

SYLLABUS Theme 1. "A problem of the man as a crossroads of scientific and theological knowledge"

1.1. Problems for the lecture

1.1.1. What is the man?

Illusory of an intuitive simplicity (easiness) of the answer is stipulated by a naive self-evidence of introspection and self-reflection. Collisions of empirical and theoretical languages: the empirical performances are taken (are selected) on the base of some theoretical principle. It means that even the appropriate theoretical structure is previously necessary for the empirically constructed answer. Even the simple enumeration of empirical performances of the man obviously or implicitly is based already on "knowledge", what the man is. The answers of a science on man's nature are unsatisfactory. It is impossible to put allowable limits (boundaries) of biotechnological and other modifications of the man on their basis. Searches of the answer in other systems of knowledge.

1.1.2. Specific character of problems, which have caused emerging a man's problem in various systems of knowledge. A problem of the man in Christian tradition. A "biotechnological" condition of its co-ordination with scientific tradition. Possible types of correlating theos-logos and anthropos-logos:

- a) theos- and anthropos- logos is considered from a scientific point of view;
- b) theos- and anthropos- logos is considered from a theological scientific point of view;
- c) various combinations of theological and scientific modalities of this three-component system.

Logos and "formal" explication of a correct ratio of scientific and theological knowledge. Semiotic levels and systemological aspects of the correctly organized knowledge. Necessity of overcoming of anthropological and Antropic syncretism as substance (object, thing) and relational (structure, relation) methods of representation of knowledge on the man.

Logos and "contents" explication of a correct ratio of scientific and theological knowledge. The genetic approach to the analysis of scientific and theological knowledge. A science as a phenomenon of Christianity. Origin of a science after high "Scholasticism". Necessity of consideration of pagan and Christian understanding of the logos in the following theme.

1.2. Questions for discussion

1.2.1.1. Why is the intuitive representation on man's essence unsatisfactory?

1.2.1.2. How is it possible to overcome a "collision of empirical and theoretical languages", determining of man's nature?

1.2.1.3. What is the defect of the scientific approach in determination of a nature of the man in?

1.2.1.4. Why is the problem of the man decided in various systems of knowledge?

1.2.2.1. What types of a solution of the man's problem are correct in Christian tradition?

1.2.2.2. What does necessity of the co-ordination of scientific and theological understanding of man's nature stipulate?

1.2.2.3. What does the necessary condition of a correct ratio of the correctly organized knowledge consist in?

1.2.2.4. What consequences does syncretism of anthropological and Antropic knowledge result in?

1.2.2.5. How can we realise the genetic approach to the analysis of scientific and theological knowledge?

1.3. Suggested readings:

1.3.1.1. Brooke J.H. Science and Theology in the Enlightenment // Religion and Science. N.Y. 1996, pp.18-24.

1.3.1.2. Bugliarell G. Science at the Crossroads // Cosmic Beginnings and Human Ends. Chicago.1993, pp.121-125.

1.3.1.3. Lubac de H. Drama of atheistic humanism. – Milano – Moscow, 1997, 136-157. (in Russian)

1.3.1.4. Meer van der J.M. The Concept of Human Nature in Science and Theology // Studies in Science and Theology. Vol.3 (1995), pp.187-190.

1.3.1.5. Nesmeloff V.I. A Faith and Knowledge. Kazan, 1994, pp.3-28. (in Russian)

1.3.1.6. Peacocke A. Theology for a Scientific Aye. Oxford, 1996, pp.213-232.

1.3.1.7. Polkinghorne J. Science and Christian Belief. - Moscow, 1998, pp. 7-25; 245-254.

1.3.1.8. Templeton J.M. The Humble Approach. Philadelphia and London, 1995, pp.136-139.

1.3.2.1. Bibihin V. Firing of Christianity // New Renaissance- Moscow, 1998, pp.205-240. (in Russian)

1.3.2.2. Gaydenko P.P. Christianity and genesis of new-european natural science // Philosophical - religious sources of a science - Moscow, 1997, pp.56-82. (in Russian)

1.3.2.3. Hodgson P. The Christian Origin of Science. Pre-print. Oxford: Corpus Christi College, 1995, pp.7-12.

1.3.2.4. Soskice J.M. Metaphor and Religious Language. Oxford, 1988, pp.17-38.

1.3.2.5. Stepin V. Science, Religion and modern problems of the dialogue of cultures // Reason and exestuation. – St-Petersburg, 1999, pp. 21-33. (in Russian)

1.3.2.6. Stoeger W.R. Interaction of the Different Levels of human Knowledge and Divine Action. Tarnow, 1996, pp.72-74.

1.3.2.7. Suppe F. The Semantic Conception of Theories and Scientific Realism, Urbana, 1989, pp.82; 84; 86; 270-271.

1.3.2.8. Torrance T.F. Theological Science. Edinburg, 1996, pp.55-59; 85-105; 286-311.

1.3.2.9. Trubetskoi S. Logos // Collected works. - Moscow, 1908, v. II, pp.493-509. (in Russian)

Theme 2. "Anthropology of Paganism: philosophical synthesis versus Science-Religion Dialogue "

2.1. Problems for the lecture

2.1.1. Logos as the invention of the Greek genius. Formation of a new epistemological paradigm. The "virtual" status of Anthropos. "Recurring" of a modal discourse of paganism.

2.1.2. Pagan priest, biblical prophet and Greek genius. Anthropos or Logos: latent and "virtual" alternatives. The nature of the man is comprehended by means of "metaphysics" of Logos and Theos. Reason in man's nature. Reason as Logos. Anthropos and Logos. Logos as Theos. A conceptual closure of Anthropos, Logos and Theos.

2.1.3. "Virtual" status of Anthropos and variety of systems of Antropic knowledge in modern philosophical discourse. Man's nature in philosophical anthropology of M. Scheler and H. Plessner: experience of "frontal attack". Necessity of the "flank" approaches: positive tradition of man's nature consideration and its alternative (phenomenology, personalism and existentialism). Perspectives of "synthesis" of Antropic knowledge in a philosophical discourse.

2.2. Questions for discussion:

2.2.1.1 What problems was «invention» of Logos stimulated for?

2.2.1.2. Why is Logos absent in mythological thinking?

2.2.1.3. Can we consider that in paganism and Judaism the absence of Logos is stipulated by the same reasons, as in the myth?

2.2.2.1. What has necessity of Logos' use caused for man's nature understanding?

2.2.2.2. What personality features of the man are uncovered by means of Logos and Anthropos?

2.2.2.3. What are epistemological consequences of a conceptual closure realisation of Logos and Theos?

2.2.3.1. What does "virtuosity" of Anthropos' status mean in philosophical discourse and what are its consequences for man's nature research?

2.2.3.2. Why was philosophical anthropology issued as the separate philosophical doctrine so late - only in XX century?

2.2.3.3. How does this fact conform to the known Prothagoras' assertion that the man is a measure of all things?

2.2.3.4. Why are there alternatives of philosophical anthropology in man's nature understand?

2.2.3.5. Can a philosophical approach synthesise of "substratum's" and "relational" treatments of the man?

2.3. Suggested readings:

2.3.1.1. The Doctrine about Logos in its History // Trubetskoi S. Works. - Moscow, 1994, pp.54-80. (in Russian)

2.3.1.2. Hubner K. Progress from the myth through logos to a science // Reason and existention. – St. Petersburg, 1999, pp. 114-125 (in Russian)

2.3.1.3. Sire J. The Universe Next Door. – M., 1997, pp. 10-17. (in Russian)

2.3.1.4. Shahnovitch. Primitive Mythology and Philosophy. - Leningrad, 1971, .3-14, 24-40.

2.3.2.1. Coreth E. Fundamentals of Metaphysics. Kyiv, 1998, pp. 117-195 (in Russian)

2.3.2.2. Losev. Being. Name. Cosmos. - Moscow, 1993. 700-725, 781-785. (in Russian)

2.3.2.3. Kimelev Y. Religious experience // Philosophy of religion. – M., 1998, pp. 39-62. (in Russian)

2.3.2.4. Neretina S. Christian and pagan understanding of resurrection // Believer reason. – Arhangel'sk, 1995, pp. 26-35. (in Russian)

2.3.2.5. Posdnyakiv E.A. Religion and Culture // Philosophy of Culture. – M., 1999, pp. 395-390. (in Russian)

2.3.3.1. Agacci E. The Man as a Subject of Philosophy // Phenomenon of the Man. - Moscow, 1993. 142-152. (in Russian)

2.3.3.2. Ajer A. The Man as a Subject of Scientific Research // Phenomenon of the Man. - Moscow, 1993. 123-130. (in Russian)

2.3.3.3. Espinosa Cervera A. Who is the Man? Philosophical Anthropology // It is the Man. - Moscow, 1995. 77-82. (in Russian)

2.3.3.4. Plessner H. Stages of an Organic and Man. Introduction in Philosophical Anthropology // Problem of the Man in Western Philosophy. - Moscow, 1988. 98-104. (in Russian)

2.3.3.5. Rickman H. Is Philosophic Anthropology Possible? // It is the Man. - Moscow, 1995. 54-63. (in Russian)

2.3.3.6. Scheler M. A position of the man in Cosmos // Elected works. - Moscow, 1994. 151-160. (in Russian)

Theme 3. "Mereological Anthropology: Permanent Diagnostics and the "Diatropical" man".

