

7. Сенека Л. А. Моральні листи до Луцілія / Луцій Анней Сенека ; [пер. з латин. А. Содомора]. – К. : Основи, 1995. – 604 с.
8. Сенека Л. А. О скоротечности жизни / Л. А. Сенека // Историко-философский ежегодник'96. – 1997. – С. 16-40.
9. Хлодовский Р. И. Франческо Петрарка и гуманизм Треченто / Р. И. Хлодовский // История всемирной литературы : в 9 т. Т.3. / АН СССР ; Ин-т мировой лит. им. А. М. Горького. – М. : Наука, 1983. – 1985. – С. 68–77.
10. Цицерон М. Т. Про державу. Про закони. Про природу богів / М. Т. Цицерон. – К. : Основи, 1998. – 476 с.

#### References

1. Perevezentsev, S. V. (2001). Anthology of philosophy of Middle Age and Renaissance. Moscow: OLMA-PRESS [in Russian].
2. Gershenzon, M. & Petrarka, F. (2000). The love: poems and prose. Moscow: EKSMO-Press [in Russian].
3. Bragin, L. M. (2004). Humanistic think of Renaissance in Italy. Moscow: Nauka [in Russian].
4. Diltey, V. View on the world. Human study from the time of Renaissance and Reformation. Essay 1. Human comprehension and study in 15-16th centuries. Retrieved from: <http://progvek.com/classik/dilthey/ocherk1>
5. Petrarka, F. (1998). Philosophical and polemical poems. Moscow: "Rossiyskaya politicheskaya entsiklopediya" [in Russian].
6. Sabadash, JU. S. (2008). Humanism as a phenomenon of Italian culture. Kiev: DAKKIM [in Ukrainian].
7. Seneka, L. A. (1995). The moral letters to Lutsilia. Kiev: Osnovy [in Ukrainian].
8. Seneka, L. A. (1997). About the transience of life. Historical and philosophical yearbook, 96, 16-4 [in Russian].
9. Khlodovskiy, R. I. (1983). Francesco Petrarca and Trecento's humanism. Moscow: Nauka [in Russian].
10. Ciceron, M. T. (1998). About state. About laws. About character of gods. Kiev: Osnovy [in Ukrainian].

*Стаття надійшла до редакції 5.06.2017 р.*

UDC 130.2=111

**Smolina Olha**

Doctor of Science in Culture Studies,  
assistant professor, professor of chair of philosophy  
of Volodimir Dahl East Ukrainian National University  
[laprimavera555@gmail.com](mailto:laprimavera555@gmail.com)

### "DAYTIME" AND "NIGHT" CULTURES IN P. FLORENSKY AND G. FLOROVSKY'S CONCEPTS

**The purpose of the article** is to reveal the essence and to carry out comparative analysis of the culture typologies of the same name ("daytime" and "night"), proposed by P. Florensky and G. Florovsky. The **methodology** is based on the comparative-analytical, hermeneutical and semantic approaches. The **scientific novelty** of the work is that such investigation of similarities and differences of the same culture typologies of these thinkers is carried out for the first time, just as for the first time their concepts are combined into a single typology, including the latter in the context of existing approaches to the typology of culture. **Conclusions:** P. Florensky's concept is broader both in terms of the scope of the material covered, and in the scale of the conclusions drawn on its basis. G. Florovsky's concept has a local character and does not go beyond the characteristics, stable in the church-Christian culture: the "day" ("light") of Christianity and the "night" of paganism. For G. Florovsky, the criterion for distinguishing between "daytime" and "night" types is the correspondence of the culture to the Orthodox Christian, ascetic, and actually hesychast tradition. For P. Florensky, however, such a criterion is the basic type of culture reflection, the closeness of culture to a widely understood religious-mystical consciousness or, on the contrary, scientific-rational one. For P. Florensky, the "daytime" and "night" cultures are the equivalent types. G. Florovsky, however, believes that the "night" culture should be changed by the "daytime" culture. At the same time, Florovsky's concept can, in a certain sense, be an integral part of Florensky's concept, if the "daytime" culture is left in the treatment of Fr. Paul, and the "night" culture (in Fr. Paul understanding) is represented in two components: a) Christian-religious (Florovsky's "daytime" culture); b) Mytho-magical (Florovsky's "night" culture). United in such a way typology of "daytime / night" culture of Florensky / Florovsky can be included in the context of the rhythm of apollonian and Dionysian types of culture, as well as broadly defined periods of "baroque" and "classicism" in culture.

