

УДК 111.3:2-184:2-58:002.6

The Utmost Reality in Philosophy, Mysticism and Informology: the Knowledge-Studying Method

**Yury F. Abramov^{a*},
Pavel V. Ushakov^b and Sergey V. Khomuttsov^c**

^a Irkutsk State University
1, Karl Marx Str., Irkutsk, 664003 Russia

^b Altai Academy of Economics and Law,
86 Komsomol, Barnaul, 656038 Russia

^c Altai State Pedagogical Academy, Barnaul
55 Youth, Barnaul, 656031 Russia

Received 11.03.2013, received in revised form 18.03.2013, accepted 25.03.2013

The article presents the research of one of the most difficult and insufficiently studied problems. This is the problem of existence and the main point of the objective reality's resolute substance (modern terms for this substance are energy-informational substance, informational-virtual reality, etc.). It had been considered the main world's reality, soteriological aim of existence for a great number of adherents in many religious-mystic doctrines since ancient times. The adherents regarded it as the utmost reality of objective reality and aim of a human's life. A lot of possibilities to study this amazing world's phenomenon emerge on a new cultural, religious and scientific-and-philosophical background nowadays.

Keywords: religion, mysticism, philosophy, science, the utmost reality, God, theosubstance, transsubstance, energy-informational substance, information-virtual reality.

The problem of the world's immaterial, or energy-informational substance has been widely discussed in various fields of philosophy and science (in ontology, epistemology, physics, cosmology, psychology, energy informatics, etc.). Its research focuses on various aspects – the world's fundamental principles, physical vacuum, energy-informational reality, super mind, higher substance, etc. The object of this article is a study of interconnections between philosophic-and-scientific and philosophic-and-religious

approaches to the research of the world's energy-informational substance.

We'll focus on several epistemological, axiological and praxiological aspects of comprehension of the world's immaterial forms attracting a human's soul and mind at all times of his existence – from primitive states to life in the informational society being a result of scientific and technical progress.

The main material of the article is connected with P.V. Ushakov's research of the so-called

utmost reality gaining its significant importance in practically all human's religious-mystic, ascetic-mystic practices. However, it is differently termed and defined in mysticism, theological and philosophical doctrines notwithstanding its absoluteness and uniqueness (Ushakov, 2008, 2009). Yu.F. Abramov's research is devoted to the problems of the informational picture of the world, informational substance, ecological-informational reality, information-virtual reality and civilization of XXI century. But at bottom of fact it aims to disclose the utmost reality as well but reflected in scientific-and-philosophic categories of cognition. Moreover, taking into account the achievements of various forms of the human culture, the author is in search for the ways of philosophic integration of knowledge about informational substance in basic categories of the main question of philosophy (Abramov, 1988; Abramov, Kuibar', 2010, 2011). S.V. Khomutsov's research covers the problems of spirituality and considers the reality which constitutes the Spirit of the World and a human, the society's spirituality, which is the utmost reality per se, but does it in the focus of the human spiritual culture (Khomutsov, 2004, 2009).

Starting our reasoning with "analytical-and-inductive" material of human religious and mystical knowledge in ancient times, we should refer to specific ascetic-mystical religious practices (AMRP) existing in almost all human cultures. The experience of various interactions between mystics-practitioners and later theorists and a specific immaterial utmost reality, regarded as the human's soteriological aim (the aim of spiritual rescue) in those practices, had been perfected for centuries.

The integral philosophical research of such mystical practices makes it possible to single out the following levels of a mystic's and adherent-practitioner's understanding of the utmost reality:

1) a practitioner's own sense of new mystical states, non-verbalized yet; 2) the ability to verbally describe a mystical state; 3) a mystic's individual interpretation of his own experience from some general positions; 4) interpretation of mystical experience by another person which is possible when an adherent's personal verbalized experience becomes the public heritage and the subject of the appropriate specialists' research; 5) cognition of mystical experience, mysticism, AMRP, etc., being a specific problem of research in various, more wider spheres, such as: 6) a religious confessional cognition of the problem; 7) religious non-confessional, meta-confessional cognition; 8) religious-philosophical (in its general aspect) cognition; 9) general philosophical cognition of the problem as a specific socio-cultural phenomenon (repeated, reproduced phenomenon) in social life.

In the typology mentioned above levels 7, 8, 9 can be considered to be "proper philosophic" levels of mystical reality understanding as it is here where "the knowledge over knowledge" of a philosophical character is formed. In cases when the utmost reality is comprehended by a definite mystic-practitioner, these could be processes and results of cognitive levels 4, 5 and 6. That's why the mystical reality in mystics-practitioners', ascetics-mystics' mind is supplemented with the richness of imagination and thus it is defined differently in comparison with the definitions given by mystics-theorists and philosophers of a mystical area of research in particular.

Having briefly reviewed a multiform "view" of the utmost reality, we'll turn to a philosophical analysis of possible approaches to its content and the main point. For this it will be designated by the initial term "mystical reality" (from Latin term *mystika* – mystery).

First, we'll regard this reality from religious, mystical, philosophical points of view. Then we'll refer to the contemporary ideas of this

reality from the points of view characteristic to culturology and then scientific philosophy, considering energy, energy-informational reality of the world.

According to core philosophical ideas, the main point of this reality can be reflected in the universal objective world in the form of the transcendent reality; in a subjective form – in the form of the transcendental reality; and also in the form of synthesis of both. At that the description and definition of this higher, utmost, etc. reality turn out to be quite different.

Firstly, such reality can be termed differently – the personified (personal) God; the non-personified divine reality; the utmost, higher reality, the absolute idea, the transsubstance, the Absolute, etc., in modern terms – the energy-informational substance.

Secondly, it can be differently described.

Thirdly, various properties either of a personal, “anthropomorphic” character or an impersonal, “cosmomorphic” character can be attributed to it.

These make it very difficult to choose even a general term that can be used in an extended comparative and philosophic research to designate this higher reality, revealed and defined in various kinds of AMRP.

Considering the level of this reality understanding by religious mystics (levels 4, 5, 6), it is possible to speak of the **Divine substance** of a personified or non-personified character. At this level it can be defined as **Theosubstance** (transcendent or immanent). The process of its cognition and methods applied can be designated as **theoepistemology** and **themethodology** (Andreev, 2005; Florensky, 2001; Khomuttsov, 2009; Oldak, 1993; et al.).

But when cognition moves to more abstract philosophical levels (levels 7, 8, 9) the main subject of epistemological analysis turns out to be a more abstract term **Transsubstance** –

transcendent and transcendental substance (the Absolute, the Absolute Idea, the utmost reality, the energy substance of the World, the world virtual energy-informational substance, etc.), including Theosubstance (a narrower category, if the substance is regarded as the Divine substance of objective reality). In this cognitive general philosophic aspect **transepistemology** and **transmethodology** can be spoken about.

