

## NIKOLAY BERDYAEV: THE DIALECTICS OF SOBORNOST

ANNA VIKTOROVNA TONKOVIDOVA, Kuban State University of Physical Education, Sports and Tourism, Department of Philosophy, Cultural Studies and Social Communications, Krasnodar, Russian Federation

TONKOVIDOVA, A. V.: Nikolay Berdyaev: The Dialectics of Sobornost  
FILOZOFIA, 77, 2022, No 2, pp. 112 – 126

The subject of this research is the concept of sobornost in the philosophy of Nikolai Berdyaev. On the basis of the dialectical method, such stages of the development of sobornost are distinguished as being, essence, concept. The actualization of sobornost arises in the church community, the secular community, the church-secular community. The thesis in the formation of the category of sobornost at the level of its beingness is the church community in the maxims of salvation. The essential stage in the formation of sobornost is the secular community, where sobornost is revealed as a collection, collectivity, ideas of creativity develop, and a split and disunity are characteristic. The resolution of the Divine Trinity, human and cosmic community in freedom and love – this is the state of the conceptual level of sobornost in the church-secular community, where salvation and creativity are united. It can be concluded that sobornost is present in all designated types of community, being in dialectical development.

**Keywords:** Sobornost – Communitarianism – Dialectics – Community – Being – Essence – Concept

### Introduction

The category of sobornost is currently gaining momentum in connection with the declaration of universally valid ideals, the need for their content and conceptualization. The idea of sobornost is introduced into philosophy by Aleksey Khomyakov initially as a religious idea and is defined by him not in the sense of the quantitative or geographical universality of the church, but in the sense of “according to the unity of all”, as a translation of the Greek *kath’olion* (1994, 242). In his texts, “cathedral expresses the idea of an assembly existing potentially without external connection. It is unity in plurality” (Khomyakov 1994, 242). Berdyaev notes that Aleksey Khomyakov associates sobornost “with freedom and love” (2008 b, 79). Sobornost received its further development in the works of Vladimir Solovyov. He expanded the meaning of the idea of sobornost to the idea of cosmic unity. Rarely used the concept of sobornost in his works, “paradoxically strengthened its ontological status through his philosophy” (Posacki, 2021, 207). In the works of Sergei Bulgakov, the meaning of sobornost

is revealed. He notes that sobornost consists in “unity in the subject.” Sobornost is “unity in multitude” (Bulgakov 1993, 411). The concept of sobornost was further developed in the works of Nikolai Berdyaev. Nikolai Berdyaev wrote that communitarianism and sobornost always recognize “the value of the individual and freedom”, and “religious communitarianism is called sobornost, which is the opposite of the authoritarian understanding of the church” (2008b, 80). He defined the path to sobornost as “a period of historical wandering” (Berdyaev 2008a, 7).

In my research, I define the types of community in which sobornost is manifested, and the stages of the formation of sobornost in society on the basis of Berdyaev’s texts. The character of Russian religious philosophy, its main protagonist is “an educated secular person undergoing religious conversion” (Antonov 2020, 380). In this aspect, it is important to consider the question of how a person actualizes sobornost, and whether he can be outside of sobornost.

The study of sobornost in the works of N. Berdyaev presupposes an examination of its formation, on the basis of the dialectical method of G. V. F. Hegel, as being, essence and concepts in the church community, the secular community, the church-secular community (Hegel 2019). The choice of the research method is due to the fact that N. Berdyaev himself wrote that it is necessary to move from the “phenomenological method” to the “dialectical” (Berdyaev 2008 c, 4). A number of studies indicate that “Berdyaev’s approach lacked the crucial dialectical component that alone could help him articulate a genuine alternative to the modern outlook” (Marchenkov 2021, 217). But the significant influence of Hegel’s philosophy on Russian philosophy and on the philosophy of Berdyaev is also noted. “There is no doubt that Hegel had the greatest impact on Russian philosophy” (Nizhnikov 2012, 254). In the God-Man idea Berdyaev shows that in order to achieve the fully divine life, personal and existential cooperation between God and man is indispensable. “This thesis is developed by means of dialectic method” (Stark 2009, 217). “The vital dialectic between the Divine and humanity was so complex that the human was often humiliated in the history of Christianity. In the historical fate of God-manhood, sometimes the divine absorbed the human, then the human absorbed the divine” (Berdyaev 2008c, 28) Having applied the comparative approach, we discover in the texts of the philosopher the influence of Hegel, his method in revealing sobornost in sociality in the form of being, essence and concept, “according to Hegel: thesis, antithesis and synthesis” (Berdyaev 2008c, 89). A significant attempt was made by Russian philosophers to “replace the dialectics of concepts with the dialectics of persons” (Krasicki 2010, 70). Exploring the work of Berdyaev based on the method of philosophical polylogue (Wimmer 1990, Malinov, 2019), we come to the conclusion that philosopher enriches the area of dialectics with the original dialectics of God-manhood, existential dialectics.