**Key words:** typology of culture, "daytime" culture, "night" culture, P. Florensky's concept of culture, G. Florovsky's concept of culture, religious modernism, religious conservatism.

*Смоліна Ольга Олегівна, доктор культурології, доцент, професор кафедри філософії Східноукраїнського національного університету ім. Володимира Даля*

#### "Денна" та "нічна" культури в концепціях П. Флоренського і Г. Флоровського

**Мета дослідження** полягає у розкритті сутності та порівняльному аналізі "денної" та "нічної" типологій культури, запропонованих П. Флоренським і Г. Флоровським. **Методологія** дослідження базується на компаративно-аналітичному, герменевтичному та семантичному підходах. **Наукова новизна** полягає в тому, що виявлення подібностей і відмінностей однойменних типологій культури зазначених мислителів здійснюється вперше. Також вперше здійснюється об'єднання їх концепцій у єдину типологію з включенням останньої в контекст існуючих підходів до типології культури. **Висновки.** Концепція П. Флоренського є ширшою як за обсягом охопленого матеріалу, так і за масштабом зроблених на його основі висновків. Концепція Г. Флоровського має локальний характер і не

виходить за межі усталених у церковно-християнській культурі характеристик: "день" ("світло") християнства та "ніч" язичництва. Для Г. Флоровського критерієм виокремлення "денного" і "нічного" типів є відповідність культури православно-християнській аскетичній, фактично ісихастській традиції. Для П. Флоренського таким критерієм є базовий для культури тип рефлексії, близькість культури до релігійно-містичного або, навпаки, науково-раціонального її типу. Для П. Флоренського "денна" і "нічна" культури є рівнозначними типами. Г. Флоровський вважає, що "нічна" культура повинна бути змінена "денною" культурою. Водночас концепція Г. Флоровського може у певному сенсі бути складовою концепції П. Флоренського, якщо "денну" культуру залишити в трактуванні о. Павла, а "нічну" культуру (в розумінні о. Павла) подати у вигляді двох її складових: а) християнсько-релігійної ("денна" культура Флоровського); б) міфо-магічної ("нічна" культура Флоровського). Об'єднана таким чином типологія "денної / нічної" культури Флоренського / Флоровського може бути включена в контекст ритмічності аполлонівського і діонісійського, а також періодів (якщо розуміти їх широко) "бароко" та "класицизму" в культурі.

**Ключові слова:** типологія культури, "денна" культура, "нічна" культура, концепція культури П. Флоренського, концепція культури Г. Флоровського, релігійний модернізм, релігійний консерватизм.

*Смолина Ольга Олеговна, доктор культурології, доцент, професор кафедри філософії Восточно-українського національного університету ім. Володимира Даля*

