

Economic Theory and Its Values: S. Bulgakov's Views^{*}

Shapiro Natalya

(University ITMO St. Petersburg, Russia)

Abstract: The crisis of political economy at the turn of XIX-XX centuries is the subject of research of Russian economist and philosopher S. Bulgakov. During the critique of political economy they were made methodological and philosophical ideas that reveal the value of economic theory. That looks like his thoughts today, when economics is again in crisis—considered by the author of this article.

Key words: crisis of political economy; values theory; logical design; pragmatic benefits; philosophy of economy/household

JEL codes: B3, B4

1. Introduction

For a proper understanding by an English-speaking audience of Sergei Bulgakov's ideas, we should make some preliminary comments on the terminology used by the author in his work "*Philosophiy khozyaystva*" (1912) (Bulgakov, 2008).

The truth is that the academic English translation of the Russian title of S. Bulgakov's "*Philosophy of Economy*" is conceptually incorrect.

S. Bulgakov assumes that the two words—*economy* and the Russian *khozyaystvo*—are not synonymous, which is often though translated into other languages, including English. The concept of *khozyaystvo*, as suggested by S. Bulgakov, is more general and extremely abstract relative to the concept of *economy*.

In order not to distort the meaning of S. Bulgakov's work and to be understood by the English-speaking audience, we shall select one word from a range of English synonyms for the word *economy* such as "farm", "household", "property", establishment, for example, the word *household* (on the ground that in Russian macroeconomic analysis there is a transliteration of the word "householder", furthermore, etymologically the Russian word *khozyaystvo* means something that belongs to the master, in English the word *household* can also be translated as "farm"), and since there is no accurate loan word, we shall consider it similar in meaning with the Russian word *khozyaystvo*. Therefore, the title of S. Bulgakov's work shall be translated as "*Philosophy of Household*" instead of "*Philosophy of Economy*"¹. This seems to be an important and principal observation.

^{*} This article is an extended abstract presented at the 16th International Conference of the European Society for the History of Economic Thought (ESHET): "Institutions and values in economic theory", 17-19 May, 2012, Saint-Petersburg, Russia.

Shapiro Natalya, Doctor of Economic Sciences, Professor, University ITMO St. Petersburg; research areas: history of economic thought, economic methodology. E-mail: v-shapiro@mail.ru.

¹ The work "*Philosophiy khozyaystva*" is final in terms of S. Bulgakov's economic and theoretical views. In after years S. Bulgakov became a minister of the Orthodox Church, and his later works were purely theological.

According to S. Bulgakov, the problem is that the word *khozyaystvo* is generally used to determine anything related to economy, while the word *household* has not been defined in terms of meaning. S. Bulgakov emphasized in his work that the concept of *household* is not subject to philosophical analysis or criticism despite the fact that economics develops most of its definitions through this concept. On the other hand, defining the unknown as unknown is non-productive in terms of science. If *the economic* is defined by *household*, but *household* is not given a scientific definition, it follows that *the economic* has no scientific definition as well as all of its derivatives. S. Bulgakov set a goal not only to overcome the mentioned logical failures, i.e., to define *household*, but also to “positively overcome” the existing political economy routines (or prevailing concepts of economic materialism).

S. Bulgakov's (1871-1944) views on the values of economics to be discussed in “Philosophy of Household” refer to the period of political economy crisis at the turn of the XIX-XX centuries, when political economy was losing its supremacy in the field of economic problems solution under the influence of emerging neoclassicism.

It is well known that political economy as system is theoretical knowledge evolved in the period of general humanitarian discourse in the XVII-XVIII centuries. At that time economics did not face the problem of values. Separated from religion science marched from Faith to Truth.

From phiocrats and Adam Smith to marginalists, political economy adhered to ideals and values developed in the Age of Enlightenment. The most important and universal of them were the ideas of progress (historicism), the thrust of humanism and essentialism (theory of truth), and the interdependence of positive and normative aspects of the study. The values of the Enlightenment comprised, explicitly or implicitly, positive or critically (Marxism, historical school), or reflexively, the basic elements of economics as a subsystem of humanities, thus the values of the theory were seen by the economic community as self-evident and obvious.