According to Berdyaev, Hegel believed “in the immanent resolution of the dialectic of contradictions” (Berdyaev 2008c, 210). According to Berdyaev, Hegel had no eschatological, religious. Berdyaev develops the Hegelian approach, but notes that “it does not recognize the identity of being and thinking, and therefore dialectics is of a different nature and is associated with religious spiritual experience” (2008c, 210). He writes that “The dialectic of contradictions requires the transcendent” (Berdyaev 2008c, 59). And in our study, we trace in the philosopher both the influence of the Hegelian method and the disclosure of dialectics, which is directed to the transcendent.

### **Church community. Sobornost as a being**

Having considered sobornost in its dialectical manifestation as being, we will designate the answer to the question of how I can be sobornost in religious sociality. The answer suggests that I can be conciliar in individualism and asceticism, without plunging into history, in the realm of the transcendent. Sobornost on its existential level presupposes its direct living, direct experience of sobornost in individual, personal everyday life. In ecclesiastical sociality, religion is life, not a theoretical construction. The existence of sobornost in church sociality was noted by S. S. Khoruzhy in the philosophical concept of Khomyakov’s sobornost. S. S. Khoruzhy writes that Aleksey Khomyakov reveals the “dialectic of “hermit sobornost” through Orthodox deeds, prayer, the antinomic combination of the general and the separate (Khoruzhy 2002, 167). We also find the definition of church sociality in Vladimir Solovyov, who assumed “hermitage asceticism”, “contemplative mysticism”, individual conversion to God, “pseudo-Christian individualism” (1989, 353, 355, 2012, 50). We can note that Vladimir Solovyov defines two types of church community: the church community of early Christianity, whose ethical principles of organization on the basis of sobornost are described in the work of Gorzak (Goršak, 2021), and the external violent theocracy, which subordinates civil society. In the texts of Pavel Florensky and Sergey Bulgakov, we trace both the description of two types of religious sociality and the disclosure of the existential level of sobornost, which, according to Florensky, is characterized by “over-temporality”, “over-spatiality”, “exit to eternity”, “aspiration to eternity”, ascent to the “one-existent” of those who love in God (Florensky 1990, 91, 92, 93). Bulgakov at the existential level of sobornost, “detachment”, “alienation”, exit into the “Divine Nothing” can be traced (2008, 93, 400, 2017, 236).

In the Berdyaev’s texts, two types of church community can be distinguished: early Christianity and historical Christianity. In the church community of early Christianity, sobornost at the level of being is determined by the universalism of a single Christian humanity, which was lost with the transition to individualism. It was the authorization of Christian humanity (Berdyaev 2008a, 25). In early Christianity, the

existential level of sobornost was determined in the church community through “deification”, mystical love, “enlightenment”, “transformation”, “selflessness”, “detachment”, “creative state of mind”, overcoming “closed creatureness” (Berdyayev 2015, 153, 154). In the spiritual life of the church community of historical Christianity, contradictions arise due to its self-closure and departure from the presence of faith in the “living God” (Berdyayev 2008a, 26). Spirituality in the church community is defined as “symbolic, conventional, rhetorical” (Berdyayev 2008c, 146).

Berdyayev defines “the crisis of the Christian world, the crisis within Christianity itself” (2008c, 8). From Berdyayev's point of view, the contradictions of the church community are associated with the idea of God, which does not come from spiritual experience, but from limited, objectified experience, both natural and social. A relationship of domination and submission arises between God and man. “The old slavery of man was reflected in the judicial understanding of redemption, in experiencing the relationship between God and man as a trial” (Berdyayev 2008c, 11). In the church community there is, denoted by Berdyayev, the transfer of sobornost into the transcendental, divine sphere, without its real achievement in human life. There is only a “conditionally symbolic”, and not real, achievement of it in an individual coming to God (Berdyayev 2015, 139). Orthodox individualism arises, separating a person through asceticism from society, from the world. Creativity in a person was suppressed, which led to the denial of churchliness and threw a person even further from his freedom. The maxims of asceticism and individualism are established in the church community, everything is determined by “transcendental egoism, utilitarianism, eudemonism.” The church community is determined by “abstract spiritual” love, which manifests itself in an indifferent attitude towards both man and nature, aimed exclusively at self-salvation (Berdyayev 2015, 152, 155). Berdyayev describes the idea of “being chosen” as “monastic-ascetic dislike towards people and the world”, “mortification” in relation to everything living and creative, putting oneself outside, above, above other nations (2015, 155, 156). An authoritarian-hierocratic system based on humility as obedience is being created in the church community; creativity is denied. Humility from a means to an end turns into a goal of a person's actions. Action sees the achievement of humility as its criterion, and the performance of an action by a person should contribute to the achievement of humility. Personal salvation comes through humility. Love and humility are seen as opposite concepts, love goes into the transcendental. Courage, height of spirit, creativity, sobornost are also seen only in the transcendental.

The fear of hell, the fear of death does not give an opportunity to open up to human freedom, hides the truth. “Fear was put above kindness” (Berdyayev 2008c, 72). The problem of suffering in the church community is connected, according to Berdyayev, with the confidence that suffering will lead a person to salvation, faith in

the “saving grace of suffering” (Berdyayev 2008c, 84). Berdyayev finds a psychological paradox in the fact that “a person can increase his suffering in order to suffer less” – this is “an existential dialectic of suffering: suffering from one, he consoles himself with another suffering” (Berdyayev 2008c, 85).

