

**THE INTERACTION OF CULTURE AND RELIGION  
IN THE CONTEXT OF THE PRESENT:  
THE PHILOSOPHICAL-CULTURAL CONTENT**

**Bodak V. A.**

**INTRODUCTION**

The study of the interconnection of culture and religion has a special importance today when humanity is experiencing a deep spiritual crisis and, consequently, moral, ideological and ecological crisis. The relevance of philosophical and cultural understanding of the interrelationship of culture and religion is also linked to the process of post-secularization, which has become a feature of modern spiritual life globally determined not only by the religious sphere but manifested itself in different planes of culture: transfer of cultural values, the dynamics of their modernization in political dimensions. Post-secularism has become a universal concept for describing the state of culture in the early twentieth century. On this evidence, the interaction of culture and religion needs an in-depth and comprehensive analysis, capable of revealing their new touch points, the possibilities and limits of their constructive influence on traditions, innovations, world views and lifestyles of man and society.

These and other circumstances have prompted us to pay attention to the philosophical and cultural understanding of the interconnection of culture and religion, which, moving beyond any theory has become an integral part of modernity. In our view, this approach necessitates the synthesis of all existing humanitarian approaches, as well as the systematic analysis of religion as a component of the universe of culture in the diversity of internal connections that exist in culture.

**1. Theoretical basis for understanding the problem**

Throughout the history of public thought a number of different socio-philosophical approaches have been developed in attempt to understand the relationship between religion and culture. According to the historical-genetic approach, religion is a factor that changes the forms of human existence, leads society either to prosperity or to the

extinction of culture. A. Toynbee argued in his “A Study of History”<sup>1</sup> for the salvation of Western civilization by strengthening the role of religious and ecclesiastical principles. In D. Bell’s concept, the meaning of religion is to reconcile the capitalist system with culture, with all hopes in the reviving religious feelings. And M. Weber sought to reveal the social functions of religion, its place in culture and social life, modern forms of religiosity.

T. Parsons believes that religion should be regarded as one of the sides of a system of human action that undergoes transformation along with the development of culture and personality, or as a system of functions aimed at culture. The latter is a consequence of the fact that religion, along with language, semiotic sign systems, etc., is a representative of culture. However, there is no doubt that the connection between religion and culture (as well as with the last of its other representatives) in the process of historical development appears as a complex system of interdependence<sup>2</sup>. Constant search for new content as a form of self-expression will form a kind of system of “dependencies” – religion adapts to the changes of culture causing new changes in it. Interrupting this process leads to a radical restructuring of the culture system or to its death. By developing this approach and considering religion as a representative of culture, it is possible to determine the level of cultural development through the semiotic cross-section of religion.

In the context of the outlined problem there are some interesting works of domestic and foreign philosophers in the field of culture and religion. The works of E. Bistritsky, S. Krymsky, B. Parakhonsky, V. Meizersky, P.A. Sorokin, O.F. Losev, Yu. M. Lotman, G.S. Batishchev, V.S. Bibler, S.A. Orlova, V. M. Mezhueva et al. are of great value.

Among the Ukrainian philosophers who have been studying the problem of the interaction of religion and culture, one should mention E. Duluman, V. Zotsa, M. Kiryushko, A. Kolodny, B. Lomovyk, O. Onyshchenko and others who tried to reveal the historical role of

---

<sup>1</sup> Тойнбі А. Дослідження історії. В 2 т. Том 1 / Пер з англ. В. Шовкуна. – К.: Основи, 1995. – 614 с.

<sup>2</sup> Американская социология. Перспективы, проблемы, методы / Под ред. Т. Парсонса. – М.: Прогресс. 1972. – С. 234.

religion in the history of culture, show the correlation of religion with spiritual culture as well as the objective conditioning of the influence of religion on the development of culture.