Therefore, *at various levels of understanding the mystical we face the categories of different degree of universality which are represented by analogous but not identical concepts and meanings. Hence, the utmost mystical reality is differently defined in different types of mysticism, especially with due account taken of non-verbalized or hardly verbalized states of mystics-practitioners of 1, 2, 3 levels of understanding the reality in the course of their senses and feelings.*

We'll try to dwell upon this most complicated problem “of all centuries and peoples” in a form of a brief summary at least, though we realize that its *final solution won't be possible*. However, the attempts to solve this set of problems to this or that extent play a significant role due to a number of reasons, and namely they make it possible to:

- 1) understand the meaning of life concepts peculiar for numerous generations;
- 2) turn to the problems of understanding universal fundamentals of objective reality;
- 3) find “the bridges” across the main achievements in the key spheres of human knowledge – science and religion.

The latter area in cognition seems to be actively used by P.G. Oldak at the beginning of the 90-s of XX century. He called it “*theoepistemology*”, or cognition of the universal divine point of the world both by means of religious philosophy and mysticism as well as science (Oldak, 1993).

It should be emphasized that modern universal and scientific-and-philosophic pictures

of the world have also turned to cognition of this universal energy substance, power and main point of the world but use other terms, such as the world laws, the laws of the Universe, fundamental interactions, etc.

However, as it is stated above, we have termed this immaterial (energy) constituent part of the world as “*transsubstance*” at the most abstract general philosophic level (but not at “lower” religious-and-philosophic and scientific-and-philosophic levels). It is this most general form that can make the term be the basis for comparison, analysis, integration and, probably, conceptual synthesis of similar knowledge from various areas. Such angle of view makes it possible to integrate relevant knowledge from the areas of religion, mysticism, esoterism, non-religious, scientific knowledge, various forms of philosophic doctrines, etc., summarize the achievements in research of both subjective reality (in transpersonal psychology, for example) and objective reality (for example, in the study of physical vacuum, information world reality, world space ontology in science).

Due to the complexity of the problem under study we’ll consider the primary, less general (other) concepts and only after that we’ll try to bring them to the concept of Transsubstance.

According to the research, in all the cases an adherent strove for some higher out-of-limit substance with its specific, utmost and best properties that served a leading light and limit of his moral aspirations. These main properties can be generally defined the following way:

I. *The impersonal variant is Universal Harmony* (substantive characteristics which can be revealed in various variants – a “cavitated” or a “physically filled” world), *Universal coherence of phenomena, Universal Power, Universal Activity* (power, determinantal characteristics).

II. *The impersonal variant, or the reflected out-of-limit substance being a universal bond*

between a human and the world, a human’s inner harmony, gains a full-scale colouring in its energy forms and manifests itself in supreme feelings characteristic to a human – *Universal Good, Love, Beauty, Truth, Fairness* (in a substantive aspect), *Universal Aim and Universal Will* (for its implementation) – in a determinantal form.

Both variants of describing the utmost reality can co-exist and be defined in: a) transcendental and b) transcendent forms.

This substance might be sensed and defined (both in impersonal and personal variants) in *the subjective form*, in the form of searching for it in one’s soul, in *the transcendental* (Ia, IIa) or in *the objective (universal) form* as the out-of-limit (for ordinary humans’ senses) *transcendent reality* (Ib, IIb). But practically in all cases and variants it is a superior *ideal* of the objective reality for a comprehending human. It is also the best *aim* of existence caused by it and determining the wish to aspire to It in the course of life and try various forms of interaction with It.

As stated above, this universal substance (in a broader meaning of the word) with its main features (in personal and impersonal, subjective and objective forms) can be termed with the words of broader synonymic semantics such as *Transsubstance, Theosubstance* or *God* according to its main feature being *Its supreme perfection and a human’s aspiration to It*. In comparison with such concepts as “Transcendent (universal objective) reality” and “Transcendental (deep subjective) reality” the concept “Transsubstance” is broader in its meaning as it simultaneously covers transcendent and transcendental (immanent) worlds, the universal and the subjective-and-personal, the religious, the mystical, the non-religious, the esoteric, etc.

It should be emphasized that understanding the word “God” as *Transsubstance*, we regard it in its *general meaning* denoting various forms of its awareness by a human: both the personal

God, *personified* in poly- and monotheistic forms of religion and the impersonal, *non-personified* Father-God, the Absolute, Brahman, Absolute Idea, etc.

In this case *theosophy*, the term for general philosophic understanding of God which was quite widely used in Russian philosophy at the turn of XIX-XX centuries, turns out to be quite correct (Mitrokhin, 1993; *Filosofy Rossii XIX-XX stoletii. Biografii, idei, trudy*, 2003). *Theosophy* here is *a supreme wisdom of cognition, possible* (for a certain person, society, etc. at a definite stage of their development) *interpretation of Theosubstance*.

In order not to mix religious and non-religious meanings put into one and the same term and knowledge area the mentioned above *Transsubstance* term should be used. What might be supposed in connection with it is the possibility of its philosophic understanding in a specific area of general philosophy which could be termed as *transsophy*.

Proceeding from this terminology and its specific status, we'll try to discuss *Transsubstance from a theosophical point of view*. This discussion, as we consider it, can't be regarded as "the universal truth" as there is no unique judgment on this issue. But a proper reasoning characteristic to the subject of cognition is possible and necessary in a philosophic research. That's why we'll set forth some results of our reasoning.

Apparently, in various forms of a human's reflection of Transsubstance there can be singled out its main variants with various transitional zones between them. These are:

Cosmomorphic and *Anthropomorphic transsubstance* being energy substances of the World and the Human that determine the existence of the latter. It is regarded here *at a general philosophic level*.

This substance can be further regarded at such levels as: A) *theistic* (religious-and-

philosophic and religious) and B) *non-theistic* (including science-and-philosophic, scientific, and esoteric).

Let's refer to the level that is of a greater interest for us. It is a more ancient theistic level which can have either a broader understanding (*religious and mystical philosophy*) or a less broad understanding (*religion, religious mysticism*).

A. The "*Theosubstance*" concept is quite applicable, to our mind, at the *theistic* concept level, especially in its religious-and-philosophic variant in the course of a comparative research. It can manifest itself here in two different forms:

1. *Cosmomorphic non-personified Theosubstance* is an impersonal *God* in "non-personified" forms of religion. It corresponds to an *impersonal* variant of a human's reflection of the out-of-limit substance in either a transcendent or a transcendental form mentioned above (I, Ia, Ib).

2. *Anthropomorphic personified Theosubstance* is a personal *God* in "non-personified" (poly- or monotheistic) forms of religion (for example, Shiva, Krishna and other gods in Hinduism, the pantheon of Ancient Greek gods, the pantheon of Slavic gods, Jesus Christ as God-man). This corresponds to a *personal* variant of a human's reflection of the out-of-limit substance in a transcendent or transcendental form (II, IIa, IIb).

(It should be emphasized once again that we regard the terms "Theosubstance" and "God" in a broader, general philosophic meaning of the Absolute Universe). Pursuant to the way a human reflected Theosubstance in his religious faith in it there appeared "non-theistic" and "theistic" forms of religion in which either a non-personified or a personified God kept the main place.