The unity of discourse provided the scientific community of economists, historians, philosophers, etc. with a high level of understanding—all of them spoke the same categorical language. However, at some point this resulted in a clear low down in the growth of knowledge. It would be necessary either to gradually give up or to complement the conventional value and its categories with the new ones which more exactly caught the specific subject of the study. The problem of the values of science begins to be realized when some seek the truth, and others who have lost faith in finding there of try to find good. The opposition of truth and good caused the problem of values, and then the scientific community began to gradually lose its methodological unity.

New cognitive values were actively evolving in economics in the last quarter of the XIX century with the rise of marginalism, its transformation into neoclassical economics and the institutional critique of the latter.

In addition, the process of intra disciplinary differentiation of the community of economists as well as economics in general, has been for a long time going in the context of standards introduced by other, mainly natural sciences, such as physics or mathematics, biology, etc. For the entire period of its existence, economics has not been among the leaders of sciences which established general scientific standards or tried to provide their own professional standards to serve as general scientific ones (Ananyin, 2013).

The discrepancy between intradisciplinary and general scientific values and the gap with humanitarian cognitive routines created competition and informed choice between truth and good, i.e., the problem of theory values.

2. The Main Theses of S. Bulgakov

Despite the fact that S. Bulgakov's main theses interpreting the understanding of theory values are given just on a few pages in “*Philosophy of Household*” (Bulgakov, 2008, pp. 282-286), referring to them seems to be

important. These terms are of particular interest since modern economics is relooking for a way out of the crisis and raises the question about theory values and philosophy of economics. Philosophical and methodological research is always relevant for understanding the causes of the crisis of science and finding a way out of it.

S. Bulgakov wrote: "The political economy has long been engaged in the theories of value, indeed, a lot more than it should, but has not so far involved really essential problems, namely *the theories of value in economic theories*, where a utility criterion (surely, together with a criterion of logical relevance) should play an important role" (Bulgakov, 2008, p. 282). In other words, the political economy was engaged in the theories of value, but not in the values of the economic theory.

According to S. Bulgakov, the problem of values of economic theory is, firstly, essential for the development of the economic theory, secondly, is poorly studied and theoretically conceptualized, and thirdly, from S. Bulgakov's point of view, the criteria of values of economic theories are logical relevance and pragmatic utility. (Note that such understanding is consistent with the modern one. Modern science includes axiology, the theory of value, with the so-called practical philosophy, where values are considered in contrast to the truth. Axiology studies the nature (essence) of values and evaluations, diversity and typology of values, ways and means of learning the concepts of value, specific features of evaluative language, etc.).

S. Bulgakov discusses in terms of logical relevance and pragmatic utility for practice the importance of the philosophy of household for economic theory.

We shall draw attention to the two points in the views of S. Bulgakov: (1) the logical approach to the problem of values of economic science in general, and substantive characteristics of values of economics in the context of the philosophy of household and the critique thereof in political economy, and (2) the implications of S. Bulgakov's views on the issue of values of science for modern philosophical and methodological research.

So, again, S. Bulgakov emphasized in «Philosophy of Household» that the concept of *household* is not subject to any philosophical analysis or critical treatment, although economics develops most of its definitions through the concept of *household*.

The cognitive "disappointment" of S. Bulgakov in political economy proceeded from the fact that it confused *the economic* and *household*, and *the economic* was empirically perceived as something purely materialistic and used as the basis of the scientific and philosophical dogma asserting the primacy of *household* in historical life and consciousness. S. Bulgakov was aimed at reinterpreting the basic economic concepts of economic materialism by defining the concept of *household* (In a certain period of life S. Bulgakov was fascinated by "legal" Marxism, which unlike classical Marxism rejected the revolutionary conclusions of the latter regarding the overthrow of capitalism. In his "*Philosophy of Household*", S. Bulgakov criticizes economic materialism demonstrating the worthlessness of its basic concepts for practice.

S. Bulgakov's philosophy of household focuses on anthropology, the study of Man in nature (Bulgakov, 2008, p. 323). According to S. Bulgakov, the contemporary household frees Man from the bonds of Nature. The Philosophy of household is determined to find ways to achieve the communion with God lost as a result of the fall of Man. (For philosophy of household, the metaphysical fall is a hypothesis (Bulgakov, 2008, p. 158). Therefore, household is not just materialism, but transcendence, metaphysics, and finally sophianic vision or Sofia [Greek for "wisdom"—N.S.] which brings the divine powers of Logos in the world (Bulgakov, 2008, p. 150). The philosophy of household is a transcendental, metaphysical explanation of the interaction between Man and Nature.