3.1 Problems for lecture.

3.1.1. "Multidimensionality" of the man, as many-sided of his performances is empirically accessible to the learning student, due to use of an introspection method. At a level of ordinary consciousness results of self-reflection are conceptualized as psychological performances of various modalities. The teacher initiates a beginning of this introspection process and pays attention that the part of these phenomena of ordinary consciousness acquires the status of "many-dimensional" performances at a level of religious or scientific consciousness. Thereby student not only meets with individual "multidimensionality", but also produces it in a system of scientific and religious knowledge. (This stimulates his personal interest in the comparative analysis and synthesis of science and theology).

The man as a self-reflecting entity can exhibit complaint by himself. The "negative" interest to himself stimulates development of critical thinking and initiates the origin of anthropological knowledge with various modalities.

The science and theology is systems of knowledge of various modalities. The measurement is a method, which allows comparing an intensity of properties with various modalities. The measurability problem initiates an origin of such aspects of relations between scientific and religious knowledge, which promote overcoming of a metaphorical representation on "multidimensionality" of the man.

The "many-dimensional" essence of the man in Christian anthropology is determined not only in trinity structures, but also in binary comparisons "human-divine", "profane-sacral" as, for example, J. Calvin did this (or Feuerbach was using the inversion relation in these categorical oppositions).

Such binary structures of Christian theology (oriented on "the man's essence" and Ideal) promote correct correlating of Christian anthropology with a binary structure of "the man's problem" in science.

3.2.1. The "man's nature" as a collection of his empirical performances has the status of norm in scientific knowledge. The measuring procedure changes this status, and gives it a quantitative qualification. The measurement gives a system of seniority for quantification, scaling and orthogonalization in such a manner that empirical "normalization" acquires the status of some theoretical structure, some kind of "ideality" (ideal as an opposite to norm). Such transformations of "multidimensionality" of the man have the specificity in anthropological systems of various Christian confessions that allows constructing an appropriate typology of "models" of the man to compare them with "models" of the man in anthropological systems of science.

Without such methodological specification Science-Religion dialog will be correct only in the case, if used systems of knowledge are represented in the form, which is relevant for their comparison. Otherwise dialogue is not held. On the known Pilate's question "What is the true?" Christ has answered with silence. Pilate has not received the answer, because he put a problem on algorithm of transformation of an Ideal in Norm and vice versa proceeding from some "context of a situation". The problem on some "normalized" method of designing (representation) of Ideal was actually put. Ratio of a faith and knowledge is fixed in the Gospels a few times, but modern Science-Religion dialogue can be considered as the developed form of the dialogue of Christ with Pilate.

3.1.3. All varieties of scientific anthropology uncover a «man's nature» by means of some latent modification of "norm", definition, measurement, diagnosis. The latent character of these operations can result in metaphorical use of correct (scientific) knowledge. The scientific knowledge is oriented on minimum overcoming of metaphorical concepts by means of obvious use of measurement procedures, definitions and diagnosis.

The use of a measurement procedure assumes some systemological representation of object of measurement necessary for this purpose. In our case mereological and diatropic concepts are objective. Mereology is a systems theory, developed by S. Lesnevski, in which definition of "part-whole" can be used to describe not only substratum, but properties and relations too. Diatropics is a section of a general systems theory, which generalizes the relation "distinction- similarity" analogically (J. Chaikovskiy).

Systemological representation of information translates not so much its contents, how much its truth. Therefore distinctions of conceptual and propositional expressions in scientific and religious knowledge is necessary. System concepts "normalizes" conditions of measurability, and so conditions of the truthfulness (but not the trues). Pilate did not distinguish the true from conditions of the truthfulness. Some anthropological reduction of "multidimensionality" to "one-dimensionality" is a corollary of this fact.

The efficiency of scientific knowledge is ensured of properties' operability, performances of various modalities (various qualities). The measurement represents properties of various modalities in such kind that becomes possible to correlate them by the certain rules. For example, it is possible to multiply meters by seconds, though it is impossible to deduct one other. Overcoming of metaphorical

"multidimensionality" of the man means construction of a "mereological anthropology" (as a basis of a scientific anthropology) because of correct use of a measuring procedure. The efficiency of measurement results is in inversely proportional dependence on complexity of conditions for realization of measurement procedure. The measurability boundaries are determined by a possibility of scientific procedures: reductions, quantification, orthogonalization and scaling of appropriate properties. Concerning the person they are realized partially and therefore there is not some integral scientific anthropology in a scientific paradigm.

An epistemological component of scientism is based on an incompatibility of science language with ordinary language and the unconditional superiority of science language is taken into account here. Theoretical language of a "mereological anthropology" is released from mental categories with the help of their translations to an inter-subjective language of science. Such inter-subjectiveness is reached by means of correct use of definitions, diagnostics and measuring procedures. At this stage of scientific knowledge constituting the restrictions of Ramsey-elimination do not act yet. Therefore it is possible to assert, that there is nothing that would not conduct itself in the correspondence with the laws of science. Therefore all "diatropical models" of the man are constructed so that to be entered in a scientific picture of the world constructed on a reductional solution of the mind-body problem. This man is a receptacle (container) of sensual perceptions (data) and simultaneously he is a logic machine. His purpose: deriving (production) of scientific trues and management of people habitability on their basis.

Here there is a need in other systems of scientific anthropology, and appropriated "methodological" models of the man (theme 4, 5, 6 of this educational block).

3.2. Questions for discussion.

3.2.1.1. How does anthropological knowledge of various modalities arise?

3.2.1.2. What does the essence of a measurability problem for an object consist of?

3.2.1.3. How are a measurability problem and "multidimensionality" of the man connected?

3.2.1.4. Why can the solution of a measurability problem promote overcoming of metaphorical representations on "multidimensionality" of the man?

3.2.2.1. Why does the "man's nature" as some collection of empirical performances take the status of norm?

3.2.2.2. Why is it impossible "to rationally" the "man's essence"?

3.2.2.3. Why did not Christ answer on Pilate's question "What is the true"?

3.2.2.4. Where are collisions of a faith and knowledge, faith and reason in the Gospels?

- 3.2.3.1. Is "the correct knowledge" used metaphorically in our cases?
- 3.2.3.2. What role does the systems analysis play in realization of a measurement procedure?
- 3.2.3.3. Why are mereological representations used in elimination of the man's "multidimensionality"?
- 3.2.3.4. What aspect of the man's "multidimensionality" is represented in a "diatropical model"?

3.3. Suggested readings:

- 3.3.1.1. Abramov A. Measurement of non measurable. – M., 1987, pp. 138-158. (in Russian)
- 3.3.1.2. Berka K. The Measurement. – M., 1987, pp. 24-31, 145-166, 247-253. (in Russian)
- 3.3.1.3. Elyasber P. How much measured information is necessary? – M., 1983, pp. 163-167, 184-199. (in Russian)
- 3.3.1.4. Fishburn P. Methods of estimating additive utilities // Statistical measurement of qualitative performances. – M., 1982, pp. 8-10, 17-23. (in Russian)
- 3.3.1.5. Grinevich F. Measurement of invisible. – Kyiv, 1989, pp. 5-13. (in Russian)
- 3.3.1.6. Pfanzagl J. Theory of measurement. – M., 1986, pp. 11-28. (in Russian)
- 3.3.1.7. Stevens S. Mathematics, measurement and psychophysics // Experimental psychology. – M., 1980, pp. 19-41. (in Russian)
- 3.3.1.8. Stimson D. Utility Measurement in Public Health decision Making // Statistical measurement of qualitative performances. – M., 1982, pp. 119-135. (in Russian)
- 3.3.1.9. Suppes P., Zinnes J. Basic measurement theory // Psychological measurements. – M., 1987, pp. 10-31. (in Russian)

- 3.3.2.1. Azgal'dov G., Rayhman E. About the qualimetrion (science about quality). – M., 1983, pp. 7-28. (in Russian)
- 3.3.2.2. Chicherin B. Science and Religion. – M., 1999, pp. 189-200, 447-455. (in Russian)
- 3.3.2.3. Forrester J. Anti-intuitive behavior of complicated systems. – M., 1977, pp. 21-34. (in Russian)
- 3.3.2.4. Girenok F.I. The slipping out being. – M., 1994, pp. 185 – 212. (in Russian)
- 3.3.2.5. Marcuse H. One-Dimensional Man – M., 1994, pp. 223 – 245 (in Russian)

3.3.2.6. Pastor Thomas Boston. Human nature in its fourfold state. Kyiv / Houten, 1996, pp. 68-90, 223-228, 334-355. (in Russian)

3.3.2.7. Popovich M.V. Rationality and measurements of human being. – Kyiv, 1997, 63-69. (in Ukrainian)

3.3.2.8. Wilder-Smith A. Man's Origin, Man's Destiny. – M., 1995, pp. 224 – 246. (in Russian)

3.3.3.1. Kozlova I. The person as a system of construct // System researches – M., 1985, pp. 128 – 147. (in Russian)

3.3.3.2. Miheyev V.I. Modelling and methods of the measurements theory in the pedagogics – M., 1987, pp. 9 – 17, 48-63. (in Russian)

3.3.3.3. Mirkin B.G. The analysis of qualitative indications and structures – M., 1980, pp. 20 – 29. (in Russian)

3.3.3.4. Mordovceva G. Integration ways in sciences about the man // Logic, methodology, science. – M., 1995, pp. 143 – 147. (in Russian)