For further reasoning the term "*religion*" should be given a more detailed definition. The meaning of this term, in which we regard it, determines our reasoning and its result which can

differ greatly. The emphasis on the meaning of the term “religion” is ambiguous. Several different aspects can be singled out, and namely:

– religion as a process of cognition of something superior like *Knowledge of God*, *Reflection of God* (epistemological aspect);

– religion as a movement to a higher perfection, *God-co-authorship*, creation of oneself on the way to God and the forms of interaction with God (mysticism-and-praxiological aspect, at-divine being as a “near to God”-state;

– religion as practice, life in compliance with religious doctrines and norms – obedience to God (praxiological, theurgy aspect in faith and obedience);

– religion as a specific form of authority and supreme power – *authority of God* (theocratic aspect),

– atheistic *Theomachism* (as a resultant denial of God in the states of extreme egoism, infinite arrogance, utmost rationalism).

Religion can have various forms in cognition of God and reflection of Theosubstance (these forms are regarded as the most important in our research):

1) belief in supernatural forces (emphasis on the supernatural as *non*-natural, mysterious, fabulous);

2) belief in a divine being, gods or God (emphasis on the Divine, usually personified, but *superior*),

3) belief in supreme justice, love, truth, harmony, beauty, etc. in the person of God or Theosubstance (emphasis on *supreme natural* harmony and world power manifesting themselves in *the world* in a certain form, in *a human* in both personified and non-personified forms).

In *the first* case the real world is categorized into natural, real and unnatural, unreal. In *the second* case the whole world is natural, real but existing in supreme (Divine) and lower (full of creatures, created) forms, both in a

perceptible (full of creatures) form and a specific transcendent state, some physical contact with which is possible to some extent only. This real transcendent here is somewhere “behind” or “above” a human. In *the third* case (variant) the real (natural) transcendent in some form and properties is contained in the world “as it is” and a human “as he is”.

Apparently, many AM practices, especially in their higher forms, embrace epistemological and mysticism-and-praxiological aspects, while in Reflection of God they are mostly connected with *the third* variant of Theosubstance understanding. That’s why, proceeding with the description of Theosubstance reflection by a human, we’ll base upon these very positions of a superior reflection of Theosubstance.

Thus, Theosubstance (in its form reflected by a human) appears either cosmomorphically or anthropomorphically. This depends on who becomes similar to whom. Keeping on our reasoning, it is worth while mentioning that *theosophical cosmomorphism* (a human is equally significant to the cosmic, universal Theosubstance, or a superior subjective world becomes similar to a superior objective world) and *theosophical anthropomorphism* (Theosubstance becomes similar to a human, or a superior objective world becomes similar to a superior subjective world) can be distinguished in *theosophy*.

It can be supposed that theosophical cosmomorphism initially based upon the cognition of the objective, universal out-of-limit substance, or the transcendent, while theosophical anthropomorphism initially departed from the cognition of a subjective out-of-limit substance in a human himself, from transcendental. But further on, the objectively reflected entered the subjective (a Human) in cosmomorphism, while the subjectively reflected came into the objective (the World) in anthropomorphism. In other words, *two initial centres of cognition and two main*

ways of dissemination of the knowledge gained are subject to denotation.

Theosophical *cosmomorphism* regards *the centre* to be the objective *World, the way* is pathed from the World to a Human (his subjective world) and into a *Human*. That's why Theosubstance is described here *with the help of the main characteristics of the objective world.*

Theosophical *anthropomorphism* regards *the centre to be a Human* (his subjective world), *the way* is pathed from a Human to the World. That's why Theosubstance is described *with the help of the main characteristics of the subjective world.*

1. Cosmomorphic way: God in the World, from the World to a Human and into a Human. Theosubstance with "supreme universal (objective) properties" and characteristics.

2. Anthropomorphic way: God in a Human, from a Human to the World and into the World. Theosubstance with "supreme human's (subjective) properties" and characteristics.

These are *two ways of theoepistemology and two main methods of themethodology per se*. They are *opposite to each other* (like analysis and synthesis, induction and deduction, etc.). But as we know from epistemology and methodology, opposite substances turn out to be incomparable and destruct each other only in extreme variants of the simplest alternative-and-double-valued logic: "either this ... or the other". However, *there are always cross-transitions between opposite substances* in more complex forms of dialectics, logic of cycles and self-movement, logic of life. The same is true for theoepistemology and themethodology.

Thus, there are various transitions between opposite substances both in non-personified and personified religions. But the following *transition* is mainly reflected in the following forms: *a Human (as he is) – a human with God (the personified Theosubstance) – God*

(Theosubstance) – the World with God (the non-personified Theosubstance).

It's very hard for an ordinary human with naïve cognition to understand and admit the supreme Theosubstance in its abstract non-personified form. That's why it is embodied in a transitional, easy for understanding anthropic form – Gods in Hinduism, Buddha in Buddhism, Brahman in Brahmanism, Dao and wise men in Daoism, etc.

On the other hand, it's well known that God is represented in a personality form in personified religions (for example, Jesus Christ in Christianity). However, even in supreme forms of mystical insight God is also non-personified and there exist several transitions in theosubstance understanding. For example, it's triplicity of Theosubstance in Christianity: Jesus Christ as the Son of God, God-man; God as Holy Spirit; Father God leading to the statement that *God is Light*.

Relying on the works of such theologians, mystics, scientists, philosophers as St. Maxim, St. Gregory Palamas, St. Isaac the Syrian, St. John Cassian the Roman, St. Symeon the New Theologian, Sophronius, Plato, Plotinus, Archbishop Basil (Krivoshein), L.P. Krasavin, V.N. Lossky, and others, S.S. Khoruzhiy in his fundamental "Analytical Dictionary of Hesychast Anthropology" made a significant research of the "mysticism of the light" problem as "deification of an adherent", a process and result of a subjective-and-personality dialogue with God, communion with God (Sinergia). *Problemy asketiki i mistiki v pravoslavii*, 1995; Khoruzhii, 1991). The author writes: "Divine Light doctrine is characteristic to the orthodox thought: as for its composition and type, it's not exactly "the learning", theological doctrine, but "mysticism of light" when mysticism is not a speculative practice but a spiritual one which causes chiefly "practical" texts, evidences of experience and

sometimes, because of outward necessity and for the sake of defense from attacks and perversion it turns to analysis and introspection, working out of theoretical formulae” (Sinergii. Problemy asketiki I mistiki v pravoslavii, 1995: 133).

Relying on St. Gregory Palamas’ quotations, S.S.Khoruzhiy thinks of several main propositions about Divine light (Sinergii. Problemy asketiki I mistiki v pravoslavii, 1995: 134-135):

1. The Light of Jesus Christ’s Transfiguration, the Tabor Light is neither physically perceived nor intellectual (knowledge, gnosis). It is a different type of light. It is special as it is divine and belongs to this world. It is without the starting point, infinite, running through every creature. It’s a special non-visible light which can be contemplated differently and up to the highest stages of vision at which a contemplating being “turns to being the light himself”. It can be differently described, and namely infinite, devoid of shape and form; resembling a cloud; spherical, calm and divine light, etc.