According to S. Bulgakov, the concept of *household* should reflect the relationship between Man and Nature, since Man subdues and conquers Nature, but at the same time is overcome by this victory and increasingly feels

like a slave of household. This relationship between Man and Nature was called “economic Hamletism” by S. Bulgakov (Bulgakov, 2008, p. 316).

By stressing the relationship between Man and Nature, he tried to find out what her household is a function of human or human is a function of household. The answer was formulated as follows: household should be considered as activities of a universal (transcendental) subject or humanity, but “not of a collective or aggregate”. Therefore, household is a function of humanity.

The question whether household is a function of human or human is a function of household was answered by S. Bulgakov in the context of synthesis of scientific world view and religion. It is this sense in which he treated the philosophy of household.

From his point of view, the progress of science brought not only the success of economic materialism (and/or material production), but also thermal separation of science and religion, which resulted in a brutal, one-sided perception of the real world by economic theory. In his opinion, the only exception is a theory of the German historical school containing the transcendental ideas of the German Spirit which sets a social ideal for the theory. “Social ideal creates social science, but is not created by it” (Bulgakov, 1999, p. 279).

S. Bulgakov believes that the broken relation between scientific world view and religion in political economy can be restored through the philosophy of household.

In *Philosophy of Household* S. Bulgakov seeks to provide a framework of the social ideal to overcome the rough, mechanistic perception of the real world. Economism is understood outside the context of household, but is “certainly eo ipso materialism....This is not only arbitrary, but a completely false assumption” (Bulgakov, 2008, p. 320). Such assumption makes economic materialism militant, produces the philosophy of action and denies the importance of all other spheres of human life.

S. Bulgakov was at the time convinced that distrust and alienation between religion and science, especially in the economic sphere, contribute to the ideological stagnation, and at the same time believed that this ideological stagnation is being recognized by society and there comes a time of philosophy to provide a synthesis of religion and science.

“In that common scientific, philosophical and religious fear which is increasingly spreading to the modern mankind, old walls which have hermetically partitioned different areas of thought are falling, and the boundaries of these areas are changing. In this change of relationship and boundaries which takes place now a days, the work [*Philosophy of Household*—N.S.] finds its justification and defends the right of ‘academic’ existence while belonging by its intention both to pure philosophy and the group of socio-economic sciences” (Bulgakov, 2008, p. 320).

The author saw the possibility to overcome the gap between science and religion through philosophy in the idea that human, or rather humanity, appears in philosophy as a transcendental subject of household. The development of economic science—requires a philosophical concept of the world as household. In S. Bulgakov’s opinion, philosophy of household is designed to provide a link between science and religion as integral aspects of life in the real world. He noted that the problem which he posed himself has a solution in “the organic synthesis of V. Solovyov’s philosophy and principles of Real politik”². Since S. Bulgakov was looking for ways to overcome the alienation of science and religion, he admitted that his version of the philosophy of household may be one among many. “... I have to admit beforehand that the systems of philosophy of household may reasonably differ,

² Vl. S. Solovyov (1853-1900), Russian religious philosopher, Mystic poet, journalist, literary critic. The main idea of his religious philosophy was the idea: Sofia-the soul of the world as a mystical cosmic beings, uniting God with the earthly world.

when the prime axioms are different. There is a possibility of insuperable, at least by means of theory, contradictions, and the unity of thought can only be achieved through the unity of life. And so it is clear for me that apart from this philosophy of household one can build a completely different one" (Bulgakov, 2008, p. 327).

S. Bulgakov aimed at creating the philosophy of household which would, firstly, close the intellectual gap in the philosophical understanding of the world (while not defining the unknown—*economy* through the unknown-*household*), and secondly, be a new methodology for political economy plunged in to crisis by former methodological grounds, or rather the lack thereof. In his opinion, political economy more than other social sciences "needs methodological consciousness", it "can no longer remain in a state of blissful ignorance of the classical school and its social followers" (Bulgakov, 2008, p. 325). As S. Bulgakov thought, "... philosophy of household regards the general theory of science as its own problem, but at the same time it establishes a philosophical theory of household" [ibid.].

