
SCIENCE & RELIGION

IN RUSSIAN POST-SOVIET CONTEXT

Evgeny Arinin*

*Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies, Faculty of Humanity, Vladimir State University,
Gorkiy str. 87, Vladimir, 600000 Russia*

(Received 14 February 2005)

Abstract

Nowadays in Russia we can speak about three types of identification preferences among people: Secular, Christian Orthodox and Esoteric. The majority of scientists and philosophers held Secular view, which has some difficulties for a constructive and fruitful dialogue between science and religion. The Methodology is very important for our discussions. For the first time ever, Shelling and Hegel interpreted the phenomenon as the substratum, process and substance, as levels of understanding and interpretation of the objects' essence. The present paper intends to give a constructive analysis of the following notions: *substrate, function* and *substation*. The great definitions variety of the essence of Religion and Organic Life is interpreted in the context of conflict and unity of three approaches: *substrate, function* and *substation*.

Keywords: methodology, dialogue, science and religion

1. Introduction

The New Russian Identity

In new conditions of today Russia has faced quite a new problem – that concerning the search of a 'Identity Model', of a 'National Ideal', of a 'Russian Dream', and many other similar things which are widely discussed in our press, including the scientific one. It is well known, that a person finds oneself only in the process of interaction with that religious and social-cultural environment, in which one exists and to which one tries to adapt, accepting its norms and values. This process is fraught with the 'crisis of identity' and the conversion of one system of norms to another. Then 'false identification' or 'pseudo-identification' may happen (like Nazi Fascism). This kind of 'false identification' has false values, which never correspond to real interests of people.

Every individual subconsciously searches its identity. During the whole history of humanity one always related oneself with Tradition, which was always a symbolic fixation of people's experience by means of texts or customs.

* e-mail: eiarinin@mail.ru, Phone: (+7) 903 647 67 82, Fax: (+7) 0922-233 358

'Religion' in our previous – 'Marxist' – literature was qualified as only an 'Ideology' or as a set of 'Religious Beliefs of people' [1]. People considered 'Religion' to be similar to other 'Convictions' and 'Ideologies'; religion was considered to be a subject of conviction, as if it was quite enough to organize 'propaganda'. In reality, there exists a radical difference between 'Religion' and 'Convictions' or 'Ideologies'. Though in sociological questioning this difference is usually lost, it usually reveals itself in crucial periods, when all of a sudden 'propaganda' stops being able of persuading anyone. It turns out that man can't be convinced of anything you like.

Evidently, one can't think of any system of social values – or 'Ideology' – as of only 'illusion' or 'mystification', which are profitable to the power. Crush of the USSR became the starting point for the crisis of identification at the civilization scale. One can see the growth of number of 'Neo-Pagans' groups and esoteric irrational occult 'Saviours'. There is also another extreme: fundamentalist identification with traditional confessions – Orthodoxy, Islam, Protestantism or others. There is a third group, which sees itself in the Western tradition of Humanistic and Open Society. Each of them interprets all the others as a kind of 'pseudo-identification', or 'not valuable enough', and 'incompletely-precious' identification.

This is a typological, theoretical approach. Besides this one, there may also be sociological approaches, reflecting direct identification preferences. A study performed at Pomor State University and Vladimir State University on a group of 2500 first and second year students revealed that though 65% of students consider themselves to be 'believers' in one way or another, still only 9% of them think that they are 'believers' first of all (the Bible is authoritative only for 3%; priests are authoritative for 2%). This result shows a considerable indefiniteness and instability of their world orientation.

They are rather independent – 45% do not refer 'themselves' to any of those 'categories'. A proportion of 73% think that only their own experience is authoritative. It's evident, that 'political' (national) or 'professional' and 'family' interests are prevailing over 'local' or 'confessional' interests – 51% name themselves 'Russians' or 'Citizens of Russia'; 24% – 'students'; 19% – 'son' or 'daughter'; only 3% – 'Pomors' \ 'Vladimirs' (local identity); 18 – 'believers' and 3% - 'Orthodoxies'. One can also clearly see a constructive approach towards political power – 82% stand for a President as 'Professional', who must not be either an 'atheist', or a 'non-Christian'. The rating of political leaders is very low – 1%. 49% vote for the equality of all confessions and religions or religious units in general.