2. Divine light is unique. It is one and the only Divine light, limited by neither time nor space. It appears in all the phenomena of light, mentioned in Holy Writ, and other light phenomena to be seen by Christian righteous men and saints.

3. Divine light isn’t God’s main point but the energy inherent to (existing with) God which is consequently divine. The light possesses all the features of Divine energies. It is common for everyone. God is contemplated not in his supreme nature but in his energy.

4. Divine energy circulating in the world is bliss. Yet bliss, though in its numerous forms, can be revealed in non-light manifestations.

Reasoning further on, it is worth while mentioning that *the terms “theistic” and “non-theistic religions”*, widely used in philosophy of religion and religious studies, seem to be inappropriate. If “theos” to be understood as “God”, then these terms can be interpreted as

“religions of God” and “godless religions”. Thus, firstly, the main point of religion being convictions and belief in supreme Divine substance loses its meaning (because according to the mentioned above semantics religion turns out to be both that of “God” and “godless” = atheistic!?). Consequently, we face the logic violation of the determined and the determiner. Secondly, the initial guideline, *aim* of this terminological antithesis is to show the *form* of the reflection of God by a human and by the definite religion – a personality one or an impersonality one. As a matter of fact, as per *the result* we have come to and the meaning, one of the terms (according to its meaning) denies God (non-theistic religion). So, we face the violation of a logical procedure here.

However, as these categories are often basic in the ideas of philosophy of religion they cause a chain of further violations of logic, nonsense meanings. That’s why, as it is mentioned above, we tend to use *other* terms for the same aims. These are “*personified*” and “*non-personified*” (as per the form of the reflection of God as a universal attribute) *religions*. *Both religions are theistic* as they would lose their main *axiological meaning* without God (in his universal understanding), the meaning being *belief in God*. In this case the suggested terms can be specified as “*theo-personified*” and “*theo-non-personified religions*”.

Consequently, in *theosophical cosmomorphism* a human diverts away from what is inherent in him and becomes similar to Theosubstance as the universal transcendence. *Cosmomorphic theosophy with the non-personified God* and “non-theistic” (that means the absence of the personality God), or, to be more exact, *theo-non-personified religion* (Buddhism, for example) is formed. At that in the process of Reflection of God and God-co-authorship a human *turns away from subjective “human proper” characteristics* in accordance with a primary cosmomorphic

idea, if necessary. His feelings and thoughts are “renouncing” and getting calmer. His nature, spiritual substance, spirit start “leaving his human capsule” for the eternal Divine universe of Theosubstance (in eastern AMRP there is the ‘travel of consciousness’ expression and that is not without reason). *A human leaves himself for God, Theosubstance*. This form of theoepistemology shows that *God is pre-energy, śūnyatā, nirvana-eternity* (and other similar terms) – “emptiness” – but not universal, almighty, giving birth to everything, constantly creating everything (Dalai Lama, Bohm, D., Weber, R., 1989; Grigorieva, 1992; Kastrubin, 1995; Maliavin, 1997; Sinergiia. Problemy asketiki i mistiki v pravoslavii, 1995; Tainy sziznennoi energii, 1997; et al.).

Describing Mahāmudrā’s Tibetan yoga everyday practice in their “The Dawn of Tantra” book, H. Guenther and Ch. Trungpa mention that its main point and aim are transition from habitual perception of the world to primary inner vision and understanding things as they are, without prejudices and subjective-and-psychological layers. As a result of such pre-vision a meditator’s consciousness sort of mingles with all the processes in the world and the initial creation’s energy-emptiness opens to him. At that all substances and events, including phenomena of consciousness, unveil as fluctuations of this initial creation’s energy-emptiness, pre-energy. In H. Guenther and Ch. Trungpa’s point of view, śūnyatā can be interpreted not as “emptiness” but an immutable originative “bosom-field” giving birth to and serving the background of a variety of material and psychic processes. At page 30 of their book the authors state: “Speaking about śūnyatā, we speak about openness of objective reality” (citation from (Ivanov, 1999: 100)).

A.V. Ivanov in his comparative research of the state of consciousness and psychics in the process of a meditational cognition of the world in various AM yoga practices and analysis of

their understanding in the works of contemporary researchers and adherents – D. Brown, D.T. Suzuki, W. Evans-Wents, lama Govinda Anagarik, and others – came to the following conclusions. Firstly, the aim of yoga practice (Mahamudra, one of the most ancient forms of Indian yoga, described as long ago as in the 1st century B.C.) “is in an adherent’s getting the knowledge of a unique energy reality being the base of existence of all the substances and his own consciousness” (Ivanov, 1999: 99). Secondly, “śūnyatā can be interpreted as some rationally indefinable pre-substance of the world – its creative but immutable energy basis. In yoga texts it is unalterably stated that when a human cognizes śūnyatā he feels his inseparable ties with Cosmos” (Ibid., p.100-101). Thirdly, the author shows the relationship between ancient intuitive knowledge with modern physical knowledge of cosmic energies: “It’s not inconceivable that it is the attempts of working out of a single physical theory of the field ... that will give the key to a scientific understanding of this single pre-energy basis of objective reality” (Ibid., p. 101). Fourthly, in an adherent’s AM practice “the stages of concentration-and-plunge in pre-structures of psychics are reverse to those informational processes which are gradually getting more complex in the course of ontogenesis of consciousness” (Ibid., p.102).

Thus, we can say that cognition of Theosubstance in numerous meditative AM practices of the East represents a spiritual substance’s “going out” of its “usual” rational and sensible-and-emotional boundaries. As a result, a specific interaction or even mержence with the energy pre-basis of Cosmos takes place. At that *Theosubstance’s characteristics* reflected in the Knowledge of God are represented in a general *non-personified* form.

At the *general philosophic* level of a unique Transsubstance analysis in modern terms the most adequate concepts are Universal Energy,

Universal Power, Universal Movement, Universal Cycles, Universal Unity, Entirety, Universal Harmony.

In theosophical anthropomorphism, on the contrary, Theosubstance appears like a human with his main features. There appears *anthropomorphic theosophy*, *the personified God* and “theistic” religion, or *theopersonified religion* which is a more precise term. Anthropomorphic assimilation of partially cognizable and reflected God (Theosubstance) to a Human’s feelings and thoughts takes place. That’s why in this Description of God there is a full *spectrum of supreme and perfect human feelings and moral qualities* (Good Will, Kindness, Love, Beauty, Justice, Equality, Fraternity, Fellowship, Collegiality, Truth, etc.). The understanding here is that it is Theosubstance itself, *the Personality God that penetrates into a Human*, or in other words *a Human is given the grace of God*. It burns up in him in a specific inner light. *God is Light!*

Modern synthesis of knowledge and doctrines of Divine light carried out by S.S. Khoruzhiy shows a fundamental position of patristics according to which communication with God, communion with God neither belittles nor destroys humaneness, a human’s personality quality. On the contrary, it enriches them (Sinergiia. Problemy asketiki i mistiki v pravoslavii, 1995: 128). The author singles out three main points.