Philosophy of household is the basis of the general theory of economics or its methodology and presents two main measures of value—logical relevance and pragmatic utility.

The axioms of philosophy of household should limit the logical constructs to some ultimate theoretical meaning which would not allow them to become "particularly complicated", "smart un necessities", but enable them to judge specific facts. Judging specific facts means evaluating them in terms of pragmatic utility without substituting theoretical estimates for judgments of practical reason or commonsense. In theory, as noted by S. Bulgakov, there is no gradual transition from the general to the particular, but a logical leap (Bulgakov, 2008, p. 285).

The significance of theory is thus manifested in the possibility to evaluate the real set of facts based on a certain logical construct. (In this case, we believe that it is the ability of the subject that—makes this possible, i.e., we rule out the possibility of formal logic errors.)

We agree with S. Bulgakov that political economy, especially the Marxist one, is hardly suitable for evaluating a set of ordinary facts. For example, the cornerstone of Marxist political economy is the theory of surplus value, and the theory supposes that surplus value is the result of capitalist exploitation of labor, wherefrom we conclude about the necessity of overthrowing capitalism and transferring the ownership of all means of production to the proletariat. It remains unclear what wage workers should do every day, here and now, for their livelihood—work or not work, or just fight for this overthrow?! But according to the Marxist logic, a capitalist implementing a new technique increases the degree of exploitation. So, does that mean that he should not implement it, if he sympathizes with the proletariat!? (For example, in neoclassical economic theory the answers to the following questions—to work or to fight, to implement or not to implement—can be obtained by comparing the limit values of costs, productivity, and revenue/income).

S. Bulgakov wrote that "it is high time to forget the internal contradiction of classifying bourgeois and proletarian science which means neither more nor less than biased (in either direction) or false science" (Bulgakov, 1999, p. 281). He had a negative attitude towards "labor theory of value" which became a basis of the theory of surplus value developed by Marx. He believed that it was in vain given ethical character which resulted in a "total accusation of capitalist production" (Bulgakov, 1999, p. 291).

Delving into the abstract depths of theoretical knowledge that takes place in political economy, theories of profit, capital, utility and etc. gets, as noted by S. Bulgakov, to a meta-empirical level with losing a property of utility, and becomes "a fruit of logical confusion" (Bulgakov, 2008, p. 283) with no limits.

A countless number of logical constructs can be grown like in a greenhouse. It all depends on the ability to think,

wit and grace of a thinking subject, on the human ability to imagine or “produce” a logical and aesthetic diversity. Logical aesthetics itself does not protect logical construction from turning into a “smart un necessity”, “logical play”.

The realistic limits of logical construction should be tied to life tasks or pragmatism of science which S. Bulgakov framed as a question: who benefits? Determining the regularity in the sea of facts is possible by organizing the facts while answering the question that every science sets itself. “Every science always asks some questions” (Bulgakov, 2008, p. 284). Indiscriminate piling up facts is the opposite pole of uncontrolled theorizing. Everything contained in the “facts”, especially in the cabalistic form of statistical tables, is often mistaken for science, says S. Bulgakov. Collecting or mindless accumulation of facts is a “scientific sport”.

“Smart unnecessary” on the side of logical theorizing and “scientific sport” on the side of facts. According to S. Bulgakov, to avoid this “bad infinity” is possible with the help of philosophy of household which, by interpreting the world as household, would allow on the basis of logical construction to integrate the indefinitely great amount of empirical evidence in the entire modern economic [household] life, determine its typical features. In the absence of a common philosophical foundation, “... there is such ascending from facts to theory which may be not followed by descending Theory is for practice which is always actual and historical” [ibid].

He had a very negative attitude towards the application of mathematics which, in his opinion, “will lead to absurdum of theoretical economics and its problems while turning the economics into innocent math exercises or the play of philosophically undisciplined mind” (Bulgakov, 2008, p. 170).

To avoid the unjustified logical construction or application of mathematics, one should not consider the values of economics out of objective pragmatic context of the theory, because only in this context one can understand the rational sense of theorizing.