It's impossible to name this worldview as 'Theism' (56%) or 'Christianity' (26% believe in Christ's Resurrection), when 65% say that they are 'believers'. But we may mention the presence of some 'Feeling of Sacrament', experience of 'Higher Existence' connected with 'Esoterics' – belief in Miracles and Fortunetelling (42% and 45%). Mass Media take the next place after teachers in their authoritativeness (1 and 3%). The living values, taken from real life, are prevailing – 'themselves' – 73% and 'parents' – 58% (compare: Bible –

3%, priests -2 %) [2].

Nowadays, as in the Soviet time, the majority of “scientists and philosophers held atheistic and materialistic view, with no room for religious thought” [3]. There were difficulties in re-organizing the constructive and fruitful dialogue between science and religion. We have several years of experience of interdisciplinary collaboration in the spheres of Humanity, Natural Sciences and Theology at Vladimir State University in cooperation with Pomor State University, Moscow State University, Moscow St. Andrew's Biblical Theological College, Vladimir Orthodoxy seminary, Ministry of Education RF, the colleagues from the Nordic Countries (Assoc. Prof. Roald E. Kristiansen, Tromsø University and Prof. Dr. Sigurd Bergmann, Trondheim University, Norway), Italy, Netherlands, ESSSAT, CTNS and Metanexus Institute, USA.

Starting from 1993 we have been acquiring constructive practical experience in organizing seminars, conferences and colloquiums with persons involved in research and practical work in the spheres of Ecology, Biology, Medicine, Philosophy, History, Ethnography, Linguistics, Pedagogic, Sociologists, Folklore and Theology within the framework of the project “Istoki” and “Ecology of Spirit”. The Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies has become the first interdisciplinary scientific community uniting other scientific research departments of the University. The results of meetings and seminars held were summarized and presented at the general annual conferences “Russian Inter-region LSI-Symposium on Science and Religion” (2001-2004). The lectures, articles and the materials are published in a collection of articles “Candle” (1997-2005, vol. I-XI), books and study-books.

2. The Methodology for the interpretation of Sacred

In Russia we need a renewed interest in the serious analysis of basic worldview concepts that can express a genuine understanding of the ‘Sacred’ (Essence, Being, Ultimate Reality). Such concepts express the main principles for cognising reality. They help us to systematise the information about our surrounding world, and to determine not only how we perceive ourselves and the world, but also a specific logic of linking such statements with the reasons for our behaviour. Nowadays, the Methodology is very important for our discussions, else as the international experience. Now, Russia is a pluralistic society and we can mark out three tendencies of worldview (at academic level): Marxism or atheistic tendency, Orthodox theology and Russian philosophy, phenomenological tendency (“system approach”). In our work, at the Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies, we are guided by the phenomenological approach [4].

During the Soviet period, ‘Idealism’ and ‘Materialism’ emerged as a shift from Official Ideological Philosophy. For example, V.P. Kuzmin distinguished between ‘systematic’ and ‘meta-systematic’ understanding of objects [5]. He also showed the appropriate stages and levels through which one could develop a true understanding of the object's essence. A. Tchanyshev emphasised

'naturalistic' and 'anthropomorphic' principles for cognising the essence of objects [6], whereas B.T. Grigoryan, through the principles of 'objectivism' and 'subjectivism', made it possible to comprehend the notion of essence with regard to Human Beings [7]. Y.A. Shreider juxtaposed 'naturalistic' and 'personalistic' principles for cognising the world [8]. S.N. Smirnov emphasised 'functional' and 'structural' principles for the development of a scientific interpretation of objects [9]. S. Petrov distinguished between 'structural', 'functional', 'phenomenological' and 'substratum-substantial' principles [10], B.M. Kedrov between 'functional' and 'substratum' principles [11], while A.R. Sokolov worked mainly with 'functional-substantial' principles [12]. In the works of the authors mentioned above, one can discern their will to deny the dogma of State Marxism in favour of a dialogue with Western philosophical and Church traditions.

Today there have emerged quite new possibilities for such dialogue, although there remain a number of basic problems to solve. One of the most important is the problem of unity between methodology in Theology and Natural Science. Is there any common epistemological ground between the Wisdom of the Church, and the Wisdom of Secular (Philosophical) Tradition?

For the first time ever F.W.J. Shelling and G.W.F. Hegel interpreted the phenomenon as the substratum, process and substance, as levels of understanding of the objects' essence [13]. I would like to give a constructive analysis of the following notions: *substrate*, *function*, and *substation*. The latter term refers to the principles for knowing the Essence and Sacred ('sacred').