3.3.3.5. Russ J. March of modern ideas. – M., 1998, pp. 362 – 370, 424-439. (in Russian)

3.3.3.6. Samasiuk I.Z. Non-traditional methods of diagnostics (Diagnostics of measurements and evaluation of outcomes). – Kyiv, 1994, pp. 93-117. (in Russian)

3.3.3.7. Tchaykovskiy Y.V. Elements of the developmental diatropic. – M., 1990, pp. 6 – 17, 57-75. (in Russian)

3.3.3.8. Tiurin Y. The analysis of a non-numerical information. – M., 1981, pp. 7 – 19. (in Russian)

3.3.3.9. Uyomov A. Zharikov V. Expression of properties of the man through the system parameters // Logic and methodology of system researches – Kyiv-Odessa, 1987, pp. 239-253 (in Russian)

3.3.3.10. Yeriomenko V. About a system approach to the research of man // System approach and modern science. – Novosibirsk, 1982, pp. 172-177 (in Russian)

Theme 4. "Physicalistic anthropology: radical reductionism and the "one-dimensional" man"

4.1. Problems for the lecture

4.1.1. Prolongation of searches of "perfect" scientific anthropology. Physics as the sequential (completed) embodiment of scientism. Reductionism is a necessary methodological component of scientism. Differences of physicalistic scale of reduction from structuralistic and bio-synergetic ones. Epistemological component of physicalism is incompatibility of scientific language with ordinary language and unconditional superiority of science's language. Theoretical language is released from mental categories with the help of their translations to inter-subjective language of physics. Comparison

of cognitive physicalism's orientation with epistemological component (orientation) in structuralistic and bio-synergetic anthropology. The ontological orientation of physicalism ("everything is physical") is constructed on the base of Quine's interpretation of ontology: W. Quine considered ontology depending on a faith in that theory, which is accepted as indisputable. Accordingly the reality is identified with a reality of physics or a language of physics. There is nothing, apart from of essences of physics. Therefore anthropology physicalism is oriented on creation of such model of the man, which would be conformed to a physical picture of the world constructed on a monistic solution of mind-body problem. The man is a receptacle of perceptions (data) and simultaneously is a logic machine. His purpose: production of scientific trues and management of habitability of the people on their basis. Bio-synergetic anthropology with neuro-physiological processes correlated simple forms of mental activity. Anthropology of physicalism tends to consider the man as an intentional, estimating, morally responsible and self-reflexive entity.

Impossibility of reduction "ought" to "is". Kant's dualism is unacceptable because of physicalism aspiration to reduce moral to physical. "Free Will" is considered as a term used in those cases when causal mechanism of man's behaviour is unknown.

4.1.2. Radical monism of anthropology of physicalism: the attempt of reduction "ought" to "is" by means of correct solution of mind-body problem. Mind-body problem in anthropology of physicalism: " ... physics exhibit bravery, but not the competence. The biologists are competent in this case, but are not courageous" (F. Dayson). "Super-bravery" of von Neumann and E. Wigner shown, that in a quantum mechanics the process of wave function reduction (representing a condition of physical system) happens due to interference of consciousness in process of quantum mechanical measurement. Thus intentional aspect of consciousness of the man, his subjectivity has taken the same ontological level, as other components of paradigm of physicalism. The man's "Free Will" in this paradigm determines possible canonical forms in which objective physical magnitudes of micro-object will be represented. H. Margenaw's radicalization of this point of view: "Does an electron have a free will?" An unexpected result of physicalism radicalization - the obtained answer has changed a sense of the question itself. Was there a reduction of "subjective" mentality to natural or not? "The "super-symmetries" (W. Heisenber) have a true reality in physics", "it is not meaningful to distinguish spiritual and physical at a sub-quantum level" (D. Bohm), "inexpressibility of consciousness executes ... the same function that inexpressibility of divine executes, - it assumes latently, that science has not the last word" (R. Rorty).

4.1.3. Anthropic principle (AP) in a modern cosmology is a "Trojan Horse" in paradigm of physicalism. Weak and force the form of AP. Necessity of caution holding for want of their theological interpretation. B. Russell about "easy" transition from teleology to theology. AP participation (???) and von Neumann's approach to quantum mechanical "solution" of mind-body problem. Radical monism of J. Wheeler's universe will be agreed with monistic theism. Difficulties of Christian interpretation of ????. A "problem of Demiurge" in anthropology of physicalism. A final AP (FAP) of A. Tipler as "perfect" pantheism and scientification of the concept of Teilhard de Chardin. Difficulties of Christian interpretation FAP. Physicalization of "free will" has physicalization of a sacral and "eternal life" as its corollary. Mobility or vanishing of any demarcation between scientific and religious.

Retrospection of a main problematic is considered in the theme 1. Any scientist? anthropology is based on reduction. Reduction assumes availability of opposite process - deduction (derivation). The various embodiments of derivation - teleology, self-organizing, structurality etc. – are enable to create appropriate kinds of scientific anthropologies. Each of them is capable to decide own limited problems, but it is impossible to create an "universal" scientific anthropology until the "universal derivation" will "be invented". The difficulties of scientific and religious anthropology co-ordination are stipulated by various system organisation of scientific and religious knowledge.

4.2. Questions for discussion

4.2.1.1. What do new possibilities and new difficulties of understanding of man's nature in anthropology of physicalism consist in?

4.2.1.2. What principles is anthropology of physicalism based on and what does it differ from structuralistic and bio-synergetic anthropology?

4.2.1.3. How is man's "free will" understood in anthropology of physicalism?

4.2.2.1. What is an essence of mind-body problem and what place does it take in anthropology of physicalism?

4.2.2.2. Why does mind-body problem play a role of the "third storm of the twentieth century"?

4.2.2.3. Is there "Demiurge's problem" in religious anthropology?

4.2.3.1. Why do theological principle and problem of its parity with religious anthropology arise in anthropology of physicalism?

4.2.3.2. Is it possible to name FAP the "fourth storm of the twentieth century"?

4.2.3.3. What is the main difficulty of scientific and religious anthropologies coordination stipulated?

4.2.3.4. Is radical reductionism a method of maximum distancing of scientific anthropology from religious anthropology?

4.3. Suggested readings:

4.3.1.1. Armstrong D. Materialist Theory of the Mind // Substance and Consciousness. - Moscow, 1985, pp.20-32. (in Russian)

- 4.3.1.2. Davidson D. Material Consciousness // Analytical Philosophy. - Moscow, 1993, pp.130-144. (in Russian)
- 4.3.1.3. Heller M. The New Physics and a New Theology. Vatican, 1996, pp. 81-94.
- 4.3.1.4. Houghton J. Does God Play Dice? - M., 1998, pp. 53-62. (in Russian)
- 4.3.1.5. Margolis J. Persons and Minds: the Prospects of Non-reductive Materialism. -Moscow, 1986, pp.70-79,120-138. (in Russian)
- 4.3.1.6. Polkinghorne J. Scientists as Theologians. London, 1996, pp. 26-41.
- 4.3.1.7. Popper K. Objective Knowledge. - Oxford, 1979, pp.289-296,301-304.
- 4.3.1.8. Rorty R. Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature. - Novosibirsk, 1997. 25-29, 46-51, 85-93. (in Russian)
- 4.3.1.9. Rubcov V., Ursul A. Taboo of the scientific methodology // Problem of outside terrestrial civilizations – Kishenau. 1997, pp. 253-283. (in Russian)
- 4.3.2.1. Beauregard Costade. The Third Storm of the Twentieth century // Study of Time, N.Y., 1978, vol.3, N4, pp.53-70.
- 4.3.2.2. Bunge M. The Mind-Body Problem // Substance and Consciousness. - Moscow, 1985, pp.53-69. (in Russian)
- 4.3.2.3. Dubrovski D. Information, Consciousness, Brain.- Moscow, 1980, pp.172-204. (in Russian)
- 4.3.2.4. Krein I. Contact of reasonable civilizations // Problem of search of life in the universe. -.Moscow, 1986, pp.104-109. (in Russian)
- 4.3.2.5. Polkinghorne J. Science and Christian Belief. - Moscow, 1998, pp.17-36. (in Russian)
- 4.3.2.6. Tsehmistro I. Searches of the Quantum Concept of the Physical Basis of Consciousness. - Kharkov, 1981. 131-150. (in Russian)
- 4.3.2.7. Valentine E. The Mind-Body Problem // Substance and Consciousness. - Moscow, 1985, pp.73-94. (in Russian)
- 4.3.2.8. Wigner E. Symmetries and Reflections. -.Moscow, 1971, pp.152-158. (in Russian)
- 4.3.3.1. Barrow O.J., Tipler A.J. The Anthropic Cosmological Principle. - Oxford, 1986, pp.21-25.
- 4.3.3.2. CETJ Problem. – M., 1985, pp. 101-130. (in Russian)
- 4.3.3.3. Caracas H. SETJ and some problems of the world cognition // The universe. Astronomy. - Moscow, 1988, pp.102-105. (in Russian)
- 4.3.3.4. Leslie J. Time and the Anthropic Principle // On Primaries of the World in Science and Theology. – St. Petersburg, 1993. 363-366. (in Russian)

4.3.3.5. Pavlenko A. The Anthropic Principle: Sources and Corollaries in European Scientific Tradition // Philosophic and Religious Sources of Science. - Moscow, 1977, pp.210-218. (in Russian)

4.3.3.6. Russell R. Cosmology: Evidence for God or Partner for Theology? // Evidence of Purpose.- N.Y., 1994, pp.70-90.

4.3.3.7. Zucinski J. The Weak Anthropic Principle and the Design Argument // Zygon, March 1996, vol.31, N1, pp.115-129. (in Russian)