The following Y. Kimelev's anthropological conclusions are of interest: the philological and religious conceptualization leads to the understanding of the human being as a definite ontological holistic essence intended to indicate the conditions of the possibility of his religious life [133; 314], because man is essentially a "religious being" [133; 316]. Such a holistic philosophical-religious "being-essential" image of a person is intended to integrate different levels of personal consciousness (religious, scientific), to comprehend their unity as forms of social consciousness. A common problem with the philosophy of religion and theology is the "obvious fact of their pluralism"<sup>3</sup>.

V. Bibler<sup>4</sup> distinguishes "genesis of sense" as a feature of culture, which makes it a sphere of self-determination of a personality, because culture is the only meaningful beginning of human existence itself. Hence, it appears that the problem of the senses of culture is relevant not only to science, but also to individual consciousness. As far as religion is concerned, we can say that in certain epochs it was the only sense-making factor. And, despite the apparent weakened role of religion in the modern world, it has not lost its sense-making function in culture today.

The issue of the interaction of religion and culture was raised by Protestant theologians (P.J.Tillich, brothers Reinhold Niebuhr and Richard Niebuhr, etc.), Catholic (J.Maritain, É.Gilson, P.Poupard, etc.), Orthodox (P.Florensky, V.Rozanov, A.Men, V.Zenkovsky and others). In Orthodoxy, there are at least two directions in terms of understanding the possibilities of the interaction of religion and culture: ascetic approach that needs to isolate it from the influence of secular culture and liberal one. P. Florensky's antinomy should be attributed to the most valuable sources of Orthodox cultural studies. He does not only derive the name, but also the essence of culture from the liturgy, from the church cult. He wrote: "Most cultures, according to their etymology ...,

---

<sup>3</sup> Кимелев Ю. А. *Философия религии: Систематический очерк*. М.: Издательский Дом "Nota Bene", 1998. – С. 323.

<sup>4</sup> Библиер В. . *Мышление как творчество / Введение в логику мыслительного диалога*. – М.: Политиздат, 1975. – С. 197.

were precisely the sprouting of the grain of religion, a mustard tree grown from the seeds of faith”<sup>5</sup>. P. Florensky also proceeds from the fact that “art is, in essence, liturgical, just as liturgical thought is painted aesthetically”<sup>6</sup>. He attributes the talent and achievements of prominent representatives of the national culture exclusively to their religiosity. These principles of Christian cultural studies have been developed by the modern Orthodox theology. N. Berdyayev’s idea that the essence of culture is the struggle of eternity with time remains relevant. Culture struggles with death, although it is not able to defeat it realistically. Only religion conquers death in the mind of the believer<sup>7</sup>.

## **2. Culture and religion: limits and possibilities of their interconnection**

The interconnections and structures of religion and culture do not coincide in absolute terms, but they are certainly correlated. Modern researchers are recording the trend of increasing influence of religion on all spheres of social life. It is in spirituality that the most effective tools for explaining social processes are sought and found. And religion, of course, belongs to this sphere of culture. It is possible to agree with. Religion, being an integral part of culture, performs a cultural and translational function. It promotes the development of certain of its components – writing, printing, art, provides protection and development of values of religious culture, transmits accumulated heritage from generation to generation. We mean culture as a means of human spiritual and moral growth. If the forms of culture and art do not promote spiritual growth, but on the contrary, promote the passion, instincts, decay of the human personality – this is pseudo-art, anti-culture. A true culture should lift a person, inspire him. It is in the rebellion of man against the world and the harmony of being that anti-culture is born.

A thorough and logically harmonious morphological model of culture was proposed by E. Orlova. It reveals the correlation of universal

---

<sup>5</sup> Флоренский П.А. Христианство и культура // Журнал Московской патриархии, 1983. – № 4. – С. 53.

<sup>6</sup> Флоренский П.А. Христианство и культура // Журнал Московской патриархии, 1983. – № 4. – С. 18.

<sup>7</sup> Бердяев Н. Философия творчества, культуры и искусства. – Искусство, 1994. – С. 17.

and specific characteristics in the structure of a particular culture. There are two areas in the structure of culture: everyday and specialized culture. In the specialized activity one can single out three functional blocks: cultural aspects of social organization (economic, political, legal culture); socially significant knowledge (religious, artistic, philosophical, scientific culture); channels of broadcasting of socially significant experience (education, education, mass culture).