One may attempt to comprehend the Sacred through the alternative concepts of 'Magic' and 'Religious' [14] with a clear-cut distinction between the 'Pagan' (to which magic belongs) and the 'Christian' (the "Religious") [15]. On the other hand, one can emphasize the basic unity within the cognition of the Sacred and assume a basic identity between Paganism and Christianity due to the isomorphism between Spiritual Cultures. In this case, Paganism is understood in terms of the 'Pre-Christian' so that 'Magic' has much in common with the 'Religious'. In this latter case, the lower (Paganism) is understood in terms of higher (Christianity). This point of view is quite different from that of the Marxists, who identified Religion with Magic by interpreting the higher in terms of the lower [16]. In fact, the Marxist's view can be considered as an attempt to deny the very essence of being 'Human'. One can distinguish between three contemporary cultural 'images' of what it means to be a human being: the Neo-Pagan, the Christian, and the Secular. The Marxist way of interpreting the higher in terms of the lower can also be considered as an attempt to deny any fruitful dialogue between the representatives of these three cultural types.

Secular culture often considers historical progress on a linear scale. It begins at a 'magical' stage, continuing through the 'religious' stage, until it finally reaches the 'scientific' stage [17]. Christian culture, on the other hand, rather interprets history as a conversion from an Original Perfect state, to a Fallen and Sinful state [18], and subsequently to the renewal of Religiousness in which there is a constant danger of falling back into the Non-Religious and

Secular stage. Another side of this interpretation incorporates the world's transition from a magical stage to an Ethical stage, either through the teachings of the Church or scientific insight [19]. Magic reduces everything to itself; it has no other method [20]. In fact, the essence of being 'Human' is understood in the light of what is considered to be Sacred in culture itself as the cult of *Mind, Science, Supernatural, the Immanent Person or Natural Powers*.

It is necessary to analyse the principles of cognising the Sacred according to the three types of world-orientation: Archaic\Esoteric (magic and mythological), Christian (personal and symbolic), and Secular (scientific and humanistic). The discovery of any similarity between these types will allow us to affirm that 'Being Human' is essentially unchangeable, and to see how its unity is preserved within each image. The meaning of 'Being Human' is in itself unique and independent of specific cultural images. Such a perspective will imply a paradigm change in the way we understand the meaning of 'Being Human' because it means a transition from a typological paradigm which understands the essence of 'Being Human' in terms of conforming to pre-conceived ideals, to an ecological paradigm of a pluralistic nature, in which each individual will have an 'ecological area' due to their non-reducible mode of being and their unique significance. This does not imply any 'Chaotic Pluralism' in which everything is accidental and nothing has any meaning.

The archaic world-orientation displays a *substratum* principle for cognising a phenomenon's essence and conceives the *Sacred* in terms of mysterious powers, spirits, demons, or gods. Its most important peculiarity is the sense perception of an object, an emotional attitude to it, a spontaneous conviction that it is impossible for the mental and the physical to exist as separate entities, and also that everything is in a sense animated and alive. Fetishes, amulets and idols, all these things express the idea that there is a fundamental identity between the human being and the natural world and that this identity include both the dead and the living. The whole world (and each objects) is seen as a 'psycho-physical system'.

The 'psycho-physical' – the functional and substratum – character of an individual is initiated, sanctioned, and regulated by a supra-individual system such as a group or a tribe in an archaic society. It is the substance of an individual, a marginal basis for his/her display of substratum and functional peculiarities. And even more, it is usually comprehended as something visible and bodily substratum such as 'Meat', 'Blood', 'Eyes', 'Breath', 'Heart', etc. Thus, the archaic world-orientation is based on revealing the visible, the bodily and obvious 'substratum' notions of a substance, of all its forms of expression. This archaic orientation focuses on an object's characteristics, that which is Sacred and mysterious, the 'Magic Power', the 'Soul', the 'Demon' of an object, its inner 'Self' or 'Ego' - in short, its anthropomorphous subjectness. Pre-Socratic philosophers like Protagoras and Zeno, thought in terms of being and intelligibility. Democritus and Epicurus thought in terms of atoms, which in modern times became a mechanical conception of matter as substance. Descartes and Leibniz also used this idea as displaying different versions of the substratum

approach, the principle for interpretation of reality and cognition of new phenomena. The ‘substratum’ approach is based on the spontaneous conviction of the fact that every action has some ‘Actor\actor\’, an acting object, a sensible object, while the ‘functional’ approach, appearing in the early philosophical systems, is based on the conviction of the existence of particular invisible objects must be cognised through the mind, not through feelings.