Theme 5. "Bio-synergetic anthropology: moderate synthesis and the "insufficient" man"

5.1. Problems for the lecture

5.1.1. Material conditions of man's nature. A dichotomy of E. Wilson: (i) man is not a biological machine, but there are biological mechanisms in him, which are not supposing of the purposes and operations, contrary to his biological nature; (ii) majority of the stereotyped forms of behaviour are peculiar to other alive entities, and the man frequently concedes to them in cooperation of operations or altruistic behaviour. Necessity of the coordination of these theses for understanding of man's nature. Problematical character of the first thesis from the point of view of religious mind - the man can have a "transcendental" purposes arising beyond his own biological nature. Radical theology and radical scientific monism on the basis of biological reductionism. The most widespread scheme of the given reduction in biological paradigm is a description of "interaction" between genes (or other biological structures) and "behaviour" of the person. Scientification of such "interaction": the certain biological processes ("epigenetic rules") are genetically set only which control forming of human reason (Ch. Lumsden, E. Wilson). "Epigenetic rules" as a method of overcoming of "black box" between genetic structures and individuality of man's behaviour. The brain of the man is completely determined of genome of the individual. "Epigenetic rules" are the purposes, on which reaching the process of decision making is directed. Interacting with signals arriving from an external medium, epigenetic rules cause transformation of the individual in purely human (cultural) entity. Thus sequential biological reductionism results in the same outcome, as religious thinking rejecting the first thesis in Wilson's dichotomy.

5.1.2. Necessity of biological reduction inversion, as attempt to save scientific approach to man's nature and at the same time not to contrary religious anthropology positions. E. Schrodinger had the full right to look at life from the physical point of view: any biological object is subject to the physical laws. But any biological object is not deducible from physical laws and it does not follow from theoretical constructions (schemes) of a microphysics. Still L. Pasteur understood: it is possible to reduce, but it is impossible to deduce. He has shown that it is possible to reproduce only something that already was alive. The reproduction is arranged analytically. It is impossible to create alive from lifeless. Here we have full accordance with religious anthropology. When "creation" (as synthesis in scientific anthropology) has taken place, the man can repeat it only analytically, in object terms. It is impossible to cancel this first step, for the life is already given as a phenomenon and we are existing as living entities. The biological description of the man fails, as soon as we try to glance outside of this synthesis that is to introduce an analytic outside of its application sphere. It is just here demarcation between scientific and religious understanding of man's nature passes. And if we try to create a "biological" anthropology, we

should define the paradigm and the information basis that we need. In other words, it is necessary to answer the question - are there possible judgements, which Kant named synthetic a priori in a biology. "Biological" anthropology should overcome fundamental dichotomy: on the one hand, it is based on data extracted from our own experience, and on the other hand, it is based on independent of this experience conditions of the man, as biological object. Creating "biological" anthropology, a scientist, all time should throw a "bridge" to fill up the gap between things that give him an "objective" scientific description and those ones that he can describe, only being an alive entity, that is being inside already "happened" phenomenon of life. Such difficulties or do not arise, or there are easy overcoming in religious anthropology. But general tendency of biological knowledge development absorbs the methodology of philosophical anthropology more and more, for the life is capable, as Kant could say, to begin a number of the phenomena of itself. Here we feel a necessity of consequent transition from philosophical to religious anthropology. Such premises will be considered in the following theme (Theme 9). Here in addition of a possible alliance of biological and philosophical anthropology, it is necessary to point, that without an assumption of a phenomenon of a "free causality" a construction of "biological" anthropology cannot be completed. Such function of expediency can be executed with concept of self-organisation.

5.1.3. The man as an "celestial and self-organising" entity is an "insufficient" entity. The difference of self-organisation of the man and simple alive organisms. Even animal, in process of self-organising, has own being - it is. The man is not a realised entity - he always is in a condition of "becoming by the man": the man cannot be, he can only be becoming. The man is not a norm, but an ideal, as a purpose of a self-organising human entity. Ideal as a concept of Christian anthropology. Self-organisation as a concept of synergetic. But the self-organisation considered in ideal aspect is connected with self-reflection, that is a prerogative of philosophical thinking. In this item biological anthropology absorbs this philosophical intention (item 8.1.2) and turns in more sequential bio-synergetic anthropology. The synergetic is oriented on "external" processes of self-organisation, and philosophy - on "internal" self-organisation as self-reflection. In the latter case, both ideal character of the purposes of self-organizing process, and the genesis of self-reflection process assumes necessity of bio-synergetic and religious anthropology correlating. Thereby philosophical, scientific and religious anthropologies meet here.

Synergetic explication of purposing, freedom and creativity of the man. "Synergetic without shores" results to joyless outcomes obtained still. Eliade and S. Lem long before synergetic emerging: the man is not so much a creator, as a provocateur of crises, and culture is an error. Thereby bio- synergetic anthropology represent scientistically not the whole man, but only that aspect of his nature, which is a small part of Christian anthropology. But scientism tries to construct anthropology, proceeding from more broad scientific paradigm on the base of physical knowledge.

5.2. Questions for discussion

5.2.1.1. Why are reductionism processes of "reduction" and "deduction" non-symmetric?

5.2.1.2. Is the process of reduction used in religious anthropology?

5.2.1.3. What does a need of an assumption of "free causality" phenomenon mean for biological anthropology? Will it be agreed with scientific paradigm?

5.2.2.1. What methods of "black box" situation overcoming between a genetic structure of the man and individuality of his behaviour can you offer?

5.2.2.2. How is connection between the "objective" description of the person and the fact of observer's being "inside" life carried out in biological anthropology?

5.2.2.3. What corollaries for biological and religious anthropology has the fact that the brain participates in own forming actively and in this sense it can be considered as a self-organising system?

5.2.3.1. What is the basic essence distinction of man's "inselfsufficient" understanding in bio-synergetic and religious anthropology?

5.2.3.2. What allows concept of "self-organization" to execute a connecting role between scientific, philosophical and Christian anthropology?

5.2.3.3. What are limits of man's synergetic explication?

5.3. Suggested readings:

5.3.1.1. Borzenkov V. Problem of Reduction in Biology // Biology and Medicine. - Moscow, 1985, pp.272-280. (in Russian)

5.3.1.2. Cvetkova L. Brain and intellect. – M., 1995, pp. 8-22. (in Russian)

5.3.1.3. Drish G. Vitalism. Its History and System. - Moscow, 1915, pp.23-31,258-270. (in Russian)

5.3.1.4. Irabadjakov N. Criticism of Metaphysical reason. - Sofia, 1979, pp.213-224,239-252.

5.3.1.5. Lorenz K. A Back Side of Mirror. - Moscow, 1998, pp.209-276, 392-400. (in Russian)

5.3.1.6. Monod J. The Boundaries of Biology // Nature, 1971, ?4, ??40-45. (in Russian)

5.3.1.7. Mejen S.V. Reductionism Problem in Biology // Dialectics of Development in Nature. - Moscow, 1978, pp.137-155. (in Russian)

5.3.1.8. Wright R. Biology through the eyes of faith. M., 1994, pp. 179-200 (in Russian)

5.3.2.1. Efframson V.P. Genetics of the ethics and aesthetics. – M., 1995, pp. 45-55. (in Russian)

- 5.3.2.2. Fuchs - Kittovski K. Problems of Determinism and Cybernetics in Molecular Biology. - Moscow, 1980, pp.279-290, 312-326.
- 5.3.2.3. Kooten Niekerk K. Van. and Sundstrom P. Genetic Counselling and Prenatal Diagnosis: an Exchange between a Medical Doctor and a Theologian // Life and Death. Geneva, 1995, pp.36-40.
- 5.3.2.4. Kurayev A. Whether can an Orthodox be an evolutionist? // That who are rule over... - Klin, 1999, pp. 82-112. (in Russian)
- 5.3.2.5. Lumsden Ch., Wilson E. Genes, Mind and Culture: the Co-Evolutionary Process. - Harvard, 1981, pp. 95-99,180-186, 305-310, 331-332, 343-346,352-355.
- 5.3.2.6. Niebuhr H. Richard. Radical Monotheism and Western Culture // Christ and Culture. - Moscow, 1996, pp.256-275. (in Russian)
- 5.3.2.7. Schrodinger E. What is Life? - Moscow, 1972, pp.77-86. (in Russian)
- 5.3.2.8. Skladnoff D. What can Biotechnology? - Moscow, 1990, pp.10-28. (in Russian)
- 5.3.3.1. Ashby W. Principles of Self-Organization // Principles of Self-Organization - Moscow, 1966, pp.331-342. (in Russian)
- 5.3.3.2. Knyazeva E.. Kurdyumov S. Synergetics at the Crossroads of the Eastern and the Western Cultures. - Moscow, 1994, pp.28-51. (in Russian)
- 5.3.3.3. Knyazeva E.. Kurdyumov S. Synergetics as New Worldview: Dialogue with I. Prigogin // Problems of Philosophy, 1992. 12. 3-18. (in Russian)
- 5.3.3.4. Laszlo E. The Century of Bifurcation // The Path, 1995. 7. 115-125. (in Russian)
- 5.3.3.5. Udumyan N. Concept of Self-organizing and Problem of Molecular Evolution. - Moscow, 1994, pp.127-139. (in Russian)

Theme 6. "Structural anthropology: latent invariance and the "archetypical" man".