1. The fathers constantly emphasize that coupling together with God preserves identity of a human’s personality, his self-consciousness. A human doesn’t remain the same but remains himself. At that every human’s personality manifests itself, but does it individually, in his own way.

2. Coupling together with God preserves a human’s integrity, both his many-sided psychophysical nature and corporality: “The body

and soul couple together with God” (Gregory Palamas).

3. Coupling together with God results from the synergy, a concordant cooperation of a human’s freedom and God’s grace. This means that personalities are not involved in some physical and unconscious process of coupling together with God which abolishes freedom and personalities but, on the contrary, spiritualizes and develops them (Ibid., p. 128-129).

The phenomenon of Divine light, discussed with Seraphim of Sarov, a Russian saint of XIX century, is described by N.A. Motovilov (Chelovek. Mysliteli proshlogo i nastoiashchego o ego zhizni, smerti i bessmertii. XX v., 1995: 367-386). When asked to define the grace of God, monastic elder Seraphim said: “The grace of Holy Spirit is light enlightening a human...” (Ibid., p. 379). He also said: “Actually, many eyewitnesses were shown by God how Holy Spirit’s grace affected those humans whom He sanctified and enlightened with His inspirations. Think of Moses after his conversation with God on the Mount Sinai. People couldn’t look at him – the light around his face was unbearably striking. He even had to appear in front of the people only under the mantling” (Ibid., p. 380).

When N.A. Motovilov wanted to make sure in Holy Spirit’s descent with his own “eyes of a human” the monastic elder said: “Why aren’t you, my dear fellow, looking in my eyes? Look straight and without fear – God is with us!” And the pleader saw the mysterious: “After these words I looked in his face and was seized by a most awesome fear. Just imagine a face of a human talking to you which is in the centre of the sun in the brightest light of its midday beams. You see the movement of his lips and changing expression of his eyes, hear his voice, feel somebody holding your shoulders with his hands but see neither these hands nor yourself even nor his figure. What you see is only light which is

dazzling, stretching far (several sazhen around) and illuminating everything (the mantle of snow covering the glade and snowy sleet showering on me and the monastic elder from above) with its bright glitter. Is it possible to imagine my feelings then?

– What are you feeling now? – the father Seraphim asked me.

– Incredibly fine! – I replied”. (Ibid., p. 381).

Thus, the reflection of Theosubstance in cosmomorphic and anthropomorphic theosophy is different and carried out differently but it eventually means *the Entire substance*.

As for anthropomorphic theosophical cognition, it will be subject to a brief but deeper research which shows that various ways of evolution of the Reflection of God, Obedience to God, Power of God, etc. actually take place here. It turns out that this evolution can evolve *in quite opposite directions*. In fact, two lines of reflection are formed. These are *constructive* (a god-like, god-man one) and *destructive* (a theomachist like, “superhuman”, “post-human” one). On the one hand, *the supreme harmony* of feelings and mind, soul and spirit of *anthropomorphic* theosophy gives birth to *the ideal of God-man* and highly spiritual humans’ real aspiration for him (that is reflected in the works by religious philosophers at the turn of XIX-XX centuries, for example) (Filosofskii slovar’ Vladimira Solovieva, 1997; Filosofiy Rossii XIX-XX stoletii. Biografii, idei, trudy, 2003; Florensky, 2001; Khomutsov, 2009; et al.). This line of the reflection of God evolution is constructive.

However, there is a different way which is clearly seen at a more intent dialectic consideration of the ways of cognition in anthropomorphic theosophy (a *destructive* line). As it is shown, cognition of God starts in it from a human and his higher spiritual characteristics and values. And then the whole Theosubstance of the Universe is subject to anthropomorphic interpretation in

common with a human’s higher subjective world. That is to say that the way of Theosubstance understanding is the following one: *a human’s higher subjectivity is a centre* of cognition. The subjective world then leads to the transcendence of the objective world. Very significant *transformations of the cognition of God (right up to the transformation to its opposition)* can happen further on. They are concealed first of all in the main initial level of cognition which is a centre of a human’s subjectivity and then spreads to the whole way of cognition and getting the sought-for knowledge.

The main point of this process is in the following. A human himself, his subjective world logically change in the course of social evolution. The differentiation of society into different social layers, classes, etc. leads to a greater difference in social conditions of the humans’ lives. On the one hand, the most part of the society is constituted by working people to whom the most numerous part of the population belongs. They live rather poor but mainly in compliance with their conscience; they are guided by main virtues, the law of God. On the other hand, there are layers and classes limited in number but represented by the richest and most powerful members of society who really seize all power. Collectivism which is vitally necessary for the people to survive in difficult conditions predominates in working classes. Moreover, they believe in social equity and better life. The basis of their life is predominantly spiritual and moral. They are guided by religious and cultural-and-historical moral norms and forms of moral behavior. All this harmonizes a human’s spiritual world even in difficult circumstances of life, determines religious and social belief in the best, higher ideals, fills life with a positive aim, directed forward and high.

On the contrary, super-rich and super-powerful people concentrate in higher ruling circles. They secure their grip not only on all

social riches but on almost all the power in society. However, as it is known appetite comes with eating. That's why all creature comforts and power do not satisfy them already. So, the super-rich and super-powerful are getting eager for appropriation of the power of God. As a result *a higher form of arrogance, egoism, extreme individualism is growing*. The soul of many "*mighty people of the world*" which is oriented towards material welfare and power only as well as towards satisfaction of the body's demands becomes more and more deformed. It gets disharmonious due to growing hard-heartedness, immorality, dissoluteness, injustice, insidiousness, malice, jealousy, passion for bodily pleasures, lies, hypocrisy against other layers of society, people, etc.

As for anthropomorphic theosophy, deformations of a human's personality cause *logical shifts and deformations of the centre of a subjective cognition of God*. *Egoistic aspirations aimed at getting the power and becoming rich as well as a growing arrogance but not divine virtues become higher subjective values*. An extreme deformed form of anthropomorphic state leads to the assimilation of Theosubstance with subjective characteristics of a soul. The assimilation concerns not a harmonious human but just subjective perverted characteristics of egoistic personalities from ruling social structures.

Super-rich and super-powerful people start calling themselves gods, as they naively suppose that they rise higher than God in their arrogance. Thus, a disharmonious human is growing further and further. He hypertrophies to the extent when God is not needed to him anymore; God is even dangerous and harmful. Firstly, God is the higher Harmony of the Universe and a super-man is the greatest disharmony of a human. Secondly, God and people's belief in real God prevent a super-man from wielding power over people.

As a result real God himself turns out to be a super-person's rival, competitor. A super-person becomes similar to an insatiable old woman from a fairy-tale about a fisherman and a fish. This is the reason why "*a super-person*" *rejects God*. Nietzsche exclaimed: "God has died!" and not without reason. This is a super-person's "dreamboat". Thus, *a disharmonious form of theanthropocentrism turns into theindividualism* (a disharmonious human starts calling himself god) *and then in a-theism and theomachism* of "super-humans" who do not tolerate those who are equal to them among people, on Earth, the whole Universe and those who are higher than they, even God.