When it comes to the structure of religion, we mean that the stable elements of the religious system (norms, models, institutions, groups, cults, etc.) are in a certain relation and interaction, ensuring the stability of the religious system, its reproduction, the possibility of transferring the religious tradition as well as the cultural experience as a whole.

Based on the methodology of structural and functional analysis (T. Parsons), in religion as a system, there are four main functional blocks: adaptive, purposeful, integration, and functions of reproduction of culture and removal of latent stresses. Any religion has these functions, therefore they can be considered universal, but in a certain hierarchy they are constructed differently, depending on the unique features of a culture. The question of the functions of culture implies consideration of those roles that culture plays in relation to society. In functional terms, culture is seen as a dynamic, interdependent system in which the change of one element causes the change of the other.

The specificity of philosophical and cultural analysis is the orientation of its content to ensure not only the accumulation of rational knowledge of religion, but also the attainment of values of national importance, religious culture, the formation and development of social experience, worldview, cultural and social identity. Even the most general view of the history of cultures suggests that religion is involved in the creation of the most important ideals of people and contributes to the creation of a social system with favorable or unfavorable conditions for the progress of society.

A conscious orientation to the principle of historicism allows us to provide a particularly important aspect of the scientific setting – the transition from the phenomenal level to the essential level. It becomes necessary to become aware of the relationship of religion with other cultural phenomena as a unity, for which it will be necessary to delve into the essence of these relationships. It is necessary to uncover the internal logic in the genesis and in the subsequent relationship of

religion with other cultural phenomena. It is necessary to refer to a number of related disciplines – such as ethnology, ethnography, general history, art history, economics of early class society, etc.

If the concepts of “culture” and “religion” are logically linked by relations of part and whole, religion is part of culture, then, axiologically – in the sphere of relations of value and evaluation – they are equal: not only religion can be evaluated from the standpoint of culture, but also culture can be evaluated from the standpoint of religion. P. Sorokin defined culture as “... unity, or individuality, all components of which are imbued with one basic principle and express one and most important value. That value is the basis and foundation of any culture. For this reason, the most important components of such integrated culture are most often interdependent: if one of them changes, the other inevitably undergoes a similar transformation”<sup>8</sup>.

If, in turn, to raise the question: what is it that determines the culture itself, then in cultural studies the thesis that culture defines itself, in the process of internal interaction of its elements, properties, patterns, norms, etc., is accepted. This interaction takes place simultaneously “horizontally” (in space) and “vertically” (in time). This does not mean that cultural studies ignore the so-called world of the order of nature – topographic, climatic, other natural factors of the landscape, for example, according to L. Gumilev, – in the processes of origin and formation of culture (the world of artificial order), as well as biological and psychological factors.

The peculiarities of man as a species, the specificity of his physical arrangement, biological processes of interaction with the environment – everything matters for culture genesis.

For a long time, philosophers and culturologists have had an issue with the question, in modern times most clearly formulated by K. Jaspers: “One of the main and mysterious puzzles of the cultural history of mankind is the sudden appearance of mankind at different ends of the globe, independent of each other civilizations, but at the same time powerful and broad teachings on the nature and content of being. Whence such simultaneity? Can it be a coincidence that at this

---

<sup>8</sup> Сорокин П. Человек, цивилизация, общество. – М.: Политиздат, 1992. – С. 429.

time in all directions there was a transition to universality?<sup>9</sup>. It is not historical science in itself but cultural studies, namely philosophy of culture that can answer this question.