#### **"Дневная" і "ночная" культури в концепціях П. Флоренського і Г. Флоровського**

**Цель работы** заключается в раскрытии сущности и сопоставительном анализе одноименных типологий культуры (типов "дневного" и "ночного"), предложенных П. Флоренским и Г. Флоровским. **Методология** исследования базируется на компаративно-аналитическом, герменевтическом и семантическом подходах. **Научная новизна** работы заключается в том, что выявление сходств и отличий одноименных типологий культуры указанных мыслителей осуществляется впервые. Также впервые осуществляется объединение их концепций в единую типологию с включением последней в контекст имеющихся подходов к типологии культуры. **Выводы.** Концепция П. Флоренского шире как по объему охватываемого материала, так и по масштабу сделанных на его основе выводов. Концепция Г. Флоровского имеет локальный характер и не выходит за рамки устойчивых в церковно-христианской культуре характеристик: "день" ("свет") христианства и "ночь" язычества. Для Г. Флоровского критерием выделения "дневного" и "ночного" типов является соответствие культуры православно-христианской, аскетической, фактически исихастской традиции. Для П. Флоренского таким критерием является базовый для культуры тип рефлексии, близость культуры к широко понимаемому религиозно-мистическому или, напротив, научно-рациональному сознанию. Для П. Флоренского "дневная" и "ночная" культуры есть равнозначные типы. Г. Флоровский считает, что "ночная" культура должна быть изменена "дневной" культурой. Вместе с тем, концепция Г. Флоровского в определенном смысле может быть составной частью концепции П. Флоренского, если "дневную" культуру оставить в трактовке о. Павла, а "ночную" культуру (в понимании о. Павла) представить в виде двух ее составляющих: а) христианско-религиозной ("дневная" культура Флоровского); б) мифо-магической ("ночная" культура Флоровского). Объединенная таким образом концепция "дневной / ночной" культуры Флоренского / Флоровского может быть включена в контекст ритмичности аполлониевского и дионисийского, а также широко понимаемых "барокко" и "классицизма" в культуре.

**Ключевые слова:** типология культуры, "дневная" культура, "ночная" культура, концепция культуры П. Флоренского, концепция культуры Г. Флоровского, религиозный модернизм, религиозный консерватизм.

Topicality. Typologicalization of culture is, as it is well known, one of the topical and problematic issues of culture studies. Among the existing numerous approaches to its solution the selection of "day" and "night" types of culture by Fr. P. Florensky and Fr. G. Florovsky attracts attention. Despite the extensive literature about both extraordinary thinkers, a comparative analysis of their concepts has not been conducted yet. It remains unclear how similar or, on the contrary, dissimilar manifestations of the culture Fr. Paul and Fr. George was referring to the types of "daytime" and "night" cultures. It is necessary to find out if this typology can be brought to some "common denominator" and used to explain the cultural processes. The solution of these problems is the goal of this article.

Main part. First, let us consider the semantic content of distinguished types that the thinkers offer.

Thus, P. Florensky describes the "daytime" culture as a blooming time corresponding to the 7th and 6th, 14th and 15th centuries of European history. It is the "age of refinement and over-refinement", the predominance of rationality and scientific outlook. Philosophy, in his opinion, is a product of the "daytime" consciousness, it "is a matter of the cutting clarity of daylight" [3, 74].

"Night" culture in P. Florensky's interpretation is an archaic culture corresponding to the period of the Western European Middle Ages. The image of the night is used here not in the meaning of the ignorance darkness, but in the sense of being open to the "night soul". This is the "night of archaism". This time is "foreign cultural", "one's own culture", "one's own way". This period is characterized by disgust from rationality, religious interests' revival, a growing fascination with mysticism, disenchantment in natural science as a system of understanding and voices of doubt at the address of humanism [3, 74, 92].

As the equivalents of the "daytime" and "night" cultures, P. Florensky uses the concepts of "renaissance" and "medieval" cultures [2, 38-39]. The type of "renaissance" one corresponds to the "daytime" type and is characterized by fragmentation, subjectivity, abstraction, and superficiality. On the contrary, the type of "medieval" or "night" culture is characterized by organicity, objectivity, concreteness, and self-assembly [2, 38-39].

It should also be noted that the idea of P. Florensky's two cultures is included in his broader concept of rhythm and cyclicity in culture as a whole. He writes about his views: "The governing theme of Florensky's cultural and historical views is the denial of culture as a process that is united in time and space, with the consequent negation of the evolution and progress of culture" [2, 38]. The types of "daytime" and "night" cul-

tures appear as alternating parts of a single cultural cycle, each "daytime" stage associated with the "day"-part before it, and each "night" stage, respectively, with the preceding "night" one.