A disharmonious human starts denying God and fighting with Theosubstance that is with the forces of Universal Harmony. The fight with the church is fierce and goes in various ways. This is how a human conflict of a degenerative soul logically pushes harmony and disharmony away, cooperation with God turns into theomachism, a believing Human becomes an unbelieving one and then an atheist, atheistic super-human, theomachist who can turn into a post-human, devoid of higher human qualities, in modern life (Frolov, 1999; Kagirov, 2006, Book 2; Nietzsche, 1990).

Thus, it can be concluded that *religion* in its main feature is neither belief in something especially fantastic which is *unreal* (supernatural) nor *belief in God* (as a special real substance) *only*. More exactly, religion is belief in natural but special transcendent, higher *Divine substance* of the universe, in *Theosubstance* which can manifest itself in various forms of its understanding (cosmomorphic – non-personified and anthropomorphic – personified).

One more issue – that of *new, unconventional approaches to the problem of substantiation of God and Theosubstance in philosophic cognition*

of God – should be considered in the conclusion part of the article.

We have undertaken such an attempt (in the focus of unconventional approaches). For this we based upon modern systemic-synthetic modeling of a general picture of the world.

It should be emphasized once again that *the concept of “God”* is understood not in a special-religious (confessional, etc.), but a general, meta-confessional, religious-and-philosophic and axiological meaning. At that “God” is considered a universal “Theosubstance”, “Divine substance” (in its various manifestations, ways of reflection and representation – personified and non-personified, in various forms of its understanding by the subjects of cognition). In a broader, general philosophic meaning it is regarded as Theosubstance. This issue was dwelt upon in the previous part of the article. On account of this it won’t be subject to a special analysis here.

The peculiarity of our philosophic research of this fundamental philosophic-and-theological problem is in distinguishing and a further more detailed analysis of *different approaches to the understanding of God, and namely a substantive approach and a determinantal one*. It’s worth while pointing out that we suggest only one of possible *variants* of a general philosophic solution of the problem which can be either reasonably rejected or supported, or critically supplemented, creatively modified. We do realize that this is an extremely complicated topic in which absolute truth is hardly possible. “God “in Himself” as an Object of cognition can be cognized by Himself only. His Absolute truth as well as the Absolute truth of the Universe is accessible to Him only. It’s clear that any *particular* truth, nevertheless how minor an object of cognition could be, is accessible to us in its *relative* variant only. Such agnosticism, however, mustn’t be understood as indisputable... So, strictly speaking, all our truths are only approximations to truths” (Oldak,

1994: 23). Getting nearer to the Universal Truth can be carried out in various ways. However, “he who makes no mistakes makes nothing”. As for a cognoscitive mind, it puts questions and tries to find possible answers to them by no means.

The research has made it possible to suggest that there, probably, can be *two* approaches to God, divine substance understanding. They are historically and logically determined but *different in their essence*. For convenience they can be designated as I – *substantive* and II – *determinantal (causal)*, the latter manifesting itself in two different variants.

Both approaches have something in common. They admit *the Unity and universality of the Divine reality, God*. Their difference lies in *different forms of the Divine understanding by different people and at different social-and-historic time*. It’s well known that a Human’s and the Humanity’s intrinsic feature is development. *One and the same natural, social and universal laws were differently defined* at different stages of the society’s social-historical development (for example, thunder and lightning were differently construed in pagan, religious-and-mythological and scientific interpretation).

In the course of a human’s and society’s development the cognition of one and the same universal law led to a gradual transition from phenomena to substances, from substances of the first rank to deeper ones. This explains different versions, interpretations and special forms of Macrocosm understanding. Cultural-and-historical, national-and-historical specificity of Macrocosm understanding were naturally formed. As for the disputes about different interpretations of understanding the Divine, they often grew into fierce personality and social conflicts. Similarly, one and the same human can regard the problem through various focuses when the main point of Macrocosm unveils to a greater extent. It is determined by different stages of his

individual development, different age periods, personal experience gained in the course of life.

That's why different approaches to understanding God are natural. At that historical and logical forms of a gradual, deeper penetration into the main point of Macrocosm can be singled out (the main types of arguments for the existence of God are mentioned in the previous part of the article). Apparently, the possibility of a more humane consolidation of people and humanity without conflicts and on the basis of God's Common Universal laws is an outer indicator of a correctly chosen way of understanding the Divine. A broad social-and-historical transformation of a religious understanding took the direction from a vindictive God to a loving God (i.e. uniting in Harmony – in Love, Truth, Kindness and Beauty) not without reason. Thus, they are dynamics and variability of the subjects' cognitive possibilities that make it possible to consider 1) substantive and 2) determinantal approaches to understanding of God.

Firstly, *substantive* understanding has the following logic. It was originally thought that body and soul coexist in a human; the corporal and the spiritual (immaterial) coexist in the Universe. At that an active, creative origin, God related to the soul and later to the Spirit. Thus, the concept of God was first and foremost connected with substantial characteristics of the Universe, its spiritual or, in other words, immaterial, incorporeal, energy substance. In this case God turns out to be only in one part of the Universe. He is connected with a specific form of substance. Search for this substance and finding it mean the phenomenon of God. Numerous different views on whether God is in everybody's soul or in the souls of individuals (subjects), in the other world (in the object), in the sky, in outer space are being formed. Questions arise naturally due to, for example, the fact that cosmonauts were in space but saw God neither in the sky nor in space,

etc. In the whole, this *substantive understanding of God is partial*. It connects his presence with definite forms of immaterial unflashy substance and logically directs towards the search for this divine (pervasive – synergy) substance and their merging. Impossibility to find such a definite substance in a number of cases means disappointment in the search for God and refusal from it. This approach can be designated as God's partial presence.

The second, *determinantal* understanding of God has the following logical line. The focus here is directed not towards substantive, but power, causal (determinantal), original characteristics of God. God gives life, invigorates, has a vivifying (generating, harmonizing) power. God is Universal Force and Universal Cause of *the whole* substance, of everything real – the Universe as a System in all its forms and representations (material and unfleshy in perpetual changes).

Moreover, the second approach also presupposes two variants of determination: II.1 – final (partial) and II.2 – endless (universal both regarding cause and content).

In the first, *partial* variant God acted as a primary cause and a primary impulse that initiated the Universe. Hence, there is the problem of creation by God regarded as the beginning of the Universe. Consequently, all the ideas of the universal are divided into two parts: before the creation and after it. There was nothing before the creation. Spatial and temporal characteristics were zero. Only pure divine Nothing (immaterial Absolute) existed which then created the Universe as a System. The moment of creation meant the appearance of space, time and substance, the appearance of the Universe of creatures. "After the creation" starts from this moment. From these positions, God's being itself includes three different phases. "Before the creation" is the period of rest. "The moment of creation" is the culmination of activity, the

main universal mission. “*After the creation*” is the pause of activity (“God had a rest”). That is why within the period of “after the creation” God can both manifest himself as well as not to. In connection with this the conceptions of religious materialism are formed in science. They include the first divine impulse but then study natural forces which are far from being divine (from these positions) and interactions – mechanical, chemical, etc. In the variant mentioned God’s Activity is different at different stages. In the whole it is inherent in the second stage – Creation. The first stage is Inactivity or Partial Activity (in other forms). The third stage manifests itself as either inactivity (“rest”) or partial Activity. In the whole it can be stated that *a final (partial) variant of determination represents neither universal nor everlasting, but partial Divine Activity.*

This second, universal variant of determination is connected with the idea that Activity is eternally characteristic of endless Universe in the whole. Consequently, God as a general Activity of the Universe is inherently present and acts in both any definite thing (material or unfleshy) and whole areas of the World and the whole Universe. He acts endlessly in space and eternally in time. He manifests himself in infinitely varied definite types of forces and interactions as well as in chief fundamental interactions and forces, revealed by science and other human knowledge areas.