In the history of mankind, we observe how local unique cultures were formed. Initially, all communities were ethnic, by virtue of which it is possible to speak about the special role of ethnicity in culture. Perhaps it is appropriate to mention ethnopsychology and geopsychology. However, one way or another, with the same processes of life support, under the same economic conditions, at the same stage of economic development, industrial relations different peoples had different religious views. They were different in shape, detail, but in essence very similar. Changes in culture change religious beliefs as well. And then the question arises: is the logic of a particular existence of religious views subject to the logic of culture? Everything which is the most valuable, which has a practical sense for survival, was selected by a specific social (ethnic) community, passed down from generation to generation. Thus, in particular, there was a cultural existence of religion. In his monograph "Art and Religion", D. Uhrynovych put forward an interesting hypothesis regarding the specific origin of these phenomena: the simultaneous formation of the rudiments of art and religion did not at all mean that those phenomena of the primitive culture arose on the basis of the same social need<sup>10</sup>.

The initial stage of morphogenesis (origin and formation of religion) ends with the emergence of basic universal characteristics inherent in this type of culture expressed in the form of established customs or codified sets of norms, rules and laws. In the next stages of cultural dynamics, evolutionary changes (transformation, modernization of already existing religious forms and systems) and innovative ones occur, when new systems emerge from existing religious elements (just so numerous denominations appear within one religion). Religious systems are formed, of course, under the influence of natural factors, in close connection with them, but still they are not defined.

Scientific approaches require an objective, detached from the human personality dimension of religion. But culture and man is a single

---

<sup>9</sup> Ясперс К. Смысл и назначение истории. – М.: Политиздат, 1991. – С. 38.

<sup>10</sup> Угринович Д.М. Искусство и религия: Теоретический очерк. – М.: Политиздат 1982. – С. 97.

unit: culture lives in people, in their activity, in their feelings, whereas people, in turn, live in culture. In culture and through culture, one is able to realize what is inherent in it.

Culture can be structured on different grounds. So, if the criterion takes the structure of public life, then we are talking about political, economic, legal, religious, scientific, technical, artistic culture. One can sometimes find in this list the moral culture and the culture of interethnic relations. We believe that moral culture imbues all elements of social life in its value, axiological section, and interethnic relations are, in fact, relations, and therefore should be considered in a different context.

In everyday culture, analogues of specialized activity stand out. Like, the organizational unit is responsible for the household, interpersonal relations, moral (morality); cognitive block – superstitions, everyday aesthetics, “folk wisdom”, practical knowledge; transmission – transferring cultural experiences through play, rumors, conversations, tips, etc.

A man learns everyday culture in the environment of his daily communication – family, friends, neighbors, etc., through patterns of activity, behavior, evaluation, customs and good manners as well as through mass communication. At the same time, each adult is involved in professional activity and in daily life, which is the carrier of a particular culture, and it is possible to trace the relationship between these spheres at the level of the individual, to identify the factors that influence the change of certain knowledge, skills and norms.

In some cases, a person may experience tension associated with inconsistency, imbalance of different spheres of life. It is worth noting that in society as a whole there are such tensions and even conflicts, and then we note the situation of cultural conflict in the system of intercultural communication. Tensions and conflicts can arise both “horizontally”, for example, between legal culture and the morality of everyday life, and “vertically”, for example, between economic and legal culture. One of the functions of religion is to eliminate this inconsistency, to harmonize all levels of human existence. Therefore, psychoanalytic and cultural-anthropological approaches inherent in Freudianism, in various fields of neo-Freudianism and social anthropology, view religion as a cultural form of overcoming contradictions in the human subconscious or as a social tool to meet people’s natural and cultural needs.



Regarding the causes of religion, in his work “The Future of an Illusion” Z. Freud states that the extrusion of suppressed impulses both within the individual personality and within the whole genus occurs in the form of religion, mythology, creativity. In external reality, a person projects his inner world finding for it external images. Thus, religion is considered by Z. Freud to be a form of collective neurosis built on the displacement of unwanted emotions. To prove this, Freud turns to the analysis of primitive religions.

From the natural ambivalence of the mental processes of man and society in his other work, “Totem and Taboo”, Z. Freud deduces the existence of taboo, a form of belief that preceded, in his view, any religion. Freud believes that there is a higher degree of ambivalence in the spiritual movements of primitive peoples than in modern cultural man. As the ambivalence decreases, the taboo disappears as well. However, it seems that ambivalence does not disappear as a man develops, but manifests itself on another level<sup>11</sup>.