This led to the misconception that human suffering is pleasing to God. In the church community of historical Christians, one can find a “judicial understanding” of Christianity. Consecration of freedom occurs within the framework of the judicial understanding of Christianity (Berdyayev 2008b, 62).

There are social images of God: “lord”, “king”, “father”, but theodicy becomes impossible within the designated understanding of God, which leads to the denial of the idea of God and the transition to a secular society (Berdyayev 2008c, 12). In secular and ecclesiastical communities, divine mystery and divine kenosis are denied. The objectification of revelation occurs through dogma, which, according to Berdyayev, closes God from man and throws him back to Aristotelianism and a rational understanding of God. The philosopher writes “instead of the Kingdom of God, a Church was formed” (Berdyayev 2008c, 26). The dialectic of the Church in history manifests itself at the level of the church community in “relativity”, “adaptability” (Berdyayev 2008c, 193, 206). The dialectic of the historical is associated with the idea of the millennial kingdom, which in the church community of the historical church remained lifeless and abstract. Dialectics in the texts of the philosopher can be traced in the understanding of the “historical process”, of “personality and freedom” (Shirko 2005, 113; Nizhnikov 2018, 146). In the church community, Berdyayev singles out the dialectics of history associated with the concept of messianism. “Messianic consciousness and expectation creates history, gives it a connection and meaning, and it, as it were, rips off history, wants to skip over it” (Berdyayev 2008c, 188).

Messianism in the church community is associated with eschatological beliefs. In the texts of the philosopher, in relation to history, one can trace “religious-individualistic”, moving away from the world and history, and “religious-social” messianism (Berdyayev 2008c, 191). He finds a contradiction in messianism, which consists in the simultaneous finding of meaning in history and the desire to “jump” over history, in which eschatological attitudes and antihistoricism are manifested (Berdyayev 2008c, 188). In the eschatology of the church community, there is a dialectic of “eschatology of patience” and “eschatology of expectation” (Berdyayev 2008c, 208). I find in Berdyayev's texts an understanding of the idea that secularity itself, secularity, arises from distant contradictions within church sociality.

### **Secular community. Sobornost as an essence**

Can a person lose sobornost in secular sociality? Departing from dialectics, we are faced with the fact that sobornost is lost here. But it is impossible to find faith and religiosity in non-religiousness. The transition from secularism to religiosity, which will be in conjunction with secularity, is possible only if there are moments of religiosity in secularity, or if secularism itself is considered as a moment in the development of religiosity. In this case we come to dialectics. And we can assume that catholicity in secularism is present in its otherness. The essential form of sobornost arises as a moment of formation on a negative level.

We find its description in the works of Vladimir Solovyov, Sergei Bulgakov, Pavel Florensky. Exceptional secularism needs a connecting principle, immanently inherent in secular sociality, which can be called either “anthill” (Vladimir Solovyov) or “herd” (Sergei Bulgakov), as the opposite pole of sobornost (Soloviev 1988, 309; Bulgakov 2011, 92).

In Berdyaev's texts, I define the “negative phase” or, in my opinion, the essential level of sobornost. In human existence, it is associated with the loss of freedom (2008b, 45). According to Berdyaev, the difference between the secular community and the church community is that the former is based on the idea of creativity, while the latter is based on the idea of salvation. “The torment of the problem of salvation and creativity reflects the schisms between the Church and the world, the spiritual and the profane, the sacred and the secular” (Berdyaev 2015, 137). In the secular public, through the denial of symbolism, the separation of God and man occurs. A person can belong to the spheres of salvation and creativity, churchliness and secularism. Antonov notes that it is through symbols that a bridge arises between the transcendental and empirical man, the concept of the symbol “is intended to remove the opposition of the transcendental and the empiric” (2019, 61). The contradiction arises from the inconsistency between the secular and the ecclesiastical in it, “a sharp dualism of sacred and secular” (Berdyaev 2015, 139). For Berdyaev, the secular society acts as a “godforsakenness”, a “collectivist era,” which is associated with the socialization and collectivization of economics, politics, conscience, thought, creativity, and the emergence of a collective conscience (Berdyaev 2008b, 78). Berdyaev calls collectivism “collection”, opposing sobornost (2008b, 79). He sees the main danger in the situation of the “collectivist era” in the fact that freedom in this case is completely lost, therefore, collectivism can be viewed as an instrument of domination (Berdyaev 2008b, 79). The dialectical contradiction between truth and myth is inherent in collectivism, where a collective illusory reality is created. Collectivism leads to the establishment of the “Kingdom of God without God” (Berdyaev 2008b, 82). The myths of the secular public were created to control the human masses.