Operation of this Divine Activity, as it is mentioned, is endless in space. It is also eternal in time. No matter how deeply in time the knowledge (history, archeology, paleontology, astronomy, etc.) penetrated, never-ending changes and transformations were revealed everywhere. This means that active forces are Divine Activity. This variant of divine determination is *general*. So far as forces, activities are characteristic of any area, any spot of the World, so far forth God is universal substantively – in material and immaterial World (*God is in everything, endless in space*).

So far as modern knowledge displays everlasting changes, transformations in all the objects and events of the past, present and foreseeable future, so far forth the Force of the World, Interaction acts and causes the World movement. Consequently, *God is always everlasting in time*. God is a Harmonious Force of the World in every concrete thing if it is with relations, system, harmony, development, positive meaning, kindness, love, beauty, creative force, goodwill, etc. He is also in a universal substance (material and unfleshy, material and energy one). He is pervasive – Active and Vivifying – in the whole world.

In the whole it can be stated that the second variant of the second approach is about the following: *understanding of God as General determination of the World-System means not a partial (substantive or determinantal) but universal substantial (substantive-procedural) and determinantal understanding of Divine substance as indestructible, everlasting in time and endless in space.*

But no matter how paradoxical it may seem at the first glance, such understanding of God harmoniously matches the conclusions of modern science about the ideas of the World-System with its determination due to the Universal Interaction as the Universal Interaction per se is a category, synonymic to Divine Activity or God being the result of the humanity’s enlightened knowledge in the sphere of religion, religious philosophy and specific religious-and-mystical and ascetic-and-mystical religious practices existing in these or those forms of great insights since ancient times. In other words, *theology and scientific epistemology (as well as truth understanding in ethics, aesthetics, anthropology, etc.) do not contradict each other at higher stages of the World cognition. They are mutually complementary, integrating and synthesizing sides of the Macrocosm in the World.* This entire knowledge

moves to the same point – the Utmost active energy-and-informational reality and substance of the World.

Proceeding with the analysis in modern scientific-and-philosophic focus, we'll base upon the modern life fact that from the second half of XX century and especially from its end the society entered the period of its development which is called informational society (Abdeev, 1994; Abramov, 1988). The name speaks for itself. It registers the meaningfulness of energy-and-informational constituent part not only for the World understanding in the whole but the society in its present and future states of existence. Whether we like it or not, but we move from predominant corporality (with a certain extent of spirituality) to growing energy of being. Information becomes the world's fourth power. And the future of the humanity greatly depends on how the power is executed. Unfortunately, a human's world has varied manifestation but it manifests itself not only in optimal but in non-optimal states and acts as well. In the course of humans' activity spirituality may develop its similar and antipodal forms (Khomuttsov, 2009). This is reflected in various vectors of social activity of both optimal and non-optimal character.

That's why informational civilization can also develop in different ways – conflict like and optimum like. One way – conflict like – presupposes seizure of information and power, extreme concentration of wealth in a global “nucleus” of the humanity (at the cost of super-developed direct centripetal processes) with subsequent collapse of interaction and uncontrollable social outburst similar to a general type of chain nuclear reactions of a disastrous scale (according to the synergetic theory of catastrophes).

On the contrary, the other, optimum like, way should be controllable, with the balance of direct and indirect relations, preservation

of informational and substantial-and-material (natural and social) wealth of the regions, on the basis of a balanced management in a poly-cultural world. This way of informational civilization development takes into account the specific character and demands of the regions, paramount rank of energy-and-informational component part in managing the regions, substantiality of the aim to preserve the regions' natural potential as a natural and necessary basis of the people's life, formation of a high educational level of the population capable to implement the greatest large-scale tasks of the civil progress. This type of social development is designated as ecological-and-informational society which should be provided with necessary technological attributes.

Such a safe and stable development of ecological-and-informational society considers the importance of ideal substances coordination in the life of the humanity. It presents itself as synchronization of processes of structuring and functioning of natural, social (ecological-and-informational environment) and spiritual, intellectual (informational-and-virtual environment) subsystems of ecological-and-informational system. All this in aggregate ensures an optimal mode of ecological-and-informational society development by means of self-organization and adaptive management mechanisms, i.e. the mechanisms described by synergy and homeostatics accordingly.

The analysis of ecological-and-informational civilization (Abramov, 1988; Abramov, Kuibar', 2010), spiritual-and-ecological civilization (Kastrubin, 1995) in this focus leads to the necessity of a deeper consideration of not only applied social-and-natural problems, but of deep theoretical, philosophic fundamental problems. In a conceptual focus the issue of understanding the main point and specific character of “informational-and-virtual reality” existence that nowadays has presented itself to the humanity as

both a specific form of social reality and a universal form of objective reality's existence (Abramov, Kuibar', 2010; 2011). The research of this reality in its universal manifestation makes us refer to eternal ontological problems of philosophy – to the World's fundamental principles.

At the end of XX century those doctrines that couldn't develop within the frame of a stiff dialectic materialism doctrine about the basic nature of the matter (the material) and the secondary nature of mind (the ideal) started to be revived in Russian philosophy. But the practice of a deepening scientific-and philosophic cognition of the world and integration of knowledge from different spheres of the humanity's culture necessarily lead us to new, more integral and optimal setting of the main problems of objective reality (existence) and their solutions.

Surely, if the matter (objective reality) were understood as an atomic-and-molecular material world only (that corresponds to the level of the scientific knowledge of the New time), all energy-and-informational reality would turn out to be "overboard" the materialistic philosophic consideration. But if the objective reality were considered from the positions of contemporary knowledge, it would be in principle impossible not to include objectively existing and cognizable energy-and-informational world of Cosmos, the planet and people in it. At that the concept of the substance as an objective reality broadens and includes two worlds – atomic-and-molecular (material) and energy-and-informational (energy one). Thus, a conflict like approach to materialistic and idealistic views is withdrawn; the World presents itself as a harmonious integrity of its equally significant and equally valuable parts. Similar approaches have been developed in a set of works by Russian philosophers since the end of XX century. Different authors single out such an integrated reality of the world, and correspondent schools call it differently – spiritual materialism,

dialectical materialism, synthetic dualism, etc. The main point here is that in contrast to partial-and-conflict-like approaches to the explanation of the world's fundamentals on the basis of the knowledge of XVII-XVIII centuries these approaches are *invariant* and, to our mind, the most prospective regarding the study of the world's fundamentals.

