

94(477) «1881/1962»

oirisska@ukr.net

(1881–1962 .)

Kyrychenko V.G., Assoc. Prof., Cand. Sci. (Histor.), Lecturer, Department of history and philosophy of history, Institute of philosophy of education and science of the National pedagogical university of . . Drahomanov (Ukraine, Kyiv), oirisska@ukr.net

Religious Anthropology and Philosophy V. Zinkivskoho (1881–1962)

We study the essence of the concept of religious anthropology and philosophy V.Zinkivskogo with a focus on the most significant aspects of his scientific legacy. Clarified the essence of Christian anthropology V.Zinkivskogo as a methodological basis of his teaching concept, study the main ideas that determined the foundation to create a system of Christian philosophy scholar. Has developed the study of religious anthropology and philosophy V.Zinkivskogo; introduced into science previously unknown materials that enhance the understanding of the development of

philosophical thought of the first half of the twentieth century. Argues that the main idea, determine the basis V.Zinkivsky in creating a system of Christian philosophy and the study of the history of Russian philosophy – the idea of religious experience, which scientists believe «this», which was explained by the interaction between subject and object; sofilogichnogo concept of dualism that distinguishes between God and Sophia Sofia animal, the idea of Orthodox culture, which included overcoming the dissociation of culture that has arisen as a result of secularization. It is proved that the overcoming of this incoherence V.Zinkivsky seen in the Christian theory of reception – processing studies of natural reason in the light of Christ. Convinced that the idea of creation is the central idea of Christian metaphysics, the scientist criticized the ideas of those philosophers for whom neo–Platonism replaced the idea of creation. Creating a holistic and organic system on the basis of orthodoxy, covered the reality to which it was addressed, led basic life and scientific purpose V.Zinkivsky that found vivid expression in the period emigration. Understanding Russian philosophy as a special kind of philosophizing, was in close connection with a religious worldview, V.Zinkivsky allowed to define the subject of philosophy as a «search for the unity of the spiritual life in the way of rationalizing it», where the unity of the spiritual life means the totality of human experience. A study of history Russian philosophy crystallized own concept V.Zinkivsky devoid of flaws that were inherent in his opinion, the most developed philosophical concept in Russia – the philosophy of unity. Scientists created «a system of Christian philosophy» as an attempt to create a synthesis of science, philosophy, religion, and create the Orthodox culture, overcoming secularism. Historical – philosophical analysis of the epistemology of the philosopher led to believe that it has played a negative role in the branch of philosophy and religion. According to the author, the positive, creative job in the impersonation of the truth in the life of the Church, V.Zinkivsky seen not only in the conservatism of communication with her, but and the main thing – the individual’s inner world, as well as in the whole culture, socio – economic life during istorii. Thus, a multi–dimensional activity V.Zinkivskogo was in the revival of Orthodox culture as a powerful force of history, aimed at reviving

— « » —

,

—

.

(1881–1962 .) —

.

, , ,

,

.

.

,

,

.

.

.

.

.

«

»,

—

1951 . [1]. —

[2] . [3].

. , . ,

[4, .4–5]. .

.

«

».

«

I —

.», .

—

.

.

.

.

. .

. , ,

,

.

—

.

—

,

«

» — [5;6;7].

I — . [8-11].

[12, .276-278].

» [13, .236-

242],

[14, .341-342],

[4].

(

),

I

[15;16;17].

, , .
,
.

, ,

.
—
. . ,
— ()

.
« —

, — . ,
, —

.

, «...
» [18, .73–88]. . ,

, ,
,

[19].

.
. .
. . ,

« »,

1934 . [20].

[21, .5].

[21, .12-17].

[21, .253].

« » ,

, « ».

[4].

[23;24].

« , »,

[25, .63].

[25, .72].

« » .

[25, .148].

[25, .173].

[25, .185].

« » .

[26].

1957 . « »

« » « » « »

1. с . . – – , 1951. – 560 .
2. . . – 1914–1924 . // . . – 1925. – .1. – .63–64.
3. . // . – 1932. – 34. – .52–63.
4. . – . : : 09.00.03 / . – . – ., 1997. – 18 .
5. . . // . – ., 1962. – .2. – .147.
6. . // . – 1955. – 3. – .73–86.
7. ., ., . // . – 1955. – 3. – .62–77.
8. . // : / . : . , . , . – : . – « » , 2002. – .77–79.

9. . // :
- ., 1998. - .1. - .28-37.
10. I -
- . // . - ,
1992. - .92 (,). - 136 .
11. : .
- . // : - .
- « ».- ., 1998. - .112-122.
12. (-
- .)- .: , 2001. - .276-278.
13. // . - ,
1991. - .2. - .236-242.
14. . . . - ., 1992.
15. - . //
- . - 1906. - 82. - .92-126.
16. . - ,
1905. - 37 .
17. , . - .:
- . , 1918. - 91 .
18. .
- . :
- . 1998. - 195 .
19. //
- . - , 1929. - 16-17. - .4-5.
20. . -
- , 1934. - 256 .
21. .
- .: - , 1996. - 272 .
22. :
- . - .: , 1997. - 368 .

23. . . - .1:
. - , 1960. - 149 .
24. . . - .2:
. - , 1960. - 186 .
25. . . - .: , 1996. - 559
.
26. . . - , 1957. - 262 .