Traits of the spirit can be found in atheistic teachings. Atheism, according to Berdyaev, is only “the dialectical moment of knowledge of God” (2008c, 18,19). Berdyaev designates such a form of atheism as “suffering atheism”, which can be seen as a form of religious experience, and “evil atheism” – a rebellion against false ideas about God. A new theme arises in humanism – the theme of God-manhood. In secular sociality, one might say, it is not God that is denied, but false ideas about God of the people themselves, who cannot accept God “incognito” in the world, striving for the greatness of God and God-man (Berdyaev 2008c, 19).

Berdyaev introduces the concept of “tortured person”, whose life is determined by fear, hiding the truth from him. There is a conflict between fear and truth, moral regression, and aesthetic sensitivity (Berdyaev 2008c. 58, 66, 72). Berdyaev writes about dialectics in human life of “suffering” and “joy”, “unhappiness” and “happiness” (Berdyaev 2008c, 82,83). It is necessary to go through “suffering to death” in order to move on to “suffering to salvation”. In a secular society, a person can no longer be determined by the idea of progress, since it has exhausted itself, not saving a person from suffering, not guaranteeing him freedom from death and fear of the future. Avoiding suffering occurs through the inclusion of a person in a social group, merging with everyday life, compassion for another (Berdyaev 2008c, 90, 91).

There is no separate good and evil. Evil is a dialectical moment of good. Evil presupposes a spiritual and social struggle with it; good is revealed through evil. Evil comes from the loss of integrity and integrity. It speaks of “we”, which is reduced only to the “objectification of human existence”, collectivity, the idea of sovereignty (Berdyaev 2008b, 45). Goodness in a person is his inner unity, unity with the Spiritual principle. The secular public is trying to get closer to good through the revolution, but this does not give the desired results. In a revolution, a person denies his guilt and sinfulness; only one indignation remains. A “fallen” person arises (Berdyaev 2008 c. 101, 103, 105, 104). The life of such a person is determined not by the goal, but by the means. “Man’s life is filled with the means of life that have become an end in itself” (Berdyaev 2008b, 47). Since the highest goal is absent, and only aimless individualistic activity is present, a person has nothing to ascend to in his development. At the same time, the human personality loses its status, strives for disorder, equalization “the decline and fall of the personality, the flowering of individuality, the leveling and general confusion” (Berdyaev 2008a, 17). Human freedom has as its goal the liberation of a person, but a person, according to Berdyaev, cannot be a goal for himself. “It is impossible to free a person in the name of human freedom; a person himself cannot be the goal of a person. So we run into a perfect void” (Berdyaev 2008a, 16). Freedom acquires the status of emptiness. Values are lost in the struggle for existence. “Man is free to deny his freedom” (Berdyaev 2008b, 60). Pavel

Florensky writes that a person is defined by such positions as “it is happening to me”, “it is happening to me”, “words are spoken” (1990, 174, 175).

Berdyayev rejects the hierarchy of values. The secular public began to believe in the nation as in God. “Religious life itself took the form of national isolation” (Berdyayev 2008a, 26). Each nation has its own God, which indicates a departure from true Christianity with its universalism. In the secular public, “forced universalism” arises, which Berdyayev opposes to “free universalism.” Through imperialism, socialism, internationalism, “forced internationalism” is actualized in a secular society (Berdyayev 2008a, 29). In a secular public, spirituality, adjusting to an ordinary person, acquires a formal character. There is a conflict between society, legalism and spirituality. “The conflict of the spirit and organized society with its legalism is an eternal conflict” (Berdyayev 2008c, 147).

The problem of messianism is also presented in the secular public. Here, based on the texts of Berdyayev, it is possible to designate “secularized” messianism (Berdyayev 2008c, 189). Berdyayev defines messianism as human activity in the historical sphere, inspired by faith in the approaching end of history. Consequently, messianism is inherent in both the church and secular society. In immanent history, the goal of history is unattainable; there is only an approach to “bad infinity”, to the formation of a rationalized and mechanized society (Berdyayev 2008c, 192). The secular public is characterized by “individualism” and “mechanical collectivism”, in which there is no freedom, no adaptation to the masses (Berdyayev 2008b, 55). The secular community is actualized through “individualism”, “humanism”, “humanistic morality”, “liberalism”, “democracy”, “nationalism”, “godlessness”, “atomism”, “competition”, “secularization”, “parliamentarism”, “legal formalism” (Berdyayev 2008a, 15 – 18). Humility at the essential level of sobornost is “external submission”, “decadent humility” (Berdyayev 2015, 145, 146). At the same time, human nature does not change. Individualism cannot be, according to Berdyayev, the ontological basis of personality. “A person enters the community” (2008a, 18).

Berdyayev writes that forms and meanings of life have been established, “based not on truth, but on the formal right to choose any truth or lie” (2008a, 19). “Collectivism” [...] is just a “caricature of communitarianism” (Berdyayev 2008b, 56). The real community is being replaced by the “fictitious” reality of a community built on authoritarianism. It denies the presence of subjective consciousness. This is just objectification and socialization through the creation of “quazi reality” (Berdyayev 2008b, 75). For sobornost at the level of essence, only creativity remains in the secular community, which obscures the idea of salvation. In secular sociality, a person develops creatively, but at the same time he is lost personally. Berdyayev defines the secular community as “monasticism in the world,” the creativity of the church in the world.