G. Florovsky, on the contrary, develops his typology on the local material of Russian culture. He gives the following "difference of spiritual and soul lines" in the types he singles out. The bearer of the "daytime" culture is a minority (a bookish or a cultural minority). This is a culture of spirit and mind; this is also an "intelligent" culture [4, 3]. It should be noted that in this case G. Florovsky argues in the context of hesychast anthropology, i.e. in distinction of the reason – the soul – the spirit – the mind (which is understood as the image of God in a human person).

G. Florovsky calls "night" culture the "second culture". This is a kind of syncretism, in which local pagan "experiences" fuse with the wandering motifs of ancient mythology and the Christian imagination. This is "boiling and turbulent lava", "a region of dreaming and imagination", and "syncretic "fables"". This second life proceeds under a snag and does not often break through it to the historical surface. [...] "The "night" imagination takes too long and too stubborn shelter and eludes the "mind" test, verification and purification" [4, 3].

Obviously, for P. Florensky, the "daytime" and "night" cultures are "equilibrium", the types both having the right to existence. G. Florovsky, however, believes that the "night" culture should be changed (verified, tested, purified) by the "daytime" culture.

P. Florensky, distinguishing the types of culture by analogy with the change of the time of a day (day / night) or the states of the human organism (sleeping / wakefulness), includes the cultural process in the objective-planetary and anthropological context. G. Florovsky, on the other hand, under the "night" culture understands the vestiges of "prehistoric", i.e. the pre-Christian past of Rus', paganism that does not want to leave the historical stage and mimics, "melding" with a new Christian worldview. Consequently, the "night" culture is anti-historical, superfluous, "an area of dreaming and imagination".

Specifying his conclusions, G. Florovsky writes: "The flaw and weakness of the ancient Russian spiritual development consists partly in the inadequacy of the ascetic temper (and no longer in the excessive asceticism), in the insufficient "spirituality" of the soul, in excessive "soulfulness" or "poetry", in spiritual informality of mental elements. If you like, in the spontaneity ... [...] we must distinguish: it is not a question of insufficient "scientific" rationalism, – the decomposition of "spirituality" by reason or by rational doubt is again a disease and not less than the dreaminess itself. It is a matter of spiritual sublimation and the transformation of the soulful into the spiritual through the "mind" asceticism, through the ascent to the mind vision and contemplation ... The path does not come from "naivety" to "consciousness", and not from "faith" to "knowledge" and not from credulity to distrust and criticism" [4, 3-4].

Hence it is obvious that the type of culture analogous to the type of the "renaissance" ("daytime") culture of P. Florensky (with inherent rationality, logical clarity and scientific outlook), is considered by G. Florovsky as an illness and, according to a low level of its importance, is placed on one level with his (G. Florovsky) type of "night" (actually pagan) culture.

If attempt to reconcile the types of "daytime" and "night" cultures, singled out by P. Florensky and G. Florovsky, we obtain the following table:

Author	Types of culture	
P. Florensky	Daytime (renaissance) culture	Night (medieval) culture
G. Florovsky	It is not considered separately, generally is named as an "illness"	Night (pagan)      Daytime (Christian)

According to Fr. John Meyendorff "Fr. George applies to everything once and forever accepted by him the patristic or Byzantine normativity, which for him is the only Orthodox one" [4, VIII].