S. Freud’s attempt to equate religion with the neuroses of obsessive states can be considered adequate at best with respect to only one aspect of religion – the performance of rituals. He left out the importance of the independent visionary experience of alternative realities, crucial to the development of all major religions.

Mechanisms for the distribution of cultural products play an increasingly important role in the system of intercultural communication. Today, we live in an era of technical civilization, in which the means, methods, channels and technologies of transmitting cultural information, which affect the volume and speed of this transmission, have fundamentally changed. The globalization of information processes has taken place practically removing the issue of state, political and other borders. In the new information space, only things which have a mass demand survive and such property, as J. Ortega y Gasset noted, possess standardized, unified mass culture products, of which the human-mass is the consumer (J. Ortega y Gasset), which feels like everyone else not being burdened but satisfied with this indivisibility; to live for it is to swim downstream without trying to outgrow itself. In the writings of modern scholars one can find various

---

<sup>11</sup> Фрейд З. Тотем и табу // Фрейд З. Я и Оно.– В 2-т. – Т. 1. Тбилиси, Мерани, 1991. – С. 71–138.

indications of the time of the emergence of mass culture: some believe that it existed even in ancient civilizations. In our opinion, however, mass culture is a product of modern civilization with its characteristic features of urbanization and general formation.

In further research it is necessary to pay attention to the fact that the world is a unity. There is no such thing as exclusively material and exclusively spiritual culture. For the sake of theoretical convenience, the culture is divided into material and spiritual, and it should be remembered that we obtain too strong abstractions that do not let us understand, for example, the integrity of any ideal as the identity of subject and object, material and spiritual, sensual and supersensible.

There exist three main models of the role of religion in culture. According to the first, religion is the genotype of culture; it determines the cultural phenotype, the whole spiritual and material diversity of national and transnational existence. Therefore, each individual culture is referred to by religion that gave birth and nourished it (Christian, Buddhist, Muslim and other cultures).

Diametrically opposite is the “secular model” according to which culture grows from the patterns of economic life of the people. In this case, the cultures are named either based on the characteristics of production, trade and consumption (harvesting, agriculture, nomadic or sedentary culture), or by their location, geography. A variation of this model is Marxist economic determinism that derives culture from an economic basis with religion being given an auxiliary, superstitious role.

Until recently, Marxism-Leninism generally treated religion as harmful prejudice, a vestige of an exploitative society that disappears as socialism intensifies. Meanwhile, as it actually turned out, the “socialist culture” was most closely linked to the Bolshevik religion and disintegrated as soon as that religion lost its consolidating power. The collapse of Soviet culture, as a consequence of the historic defeat of Bolshevism, showed with particular clarity that religion was not a separate but systemic factor of every culture.

The third model of culture is an attempt to synthesize the first and second models: the genotype of culture is the unity of religious spirituality and economic archetypes. The methodology of this model is based on the metaphysics of Aristotle (reality – the unity of matter and divine form), biblical ontology (the cosmos is formed by God from primordial chaos) and Hegel’s dialectic (quality has both ideal and

material sides). The more strongly the adopted by people religion influences economic life, the more necessary is their coexistence. Thus, through active interchange and feedback, religion and the economy become two sides of a single substance of culture.

This can only be deduced from the understanding that they are not static but dynamic in nature. Religion as part of culture is a complex system of functions and matrices (way of thinking, logic, axiomatics, axiology, etc.) that change in the course of historical development. In different periods of history, religion performed different functions in relation to culture, made different parts of it, and represented it in different ways. According to M. Pismanik, “the religious beginning is the most stable nucleus of national culture in the tragic periods of the history of ethnicity ... But at the same time, it is wrong to reduce the national in culture only to religious, and, for instance, to equate the spiritual revival of the nation with universal churching”<sup>12</sup>.

It is worth noting that in Europe, the center of social activity in the twentieth century shifted from the sphere of socio-political existence to the sphere of cultural and ecological, which required from humanity a new understanding of the values of culture. This process takes many forms, including those far removed from ideas of progress (for example, fascism in Germany). The information boom caused by the scientific and technological revolution actually created the field of global cultural integration on the basis of a dialogue of cultures.