Pythagoras’ ‘Numbers’ – became the first concepts in the history of philosophy about a principally new nature of ‘Actors’ (substrate) who gave birth to the world that can be perceived. Perception was the result of the ‘sacred-rational’ element of cognition. ‘Numbers’ or ‘God’ were conceived as ‘imaginary’ and ‘rough’ as distinct from ‘true’ and ‘light’ character of real substances as conceived by Plato. From Plato’s point of view, the ‘heavenly’ (light) substrate is opposed to the ‘earth’ (rough) substrate, the latter being faceless and chaotic in general. The Sophists and Skeptics had a relative and utilitarian understanding of substance. They contrasted it to the sacred understanding of substance as a functional element and affirmed a secular, earthly character of functionality based on the new understanding of Human’s intentions and opinions as fundamentally pluralistic and subjectivist. From this point of view, the sacred functional element looks like *one* of the ‘opinions’ only, profitable for a definite group of people, i.e., it is the function of circumstances.

Thus, civilization is characterized by the appearance of three types of notions for the essence of the Sacred as well as of the corresponding three principles, which direct the methodological activity of Human: the Naturalistic (or function-substratum), the Platonic-Idealistic (or substratum-functional), and the Pluralistic (or subjective-functional). All three principles are different according to the notion of the substance of that which is Sacred. For naturalists, the sacred is nature, a sensible element, a physical object, as the sources of characteristics expressed in terms of functionality and process. For Platonic philosophy, the Sacred is in principle non-physical, non-material, non-sensible. In this way they affirm a principal “functionality”, “independence”, and immanent activity of the Sacred, its ability to cause not only external characteristics of the object, but also the characteristics of the object’s sensible and physical substratum. For pluralists, the Sacred (‘sacred’) stops being universal. It loses its universal significance and rational-sensible dependence, as it turns into one of the functions of Human’s life, of ‘sacred’ individuality, or arbitrary activity. Hence the Sacred is being transformed by civilization into something ‘Naturalistic’ as it gradually loses the features of being Human. It ‘de-anthropomorphises’ itself, it becomes ‘Supra-Naturalistic’, ‘Divine’, gradually losing the features of ‘arbitrariness’ and ‘subjectiveness’. Whether the Sacred is conceived in principle as anthropomorphic or as non-anthropomorphic, they both affirm the existence of the Sacred. The conception is opposed by the de-ontologised pluralistic understanding, which de-sacralises Human’s life and regards Human’s cognition as ‘imaginary’, arbitrary and subjective.

Democrit and Plato alienate pluralism of subjectivism from Existence as well as the 'Totalitarianism of Necessity' from subjectivism. Christianity presents a contrast to those alienated categories, by virtue of the fundamental unity of person and Existence in Christ as God, the Second Person of the Trinity. The history of formulating the dogma of the Trinity reflects the transition from the Pagan to the Christian understanding of Human, which includes the faith in the existence of a Personal God.

The Trinitarian issue much debated during several centuries, reveals the depth and specific character of a new world-view. Leaving aside the details of the Trinitarian discussions, let us point out three typologically different ways of understanding the Trinity: a substratum one (Tertullian), a functional one (Arius), and a substantial one (Nicean). The new Nicean theological language should be able to express a new view of the world. The Trinity is not the Three Individuals of the same substratum kind, and not the three gods with different functions, not the three faces, or masks of a single God, and not a subordinated God in which God as Son and Spirit is close to the level of created beings. Nicean used a Greek term 'Hypostasis' and distinguished it from 'Ousia' (Essence) signifying that, which is specific apart from the universal or common. Methodologically it meant reaching a new level of understanding the problem, a transition from a linear logic to a holistic, organismic and poly-dimension logic. The Greek language being improved by philosophers for centuries, matured into a basis for a new spirituality. The Trinity is mysterious and incomprehensible, and consequently, there is no system of categories ready to describe it. The substratum and functional systems of explanation are deprived of their universal significance and self-sufficiency. Logical procedures began to act as parts, as elements of Something Larger than Itself. There occurs a breaking out from the Antique 'personless' understanding of existence, which turns into an understanding of the 'personal', an understanding with a Person that loves and is full of life [21]. All the Three Hypostases are incomparable Images of One and the Same Existence, and Each of Them gets its fullness from the Other Two, thus resembling a rainbow, which is one and multicoloured simultaneously.