S. Bulgakov believed that political economy was engaged in studying value theories “a lot more than it should” (Bulgakov, 2008, p. 282). We agree with S. Bulgakov that, from the teachings of mercantilism as a precursor of political economy to the institutional and class types of political economy—bourgeois political economy (classical political economy), petit-bourgeois political economy (J. C. L. de Sismondi, P. J. Proudhon) and proletarian political economy (K. Marx), the progress and prosperity of the nation were associated with the interests of a particular class—merchants, capitalists, petty proprietors or proletarians. This gave rise to the falsely understood problem of the value of political economy: which of them is scientific or how scientific is. It turns out that scientific truth depends on the class concept. The socially neutral answer can be obtained, if there is a general idea of the activity in which all of them are somehow engaged, and according to S. Bulgakov it is household.

Thus, we can conclude that S. Bulgakov's economy is an empirically limited household. When household is considered within the historically defined framework, or defined in terms of typical features, it is the economy. From here we can proceed to the types of economy, where the common element is the household component, and among the typical features which are always actual and historical is the economic substance.

This argument is somewhat conventional, conditional or contractual within the scientific community. In order to accomplish the act of logical conception of philosophy of household, we seem to lack the understanding of what should be attributed to the typical features which differentiate household from economy. If household is to reflect the unity of Man and Nature, then what should reflect economy and what questions, according to S. Bulgakov, should it ask!? But if we neglect these differentiations, economy and household become synonymous, and the situation of determining one unknown through another one is repeated.

3. The Relevance of Religion for S. Bulgakov

Let's ask the question: why S. Bulgakov while offering his own version of philosophy of household chooses the metaphysical fall of Man as a hypothesis, why does he refer not only to transcendence and metaphysics, but also to "sophianic vision bringing the powers of Logos into the world"?

Perhaps, there are two reasons of this. The first one is that the work *Philosophy of household* was written in the period of time when religious and philosophical issues had reached their climax in Russia. Religious and philosophical meetings were very popular, just like the clubs of political economy which were opening in England in the 20s of the XIX century to discuss and spread the ideas of free trade. At the turn of the XIX-XX centuries a particular bright phenomenon of national culture—the Russian intelligentsia—emerged in Russia. It was preceded by such prosaic circumstances of the last third of the XIX century as the production of priests over the need of religious institutions³. Having received good religious education, but having not found themselves professionally, people began to think about the meaning of life in general, whereas religion became the instrument of such comprehension. That is the reason of such a synthesis of religion and philosophy which has had an impact on many areas of human cognition, including the economic one. S. Bulgakov was particularly influenced by V.I. Solovyov's teachings on the basis of which he sought to create a methodological framework for economic theory. But Solovyov's philosophy in his eyes, was the last word in world philosophy, as its Supreme synthesis.

J. Zweynert, one of the contemporary German historians who studied the Russian economic thought of 1805-1905 in the late 90's of the XX century, in the conclusion of his essay on the work of S. Bulgakov emphasized his words that after the initial excitement for the West Russian intellectuals tend to feel disappointment and almost inevitably return to typically Russian traditions. This conclusion is confirmed by the work of S. Bulgakov who after his enthusiasm with and subsequent disappointment in the Western political economy, and particularly Marxism, began to search for "domestic economic doctrine". S. Bulgakov, as noted by the German historian, was confronted with the urgent question: "What is to replace the old worldview and fill the void?" (Zweynert, 2008, pp. 10, 347-355). As the most powerful intellectual trend in Russia at that time was religious philosophy, S. Bulgakov turned to it and declared in *Philosophy of household* his resolution to return to faith.

The second reason relates to the logical demands of philosophical analysis and critical perception of the theory substance. As a person with a university degree⁴, he realized that to give meaning to logical construction and accumulation of facts within the economic theory is possible only when suggesting meanings of a very high level of abstraction. According to S. Bulgakov, these meanings, as opposed to that of political economy, should not lie within the spatial and temporal scope of capitalist relations or be easily divided into components. Religion uses universal meanings, but their level of abstraction takes the researcher beyond the framework of scientific knowledge and puts him within the limits of faith.

As noted by contemporary methodologists, analyzing the scientific works of particular authors sometimes unveil myths about the significance of some principles formulated by the authors, since the authors of the principles violate them in their studies. Some well-known theorists demonstrate a significant discrepancy between

³ There is a Museum of Russian intelligentsia in Nizhny Novgorod where the existence of Russian intellectuals in the XIX century is regarded as a phenomenon and studied extensively and comprehensively.