Regarded from the ontological focus, informational-and-virtual reality in the meaning mentioned reflects the same utmost reality which ancient mystics, wise men, visionaries interacted with but at the same time it makes it possible to consider this subtle world from modern scientific-and-philosophic view. According to epistemological aspect this category enables to attract the newest arsenal of scientific, philosophic and culturological cognition for understanding the world's energy substances. This also makes it possible to put the question about the possible change of a categorial structure of the main philosophic issue conception and introduce a new epistemological doctrine – a dialectical realism as an instrument of rational understanding of any reality – into the methodology of cognition.

As a result it is worth while emphasizing that our conclusion about the possibility of a noncontradictory interaction between religion and science in the issues of understanding and interpretation of utmost energy bases of the Universe wasn't at all unambiguous in the history of different cultures of humanity. It is not solved even at present. But it is the peculiarity of humans' points of view on the interaction of science and religion in modern world, understanding and a more complete description of substantial foundations of the world that determine the practice of interpersonal, cross-cultural and intergovernmental relations. This explains not only philosophic and religious but also evident social practical value of the issue dwelt upon in this article.

References

1. Abdeev, R.F. *Filosofia informatsionnoi tsivilizatsii* [Philosophy of Information Civilization]. Moscow, 1994. 336 p.
2. Abramov, Iu. F. *Kartina mira i informatsia* [The Picture of the World and Information]. Irkutsk, 1988. 192 p.
3. Abramov, Iu. F., Kuibar', V. I. (2010). The Category of "Information-Virtual Reality" as a Factor of Scientific and Philosophical Knowledge Development (Theoretical and Methodological Aspects). *Vestnik Buriatskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*, (6).
4. Abramov, Iu. F., Kuybar', V. I. (2011). Cognition of Information Reality and the Conception of Dialectical Realism (Theoretico-Methodological Aspect). *Vestnik irkutckogo gosudarctvennogo universiteta*, 5(52).
5. Andreev, D. *Roza mira* [The Rose of the World]. Moscow, 2005. 606 p.
6. *Chelovek. Mysliteli proshlogo i nastoiashchego o ego zhizni, smerti i bessmertii. XX v.* [The Man. The Thinkers of the Past and Present on His Life, Death and Immortality. XIX century]. Moscow, 1995. 528 p.
7. Dalai Lama, Bohm, D., Weber, R. (1989). Delicate Matter and Dense Matter: the Dialogue of His Holiness Dalai Lama, Physicist D. Bohm and R. Weber. *Nauka i religii* (10).
8. *Filosofskii slovar' Vladimira Solov'eva* [Vladimir Solovyov's Philosophical Dictionary]. Moscow, 1997. 462 p.
9. *Filosofy Rossii XIX-XX stoletii. Biografii, idei, trudy* [Russian Philosophers of XIX-XX Centuries. Biographies, Ideas, Works]. Moscow, 2003. 1152 p.
10. Florenskii, P.A. *Pravoslavie* [Orthodoxy]. *Florenskii, P.A. Khristianstvo i kul'tura* [Christianity and Culture]. Moscow, 2001. 384 p.
11. Frolov, A.S. (1999). The Light of Pushkin in the Darkness of Postmodernism. *Polzunovskii al'manakh*, (2).
12. Grigor'eva, T. P. *Dao i logos (Vstrecha kul'tur)* [Dao and Logos (Meeting of Cultures)]. Moscow, 1992. 424 p.
13. Ivanov, A.V. *Mir soznaniia* [The World of Consciousness]. Barnaul, 1999. 240 p.
14. Kagiurov, B.N., Koliuzhov, Iu.I., Ushakov, P.V., Ushakova, E.V., et al. *Znanievedenie i upravlenie* [The Study of Knowledge and Management]. In 3 books. Barnaul, 2006. 203 p.; 160 p.; 194 p.
15. Kastrubin, E.M. *Transovye sostoiania i pole smysla* [Trance States and the "Field of Raison d'Être"]. Moscow, 1995. 288 p.
16. Khomuttsov, S.V. *Dukhovnost' i dukhovnye traditsii* [Spirituality and Spiritual Traditions]. Barnaul, 2004. 179 p.
17. Khomuttsov, S.V. *Dukhovnost' i ee podobiiia i antipody v kul'ture* [Spirituality and Its Similarities and Antipodes in Culture. Thesis ... PhD]. Barnaul, 2009. 278 p.
18. Khoruzhii, S. S. *Diptikh bezmolviia* [Diptych of Silence]. Moscow, 1991. 136 p.
19. Maliavin, V.V. *Molniiia v serdtse. Dukhovnoe probuzhdenie v kitaickoi trditsii* [Lightning in the Heart. Spiritual Awakening in the Chinese Tradition]. Moscow, 1997. 367 p.
20. Mitrokhin, L. N. *Filosofia religii* [The Philosophy of Religion]. Moscow, 1993. 415 p.
21. Nietzsche, F. *Sochineniia v dvukh tomakh* [The Works in Two Books]. Book 2. Moscow, 1990. 829 p.

22. Oldak, P. G. *Teognoseologiya: miropostizhenie v ramkakh edineniya nauki i very* [Theopistemology: Cognition of the World in the Frame of Science and Faith]. Novosibirsk, 1994. 182 p.
23. *Sinergiya. Problemy asketiki i mistiki v pravoslavii* [Synergy. The Problems of Asceticism and Mysticism in Orthodoxy]. Moscow, 1995. 366 p.
24. *Tainy zhiznennoi energii* [The Secrets of Vital Energy]. Minsk, 1997. 608 p.
25. Ushakov, P. V. *Chelovek v sovremennom znanii i misticheskikh praktikakh* [The Man in Modern Knowledge and Mystical Practices]. In 2 Books. Barnaul, 2008, 2009. 148 p.; 240 p.

Предельная реальность в философии, мистицизме и информологии: знаниеведческий подход

Ю.Ф. Абрамов^а,

П.В. Ушаков^б, С.В. Хомутцов^в

^а *Иркутский государственный университет,
Россия 664003, Иркутск, ул. Карла Маркса, 1*

^б *Алтайская академия экономики и права,
Россия 656038, Барнаул, пр. Комсомольский, 86*

^в *Алтайская государственная педагогическая академия,
Россия 656031, Барнаул, ул. Молодежная, 55*

Статья посвящена исследованию весьма сложной и мало изученной проблемы – существования и сущности энергийной субстанции бытия (в современных терминах – энергоинформационной субстанции, информационно-виртуальной реальности и т.п.), которая с древнейших времен признавалась как главная реальность мира, сотериологическая цель существования адептов многих религиозно-мистических учений и часто обозначавшаяся ими как Предельная реальность: бытия и цели жизни человека. В настоящее время появляется возможность на новой культурфилософской, религиоведческой и научно-философской основе исследовать этот удивительной мировой феномен.

Ключевые слова: религия, мистика, философия, наука, Предельная реальность, Бог, теосубстанция, трансубстанция, энергоинформационная реальность, информационно-виртуальная реальность.