In the 20th century, positivistic philosophy was struck by the fact that our common logic actually depends on a transcendental logic [22]. As one realizes this dependence, it becomes necessary to elaborate a terminological set for describing and explaining the Transcendent as far as it is possible, and to emphasize its qualitative difference from the created order. Thus the methodology of describing and explaining the objects that are systematically different, has been worked out.

Nicean Christianity is able to elaborate the methodology for cognising the world as constituted by qualitatively and systematically different objects, which are unique among themselves. Consequently they are equal, but unique, hypostases, particular forms of the common substance, of the Absolute. Substratum and functional views are not denied at all, but they become the means for reaching the unity in terms of their fullness and mutual dependence.

Secular Culture of Modernity, 'Scientism', naturalises and desacralises nature and society when "knowledge is power" is used to transform existence, while freedom is a 'cognised necessity' of existence. Existence, being unknown, becomes a depersonalised 'uncognised', a complete inhuman 'Naturalism' and 'substrate' (materialistic and mechanistic) approach. It was Leibniz who started the scientific use of the very notion of 'function' – he regarded it as a mathematical dependence between the rows of phenomena which cannot be linked – this is 'psycho-physical parallelism', the alive as an 'Ideal Automation' and 'simple monads'. Shelling and Hegel interpreted the Kant's 'noumenon' as the substratum, process and substance, as levels of understanding and manifestation of the objects' essence [23]. The notion of 'function' is comprehended today in its three main meanings: (1) The correspondence of unconnected rows of phenomena, (2) A 'phenomenon' of some non-substrate 'substance' (correspondence between the 'external' and the 'internal', the 'actual' and the 'potential', etc.), (3) The cause for some phenomena (the correspondence between the 'process' and the 'composition', the 'dynamic' and the 'static', 'time' and 'space', the 'active' and the 'passive'). 'Function' became the 'Functional principle for the cognition of existence'. This principle is opposed to the substratum principle. In scientism, the notion of 'substratum' acted as a specific principle for the cognition of existence. It attracted attention of the researchers to the discovery of the sensible, of the visible cause for our judgment on objects, to the description, which is withstanding the arbitrariness and subjectivism of individual opinions on objects. At the same time this notion was connected with 'physicalism', i.e., naturalistic interpretation of an object's phenomenon as the display of an object's composition, substance, and matter. Accordingly this principle was regarded as the criterion for scientific work and verifiability, thus giving us the opportunity to systematise all the wealth of accumulated knowledge. Besides it became the paradigm of modern science, a methodological (epistemological) order that enabled one to describe the elementary objects according to this or that branch 'Secondary Nature'. The appearance of an actually 'functional' approach is connected with the difficulties of a purely substratum interpretation of the world with the discovery of peculiar 'systematical' (in addition to additive substratum ones), non-additive, holistic characteristics [24]. The functional approach was also connected with looking for special non-substratum, non-material cause for those characteristics.

As a whole, both approaches, the 'substratum' and 'functional' ones, allow us to give two additional 'descriptions' of any object, or the existence in its marginally desacralised form. The analysis results in the possibility of manipulating the elements and constructing a new functional and virtual world. This is the very way of ontological affirmation of non-reductionistic methodologies, which take into consideration 'holistic' and 'qualifying' effects, as well as the necessity of a 'special language', i.e., specific categorical systems for adequate interpretations. Ontological 'Scientism' and 'Materialism' of the substratum approach was contrasted with 'Organicism' and 'Anthropism' of the functional view. This allows us to distinguish one more (the third) fundamental

principle for cognising the Sacred\Essence\Being and the existence as a whole, the unity of substratum and functional (holistic and active) elements of objects – the ‘substantial’ principle.

It shows itself as the principle of monism, unity, togetherness, self-substantiation of one’s own characteristics, independence, self-organization, and deep unity of an object’s characteristics. Substation, apart from substratum and functioning, looks like a mysterious something, standing in opposition to the rationally and empirically given characteristics. Substratum and functional peculiarities are not able to see the whole object and give purely ‘descriptive’, superficial knowledge. The only unity, avoiding the mixing of the three ‘images’ of an object – substratum, functioning, and substation – allows us to understand a true object, to reproduce the Sacred as such, to show it as the unity of the mysterious and the obvious, of the static and the dynamic, of the passive and the active dimensions [25].

