Original Scientific Paper

METAPHYSICAL SETTINGS OF ARCHITECTURE ACCORDING TO THE THEO-ANTHROPOCENTRIC PARADIGM OF JUSTIN POPOVIC *

UDC 72:11

Slaven Stevanović

University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Technical Sciences, Novi Sad, Serbia

Abstract. *The basic truths of architecture have been forgotten. This paper searches for the solution in the knowledge of metaphysical settings of architecture. More precisely, the metaphysical aspects of ontology, gnoseology, axiology and methodology; which together represent the basic criteria of a scientific paradigm. The initial question must be gnoseological, i.e. - what is the raison d'être of architecture? The analysis leads to an assumption that without knowing the metaphysics of man there can be no knowledge of the metaphysics of architecture; that is, a conclusion can be drawn that the problem of metaphysic of man in architecture has not been posed. Therefore, man must be the main issue of architecture, as well as of this paper. Given that the problem of knowledge in general sense, and therefore of man, is also of theological and philosophical nature, in this paper, the problem of man is understood as a gnoseological choice; namely: the choice between man as man-god (man is the source of knowledge) and man as god-man (God is the source of knowledge). Respectively, there is a choice between historical antipodes, the paradigm of anthropo-theocentrism and the paradigm of theo-anthropocentrism. In this paper, I argue that the issue of god-man and the paradigm of Orthodox theo-anthropocentrism, as interpreted by Justin Popović, is potentially the most comprehensive solution to the problem of raison d'être of man, and architecture that he creates. Discussion and analysis have established that, in this pattern, man is seen as a holistic, spiritual and physical entity, whose primary need to be met and his raison d'être – is deification. Thereby, architecture of orthodox theo-anthropocentrism acquires not only a physical, but also a spiritual, and thus, a holistic dimension. It may represent a symbolic means (through sensory and primarily visual representation) of man's ascension to God. Theo-anthropocentric paradigm solves the metaphysical foundations and potentially forms more holistically organized architecture that meets the equally holistic, spiritual and physical, needs of man. Its material manifestation is determined by only one criterion – deification.*

Key words: *Architecture, Raison d'être, Man, Theo-anthropocentrism, East Orthodox Christian, Justin Popović*

1. INTRODUCTION

*„Nobody in this country teaches or encourages us to the **art of living**. We are looking at this art as a kind of debauchery, but we are hardly aware that its principles are **moderation, cleanliness,** and **overall respect for creation** – not to mention the **creation of the world**." Bernard Rudofsky (1964)*

A bit poetic and melancholy, yet devastatingly true, the words of Bernard Rudofsky actually outline and quite accurately represent the main idea of this paper. Ideological guidance that simultaneously represents both the motive and, in general, the larger problem of research. No matter this statement was rendered more than half a century ago and addressed the audience from a completely different continent, it is timeless and spaceless, and it is as current today as it was back then; maybe even more. So, in order to analyze the state of architectural culture today, we inevitably have to ask similar questions. Can we still say with certainty what architecture is? What values should architecture convey? What is its relation to man and the natural environment in which it emerges?

This unfinished set of seemingly quite simple questions, actually gravitates around a single central issue – the definition of architecture, its essence and its beginning; which is, in the broadest sense, the main initial problem in this paper. Still, if we operationalize and analyze Rudofsky's thought in a studious way, from a metaphysical standpoint, we will find that Rudofsky is actually talking about the beginning, or, more precisely, about philosophy or metaphysical problems of living; that is, the metaphysics of architecture – that is what is forgotten. In other words, the values that Rudofsky states (moderation, purity, compliance, creation) are parts of a larger (equally neglected) axiological system; a system which we cannot discuss if we do not set the metaphysical framework of the problem. In this particular case – the metaphysical framework of architecture. Thereby, it becomes clear that the search for a general definition in fact becomes a metaphysical quest for the essence (Greek: $ουσια$, Latin: *essentia*) of architecture. In addition, if we searched for the definition of architecture by analyzing and valorizing the known historical definitions, the result would be limited and conditioned by those definitions. Therefore, if the objective is to come to know the primordial definition, i.e. the ontological truth, then, logically, the quest for it has to be beyond generally known historical boundaries. The only way, therefore, is to replace the teacher of life with the teacher, and the mother, of all knowledge – philosophy. And also, to replace the scientific definition of architectural theory with the philosophical, metaphysical paradigm (strategy, or pattern).