6.1. Problems for the lecture

6.1.1. "Super-rationalism" as an beyond-religious path to a "new humanism". "Anthropological doubt" of C. Levi-Strauss as missionary aspiration to rescue by religion or enlightening reason not only barbarian soul, but own soul too. Immersing in "anthropological dream" – an outcome of man's "self-sufficient" that stimulated not only science, but also "atheistic existentialism" (J. P. Sartre, A. Camus). A. Camus: from existentialism to an essentialistic anthropology. A problem of issuing some integrated scientific anthropology: the man in a context of biological, physical and chemical regularities. A structure as an invariant of scientific anthropology construction.

Universalism and/or integrativism of a scientific anthropology. Successes of a structuralist approach in psychology (Gestalt psychology), biology (genetics), linguistics (descriptive linguistics), mathematics (invariant and "Erlangen's program"), physics (symmetry), synergetic (dissipative structures), and psychoanalytic (archetype).

6.1.2. Scientism of a structural anthropology - hopes and illusions. Binary partitions principle in brain structures functioning as an ontological premise of sign-forming activity of the man. "Scientific thinking" in a structural anthropology as an enormous scale of reductions: Anthropos ® Logic ® Natural ® Biological ® physical-chemical ® ... Triadic conceptual base of a structural anthropology: structure, language, unconscious, instead of: history, subject, consciousness. It is offered "non-participation" in standard, uncritical thinking of ordinary consciousness instead of existential ethics of "non-participation". "The Science about the man" refuses the man for the sake of science: invariants of the second order - "epistem" of Foucault and "area of discovery for an anonymous idea" of C. Levi-Strauss. Foucault: the scientific study of the man, arising in XIX century, will die by natural death. The reason of the future loss of concept "man" in structuralism of J. Piaget: the reason of Foucault is transformed without reason; his structures are unconscious, therefore it is a "structuralism without structures". Even the structural consideration of the man as a thing entails an information of time only to the present time and loss of the most human property of the man - to create freely thinking as ability to transform chaos. A role of thinking in transformation of necessity to freedom. The man is a source of negative entropy, but he can resist to an entropy's attack. Anthropology is not a "entropology" (as Levi-Strauss considers), and is a "negative entropology". From here a "Hamlet's problem" and problem of the boundaries of teleological anthropology. Difficulties of atheistic approach.

6.1.3. "To be or not to be" from Hamlet up to Camus' myth about Sisyphus. A dilemma of atheistic existentialism: freedom or arbitrariness. Objectification of this dilemma in structural anthropology. Arbitrariness as non-freedom in structural anthropology. The structural image of the man searches for himself in the other things: in exotic of East or myths of primitive cultures. The tired rationality searches for itself in drugs, as to sublimated rushing to death. Needs in religious existentialism: "If we know ever more and more things about the man, that, probably, his essence (G. Marcel) is less clear to us. Needs in Christian anthropology. Insufficiency of religious existentialism and structural anthropology for "correct" approach to a solution of scientific problems of non-being: Euthanasia, Abortion and Suicide; and being: artificial fertilization in vitro, cloning. The modern science becomes "Hamlet's problem" more sharp: the phenomenon of cloning "liquidates" opposition of "being / non-being". Perfecting of a cloning can be converted one into an instrument of perfect murder – multiplication of the man liquidates his uniqueness as individual. An atheistic trap, as a corollary of a structuralist "replacement of cinema by a magic lantern, and movement – by sequence of conditions of inertia" (J.P. Sartre)

6.2. Questions for discussion:

6.2.1.1. What is the need of creation of scientific anthropology stipulated?

6.2.1.2. How do structuralistic and scientific approaches to study of the man correspond among themselves?

6.2.1.3. What is success of structuralistical approach in some sciences based on?

6.2.2.1. Is triadic conceptual base of structural anthropology a method of the co-ordination of a binary principle and a "scale of a reduction"?

6.2.2.2. Is it structural anthropology enough for overcoming difficulties of atheistic existentialism?

6.2.2.3. What corollary in understanding of man's nature does consideration of the man as a thing, abstract individuality in structural conduct to?

6.2.3.1. Why does "Hamlet's problem" in the sharp form find out in structural anthropology, and why cannot atheistic existentialism formulate it "correctly"?

6.2.3.2. What perspectives of a solution of such problems as euthanasia, cloning and other does religious existentialism have?

6.2.3.3. Could atheists accept the Christian anthropology approach to a solution of problems of euthanasia, cloning and other?

6.3. Suggested readings:

6.3.1.1. Hoijer H. Anthropological Linguistics // Foreign Linguistics – M., 1999, pp. 44-66. (in Russian)

6.3.1.2. Konrad. Dialectics of Content and Form//Structuralism: "For" and "Against". - Moscow, 1975, pp.314-320. (in Russian)

6.3.1.3. Levi-Strauss C. Structure and Form//Semiotics.- Moscow, 1983, pp.415-427. (in Russian)

6.3.1.4. Levi-Strauss C. Structural Anthropology. - Moscow, 1983, pp.35-52. (in Russian)

6.3.1.5. Levi-Strauss C. Primitive Thinking. - Moscow, 1994, pp.113-130. (in Russian)

6.3.1.6. MouLoud N. Modern Structuralism. Speculations on a Method and Philosophy of Exact Sciences. - Moscow, 1973, pp.29-42. (in Russian)

6.3.1.7. Yung C. The Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious // God and Unconscious. – M., 1998, pp. 325-354. (in Russian)

6.3.2.1. Foucault. Words and Things. - St. Petersburg, 1994. 333-343, 356-362. (in Russian)

6.3.2.2. . Foucault. Archeology of Knowledge. - Kyiv, 1996. 177-185. (in Russian)

6.3.2.3. Camus. Myth about Sisyphus // Twilight of Gods. - Moscow, 1989, pp.223-237, 257-270. (in Russian)

6.3.2.4. Mitina S. Genetic Structuralism. - Moscow, 1981, pp.36-38, 80-84. (in Russian)

6.3.2.5. Piaget J. Elected Works. - Moscow, 1969, pp. 61-69, 86-90, 106-108, 604-611. (in Russian)

6.3.2.6. Sartre J.P. Existentialism is Humanism // Twilight of Gods. - Moscow, 1989, pp. 327-343. (in Russian)

6.3.2.7. Yung C. Christ, Synbol of Aion // AION – M., 1997, pp. 50-78. (in Russian)

6.3.3.1. Balashov N. Artificial Fertilization in Vitro: What Do Members of Orthodox Church Think? // The Man, 1995. 3. 77-81. (in Russian)

6.3.3.2. Discussion: the Borne in Vitro // The Man, 1995. 3. 69-75. (in Russian)

6.3.3.3. Discussion: We Do not Want to Be Clones //The Man, 1996. 34. 22-33, 1996, 5. 21-37. (in Russian)

6.3.3.4. Fromm E. To Have or to Be? - Moscow, 1997, pp.78-79. (in Russian)

6.3.3.5. Camus. The Raging Man. - Moscow, 1990, pp.336-347. (in Russian)

6.3.3.6. Conovalova L. Rules and Elimination. Discussions on Ethical Problems of Abortion //The Man, 1995. 1. 107-111. (in Russian)

6.3.3.7. Marcel G. To Be or to Have. - Novocherkassk, 1994. 137-151. (in Russian)

6.3.3.8. Marcel G. The Man Have Become a Problem// Tragical Wisdom of Philosophy. - Moscow, 1995, pp.117-141. (in Russian)

6.3.3.9. Pappas D. Recent Historical Perspectives Regarding Medical Euthanasia and Physician Assisted Suicide // Euthanasia, Death, Dying and the Medical Duty. British Medical Bulletin. Vol.52, N2. April 1996, pp.386-392.

6.3.3.10. Williams R. Theological Perspectives // Euthanasia, Death, Dying and the Medical Duty. British Medical Bulletin. Vol.52, N2. April1996, pp.362-384.

Theme 7. "Anthropology of Judaism and the "normative" man of the Old Testament"

7.1. Problems for the lecture

7.1.1. The man as a "system" of modal transitions: from "modal simulation" of cultural traditions to "modal" representation of man's nature. The boundaries and possibilities of conceptual simulation: Logos, paradigm and theory.

7.1.2. Understanding of man's nature in a mythological system of representations. Anthropomorphic and anthropological needs of categorical syncretism overcoming.

7.1.3. Mysticism as the simplified method of understanding of man's nature. "Rationalism without shores" and its paradoxical effect - "high spirit animal": Logos and Theos are not necessary. The man in East and Western mysticism.

7.1.4. Paganism as a latent form of anthro-centralism. Practical rationalism and "measured-out-in-doses" mysticism in pagan understanding of man's nature. Premises of origin of the philosophical logos.

7.1.5. Judaism as some alternative to mystical and pagan understanding (without logos) of man's nature. Monotheism without logos: its heuristic possibilities and cognitive boundaries. Why is philosophical logos impossible here?

7.2. Questions for discussion

7.2.1.1. What aspect of man's nature is simulated by "modal transitions"?

7.2.1.2. Compare it to other methods of representation of man's nature.

7.2.1.3. How do such concepts as logos, paradigm, theory, model correspond?

7.2.2.1. How is the man represented in mythological thinking?

7.2.2.2. How do Anthropos, Theos and Logos correspond in mythological knowledge?

7.2.3.1. Are Theos and Logos necessary for mystical understanding of the man?

7.2.3.2. What is alternative of a "profaned" in mysticism?

7.2.3.3. What differences are there in understanding of the man in East and Western mysticism?

7.2.3.4. Is man's comprehension in anthroposophical system of knowledge really or illusory?

7.2.4.1. What categories is interpretation of man's nature in pagan religious systems based on?

7.2.4.2. What role does logos play in pagan worldview?

7.2.5.1. What does the antithesis of Judaic and pagan understanding of man's nature consist in?

7.2.5.2. How does mystical and "profaned" in Judaic understanding of man's nature correspond?

7.2.5.3. What was the monotheistic orientation of Judaism in understanding of man's nature exhibited in? Whether is it possible here to correlate monotheism and Logos?