Conciliarism here is preserved at the level of its essence, Berdyaev characterizes this state of society as “unconsciously churchly,” “man’s creativity in the church”. Secularism in creativity, denying salvation, in itself boils down to a synthesis of salvation and creativity, a return to the “new Middle Ages,” to “wanderings,” to a new “holistic consciousness,” God-manhood. The two tragedies “the tragedy of life” and the “tragedy of culture” must be overcome; human creativity must be “returned to the sacred meaning” in the church-secular community (Berdyaev 2015, 164 – 166).

### **Church-secular community. Sobornost as a concept**

In church-secular sociality, “reconciliation” or synthesis will take place. Sergei Bulgakov finds the presence of “synthesis” in the works of the early Vladimir Solovyov in the removal of the contradiction between the immanent and the transcendent (Bulgakov 2008, 402). An interesting Bulgakov’s idea that the indicator that shows that the process of the dialectical formation of sobornost is not completed is the existence of religion as a “link” between man and God. In a state of conciliar unity, achieved, actual revealed in the synthesis of religiosity and secularism, religion will become irrelevant, the need for this “bundle” will pass (Bulgakov 2017, 116). Nikolai Berdyaev also writes that in church-secular sociality “the messianic consciousness rushes towards the Kingdom of God, in which both religion and the Church disappear as separate forms that have arisen in history” (Bulgakov 2008c, 194). Therefore, as long as the dialectic of sobornost persists, the process its formation is going on and religion is present.

“Mid-neutral” new European humanism led to contradictions between the church and secular society, which lead to a new round of development in the new Middle Ages, in the religious era (Berdyaev 2008a, 14). The secular community is based on the will to religious unification, a universal spiritual culture through the coverage of all spheres of public life, including art, with a religious spark. “Religious neutrality does not exist,” writes Berdyaev, the religion of the “living God” to the church community of sobornost at the level of its being is opposite to the “religion of anti-christ,” or a person who has put himself in the place of God (Berdyaev 2008a, 13). In the ‘New Middle Ages’, as Berdyaev defines it, the autonomy of religion must disappear. The essential form of sobornost in the secular public, its external definiteness in signs and forms, must be replaced at the conceptual, concrete level of sobornost by the real achievement of the Kingdom of God.

Now there is a will to really achieve the Kingdom of God, as well as the kingdom of the devil, in all spheres of life, to free theonomy in contrast to autonomy and heteronomy. Knowledge, morality, the arts, the state,

the economy must become religious, but freely and from within, and not forcibly and from without (Berdyaev 2008a, 32).

Berdyaev writes about a return to medieval universalism, a departure from individualism, which “can no longer be pathetically experienced” (2008a, 17). Referring to the dialectical approach outlined by Hegel, Berdyaev writes, “the negative is overcome and everything positive enters the next stage” (Berdyaev 2008c, 101). Berdyaev calls this era the era of universalism, in which “a person ascends to the community” (2008a, 18). “Prophetic fire” and “mysticism” as “regenerating forces”, in our opinion, are the origins of the dialectical transition to catholicity as a concept in the church-secular community (Berdyaev 2008c, 30). In the ecclesiastical and secular community, society is free and just. “Justice demands freedom for all people” (Berdyaev 2008b, 57). Berdyaev is convinced that in understanding God it is necessary to move away from dogmas and move on to myth. “The basic myth is the myth of the divine-human and the divine-human, and this myth is realistic” (Berdyaev 2008c, 54). “In the God-Man idea ... to achieve the fully divine life, personal and existential cooperation between God and man is indispensable. This thesis is developed by means of dialectic method” (Stark 2009, 217).

Berdyaev speaks about the primacy of apophatic theology in understanding God. “God is spirit, that is, freedom”, “he must be thought apophatically in relation to the realities of the natural and social world” (2008c, 15). The Christian religion becomes divine-human and trinity. The dialectical idea is traced that “revelation is the cooperation of God and man in knowledge and truth” (McKinlay 2017, 129). In the cognition of the Christian idea, the principle of catholicity and the principle of dialectics are of decisive importance (Belov 2019, 23, Boyko 2011). In the ecclesiastical and secular state there is the power of love, the spirit of heroism, conscience and creative impulse. Humanity, love, pity, dignity, freedom are the defining moments of catholicity at the level of the concept. “In the experience of love, the Kingdom of God is revealed a little” (Berdyaev 2008c, 136). “Man inherits eternity in his humanity, he is called to life in God, he comes from eternity, through time, into eternity” (Berdyaev 2008c, 137). A new ethic should arise – “the ethic of human and human creativity” (Berdyaev 2008c, 138). Man is present in history in an eschatological and “Christian-missionary” conviction, which implies the existence of the transcendent and the transformation of historical reality through the transcendent (Berdyaev 2008c, 191). “Expressionism in philosophy is the only true path” (Berdyaev 2008c, 4). The purpose and meaning of the story is to bridge the gap between the immanent and the transcendent in the Kingdom of God. The Church is “metahistorical and must lead to the Kingdom of God” (Berdyaev 2008c, 193). Berdyaev defines the existence of a person at the

conceptual level, the disclosure of sobornost in the church-secular community, as heroism. Heroism is “fearlessness before the truth, before the truth and death” (2008c, 72). Berdyaev gives one more characteristic of personality at the level of sobornost as a concept. This is an “aristocrat”, or a person who is aware of his guilt and sinfulness (Berdyaev 2008c, 105).