3. The Methodology of Religion’s and Organic Life’s interpretation

Nowadays there has been created a great variety of new definitions of essence of Religion and Organic Life, in which the authors try to reflect the achievements of modern science. They differ one another over a number of points. First of all it is necessary to mention the contraposition of ‘Organismic’ and ‘Biospheric’ [26], ‘Organismic’ and ‘Evolutional’ [27] definitions, which differ in understanding the every object of Religious Studies and Biology - the essence of which is determined – person or organism, Society\Commune\Church or Biosphere, or process of Salvation\Transformation\Theosis or Evolution as a whole. Then it is necessary to single out the general logical level of the definition itself. It could either determine common spatial and temporal features of the object defined or express the substance of phenomena, basis of common and differentiating features, peculiarities - in this case ‘Empirical’ and ‘Essential’ [28], ‘Phenomenological’ and ‘Fundamental’ [29] definitions will differ. Depending on how the substance of phenomena is understood, the definitions are divided into ‘Substratural (substratum)’, ‘Structural’, ‘Substantial (substantial)’ and ‘Functional’ [30], ‘Functional-composite’ and ‘Structural-functional’ [31, 32], ‘Substratural (substratum)’, ‘Energetical’ and ‘Informational’ [33].

Contraposition of the ‘Mono-‘ and ‘Polyattributive’, or ‘Monistic’ and ‘Pluralistic’ definitions [34] reflects the extent of ‘curtailment’, reduction of the features of life to a single basis. Sufficiency of this ‘curtailment’, completeness of reduction is reflected in contrasting ‘Particular’, ‘Abstract Metaphysical’ and ‘General’ (theoretically concrete, deductive, dialectical) definitions.

In the light of the mentioned trends of how modern science determines the essence of Religion and Organic Life, the variety of its definitions expresses:

a) General understanding of the object (as the Person\Church or Organism\Biosphere or a Creation\Natural object in general);

b) Static or dynamic character of the object (Person\Organism or spiritual\vital functions, Commune\Biosphere or functioning, object or functioning of object);

c) Conditional (commune\ecological) or unconditional existence (disengaged from conditions) of the defined object;

d) Cognitive level of the determined features, attributes of the defined object – empirical\inductive\descriptive or theoretical\deductive\methodological (similarity or the basis of expression is analysed);

e) How is understood the basis of the defined object manifestations - whether it is substrate, functional origin or their substance.

4. Conclusions

1. Nowadays in Russia we can speak about three types of preference of identification: Secular, Orthodoxy and Esoteric. Though 65% of students consider themselves to be 'believers' in one way or another, still only 9% of them think that they are 'believers' first of all (the Bible is authoritative only for 3%; priests are authoritative for 2%). These results show a considerable indefiniteness and instability of their world orientation. However, we may mention the presence of some 'Feeling of Sacrament', experience of 'Higher Existence' connected with 'Esoterics' – belief in Miracles and Fortunetelling (42% and 45%).

2. Now Russia is a pluralistic society and we can mark out three tendencies of worldview (at academic level): Marxism or atheistic tendency, Orthodox theology and Russian philosophy, phenomenological tendency ("system approach"). In our work at the Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies we are guided by the phenomenological approach.

3. For the first time ever Shelling and Hegel interpreted the phenomenon as the substratum, process and substance, as levels of understanding and interpretation of the objects' essence.

4. The great variety of definitions for the essence of Religion and Organic Life are interpreted in the context of conflict and unity of three approaches: *substrate*, *function* and *substation*. They differ one another over a number of points. First of all it is necessary to mention the contraposition of organismic\personalistic\ and biospheric\social\ (evolutional\historical\ definitions, which differ in understanding the object - the essence of which is determined – organism \person\, biosphere \society\ or process of evolution \history\ as a whole. Then it is necessary to single out general logical level of the definition itself. It could either determine common spatial and temporal features of the defined object or express the substance of phenomena, basis of common and differentiating features, peculiarities - in this case empirical and essential, phenomenological and fundamental definitions will differ. Depending on how the substance of phenomena is understood the definitions are divided into substratural (substratum), functional, structural and substantial (substantial).