⁴ S. Bulgakov graduated from the Faculty of Law at Moscow State University in 1894. In 1901 he defended his master's thesis and in the prime of his economic career became a full professor in the Department of Political Economy of Kiev Polytechnic Institute. *Philosophy of household* was presented and defended as a Ph.D. thesis in 1912 in Moscow State University. Though formally *philosophy of household* represented a doctorate thesis on political economy, in fact it was a work on theology.

declarations and actual methodology (Machlup F., 1978, pp. 482-483). However, this methodological reproach cannot be brought upon S. Bulgakov.

When compared with Western studies of the XIX-XX centuries, it is possible to draw a certain analogy between the ideas of S. Bulgakov and the concept of ideal types of Max Weber⁵. Weber also pushed for some strong theoretical concept that would allow understanding the diversity of the world and comprehending actual material better than with the former historical science. He proposed a concept of “ideal type”. Weber’s “ideal type” represented mental constructions that had both logical and substantive meaning. (Since the comparative analysis of the views of S. Bulgakov and M. Weber is not the purpose of this paper, we will confine ourselves to mentioning the similarity of their concepts).

However, did S. Bulgakov’s feeling of the global unity of scientific, philosophical and religious thought come true? And should we for the resolution of conceptual problems of the contemporary world follow “Bulgakov’s” paradigm of connecting “economism” with the idea of human as a transcendental subject of economy? The answers to these questions can be found in the later works of S. Bulgakov. In his autobiographical notes written in Paris in 1944, S. Bulgakov said in a sense summing up his career: “At home among strangers, a stranger among my own, but in fact, never at home” (Bulgakov, 1991, pp. 31-32), wherefrom we can conclude that his way of making a synthesis of faith and science failed. S. Bulgakov did not consider his experience in creating a religious philosophy for the development of economic science as proven.

4. Useful Conclusions

However, we will not end this essay on the values of economic theory by S. Bulgakov on such a sad note. Without this leaping of thought from science to religion and equating religion and philosophy which may not be religious, some useful conclusions about the relationship of philosophy and values of the theory are possible.

For this, we use some formula of contemporary post-modernism (Žižek, 2011, pp. 8-9) according to which, when dealing with a truly great philosopher, we should be interested not in what this philosopher still has to say to us, or how he is important to us, but try to answer the question: What is his view of us, or our contemporary situation; how is our age reflected in his thought?

The problem of interaction between Man and Nature is addressed by a special science called ecology that evolved from economics, which shows the practical, scientific and theoretical importance of understanding the problem of interaction between Man and Nature. Separated in the independent science, ecology has different solutions to the problem, including alarmist concepts, but the most optimistic is developing the idea of co-evolution of Man and Nature.

The intellectual “disappointment” of S. Bulgakov in the definitions of economy and household and, accordingly, their relationship continues to exist in the modern economic discourse. Neither of these concepts has clear and widely accepted, rigorous definition, so they are often used as synonyms. The concept of household which is very clear in practical sense has not yet been given definition in theoretical and methodological sense. In the early 80’s of the XX century N. A. Tsagolov (1904-1985), the professor at Moscow University, who in his time and in his generation was one of the most famous and influential economists—theoreticians and methodologists, repeatedly emphasized (Tsagolov, 1985, p. 11) that the concept of household had not been given any adequate

⁵ The index of names in S. Bulgakov’s *Philosophy of household* does not include Max Weber, so we can assume that S. Bulgakov was not familiar with his studies. M. Weber wrote a methodological essay on the “ideal type” in 1903-1906 (Weber, 1951; 1964).

definition recognized by economic theory. This can be proved by the absence of the concept of household in such a fundamental publication as the Encyclopedia of Economics. Political economy (Economic Encyclopedia, 1980). The absence of the term household in the authoritative publication should be considered as an indirect recognition of the problem of explaining household. This fact again shows that the process of learning does not always follow the rules of formal logic, and the limitations of human intellect is not the cause of freezing the development of knowledge in general. In economic theory, there are similar black boxes, and the situation with the concept of household is no exception. (For example, the concept of money is undefined. Money is still an intellectual appendage of theoretical schemes, and generally has little analytical explanation (Èggertsson, 2001). However, this does not hamper studying various aspects of the functioning of money in today's economy).