How does a person become at the level of sobornost as a concept, according to Berdyaev? “The principles of sobornost – pure freedom, relationality, and genuine togetherness – are driving Berdyaev’s vision of the transfiguration of the world”, writes Cocksworth (2016, 225). A person becomes a “creator of culture”, an aristocrat and a hero who, in his service to the people, creates him. Berdyaev defines a person in the church-secular community as a “creator of culture” who, through aristocracy, the development of the best qualities in himself, moves away from mass character, ennobles the public. Humility can be viewed as a way of human self-determination, the development of will. Humility cannot be the goal; it is viewed by Berdyaev as one of the means of spiritual life at the level of a spiritual person. This is genuine humility, a real transformation of human nature, the liberation of a spiritual person. Tolerance, which becomes characteristic of the church-secular community, provides her with freedom (Berdyaev 2008b, 70). The existential dialectics of N. A. Berdyaev is used as a “method of reading postmodern deconstruction” (Silantieva 2005, 204). In N. Berdyaev, I find the disclosure of the concept of church society as a possible response to “progressism” and “immanent infinitism”, which, according to Marchenkov, are inherent in modern society (Marchenkov 2021, 217).

Berdyaev refers to the Hegelian concept of the objectification of the spirit. We believe that it is in the church-secular sociality that we single out that a “new revelation of the Holy Spirit” will arise, which “is the cessation of alienation and objectification not only in thought, but also in life itself, in life spiritual experience”, will become apparent “the world after that the direction of disintegration into subject and object” (Berdyaev 2008c, 205).

N. Berdyaev notes that the dialectical contradiction arises not between the individual and the sobornost, but between the “collective and the communitarian” (2008b, 77). “Sobornost-communitarianism” presupposes freedom, and “collectivism” implies alienated consciousness (Berdyaev 2008b, 80). Conscience determines entry into a universal community, not the development of “individualism” (Berdyaev 2008b, 78). Sobornost is being in communion and love between the church people and the Holy Spirit, based on the “mysterious life of the spirit” (Berdyaev 2008b, 79). Freedom is one of the central categories of N. Berdyaev’s philosophy, in the consideration of which the Hegelian approach can be traced (Barníková 2002, 608, Ermichev 1990). The dialectic of freedom is manifested in the fact that “freedom can pass

into necessity, as its opposite” (Berdyayev 2008b, 62). A justification of freedom arises.

“Free communitarianism can only be the result of a spiritual and social movement that will cease to be divided and opposed” (Berdyayev 2008c, 207). “Religious communitarianism” means sobornost, the opposite of the “authoritarian collectivism” of the historical church (Berdyayev 2008b, 80). “Communitarianism” is associated with “freedom”, with “individualization” (Berdyayev 2008 b, 81). Human freedom is determined by belonging to the “spiritual” and “social” (“the Kingdom of the Spirit and the Kingdom of Caesar”) (Berdyayev 2008b, 81). Sobornost plays a fundamental role in the actualization of the “basic principles” of Russian philosophy (Čipkár 2007, 284). Communitarianism is a spiritual quality of people, community, brotherhood.

### **Conclusion**

Based on the texts of N. Berdyayev, we can determine the dialectical contradictions that underlie the development of sobornost in the public. Berdyayev’s vision of the transfiguration of the world Godforsakenness, the “intermission” of the world (the secular public) enters into dialectical contradiction with the traditional teaching about the providence of God (the church community). In the world, two ideas are fighting, being in dialectical contradiction, the first comes from the “domination of some people over others”, the second is based on the “brotherhood of people, the dignity of the individual, the recognition of its spiritual basis” (Berdyayev 2008c, 130). The crisis of the non-Christian and anti-Christian world and the crisis of the Christian world, within Christianity itself, are indicated, and, taking into account the dialectical method indicated by Berdyayev, it is these crisis tendencies, contradictions that act as a source of self-movement, development, the transition to a church-secular society, to “eschatological Christianity”, aspiring to the future (Berdyayev 2008c, 7, 8).

Sobornost in the form of being is revealed in church sociality, understood as a dialectical stage in the formation of sociality, or mutual relations of man, society, the Church and God, which have the character of incompleteness, in which personality arises. The achievement of sobornost is transferred to the sphere of the transcendent, Divine, in social reality the moment of separation of the immanent world (man, society, church) and the divine, transcendent is the determining factor. With the general aspiration of church sociality to the world of the transcendent, its eschatological nature, religion and the church, which is considered as a necessary condition for achieving conciliar unity, albeit in the sphere of the transcendent, outside of history, through individual coming into the sphere of the divine, acquires an important role. In the otherness of the church in worldly life, or secularity, secularity, that which mediates the church in worldly life, is necessary for the existence of churchness.