Thus, the "night" culture of P. Florensky actually is a repository of both "night" and "daytime" cultures in the interpretation of G. Florovsky. Why did Fr. Paul choose the definition of "night" to designate the medieval type of culture? Perhaps, the romantic-poetic tradition influenced it, night image poeticization in the works of the Symbolists that was in the part of the intelligentsia to which P. Florensky was close. Perhaps this is also due to the concept of the unconscious (as a "night" consciousness), gradually maturing in the psychological and philosophical studies of the XIX and XX centuries. P. Florensky, according to his recollections, experienced himself a number of visions, insights, as an inexplicable manifestation of the "night" consciousness [1]. At the same time, in the Christian tradition, the night image is not associated with negative characteristics only. Night in Christianity is at the same time the holy nights of Christmas and Resurrection, a night of prayer, contemplation and insight. In a number of monasteries (Athos, for example) the night is the time of the conciliar liturgical prayer, while the day is intended for physical labor.

P. Florensky and G. Florovsky have different approaches to the understanding of the phenomenon of culture. Thus, for P. Florensky, culture is a system of means for revealing some basic and unconditional value [2, 39]. Florensky considered that "the basic law of the world [...] is the law of Chaos in all areas of the Universe. The Logos opposes the world – the beginning of entropy. Culture is a conscious struggle against the world's equalization: the role of culture is the isolation, as a delay in the equalizing process of the Universe, and the increase of potential difference in all areas, as a condition of life, by contrast with equality – that is death. Faith defines a cult, and a cult is a world outlook, from which culture follows" [2, 39].

It should be noted that the idea of equality / inequality of potentials is also contained in G. Florovsky's works: "The equation of spiritual potentials is not a testimony to the vital activity and viability of historical formations" [4, 3]. A similar idea of culture as the beginning that confronts the equation is contained in N. Berdyaev's work "Philosophy of Inequality". Apparently, idea was "in the air", and was a reaction of thinkers to the spreading of communist ideology.)

Thus, the core of culture for P. Florensky is a cult based on faith. That is, the culture is religious by nature. At the same time, "and this is very revealing for Florensky, he speaks not of religions, but of religion, which, however, assumes countless forms" [7].

The cult is necessary, as it provides the connection between worlds – earthly and heavenly, phenomenal and noumenal. Speaking about the role of the cult in the life and work of P. Florensky, S. Horuzhy writes: "According to his deepest conviction, the whole supreme essence of a man is connected with this possibility of his – and, therefore, the duty – to see another world, to enter it with the help of a cult. [...] There is a removal of barrier spoiling between the phenomenon and the noumenon, healing of the ontological reality in the cult, so it is not just debugging, but first of all fixing the connection of the worlds. Following the church tradition, Florensky calls this debugging-fixing as the reality sanctification and recognizes in it the essence, the existential mission of the cult" [5, 539].

P. Florensky sees the practical filling of the cult not only in Christian worship, but also admits other historical ways of human connection with the "other world" as the cult: "Florensky in his "Watersheds of Thought" resolutely asserts that magism is "a universal", "common to all mankind" and an enduring feature inherent, in particular, to the Christian religion. Along with and in analogy with magic he defends the occultism; he aspires to treat both phenomena in his own way, broader than usual – and to combine them with Christianity" [5, 541-542].

In the work by G. Florovsky "The Ways of Russian Theology" the term "culture" is one of the most common. Thus, the author speaks of "church culturality", of a shift of culture to the north after the Mongol-Tatar invasion, of "cultural indifference", "cultural uplift", "verbal culture", "Orthodox culture", of "external culture and culturality", of "Cultural creativity pathos", "cultural splendor and gloss", "cultural work", "church-cultural orientation", "cultural-historical point of view", "religious culture", etc.

Although G. Florovsky does not define the notion of "culture", but basing on the general context of the work and the author's assessments, we can assume that his understanding of culture is expressed in the following lines: "it is the matter of spiritual sublimation and the transformation of the soulful into the spiritual through the "mind" asceticism, through an ascension to the mind vision and contemplation ... [...] there is a path from spontaneous lack of will to a strong-willed responsibility, from the whirling of thoughts and passions to asceticism and the concentration of spirit, from imagination and reasoning to the wholeness of spiritual life, experience and is vision, from the "psychic" (that is, the sensual – O.S.) to the "pneumatic" (that is, the spiritual – O.S.). And this way is difficult and long, the path of mind and inner achievement, the path of an invisible historical making ..." [4, 4].