7.3. Suggested readings:

7.3.1.1. Zilberman D. On Understanding of Cultural Traditions through Types of Thinking // Anthology of Gnosis. St. Petersburg, 1994, pp.51-63. (in Russian)

7.3.1.2. Zilberman D. "Super-Methodology". A Modal Semiotics and Category of Philosophical Thinking // Zilberman D. Genesis of Significance in Philosophy of Hinduism. - Moscow. 1998, pp.116-119, 137-139. (in Russian)

7.3.1.3. Zilberman D. Coming Nearer Reasoning between Three Persons on the Modal Methodology and Sum of Metaphysics' // Pyatigorski. Elected Transactions. 1996, pp.191-196. (in Russian)

7.3.2.1. Avtonomova N. Myth: Chaos and Logos // Mistaking Reason? "Variety" of "beyond-Science" Knowledge. 1990, pp.37-41.

7.3.2.2. Barthes R. Mythologies. - M., 1996, pp.235-240. (in Russian)

7.3.2.3. Eliade M. Aspects du Mythe. -M., 1994, pp.20-24, 163-165. (in Russian)

7.3.2.4. Kessidi F. From Myth to Logos. 1972, pp.49-56. (in Russian)

7.3.2.5. Losev. Myth. Number. Essence. 1994, pp.8-10, 28-30. (in Russian)

7.3.2.6. Lubac de H. Paradox and Mystery of Church. – Paris, 1967, pp. 11-134. (in Russian)

7.3.2.7. Hubner K. True of Myth. - M., 1996, pp.249-254. (in Russian)

7.3.3.1. Men. Magic. Occultism. Christianity. 1996, pp.171-176,188-190. (in Russian)

7.3.3.2. Nekleushev. Myths – a Source of Superstitions and Knowledge //UM. Synthesis of the Mystical Doctrines of West and East. - N.Y., 1990, pp.278-284.

7.3.3.3. Nemirovski L. Mystical Practices as a Method of Knowledge. 1993, pp.12-16. (in Russian)

7.3.3.4. Steiner R. Christianity as the Mystical Fact and Mysteries of Antiquity. - Yerevan, 1991, pp. 60-71. (in Russian)

7.3.3.5. Jakovlev. A Model of Mystical Knowledge and Reflection // Mistaking Reason? "Variety" of "beyond-Science" Knowledge. 1990, pp.83-91. (in Russian)

7.3.4.1. Dumézil G. *Lex Dieux Souverains Indo-Europeans*. Paris, 1997 (Moscow, 1986, pp.153-157). (in Russian)

7.3.4.2. Fishermen. Paganism of the Ancient Slavs. 1981, pp. 4-9. (in Russian)

7.3.4.3. Fishermen. Paganism of Russia. 1987, pp.753, 769-775. (in Russian)

7.3.4.4. Zelinski F. *Ancient Greek Religion*. - Kyiv, 1998, pp.116-124. (in Russian)

7.3.5.1. Buber M. *Hasidic Sayings*. -Moscow, 1997, pp.286-297. (in Russian)

7.3.5.2. Buber M. *Problem of the Man*. -Kyiv, 1998, pp.89-95. (in Russian)

7.3.5.3. Glazerson R.M. *Torah, Light and Healing*. - Jerusalem, 1997, pp.27-30, 147-151,168-174. (in Russian)

7.3.5.4. Miller R.A. *Rejoice of Youth!* - Jerusalem, 1996, pp.8-15, 405-418. (in Russian)

7.3.5.5. Shestov L. *Athens and Jerusalem // Works in the 2-nd volumes, v.1*. Moscow, 1993, pp.339-347. (in Russian)

Theme 8. "Anthropology of Orthodoxy" and the "idealizing" man"

8.1. Problems for the lecture

8.1.1. The problem of man's nature not only is not decided, but also cannot be correctly put, both outside of a metaphysical, and outside of a religious context. A religious and scientific correctness. "Untimeliness" of scientific Anthropos: from Logos in philosophy to Logos in Christianity.

8.1.2. Early Christianity and Byzantine tradition. Non-objectifying and objectless (apophatics) of first principle of being in Orthodoxy and man's nature. There is a doctrine on creation of the man by a spiritual entity and on the "man- in-God's- own- image" at centre of Orthodox anthropology. In the Fall of the man the spiritual life of the man is not destroyed, but only is damaged. The man is a paradoxical and tragic entity: he has a conflict with himself. It is possible to understand the man recognising something beyond him only, i.e. with aid of his attitude to the God. Here Orthodox anthropology enters into interaction with apophatical theology.

8.1.3. Anthropologization of theology: John Meyendorff against Michel Foucault. Hesychasmus as a result of sequential rapprochement of anthropology with ontology. "Perfect" hesychasmus of Gregor Palamos is already strict asceticism. Unnecessarity not only philosophy, but also a significant part of theology.

Hyperbolization of anthropology liquidates premises of science's. "Axiological" orientation of Orthodoxy: pro et contra of a science.

8.2. Questions for discussion:

8.2.1.1. Why should the problem of man's nature be considered in religious aspect?

8.2.1.2. How is philosophical, religious and scientific correctness in man's nature putting according with?

8.2.1.3. Is it possible to assume that there is a Logos in science different from a Logos in philosophy and Christianity?

8.2.1.4. How is the miscellaneous understanding of Logos reflected in understanding of man's nature?

8.2.2.1. What the origin of apophatical divinity is stipulated by?

8.2.2.2. What are main positions of Christian anthropology?

8.2.2.3. What is specificity of Orthodox anthropology and how is it connected with apophatical divinity?

8.2.3.1. Why are the hopes of Michel Foucault on de-anthropologization of a modern idea not justified?

8.2.3.2. What consequences for scientific thinking can the reduction of anthropology to ontology have?

8.2.3.3. Could a science arise in a channel of Byzantine Christian tradition?

8.3. Suggested readings:

8.3.1.1. Illarion (Alfeev). Life and Doctrine of Sacred Gregor Theologian. - Moscow, 1998, pp.306-313. (in Russian)

8.3.1.2. Seraphim (Rose). A Gift of an Orthodox American. - Moscow, 1998, pp.496-507. (in Russian)

8.3.1.3. Trubetskoi S. The Doctrine on Logos in its History // Works. - Moscow, 1998, pp.404-412. (in Russian)

8.3.2.1. Epifanovich S. Saint Maxim Confessor and Byzantine divinity. - Moscow, 1996, pp.71-78. (in Russian)

- 8.3.2.2. Goman'kov V.A. Anthropical Cosmological Principal and Christianian Anthropocentrism // That who are rule over. – Klin, 1999, pp. 149-165. (in Russian)
- 8.3.2.3. Lossky V. Orthodox Theology. Grestwood, N.Y., 1989, pp.74-78. (in Russian)
- 8.3.2.4. Lossky V. Sketch of Mythical Divinity of East Church // Mystical Divinity. - Kyiv. 109-121,159-167. (in Russian)
- 8.3.2.5. Nesmelov V. Study of Man. – Kazan', 1996, pp. 83-97. (in Russian)
- 8.3.2.6. Thunberg L. Microcosm and Mediator. The Theological Anthropology of Maximus the Confessor. -Chicago, 1995, pp.98-104. (in Russian)
- 8.3.3.1. Horuzyi S. Analytical Dictionary of Hysahistic Anthropology // Synergy. - Moscow, 1995, pp.43-47. (in Russian)
- 8.3.3.2. Cyprian (Cern). Anthropology of Sacred Gregor Palamos. - Moscow, 1996, pp.276-287, 337-344. (in Russian)
- 8.3.3.3. Meyendorf J. Living Tradition. – St. Petersburg. 1997. 177-183. (in Russian)
- 8.3.3.4. Meyendorf J. Life and works of Prelate Gregor Palamos. - St. Petersburg, 1997. 191-195. (in Russian)
- 8.3.3.5. Stasyan Yan, Zavila P. Anthropology // Fundamentals of Dogmatic Theology. – Lviv, 1997, pp. 37-63. (in Russian)

Theme 9. "Anthropology of Catholicism and the "systematizing" man"

9.1. Problems for the lecture

9.1.1. The God creates the man as a natural entity and free entity. The man in his freedom has moved away from the God and as a sinful entity has lost a supernatural possibility to contemplate of the God. The dialogue with the God is possible only in the individual act of divine grace. As a natural and normative entity the man in his fall has lost mainly these supernatural gifts. The man as "normative" spirituality. Normative Logos and embodiment of Logos in nature. Nature's "normativeness" of as a premise of a science and natural.

9.1.2. The anthropological problem in the Middle Ages. Sanctum Augustinus: the man is free, when he acts under influence of divine grace. Resolute refusal from man's reflexive sight on himself. A "high" Scholasticism and St. Thomas Aquinas. Sinfulness of the man is not an object of reflexive knowledge but experience. Impossibility of rational transition from norms to ideals and need for mysticism.