Engaging in the discussion and analysis of metaphysical standpoints, every scientist is forced simultaneously to engage in a metaphysical *"paradigm war"* (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). During 20th century, there has been an abandonment of rigid materialistic standpoints of generally accepted positivism. The deterministic view that there is only one scientific truth has been abandoned (Groat, 2013; Ševšukić, 2006). Therefore, there is a variety of competing paradigms following various philosophical manifestos. However, this paper seeks the solution of the choice of scientific strategy beyond the boundaries of the aforementioned *"war"*. Whereas, even when the very paradigms are analyzed and verified from the metaphysical standpoint, and specifically from gnoseological perspective, a single general characteristic of great value can be perceived. Similar to what some authors, like Velimirović (2013b), Eliade (2003), Popović (1998), and Harari (2018) argue, in a gnoseological sense, all paradigms can be divided, or viewed from two antipodal angles: anthropocentric and theocentric. In other words, anthropocentrism includes all of those patterns whose gnoseological source is man. In contrast to that, theocentrism includes those patterns whose gnoseological source is God,

i.e. some or any transcendent being. This particular paper intends to solve the metaphysical problem of architecture through theocentric (god-centred) paradigm. The reason for that is simple and will be presented in more detail later. In short, we believe that theocentric holisticity is precisely the missing characteristic of anthropocentric paradigm in which contemporary architecture emerges. Since theocentrism is the common term for all theocentric strategies, this paper focuses more closely on the East Orthodox Christian, theocentric thought, respectively, the theo-anthropocentric (god-man-centred) paradigm. The reason lies in the analyzed belief that, the balance between the human and the divine, i.e. anthropocentric and theocentric has been most fully achieved in this particular thought. One of the world's most eminent representatives of Orthodox thought and this pattern, who intellectualized this thought within the wider theological-philosophical frame, is St. Justin Popović. The analysis and review of his work and thought represents the foundation of our study. Based on his research, we will try to build out independent and critical opinion about what this pattern represents, and how to use and transfer that knowledge into the context of architectural creativity.

In addition, it is important to emphasize that the main problem of anthropocentrism is relativization of theocentrism (Popović, 2009). Therefore, if we seek a solution to the problems of contemporary society, that is, architecture, relativization of theocentrism is what should be avoided. This paper will try to convey the theocentric thought in its fullness, without any narrowing or relativization of thought towards the spirit of the times (*zeitgeist*). Only external manifestos, not inner compositional-essential forces, can be adjusted to the spirit of the times. The disclosed is based on the belief that modern man, who strives to reconcile his metaphysical-existential status, does not need a variant of his own anthropocentric teaching. Current scientific trends (Alexander, 2002, 2018; Barrie & Bermudez, 2016; Carroll, 2017; Guba & Lincoln, 1994; Hoffman & Sandelands, 2004; Holmes & Lindsay, 2018; Pallasmaa, 2012; Purzycki et al., 2016; Salingaros, 2016b, 2016a; Sandelands, 2004; Zumthor, 2006) have confirmed the disclosed, but also show that contemporary man, a scientist, is striving to a transcendence of thought, because he knows and feels that it is the only way he can potentially reach a genuine socio-cultural, and hence an architectural progress. Each contrast leads to starting a new vicious circle, and thus re-mirroring mirrors in the mirror (Popović, 2009b).

Contemporary problems of architecture are primarily problems of value (axiological). That is logical, given that contemporary problems of society, and of man, respectively, are precisely of axiological nature. Therefore, the study of a paradigm whose (foremost axiological) influence is comprehensive, socially as well as culturally-productively, absolutely proves its legitimacy. We expect, through the potential transfer of theocentric, i.e. theo-anthropocentric, paradigm onto the corpus of architecture, mainly through axiological intervention, to really reach a deeply meaningful, holistically and metaphysically grounded architecture. The goal is clear and naturally complex, but, we believe, it is absolutely achievable.

