON. Berdyaev introduces the term "historical aesthetics", implying by it the amazing ability of a person to change his past. The point here is that the past itself in different historical epochs enters the semantic space of the present in different ways and each time defines itself in a new way in different configurations of its elements. Thus, the past reveals itself in the present in accordance with existing ideas about the purpose and meaning of history. The same idea was reflected in the autobiography of N.A. Berdyaeva: "I know the charm of the beauty of the past.

What is his secret? The memory of the past is a creative, transforming memory, it makes a selection, it does not passively reproduce the past. The beauty of the past is not the beauty of the empirically former, it is the beauty of the present, the transformed past that has entered the present Everything that is old, beautiful in its antiquity is present, in the past there was no such antiquity. The past was not at all old, but young, this present is old in one aspect "[20].

Historical knowledge for N.A. Berdyaeva is an artistic self-organization of the past, embedded in the semantic architecture of the present. This understanding corresponds to the ontological understanding of creativity, which N.A. Berdyaev adhered to throughout his life. Often, reflections on the specifics of history as a science led to conclusions about the aesthetic nature of historical knowledge: "History is not a natural science. The structure of its objectivity in many respects is much closer to the structure of aesthetic objectivity than natural

scientific ... the essence of the historical process lies in the constant re-creation of the superhistorical content of life ... "[21].

Thus, in Russian historiosophy, especially in sophiology, the aesthetics of history turns out to be the most important principle, which indicates the essential features of the entire Russian culture.

LITERATURE

1. Gulyga A.V. *Aesthetics of history*. M., 1974.
2. Gulyga A.V. *The art of history*. M., 1980.
3. Odoevsky V.F. *Russian nights*. L., 1975. 182.
4. Chaadaev P.Ya. Letter to A.I. Turgenev. 1838 // Chaadaev P.Ya. *Articles and letters*. M., 1987. p. 246.
5. Gershenzon M.O. P.Ya. Chaadaev. *Life and thinking*. SPb., 1908. 75-76.
6. Chaadaev P.Ya. *Philosophical letters* // Chaadaev P.Ya. *Articles and letters*. M., 1989. p. 144.
7. *Ibid.* with. 145.
8. Leontiev K.N. *Byzantism and Slavism* // Leont'ev K.N. *Full collection cit .: In 12 volumes*. SPb., 2007. T. 7. Book. 1. c. 22.
9. *Ibid.* with. 395.
10. Golovin E.V. *Man and people* // *Elements*. 2000. No. 8. p. 84.
11. See: K. N. Leontiev. *The average European as an ideal and a weapon of all peaceful destruction* // Leont'ev K.N. *collection cit .: In 12 volumes*. SPb., 2007. T. 8. Book. 1. c. 159-233.
12. See, for example: V.V. Zenkovsky. *History of Russian Philosophy*. L., 1991. Vol. 1, part 2. p. 257-260.
13. Bulgakov S.N. *Quiet thoughts*. M., 1918. S. 125.
14. See: V.V. Rozanov. *Aesthetic understanding of history* // *Russian Bulletin*. 1892. Vol. 218. p. 156-188.
15. Soloviev Vl.S. *Readings about God-manhood. Fifth reading* // Soloviev Vl. S. *Works: In 2 volumes*. M., 1989. Vol. 2. s. 65.
16. Bulgakov S.N. *Humanity versus humanity* // *Russian thought*. 1917. No. 5/6. Dept. X. c. 1-32.
17. Bulgakov S.N. *About God-manhood*. Paris, 1945, p. 342, 348.
18. Bulgakov S.N. *Orthodoxy*. Paris, 1989, p. 382.
19. Bulgakov S.N. *Non-Evening Light*. M., 1994. p. 382.
20. Berdyaev N.A. *Self-knowledge (Experience of a philosophical autobiography)*. M., 1989. p. 274-275.
21. Stepan F. *The religious meaning of the revolution* // *Modern notes*. 1929. Vol. 40. p. 431, 434.
22. Queen L. *Poetic myth-making* // *D. Andreev in the culture of the XX century*. M., 2000. 92.