References

- [1] S.A. Tokarev, *Religion in the History of the Peoples of the World*. Politizdat, Moscow, 1976, 20
- [2] E.I. Arinin, *Identification in pluralistic society: personal and universal criteria*, Proc. of Int. Conf. on Ecology of Spirit, Umea University, Umea, 1998, 78-87.
- [3] V. Katasonov, *Science & Spirit*, **10** (2000) 42
- [4] E.I. Arinin, *Science and Religion*, in *Candle-2004*, E.I. Arinin (ed.), Vladimir State University, Vladimir, 2004, 9.
- [5] V.P. Kuzmin, *The Principles of Systemness in Theory and Methodology of K. Marx*, Misl, Moscow, 1986, 36.
- [6] A.N. Tchanyshhev, *Lecture Course on Ancient Philosophy*, High School, Moscow, 1981, 5.
- [7] B.T. Grigoryan, *Philosophy about the Essence of Man*, Misl, Moscow, 1973, 32.
- [8] Y.A. Shreider, *Novy Myr*, **7** (1990) 264.
- [9] S.N. Smirnov, *Elements of Philosophic Contents in the Notion of 'System' as a stage for Developing Cognition and Social Activities in Systematical Analysis and Scientific Knowledge*, Nauka, Moscow, 1978, 69.
- [10] S. Petrov, *Methodology of Substratum Approach*, Nauka i iskustvo, Sophia, 1980, 10.
- [11] B.M. Kedrov, *Voprosy Filosofiy*, **10** (1980) 97.
- [12] A.R. Sokolov, *Categories of Essence and Phenomenon and their Methodological Role*, Tumen State University, Tumen, 1985, 8.
- [13] G.W. Hegel, *Science of Logics*, Vol. 3, Misl, Moscow, 1972, 214.
- [14] A. Men, *A History of Religion*, Vol. 1, Slovo, Moscow, 1991, 163.
- [15] M. Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane*, Moscow State University, Moscow, 1994, 13.
- [16] S.A. Tokarev, *Religion in the History of the Peoples of the World*, Politizdat, Moscow, 1976, 40.
- [17] J. Fraser, *The Golden Bough*, Nauka, Moscow, 1987, 54.
- [18] A. Men, *A History of Religion*, Vol. 1, Slovo, Moscow, 1991, 54.
- [19] M. Weber, *Science as Inclination and Profession*, Vol. 2., Nauka, Moscow, 1979, 343
- [20] C. Levi-Strauss, *Structural Anthropology*, Nauka, Moscow, 1983, 147.
- [21] G.V. Florovsky, *Eastern Fathers of the IV Century*, Palomnik, Moscow, 1992, 152.
- [22] W. Pannenberg, *Theology and Philosophy of Science*, The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1976, 29 and 45.
- [23] G.W. Hegel, *Science of Logics*, Vol. 3, Misl, Moscow, 1972, 214 – 225.
- [24] G. A. Yugai, *General life Theory*, Misl, Moscow, 1985, 54.
- [25] P. Ricouer, *The Conflict of Interpretation*, Academia-Centr, Moscow, 1995, 35.
- [26] V.I. Vernadskij, *Naturalist's Reflections*, Nauka, Moscow, 1977, 142.
- [27] S.E. Shnoj, *Physics and Chemistry Factors of Biological Evolution*, Nauka, Moscow, 1979, 18.
- [28] V.N. Sagatovsky, *Voprosy Filosofiy*, **3** (1963) 128.
- [29] K. Folsom, *Origins of Life*, Mir, Moscow, 1982, 74.
- [30] A.N. Kholmogorov, *Life and Thinking as Special forms of existence of matter*, Naselenny Kosmos. Nauka, Moscow, 1972, 27.
- [31] A.A. Butakhov, *The Main Forms of Movement of Matter and Their Interaction in the Light of Modern Science*, Vysshaja Shkola, Moscow, 1974, 270.
- [32] R.S. Karpinskaja, *Biology and Outlook*, Misl, Moscow, 1980, 109.

- [33] B.M. Kedrov, K.B. Serebrovskaja, *Jornal of Soviet Chemistry Society named by Mendeleev*, **3** (1980) 260.
- [34] G.V. Platonov, *Life, Heredity, Mutability*, Misl, Moscow, 1978, 66.