Have we succeeded in "positive overcoming" the militant economism-economic materialism? We seem to have managed this in the sense that it lost its status of the most important unifying doctrine. But this happened not because economic materialism was positively overcome with philosophy of household. It's just that a multiplicity of "images of a worldview with qualities" as well as practical and scientific needs led to a variety of scientific systems and approaches in which the most convincing was neoclassicism. Besides, A. Marshall as the founder of neo-classical theory brought beyond the framework of institutional and class institutionalization which linked theory to a specific historical state of society, had a very positive attitude towards historical research and synthesis of economic and other approaches (such as legal ones). He surely gave German economists credit for seeking to include in the analysis the institutions of law and morality, as well as relativity considerations, thereby adopting the idea of changes in society and the coexistence of different forms of economic development.

So, Marshall wrote: "It is difficult to overestimate the importance of the work that they [the historians] ... have done to trace and explain the history of economic practices and institutions. This is one of the greatest achievements of this century and an important addition to our real wealth. This work has almost endlessly expanded our ideas by increasing the knowledge of ourselves, and helped us to understand the evolution of ethical and social life and the Divine Principle manifested in it" (Marshall, 1993, p. 205). Thus, after abandoning social and class institutionalization in neo-classical economic theory, A. Marshall did not break the divine connections with history.

We can say that most of S. Bulgakov's "transcendental" expectations were evolutionarily implemented by different economic movements, trends and schools of the XX century. For example, subjectivity elements were included in the paradigm of neoclassical theory of subjective utility. Psychological elements were brought by J. M. Keynes to the theory of accumulation (Keyens, 1978). During the XX century, several attempts were made to include the results of psychological discoveries in economic theory (Raaij, 2002, pp. 977-990). S. Bulgakov's hypothesis of household as freedom in which, in his opinion, the creative activity of rational beings is manifested: "... If freedom is creativity, then personality is a genuine creative element in us which is unquenchable and in her entin household either" (Bulgakov, 2008, p. 322) is actively developed in the Austrian theory of entrepreneurship. Austrian scholars assumed that entrepreneurship cannot be considered without personal freedom which allows a person to efficiently dispose of his abilities, knowledge, information and income, enables to find the best means to meet his own and public needs. They developed the concept of entrepreneurship under the criticism of the theory of institutional coercion (Mises, 2005, p. 151), more precisely in opposition of the free behavior of economic agents of market economy and coercion in a totalitarian society. Entrepreneurship or enterprise is always ready to search, discover, create or identify new goals and means to obtain benefits or profit. "Entrepreneurship is a force that unites society and ensures its harmonious development, since it adds

coordination to mismatches inevitably generated by the process of development” (Soto, 2009, p. 39).

Moreover, there are such sub-economic disciplines as management, organization theory, etc. in which the elements of culture and even faith play important roles.

The fundamental point of all the above theories is that S. Bulgakov's “transcendental” expectations were implemented in the limits of science, not faith. Economism or economic theory added with “transcendental”, or psychological elements didn't integrate with the mystical and religious worldview.

Thus, we can make the conclusion that is not going to be something entirely new: science is developed not only by the needs of “divine Logos” or disinterested intellectual curiosity, but more often in searching for means to overcome the practical difficulties of real life. The problems of real life that get in the way of humanity to well-being and decent living make it think about why these problems occur and how they can be overcome. Therefore, theory is generally pragmatic. But science developing as a distinct and separate form of human consciousness produces its own internal rules or filters to evaluate the quality of theories. Generalizing theory or philosophy is the filter that allows us to understand how appropriate a given theory is for the established worldview (a kind of indirect verification before practice). When the number of theories that do not fit in the dominant philosophical model exceeds the critical level, the methodological unity of science is destroyed. Scientific consciousness apprehends the crisis, while some theories driven by the needs of real life can emerge with even greater intensity, but they can bring not only benefits but also confusion, as under crisis conditions the function of indirect verification is poorly, or rather, hardly performed. In these circumstances, it is necessary to look for possible matches in a variety of inconsistent theories which cannot always be known to the researcher). When there is a philosophical model, the various theories represent “the branches of a tree” or the development of a paradigm (if the paradigm is changed, the connection between the theories is broken, the “tree” falls into “bushes” and “branches”).