"Axiological" condition of mysticism in Orthodoxy. Filioque problem and incompatibility of axiology and norms.

9.1.3. The man as a natural and supernatural entity: need for immortality. Catholicism between mysticism (as an internal experience of the God alive in Christ, experience, which we cannot transmit to others) and rationalism. The man as connection of material and spiritual substances: not only the body is sinful therefore the man should be raised from the dead in unity of his mind and body. The eternal life should be opened in body - the man is created for this purpose and Logos was embodied. Miguel de Unamuno: Catholicism changes between a religionized science and pseudoscientific religion.

Anthropological normativity of Catholicism and binarity of categorical oppositions of a "high Scholasticism": the near "neighbourhoods" of metaphysics of a science.

9.2. Questions for discussion:

9.2.1.1. What does "naturalness" of understanding of man's nature consist of and how does this fact correspond with anthropology of Catholicism?

9.2.1.2. How does "naturalness" and "normativeness" of nature's understanding and reasons of the Fall of the man correspond?

9.2.1.3. What role does Logos play in "normative" understanding of man's nature?

9.2.2.1. Correlate please main positions of St. Augustinus' anthropology and anthropology of St. Thomas Aquinas.

9.2.2.2. What consequences does our consideration of man's sinfulness extremely as an object of his reflection have?

9.2.2.3. How is man's sinfulness understood depending on Filioque problem solution?

9.2.3.1. Why does the need for immortality put anthropology of Catholicism between mysticism and rationalism?

9.2.3.2. Whether does Logos' embodiment open eternal life for the man and/or link material and spiritual substations of the man? What substance of the man sins?

9.2.3.3. Could science begin only because of Catholic theology (and anthropology of Catholicism)? Why did de Unamuno consider that Catholicism changed between a religionized science and pseudoscientific religion?

9.3. Suggested readings:

9.3.1.1. Balthasar H. U. von. About a simplicity of the Christians//Symbol, 1993, v.29. p. 61-65. (in Russian)

9.3.1.2. Devies B. An Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion. - Kyiv, 1996, pp.172-191. (in Russian)

9.3.1.3. Coreth E. Fundamentals of Metaphysics. - Kyiv, 1998, pp.219-224. (in Russian)

9.3.1.4. O'Collins G. Fundamental Theology. – St. Petersburg, 1993, pp.50-65. (in Russian)

9.3.2.1. Aumann J. Christian Spirituality in the Catholic Tradition. - Rome - Minsk, 1994. 162-166. (in Russian)

9.3.2.2. Gilson E. The Philosopher and Theology. - Moscow, 1995, pp.160-170. (in Russian)

9.3.2.3. Lane T. Christian Thought. – St. Petersburg, 1997, pp.53-58, 125-130. (in Russian)

9.3.2.4. Maritain J. The Philosopher in the World. - Moscow, 1994, pp.57-67. (in Russian)

9.3.3.1. Giussani L. Christianity as Challenge. - Moscow, 1993, pp.15-23, 137-140. (in Russian)

9.3.3.2. Hildebrand D. von. An Essence of Christianity. – St. Petersburg, 1998, pp.463-473. (in Russian)

9.3.3.3. Teilhard de Chardin P. A Phenomenon of the Man. - M, 1987, pp.187-200, 228-233. (in Russian)

9.3.3.4. Unamuno Miguel de. On Tragic Feeling of Life. - Moscow, 1997, pp.74-85. (in Russian)

Theme 10. "Anthropology of Protestantism and the "active" man.

10.1. Problems for the lecture

10.1.1. The mankind lives today in epoch of anthropology... (W. Pannenberg). The Fall of the man has perverted a human nature, has deprived him of freedom and has put his life depending on divine grace. It means, that a natural cannot be sacred, but already because of other reasons, than there are in Catholicism. Necessity to put Christian (Catholic) anthropology out of limits of the traditional parity "mind and body" and to agree the newest concepts of scientific and philosophical anthropology. K. Barth

creates Christian anthropology as a Christology: only proceeding from the God, the man can get knowledge on himself. If the man is considered as a self-sufficient entity, it results to some man's "being-object" and his "dehumanization". As a self-sufficient entity the man cannot comprehend the God neither by reason, or by conscience. Own essence is opened to the man in his meeting with the God, in his revelation. Both the God and the man in their essence (nature) are opened In Jesus Christ.

10.1.2. Logos as a place of a "metaphysical" meeting of the God and the man. The venue is not a nature (physics) but ethics: this is not something existing (as norm) but something that should be (as an ideal). This "ideal" is some order in the world subordinating Logos. Human reason can perceive it "metaphysically". Such "metaphysical" orientation of thinking supposes ideal existence of the laws of nature, that distinct from normativeness of their realization. Thus interpreted anthropology of Christianity was an important "metaphysical" premise of origin of science. Science is not an outcome of "man's complacency" and there is not a form of his estrangement.

The sin is not a simple "willfulness" and "insubordination", but it is an estrangement and "unbelief". The sin is an outcome of "self-raising". Therefore not science but atheism is an "illusion". But people, who believed, that they had to execute God's will, crucified Christ. Who doubts of true, he exhibits thereby genuine aspiration to it. A paradoxical conclusion of P. Tillich: who tries to deny the God seriously, he indeed asserts Him. The courage that is capable to look in a face of despair is faith. There, where the man is not free in his faith, he finds himself in subordination of the world of things: secularization turns in secularism (world and man are self-sufficient in themselves). The man can be released of subordination to the world only in his faith.

10.1.3. Simplified understanding of atheism and identification of scientific anthropology with atheistic anthropology. Scientific anthropology is limited by the description of the facts. Philosophical anthropology puts already a problem on the subject distinguished from subjectivity that is objected. A solution of a problem of man's nature is connected to a solution of an incarnation problem. The theology should be constructed on an anthropological basis. Such basis can be given only by such anthropology, which does not make the man an object, converting him in a phenomenon of the world. The special position of the man in the world is justified not biologically, and theologically. The animal is only loaded in the world, and the man is open to the world in addition. This openness of the man to the world assumes his correlating with the God. Biological anthropology determines man's nature through his estrangement from a nature, and theological anthropology determines it through estrangement of the man from the God (W. Pannenberg). In both these cases the nature of the man is determined through an essence (instance), which is not identical with him. Thereby, the essential positions of scientific and philosophical anthropology can be transformed in theological ones.

10.2. Questions for discussion:

10.2.1.1. What is the difference of Protestantism from anthropology of Catholicism and from Orthodox anthropology?

10.2.1.2. What are the consequences of consideration of the man as a "self-sufficient entity"?

10.2.1.3. What did Barth put in the basis of his anthropology?

10.2.2.1. What role have the concepts of norm, ideal and Logos played in understanding of problems of Christian anthropology?

10.2.2.2. Why did the difference of axiological and normative have only discursive character, and why does the incompatibility of ideally and normativeness have paradigmatic character and play a role of one from metaphysical premises of origin of science?

10.2.2.3. Naive understanding of atheism results in a paradoxical perception of the important corollaries of P. Tillich's anthropology. How can we overcome this paradoxical perception?

10.2.3.1. What is atheism - philosophy, science or "bashful" form of theology? What are specific features of atheism?

10.2.3.2. What does an "openness of the man to the world" in anthropology of W. Pannenberg mean?

10.2.3.3. What are perspectives for scientific, philosophical and theological anthropology interaction?

10.3. Suggested readings:

10.3.1.1. Barth K. A Sketch of Dogmatic. – St. Petersburg, 1997, pp.10-43, 258-269. (in Russian)

10.3.1.2. Cambron M. Bible Doctrines. – 1994, pp. 159-182. (in Russian)

10.3.1.3. McGrath A. Christian Theology: an Introduction. – Odessa, 1998, pp. 375-411. (in Russian)

10.3.1.4. Tanner K. The Difference Theological Anthropology Makes // Readings in Modern Theology. - London, 1995, pp.43-55.

10.3.1.5. Thiessen C. Lectures in Systematic Theology. – St. Petersburg, 1994, pp.176-206, 213-219. (in Russian)

10.3.2.1. Erickson M. Christian Theology. – St.-Petersburg, 1994, pp. 385-458. (in Russian)

10.3.2.2. Henry C. Toward a Recovery of Christian Belief. - Moscow, 1994. pp. 21-23. (in Russian)

10.3.2.3. Tillich P. Systematic Theology. – St. Petersburg, 1998, pp.337-362. (in Russian)

10.3.2.4. Tillich P. Dynamics of Faith // Elected works. -Moscow, 1995. pp. 180-206. (in Russian)

10.3.2.5. Tillich P. The Courage to Be // Elected works. - Moscow, 1995. pp. 88-101. (in Russian)

10.3.3.1. Bonhoeffer D. Following Christ. – Tver, 1992, pp.23-32.

10.3.3.2. Niebuhr H.R. Radical Monotheism and Western Culture//Christ and Culture. – Moscow, 1996, pp.300-312. (in Russian)

10.3.3.3. Pannenberg W. An Introduction to Systematic Theology. – Edinburg, 1991, pp.22-35.

10.3.3.4. Pannenberg W. Was ist der Mensch?: Die Anthropologie der Gegenwart im Licht der Theologie. – Göttingen. 1976. s.27-36.

10.3.3.5. Robinson J. Honest to God. – Moscow, 1993, pp.21-32. (in Russian)

Theme 11. "Multidimensionality" of the Man: Science-Religion Dialogue and an "Integrated Anthropology".