In the social sphere, the tendency for social stratification on such socio-cultural bases as a way of life and lifestyle, social identity, position, status is becoming more prominent. One of the sources of socio-cultural and personal problems is the intensive migration processes that destroy the cultural integrity of settlements, which “exclude” large social groups from the process of cultural self-development, activating the lumpenization of workers and defarming of rural residents.

Topical issues that characterize people’s socio-cultural environment but have not yet been solved in an effective way are: massive non-assimilation with existing innovations in the culture; discrepancies between the requests of different members of society and

---

<sup>12</sup> Писманик М.Г. Индивидуальная религиозность и ее определение. – М.: Мысль, 1984. – С. 171.

the possibilities of their satisfaction; lack of technological means of generalization and integration of new socio-cultural experience.

The gap between the innovative potential of culture and the mass capacity of its development and use in everyday sociocultural practice is widening. The dynamism of social and cultural life has caused a significant complication of the structure and content of relations between people, with the natural and artificial environment, which is expressed as objective indicators (in the quantitative increase of qualitatively diverse subjects, scientific ideas, artistic images, patterns of behavior and interaction), as well as in the subjective plane, at the level of mental and social tension that accompanies this complication.

It should be noted that in recent times, philosophical-cultural thought has increasingly turned to the problem of the interconnection of religion and culture in its attempt to overcome the spiritual crisis. The church does the same. The social changes of the modern world, the change of direction under the influence of postmodernist changes in culture, “cast doubt on traditional values”, including religious ones, as reflected in the Second Vatican Council. As a result, more and more people are actually distancing themselves from religion, “a new type of humanism is being affirmed”. Criticizing the “new humanism”, the church is primarily concerned with the Marxist concept of humanism and culture. In this sense, the church is attempting to preserve not only the religious cultural tradition but also spirituality as such.

Culture shapes man not only as a skillful and intelligent being, but also as a carrier of religious, ethnic and transnational content. The “solid core” of culture (using the terminology of the English philosopher I. Lakatos) gives the person a transcendent sense of life, while leaving some room for the choice of alternative ideals. The everyday, transient goals and aspirations of a person form the surface layer of culture, the sacred moment of which is almost invisible, and therefore their connection with transcendental constants is not always realized. Some people live on higher ideals of their culture and abjure prosaic values; others, on the contrary, focus on pragmatic models and are deaf to the marginal content of culture as a whole, while others seek the harmony of the sacred and the secular. One way or another, culture provides the individual with a full range of possible worldviews, and within this framework makes it free.

The role of the “solid core” of religious culture is played by the main sacred text (the source of a particular religion) with interpretations and traditions. The “protective belt” of culture is created by secular ideas, adapted to interpretations of accepted religious principles and materialized in everyday, industrial, socially transformative and scientific and technical practice. These ideas are formed in the spheres of morality, politics, law, myth, philosophy, science, economic consciousness and other areas of value to the world.

Religion assumes a certain system of values and moral prescriptions that make up the modal structures of culture. It is in the value aspect that the connection between culture and religion is expressed: the latter as a representative of culture primarily performs the function of conveying a meaning (society writes about the achievement of culture in the language of religion). In this way, in its relation to culture, religion can and most often has fulfilled the function of forming normative boundaries that allow for the existence, reproduction and development of culture and, therefore, of society.

Culture, proceeding in a sacred dimension (revealed in its world, based on its axioms), appeals to real religious experience, although the reality of our time is that it is difficult to imagine now that some spiritual sphere will independently take on an integrating cultural role. Religion, religious culture, as a rule, does not claim to be “Caesar’s”, however, despite the fact that its influence on all aspects of culture is not so noticeable at present, it has completely retained its functions and it is up to the culture to choose to what extent.