2. Genesis of the Problem – from the Definition to the paradigm of Architecture

> *The problem of knowledge*, in essence, is a *religious-ethical problem*.
> St. Justin Popović (2016)

Knowledge, therefore, has a theological and philosophical dimension. But knowledge is, in practical terms, also a general process that is carried out every day in almost every

moment of human life. Therefore, knowledge as a phenomenon or process logically exists within the architectural trends. You could say that, without the possibility of knowledge, man, the world, and thus architecture, would be doomed. So, knowledge is an essential, life-giving event; and as such, it should be approached with great caution and awe. Misunderstanding of the nature of knowledge and approach to it also logically leads to insufficiently accurate or completely wrong results. Therefore, the problem of gnoseology, which has always troubled mankind, is, and should be, the primary problem of every problem, including architectural. Relativisation of gnoseology is also relativisation of the approach to a problem, and thus represents disparagement of the whole problem.

Accordingly, the approach to the problem of definition lies in the forementioned quote of Popović. He directly refers to the gnoseology of knowledge as a central issue; but at the same time, he gives the answer – the solution is in the religious-ethical, theological-philosophical determination. With this approach, it is clear that the establishment of any definition of architecture in fact develops primarily into an exploration of its metaphysical constitutions. Specifically, the definition of gnoseological sources, as a starting point. It should be also emphasized that, in the already existing literature, the term *"gnoseology"* is usually being replaced by the term *"epistemology"* (Groat, 2013; Holmes & Lindsay, 2018; Lincoln & Guba, 1985); which represents yet another consequence of relativisation of the theocentric thought. However, the term *"gnoseology"* is wider than *"epistemology"*, as it allows a specific in-depth analysis, excursions into theology and transcendent knowledge, which is limited by epistemology. Therefore, considering that this term is more receptive for the nature and objectives of this paper, and guided by the thoughts of Popović, as well as other authors, like Kant (as opposed to Piaget, for example) this paper still retains the gnoseological terminology guideline.

Lev Shestov (2002) in his analysis also highlights the importance of gnoseological determination. His well-known thought: *"Gnoseology is the soul of philosophy (...) Tell me about your gnoseology and I'll tell you about your philosophy"* clearly confirms all of the above, but also paves the way for further research. Shestov practically points to the fact that the rest of metaphysical determination originates from the problem of gnoseology. So, the basic question of ontology, is a direct product of gnoseology itself; because, what else can determine what the truth is if not determination of the source of truth (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Velimirović, 2013a; Popović, 2005b, 2016). However, what is most important is that gnoseology, and thus ontology, will determine the axiological values in the sequel; and all together, they will determine the methodology of approach (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). Finally, as Guba and Lincoln explained, all these metaphysical guidelines, in fact, make the basic settings for a scientific paradigm. In their popular paper from the late twentieth century (cited over 20,000 times!), which launched a revolution within methodology of approach to scientific research, they presented the revolutionary idea that paradigms can never be completely proven, and therefore, every strategy must be approached with a certain amount of faith. Because, it is belief or disbelief in some scientific strategy what makes determining relationship that practically valorizes the paradigm itself. This is truly a revolutionary assumption which, since it has been accepted by the scientific community, demystifies the rigid positivist approach to scientific research. At the same time, it clearly gives access to other proven scientific paradigms, such as constructivism, pragmatism, empiricism, idealism, structuralism, deconstructionism, etc. However, given that the selection of scientific strategy is a matter of faith (Guba & Lincoln, 1994), quite legitimately, we can propose testing the value of

theo-anthropocentric paradigm, as well. Without imposing it on anyone, but legitimately highlighting it as a potential solution and approach to scientific research.