G. Florovsky contrasts the notions of "culture" and "civilization". Characterizing the Russian clergy in the eighties of the nineteenth century, he notes that it has "a peculiar lack of freedom in dealing with cultural values: a naive inclination toward the external civilization and a lack of inner habit for living "in culture", in the atmosphere of creative tension" [4, 424]. Therefore, for G. Florovsky "to live in culture" means to live in the atmosphere of creative tension. The Church's separation from the culture means its distancing from intense spiritual life, theological and world-orientated search.

Summarizing we can say that G. Florovsky understands culture as spiritual creativity, which is a synonymous to theological creativity. Creation is making. It can not be replaced by enlightenment or learning: "It was necessary to learn theologizing not from the learned tradition or inertia only, and not only out of curiosity, but from the vivid church experience and from the religious need for knowledge" [4, 364]. Speaking about culture, G. Florovsky contrasts culture with "interrogation".

Thus, for G. Florovsky, culture has the same characteristics as the culture of monasticism (asceticism, concentration of spirit, mind vision, contemplation). Or in other words: from the position of G. Florovsky, the culture of monasticism and, more broadly, ascetic culture, acquires a universal character as a means of spiritual revival of the Church and society.

This analysis of P. Florensky's and G. Florovsky's understanding of culture allows us to conclude that Fr. George's position is more consistent with the official church-Christian doctrine. Fr. Paul's ideas have more philosophical freedom; represent a line of religious modernism in the frames of the Orthodox tradition.

At the same time, there is an opposite opinion on this issue. Thus, E. Ivanova believes, that it is G. Florovsky's work "The ways of Russian Theology" that provoked a negative attitude towards the works of Fr. Paul [6, 614]. A distinctive feature of G. Florovsky's views, according to E. Ivanova, is not only jealousy about the purity of Orthodoxy, but also nihilism inherent in the modernistic moods: "After all, Florovsky declares a mistake nothing more than a three hundred-year experience in the development of Russian theology, which he offers to reject with the purpose to start creating some new theology according to his program. [...] a similar attitude to predecessors cannot be found analogous in the patristic tradition, with which Florovsky connects his hopes, but in the culture of Russian modernism. [...] In addition, much in Florovsky's book – its polemical passion, the author's predilections, the methods of polemics themselves – characterizes him as one of the fig-

ures of the Russian religious Renaissance. [...] For the above reasons, Florovsky, to a much greater extent than Florensky, can be called a representative of Russian philosophical modernism" [6, 615]. On the other hand E. Ivanova considers that the specific nature of P. Florensky's ideas is understandable only in the context of the tasks of his time: "The path he found was in keeping with the objective needs of the time [...] Florensky's search, in contact with academic theology and combined in his personality with a high sense of responsibility for his words and deeds, allowed [...] conservatives to see in him their future" [6, 617].

On this issue, it should be noted that a certain polemical passion and predilection are also inherent in P. Florensky's works. At the same time, the ideas of both thinkers solved the tasks of their time, such as the popularization of Orthodoxy, the "return to the roots", the purification of the dogma from distortions and later layers. The dissimilarity of the thinkers' positions only emphasizes the originality of their ideas, erudition and freedom of thought.

Scientific novelty and conclusions:

1. P. Florensky's concept is broader both in terms of the volume covered in the chronological and topological plan of the material, and in the scale of the conclusions drawn on its basis. G. Florovsky's concept has a relatively local character and does not go beyond the characteristics are stable in the church-Christian culture: the "day" of Christianity and the "night" of paganism.