11.1. Problems for the lecture.

11.1.1. In modern world-outlook "multidimensionality" of the man is already determined by the fact of existence of various systems of anthropological knowledge such as scientific anthropology, religious anthropology, philosophical anthropology. The multidimensionality of the man known from times of the Old Testament has played a role of the catalyst in formation of scientific - religious problems of a new type in the end of the 20-th century. They are a corollary of secularization of modern world-outlook translated in the new millenium.

Achievements of modern science are capable radically to affect on "man's nature" and this fact determines the specificity of mutual relation between various systems of anthropological knowledge. The various systems of anthropological knowledge notify about a possibility of origin "ecological anthropic crisis" and in relation of "man's nature". In the field of modern medical anthropology (transplantology, artificial intelligence, genetics, molecular biology, the neuro-physiology of a brain) were unexpectedly derived in principle types of problem situations in modern society. But frequently recommendations, which are offered in this connection in various systems of religious and scientific anthropological knowledge, are not compatible. This prevents development of scientific and technical progress, and creates some kind of "stalemate's problem situation". Its peculiarity is not simply difficulty of choice from admissible alternatives, but impossibility to postpone a solution of this problem situation (as usually practiced earlier). For such "postponement of a solution on the future" entails frequently not less heavy consequences, than acceptance of an error solution.

Now those "stalemate's" problem situations have greatest sharpness, which arise in biomedical science because of indeterminacy of allowable boundaries of modifications of "man's essence" or "man's nature". This "indeterminacy" is a corollary of superposition (identification) of various treatments of "man's essence" and "man's nature" in various systems of knowledge. The given circumstance is aggravated also by that fact, that to postpone realization of appropriate researches or modifications of the man is impossible too. Traditionally these problems refer to bio-ethics, which have borrowed from an ecological problematic very much. The problem of the allowable boundaries of "man's nature" modification has the specificity on a comparison with a problem of allowable boundaries of biosphere modification because of there is a subjective factor in man's problem that requires appropriate account of religious representations. Therefore complex or interdisciplinary consideration of the man's essence traditionally carried out within the framework of scientific paradigm is not already enough (though it was allowable for an ecological problem). Accordingly "stalemates" and other anthropic problem situations do not concern to the competence only of bio-ethics. It is necessary to conduct consideration of a problem of the man in philosophical and religious paradigm too. "Stalemate's" anthropological problems are a corollary of simplification (reduction) of "multidimensionality" of the man. The bio-ethics have not methods, sufficient to prevent such reduction. Therefore without Science-Religion dialogue we cannot have managed here.

11.1.2. Without development of integral scientific and religious representations on "man's nature" in the field of "integrated anthropology", the process secularization of culture of a scientific and technical civilization will be aggravated, that will be accompanied generating of new "stalemate's anthropic" situations. Exceeding some minimal level for them will be "neutralize" all achievements of a scientific and technical civilization ("an anthropic blow-up"). The religious system of knowledge becomes the necessary factor of scientific and technical progress. The synthesis of scientific and religious knowledge is implicitly based on a premise of compatibility of scientific and religious anthropology. The synthesis of scientific systems of knowledge, for example in the form of biophysics, means that the methods of physics researches are used in subject domain of biology

Thus, it is impossible "to synthesize" systems of knowledge on the man in various sciences in integral "scientific anthropology". Frequently used concept "scientific anthropology" is a metaphor. Concept "religious anthropology" is a metaphor too. The contents of this concept is not the result of synthesis of various anthropological systems of knowledge, which are integrated in an "orthogonal" system, with "zero point" (as some invariant of their common contents) (theme 3).

"Religious anthropology" represents only this invariant of the contents of religious anthropology, in which the parities between them are not certain. Content and heuristic abilities (possibility) of this concept are inversely proportional to number generalized and religious anthropology. Accordingly and operational performances of this concept will be changed, therefore it actually functions as a metaphor. This metaphorical can be overcome by "integrated anthropology" if to construct a system of "orthogonal" representations. For this purpose it is necessary to determine appropriate system discrete characteristics. They should be determined depending on characteristics of a problem, which is soluble. The "stalemate's" anthropic problem situation is characterized by absence (or indeterminacy) of a system-forming property (Concept). Pertinent question here considered, as a concept is "What is in actual fact" is the most relevant theological system of knowledge. System characteristics of an

"integrated" anthropology oriented on the solution of "stalemates" anthropic problem situations correspond with principles of "Humility Theology". The possibility of construction of integrated systems of knowledge with various modalities finds its confirmation in the fact of existence of "integrated Vedanta".

11.2. Questions for Discussion

11.2.1.1. Why have "stalemates" anthropic problem situations arisen in «The Scientific Age»?

11.2.1.2. What role does religious knowledge play in their solution?

11.2.1.3. Why can the bio-ethics not allow "stalemates" anthropic problem situations?

11.2.1.4. Why do we have to use systems of scientific and religious anthropology for this purpose?

11.2.1.5. Can "stalemates" anthropic problem situations be arisen, if the man would not be many-dimensional?

11.2.1.6. What is stipulated the necessity of simplification (reduction) of "multidimensionality" of the man?

11.2.2.1 What is stipulated the necessity of creation of an "integrated anthropology"?

11.2.2.2. What is difference of "synthesis" of knowledge from "integration" of knowledge in science and religion?

11.2.2.3. Why are the metaphors used widely in scientific and religious knowledge?

11.2.2.4. Is the reduction of "multidimensionality" of the man for construction of an "integrated anthropology" is allowable?

11.2.2.5. Is an "integrated anthropology" a form of Science-Religion dialogue or a result of "synthesis" of scientific and religious anthropology?

11.2.2.6. Can forgiveness execute a role of a concept in an "integrated anthropology"?

11.3. Suggested readings:

- 11.3.1.1. Introduction to the bioethics. – M., 1998, pp. 53-75. (in Russian)
- 11.3.1.2. Bochkov N. P. Genetic aspects of complex research of man. // The man in a system of sciences. – M., 1989, pp. 143-154. (in Russian)
- 11.3.1.3. Bulayeva N. B. To the problem of a complex experimental research of the man. // The person in a system of sciences. – M., 1989, pp. 230 – 234. (in Russian)
- 11.3.1.4. Girenok F. I. The slipping out being. – M., 1994, pp. 50 – 66. (in Russian)
- 11.3.1.5. Goodman N. Metaphor as moonlighting // The theory of a metaphor– M., 1990, pp. 194 – 199. (in Russian)
- 11.3.1.6. Kluckhohn C. Mirror for man. The Relation of Anthropology to Modern Life. – M., 1998, pp. 297-310. (in Russian)
- 11.3.1.7. Lektorskiy V. A. The person as a problem of a scientific research // The man in a system of sciences. – M., 1989, pp. 31-35. (in Russian)
- 11.3.1.8. Lomov B. F. System of sciences about man // Philosophy and sociology of a science and engineering. – M., 1985, pp. 124-132. (in Russian)
- 11.3.1.9. Mezhujev V. M. The person as a subject of science. // The man in a system of sciences. – M., 1989, pp. 49-58. (in Russian)
- 11.3.1.10. Markov V. The man in space of culture. – M., 1999, pp. 17-23, 28-46. (in Russian)
- 11.3.1.11. Romanov Y. A. Interdisciplinary character of researches of temporary organization of biological systems. // Biology and medicine. – M., 1985, pp. 90 – 100. (in Russian)
- 11.3.1.12. Simonov P.V. Interdisciplinary concept of the man. // The person in a system of sciences. – M., 1989, pp. 58 – 72. (in Russian)
- 11.3.1.13. Stiver Dan R. The Philosophy of Religious Language. – Oxford, 1996, pp. 114-122, 127-133.
-
- 11.3.2.1 Maslov A. H. The Farther Reaches of Human Nature. – M., 1999, pp. 282 – 308. (in Russian)
- 11.3.2.2. Muzdybayev K. Psychology of the responsibility. – Leningrad, 1983, pp. 5 – 22, 43-51, 57-65. (in Russian)
- 11.3.2.3. Myslyvchenko A.G. Idea of creation of the integral concept of man// The man in a system of sciences. – M., 1989, pp. 43-48. (in Russian)
- 11.3.2.4. Nalimov V.V. Whether is possible the doctrine of the man in the uniform theory of knowledge's? // The man in a system of sciences. – M., 1989, pp. 82-91. (in Russian)
- 11.3.2.5. Polikarpov G.A. System approach as a premise of new synthesis of knowledge // Synthesis of knowledge's: a new stage– Moscow - Odessa, 1990, pp. 82 – 91. (in Russian)

11.3.2.6. Ricoeur P. The Metaphorical Process as Cognition, Imagination and Feeling // The theory of metaphor. – M., 1990, pp. 416-430. (in Russian)

11.3.2.7. Saringulyan K.S. The methodological basis of a new integrative social theory // Logic, methodology, science. – M., 1995, pp. 113-117. (in Russian)

11.3.2.8. Soskice J.M. Metaphor and Religious Language. – Oxford, 1987, pp. 142-161.

11.3.2.9. Templeton J.M. The Humble Approach. – Philadelphia & London, 1995, pp. 44-54.

11.3.2.10. Templeton J.M. Worldwide Laws of Life. – Philadelphia & London, 1998, pp. 30-32, 102-104, 162-164, 204-206, 461-467, 482-484.

11.3.2.11. Wierzbicka A. The comparison - grace – metaphor // The theory of metaphor. – M., 1990, pp. 142-149. (in Russian)