S. Bulgakov studied and applied the measures of value of science (logical relevance and pragmatic utility) as methodological tools that enabled him to (1) demonstrate the absence of a philosophical model of economic knowledge (economic materialism) at that historical moment and make a well-founded conclusion about its state of crisis (the relevance of his scientific work); (2) try to use the religious teaching of philosophy of household as a new model of economic knowledge (the historical significance of the work).

He definitely succeeded in the one, while in the other he definitely failed. But it's not recognizing his own failure in efforts to establish a religious philosophy within economics. It's the fact that since the religious teaching is not one (there are world religions), giving any religious ideas the status of universality will lead the economist either to one of the religious teachings, and then he will be even further away from searching for scientific truth, or to the conflict with religion which happened to S. Bulgakov and his teaching⁶.

But intellectual search in the direction of what is philosophy of household is still relevant for Russian researchers⁷.

⁶ In 1918 S. Bulgakov was ordained for ministry and therefore excluded from professors. In 1922 on V. I. Lenin's initiative, Father Sergei was included in the SPD list of scientific and cultural workers to be expatriated. In the same year he was arrested and expatriated. In 1935 S. Bulgakov's religious works were also condemned in the decrees of the Moscow Patriarchate and the Council of Bishops in Karlovci. He died in Paris in 1944.

⁷ For example, Laboratory “Philosophy of household” at the Faculty of Economics of Lomonosov Moscow State University has been existing for more than 10 years, academic journal “Philosophy of household” is published, Academy for Philosophy of Economy—the Interregional Public Organization (2009) has been founded and currently consists of more than 150 people representing various universities and other scientific and artistic organizations of the Russian Federation, the CIS and other countries. Research conducted under the auspices of the Laboratory and the Academy for “Philosophy of household” represents the scientific

References:

- Ananyin O. I. (2013). "The value of science and the development trajectory of economic theory", in: *Second Russian Economic Congress*, 18-22 Feb. 2013, available online at: <http://www.econorus.org/c2013/program.phtml?vid=report&eid=752>.
- Bulgakov S. N. (1991). *Autobiographical Notes* (2nd ed.), Paris.
- Bulgakov S. N. (1999). "Problem of political economy: From Marxism to Idealism", *Works on Sociology and Theology Energy*. Vol. 1, Nauka, Moscow.
- Bulgakov S. N. (2008). *Philosophy of Economy*, Moscow: TERRA-Book Club.
- Weber M. (1951). *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Wissenschaftslehre*, Tübingen.
- Bulgakov S. N. (1964). *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*, Bd 1-2, Köln–Berlin.
- Žižek S. (2011). *Reflections in Red: The Communist View of the Crisis and the Accompanying Pre-Meta*, Moscow: Publishing House "Europe".
- Keyens J. M. (1978). *The General Theory of Employment Interest and Money*, chapter 9, 15, M.
- Marshall A. (1993). *Principles of Economic*, M., V. III.
- Machlup F. (1978). *Methodology of Economics and the Social Science*, New York: Academic Press.
- Mises L. Von (2005). *Human Activities: A Treatise on Economic Theory*, Chelyabinsk Sotsius.
- Osipov U. M. (2005). *Course philosophii khozyaystva: Textbook allowance*, M.: Economist.
- Osipov U. M. and Zotova E. S. (2011). *Renaissance Philosophy of Economy*, M.: TEIS, p. 446.
- Raaij F. Van (2002). "Economics and psychology: Panorama economic thought in the late twentieth century", in: D. Greenaway, M. Bleaney & I. Stewart (Eds.), *Companion to Contemporary Economic Thought*, Vol. 2.
- Soto Al. de H. (2009). *Austrian School of Economics: Market and Entrepreneurial Creativity*, Chelyabinsk: Social.
- Tsagolov N. A. (1985). *Introduction: Development Problems of Political Economy and to Improve Its Teaching Action: Scientific Metod, Posobie for Professors of Political Economy*, M.: High School.
- Zweyner J. (2008). *History of Economic Thought in Russia: 1805-1905*, M. Izd. Dom HSE.
- Èggertsson T. (2001). *Economic Behavior and Institutions*, Cambridge University Press.
- Economic Encyclopedia "Political Economy"*, 1980, Vol. 4.