2. For G. Florovsky, the criterion for distinguishing between the "day" and "night" types is the conformity of the culture to the Orthodox Christian, ascetic, and in fact hesychast tradition. The true culture for him is in fact identical with the ascetic feat of the orthodox monasticism, the "culture of holiness". For P. Florensky, however, such a criterion is the basic type of culture reflection, the closeness of culture to a widely understood religious-mystical or, on the contrary, scientific-rational consciousness.

3. By the types of "daytime" (and renaissance) and "night" (medieval) culture P. Florensky denotes two main equivalent directions, two lines in culture. Interrupting the stage of the opposite line, each of them continues its previous stage. G. Florovsky, on the other hand, considers the "night" (pagan) culture as anti-historical in the conditions of spreading the "daytime" (Christian) culture. The first one must be tested and defeated by the second one.

4. At the same time, G. Florovsky's concept can be, in a certain sense, an integral part of P. Florensky's concept, if the "daytime" culture is left in the interpretation of Fr. Paul, but the "night" culture (in the Fr. Paul's understanding) is represented in two components:

a) Christian-religious (Florovsky's "daytime" culture);

b) Mytho-magical (Florovsky's "night" culture).

5. The combined typology of the "day / night" of Florensky / Florovsky culture can be included into the context of the rhythm of Apollonian and Dionysian types, and also in widely understood "baroque" and "classicism" stages in culture.

### **Література**

1. Андроник (Трубачев). Жизненный путь священника Павла Флоренского: к 135-летию со дня рождения [Электронный ресурс]/ Андроник (Трубачев), игумен. – Режим доступа: <http://www.stsl.ru/news/all/zhiznennyy-put-svyashchennika-pavla-florenskogo>.
2. Флоренский П. Сочинения в 4 т.: Т. 1. / Павел Флоренский, свящ. – М.: Мысль, 1994. – 806 с.
3. Флоренский П. Сочинения в 4 т.: Т. 2. / Павел Флоренский, свящ. – М.: Мысль, 1996.– 882 с.
4. Флоровский Г. Пути русского богословия / Георгий Флоровский, протоиерей. – Paris: YMCA-PRESS, 1983. – 600 с.
5. Хоружий С.С. Философский символизм П.А. Флоренского и его жизненные истоки /Хоружий С.С. // Флоренский: Pro et contra. – СПб.: РХГИ, 1996. – С. 525-557.
6. Иванова Е.В. Наследие о.Павла Флоренского: а судьи кто? /Иванова Е.В. // Флоренский: Pro et contra. – СПб.: РХГИ, 1996. – С. 609-624.
7. Кожурин А.Я. Философия культуры П.А. Флоренского [Электронный ресурс]/ А.Я.Кожурин. – Режим доступа: <http://anthropology.ru/ru/text/kozhurin-aya/filosofiya-kultury-pa-florenskogo>.

### **References**

1. Andronik (Trubachev). The Life Path of Priest Pavel Florensky: on the 135th Anniversary of his Birthday. Retrieved from <http://www.stsl.ru/news/all/zhiznennyy-put-svyashchennika-pavla-florenskogo> [in Russian].
2. Florensky, P. (1994). Works in 4 volumes. Vol.1. Moscow: Myisl [in Russian].
3. Florensky, P. (1996). Works in 4 volumes. Vol.2. Moscow: Myisl [in Russian].
4. Florovsky, G. (1983). The ways of Russian theology. Paris: YMCA-PRESS [in Russian].
5. Horuzhiy, S.S. (1996). P.A. Florensky's philosophical symbolism and its life sources. Florensky: Pro et contra. St. Petersburg, 525-557 [in Russian].
6. Ivanova, E.V. (1996). The legacy of Father Paul Florensky: who are the judges? Florensky: Pro et contra. St. Petersburg, 609-624 [in Russian].
7. Kozhurin, A. Ya. Philosophy of Culture of P.A. Florensky. Retrieved from <http://anthropology.ru/ru/text/kozhurin-aya/filosofiya-kultury-pa-florenskogo> [in Russian].

*Стаття надійшла до редакції 17.05.2017 р.*