The dialectical stage of sobornost in the form of essence is embodied in the secular type of sociality, mutual relations of a person, society, church, God, the formation of personality through these relations, in which the separation of the immanent world (man, society, church) and the transcendent is overcome through the denial of the transcendent God. Man is brought to the status of God in the immanent world, religiosity is directed at him. But in connection with the denial of one common transcendent foundation, in the immanent world separateness, isolation arises. The secular type of sociality also has the character of incompleteness, like the ecclesiastical type of sociality, the achievement of social unity is transferred to the future, beyond the moment of the present.

Sobornost at the conceptual level of actualization is a church-secular sociality in which there is no separation of man, society, church, God, the situation of God-mankind. Cathedral unity, which is present in the present in social reality.

The dialectic of N. Berdyaev is based on the dialectic of G. Hegel, but also that the philosopher brought his own approach to it. N. Berdyaev's dialectic is not logical, but vital, existential dialectic of divine and human, dialectic of divine-humanity, an existential dialectic of suffering, dialectic of good and evil, dialectics in human life of suffering and joy, unhappiness and happiness, dialectic of eschatology of patience and eschatology of expectation, the dialectic of freedom, dialectic of trinity, the dialectical moment of knowledge of God. The dialectic of life consists in the absorption of the human by the divine, in our opinion, in the church community, and the absorption of the divine by the human in the secular community. The dialectic of the Church in history.

It can be concluded that in one historical reality there can be two types of community, secular and church. Sobornost is in dialectical development, going through the stages of its formation, being, essence and concept in the church, secular and church-secular community. Sobornost is one, it only manifests itself dialectically in different types of community. Both historical Christianity and secular statehood will be overcome in the ecclesiastical and secular community, the gap between God and humanity will be lifted. The end of history depends, according to Berdyaev, both on God and on man, since fatalism is overcome by freedom. The result of the historical process finds its concrete embodiment in the sobornost, or, according to Berdyaev, free communitarian, leading to the infinity of eternity, which will be the completion of the dialectic of trinity. A person, being in any of the types of socialities, retains sobornost. All types of sociality find their basis in religiosity, and secularity, as such, is questioned, is considered as one of the types of religiosity.

## Bibliography

- ANTONOV, K. M. (2019): Ideya „kritiki otkroveniia“ v filosofii religii i filosofskoj teologii v pozdnem tvorchestve N.A. Berdyaeva. *Filosofiya religii: analiticheskie issledovaniya*, 3 (1), 57 – 78. DOI: 10.21146/2587-683X-2019-3-1-57-78
- ANTONOV, K. M., KYRLEZHEV, A. I. (2020): Novaya interpretaciya istorii russkoj religioznoj mysli: filosofiya religii kak znachimyj aspekt religioznoj filosofii. *Voprosy teologii*, 2 (2), 368 – 383. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu28.2020.211>
- BARNÍKOVÁ, Z. (2002): Problém slobody u ruských exilových filozofov 20. storočia. *Filozofia*, 57 (8), 605 – 611.
- BELOV, V. N., IVLEVA, M. L., NIZHNIKOV, S. A. (2019): The Possibility of Christian Philosophy. *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies*, 18 (52), 17 – 30.
- BERDYAEV, N. A. (2008a): *Novoe srednevekov'e: razmyshlenie o sud'be Rossii i Evropy*. Moskva: Direct-Media.
- BERDYAEV, N. A. (2008b): *Carstvo Duha i carstvo Kesarya*. Moskva: Direct-Media.
- BERDYAEV, N. A. (2008c): *Ekzistencial'naya dialektika bozhestvennogo i chelovecheskogo*. Moskva: Direct-Media.
- BERDYAEV, N. A. (2015): *Izbrannye filosofskie sochineniya 1920-h gg.: Sbornik nauchnyh trudov*. Moskva: Direct-Media.
- BOYKO, P. E. (2011): Vseobshchaya dialektika religioznogo soznaniya kak metodologicheskij princip ponimaniya hristianskoj idei v sovremennom mire. *Filosofskoe obrazovanie: Vestnik Associacii filosofskih fakul'tetov i otdelenij*, 1, 227 – 233.
- BULGAKOV, S. (2017): *Svet nevechernij: Sozercaniya i umozreniya*. Moskva: Azbuka, Azbuka-Attikus.
- BULGAKOV, S. N. (1993): *Sochineniya v 2-h tomah*. Moskva: Nauka, Tom I. Filosofiya hoz'yajstva. Tragediya filosofii.
- BULGAKOV, S. N. (2011): *Pravoslavie. Ocherki ucheniya Pravoslavnoj Cerkvi*. Minsk: Izdatel'stvo Belorusskogo Ekzarhata.
- BULGAKOV, S. N. (2008): *Dva grada: issledovaniya o prirode obshchestvennyh idealov*. Moskva: Astrel'.
- ČIPKÁR, J. (2007): O svojbytnosti ruskej filozofie. Self-subsistence of Russian Philosophy. *Filozofia*, 62 (4), 282 – 297.
- COCKSWORTH, A. (2016): “Soborny” Spirituality: Spirit and Spirituality in Berdyaev and Barth. In Moyse A. – Kirkland S. – & McDowell J. (eds.): *Correlating Sobornost: Conversations between Karl Barth and the Russian Othodox Tradition*. Minneapolis: 1517 Media, 213 – 240. DOI: 10.2307/j.ctt17mcrxw.14
- ERMICHEV A. A. (1990): *Tri svobody Nikolaya Berdyaeva: (Iz cykla “Stranicy istorii otech. filos. mysli”)*. Moskva: Nauka.
- FLORENSKY, P. A. (1990): *Stolp i utverzhdenie istiny*. Moskva: Pravda.
- HEGEL, G. V. F. (2019): *Nauka logika*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo AST.
- HOMYAKOV, A. S. (1994): *Sochineniya v 2 tomah. T. 2. Raboty po bogosloviyu. Zhurnal Voprosy filosofii*. Moskva: Moskovskij filosofskij fond, Izdatel'stvo Medium.
- KHORUZHYY, S. S. (2002): Aleksej Homjakov: uchenie o sobornosti i cerkvi. *Bogoslovskie trudy: religiozno-prosvetitel'skoe izdanie. Sborik 37*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskoj Patriarhii, 178 – 189.
- KRASICKI, J. (2010): “The tragedy” of German philosophy. Remarks on reception of German philosophy in the Russian religious thought (of S. Bulgakov and others)”. *Stud East Eur Thought*, 62, 63 – 70.
- MALINOV, A. V., OBOLEVICH, T. (2019): O „novyh“ metodah izucheniya istorii russkoj filosofii. *Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta. Filosofiya i konfliktologiya*, 35 (2), 285 – 296. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu17.2019.205>