The problem of the senses of religion as an integral component of culture is brought about by the very concept of philosophy of culture. The cultural world, emerging on the material of the natural world, acquires a new quality that the natural world does not know – sense. The problem of sense or more precisely, the senses of culture is one of the key in contemporary cultural knowledge. This is due to the fact that any material in the world of culture does not reflect itself so much as another; meaningful space of culture exists and is described in the framework of a binary code, which is based on the anthropologically given opposition “I – other”.

The senses are revealed in the cognitive process of the three interdependent processes: generation (production), functioning and interpretation. The whole culture can be seen as a space in which the

processes of creating the sense are made with religion playing a leading role in it. Any artifact (i.e., an artificially created object: a material property, a pattern of behavior, an artistic image, etc.) has the parameters of values that are expressed in particular semiotic codes of culture. That is, the primordial experience is codified in cultural content, finding a symbolic form, including religious. Therefore, religion enters the culture and, through its own artifacts, influences not only the individual and society but also itself.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

Philosophical and cultural understanding of the interconnection of culture and religion showed that our time requires an idea that has a meaningful value for man and society, which is difficult to find in the culture of the XXI century outside the religion. Therefore, the axiological aspect in modern culture is of ontological importance. Paradoxically, choosing one way or another of their development, one purpose or another, man and culture cannot consciously do this without answering for themselves the question of attitudes to religious values and the question of the existence of the supernatural beginning of the world and man. The vitality of any culture will depend on how fully it embodies the universal content of spiritual traditions. Developing the fundamental ideals that make up the spiritual essence of culture, religion becomes the most important form of understanding the unity of the world and strengthening the solidarity of people and the deep absorption of national and world culture is impossible without immersion in their religious grounds.

The essence of the problem, in our view, is that there are two deep levels in religion: the spiritual and the cultural. Ignoring the differences between the two modes of religion gives rise to a confusion of its semantic accents, which may cause a superficial view of contemporary socio-political, cultural and religious processes.

## **SUMMARY**

The proposed materials prove that the whole culture can be considered as a space in which the processes of creating the sense take place with religion playing a leading role in it. It is also emphasized that philosophical and cultural analysis of the content of the relationship between religion and culture is capable of contributing to the formation

of healthy conservatism of mass consciousness: rejection of nihilism in culture, strengthening of immunity to the destructive tendencies of modernity.

### REFERENCES

1. Американская социология. Перспективы, проблемы, методы / Под ред. Т. Парсонса. – М. : Прогресс. 1972. – 392 с.
2. Бердяев Н. Философия творчества, культуры и искусства. – Искусство, 1994. – 542 с.
3. Библер В. Мышление как творчество / Введение в логику мыслительного диалога. – М.: Политиздат, 1975. – 399 с.
4. Бодак В. Релігія і культура: взаємодія та взаємовплив : [монографія] / В.Бодак. – Київ-Дрогобич : Коло, 2005. – 305 с.
5. Кимелев Ю. А. Философия религии: Систематический очерк. М.: Издательский Дом “Nota Bene”, 1998. – 424 с.
6. Писманик М.Г. Индивидуальная религиозность и ее определение. – М.: Мысль, 1984. – 205 с.
7. Сорокин П. Человек, цивилизация, общество. – М.· Политиздат, 1992. – 543 с.
8. Тойнбі А. Дослідження історії. В 2 т. Том 1 / Пер з англ. В. Шовкуна. – К.; Основи, 1995. – 614 с.
9. Флоренский П.А. Христианство и культура // Журнал Московской патриархии, 1983. – № 4. – С. 12–24.
10. Фрейд З. Тотем и табу // Фрейд З. Я и Оно.– В 2–т. – Т. 1. Тбилиси, Мерани, 1991. – С. 71–138.
11. Угринович Д.М. Искусство и религия: Теоретический очерк. – М.: Политиздат 1982. – 288 с.
12. Ясперс К. Смысл и назначение истории. – М.: Политиздат, 1991. – 527 с.

### Information about the author:

**Bodak V. A.,**

Doctor of Philosophy Sciences,

Professor at the Philosophy Department named after Valeriy Skotnyy,

Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University

24, Ivan Franko str., Drohobych, 82100, Ukraine