- MARCHENKOV, V. L. (2021): Nikolai Berdyaev's Philosophy of Creativity as a Revolt Against the Modern Worldview. In: Bykova, M. F. – Forster M. N. – Steiner L. (eds.): *The Palgrave Handbook of Russian Thought*. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. 217 – 238. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-62982-3\\_11](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-62982-3_11)
- MCKINLAY, B. (2017): Revelation in Nicolas Berdyaev's Religious Philosophy. *Open Theology*, 3 (1), 117 – 133. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/opth-2017-0009>
- NIZHNIKOV, S. A. (2012): On the Specific Traits of Russian Kantianism. *Filozofia*, 67 (3), 254 – 261.
- NIZHNIKOV, S. A., GREBESHEV, I. V. (2018): Ekzistencial'naya dialektika lichnosti i svobody v filosofii N. Berdyaeva. *Voprosy filosofii*, 2, 146 – 153.
- POSACKI, A. (2021): „Sobornost” jako idealny model „solidarności mistycznej” w kulturze rosyjskiej Is part of: *Solidarność: człowiek w sieci zależności społecznych*, pod redakcją Jarosława Jagiełły i Karoliny Tytko. Kraków: Uniwersytet Papieski Jana Pawła II w Krakowie. Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 203 – 214. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15633/9788374389952.15>
- SHIRKO, K. N. (2005): Istoricheskij process v interpretacii N. A. Berdyaeva: dialektika bozhestvennogo i chelovecheskogo. *Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*, 289, 113 – 120.
- SILANTIEVA, M. V. (2005): Ekzistencial'naya dialektika N. A. Berdyaeva kak metod prochteniya postmodernistskoj dekonstrukcii. *Vestnik Voronezhskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya: Gumanitarnye nauki*, 11, 204 – 221.
- SOLOVYOV, V. S. (1988): *Sochineniya v 2 t., T. 2*. Moskva.: Izdatel'stvo Pravda.
- SOLOVYOV, V. S. (1989): *Sochineniya v 2 t., T. 2*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Pravda.
- SOLOVYOV, V. S. (2012): *Rossiya i vselenskaya cerkov'. Russkaya ideya. Talmud i novejschaya polemicheskaya literatura o nem v Avstrii i Germanii*. Moskva: Direkt-Media.
- STARK, K. (2009): The Idea of God-Man in Nicolas Berdyaev's Existentialism. In: Tymieniecka AT. (eds). *Phenomenology and Existentialism in the Twentieth Century. Analecta Husserliana (The Yearbook of Phenomenological Research)*, 10, 217 – 229. Springer, Dordrecht. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-2725-2\\_15](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-2725-2_15)
- WIMMER, F. M. (1990): *Interkulturelle Philosophie: Geschichte und Theorie. Band 1*. Wien: Pöschel Verlag.

---

Anna Viktorovna Tonkovidova  
 Department of Philosophy  
 Cultural Studies and Social Communications  
 Kuban State University of Physical Education, Sports and Tourism  
 161, Budennogo st.  
 Krasnodar, 350015,  
 Russian Federation  
 e-mail: [tonkovidova@mail.ru](mailto:tonkovidova@mail.ru)  
 ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2756-9577>