Finally, why is all of this important for architecture? As already indicated, the choice of a paradigm, or metaphysical determination towards the problem of gnoseology, ontology, axiology, methodology, have the ability to give the final formulation of concrete architectural theories, i.e. consequently, definitions. Therefore, logically, not a single established definition, nor our relationship to architecture, can be determined without a clear metaphysical standpoint and the choice of a paradigm, which every architect uses to work and create. So, this is the necessary, although seemingly forgotten, beginning of architecture. Of course, all of this refers to those creators who still perceive architecture more as a demiurgy rather than a technical discipline. Bogdan Bogdanović was particularly inspired to write about an architect as a demiurge and the importance of this interpretation (Abramovic, 2007); although he was a somewhat controversial personality, it would be good to recall some of his important thoughts:

*"The fact that, since Alberti till this day, no one has entirely exposed the **internal form** of architecture does not indicate the inability of architects, but the masterful skill of demiurgy, embedded in every architectural inch, elbow, thumb or fingernail. It is an honorable task of true builders to painstakingly search for those **seals of the gift of the holy spirit**, although we all know they cannot be reached. "*

These poetic and true thoughts, however, contain a small problem that, in fact, potentially resolves the raised question of demiurgy. Negation (emphasized by the author) of the possibility of knowing the inner form, i.e. primal architectural force, or as we call it, its *raison d'être*, is a kind of negation of architecture itself. How can one be a true architectural creator if he do not believe it is possible to achieve and fulfill its *raison d'être*? We can certainly agree that it is almost a utopian endeavor, conditioned by countless feats; but we cannot negate the possibility itself. For, conditionality is more positive than negative, rather a possibility than impossibility, or it is at least of neutral determination; which is certainly encouraging, despite the improbability of the possibility itself. Perhaps the reason for the author's negation lies in the fact that while he uses big words like *"seal of the gift of the holy spirit"*, he uses lower case for the *"holy spirit"*; which is completely understandable, considering his communist ideological background. Using the aforementioned theological guidelines for him is obviously more of a literary act than actually a belief in it. This paper will, contrary to him, guided by the spirit of the Orthodox faith, truly try to believe that reaching the gift of the **H**oly **S**pirit is actually possible; and so is architecture as *"masterful skill of demiurgy"*. Finally, we believe that in this way, the metaphysical significance of the quest for the inner and hidden architectural paradigms, can be clearly seen.

3. *Raison d'être* of Architecture – Man

*"**Gnoseological problem** of knowledge dissolves into an ontological-ethical, and ultimately **comes down to the problem of the man's personality**." St. Justin (2016)*

The clear and concise thought of Justin Popović precisely defines and provides additional explanations why ontological beginnings of architectural thought in fact should be sought in philosophical, metaphysical considerations. Thus, practically every metaphysical problem, for example, the ontological, or ultimately gnoseological, is connected with man; and a man further with the surrounding space, natural or built. Yet, the disclosed can certainly be verified

and valorized by analyzing, for example, the basic questions which are usually posed when confronted with something unknown (Velimirović, 2013a; Dinulović, 2012):

Table 1 Basic questions towards the unknown

"What is it?"	The question of ontology
"Who is it from?"	The question of gnoseology
"What is it made from?"	The question of axiology
"How is it used?"	The question of methodology

In reflecting on the presented above, one can see that the knowledge of all these questions loses its value if we do not know *what to do with all this knowledge* – "**What is this knowledge for?!**" asks Nikolai Velimirović (2013c). Therefore, the main foremost-question, of all questions simply must be: *"What is it for?"* In other words, this is about (gnoseological) primordial question **reason of existence**, or perhaps using more inclusive French term – **raison d'être**. So, we conclude, in the context of architecture, this foremost-question would be – what is the reason for the existence of architecture? Or, more subtly, what is the *raison d'être* of architecture? With this, we believe, we finally come to the core of the epicentral problematic question of both philosophy and architecture. Also, it must be stated that today, modern architecture simply does not know its reason for existence. Or, perhaps scientifically more precisely – modern architecture has relativized its *raison d'être*.

Table 2 Primordial question

"What is it for?" / "Reason for existence?" / "Raison d'être?"	The question of gnoseology

A good example of relativization and the evidence for the disclosed is the case of modernism. The theme of Le Corbusier and his idea is certainly special, very complex and interesting architectural-philosophical problem. But, the single detail that is important for us now is the fact that Charles-Édouard Jeanneret-Gris is one of the few architects who has actually asked the ontological question of architecture. Having said the historical thought that marked the past century: *"The problem of the house has not yet been stated"* Le Corbusier (1999) in fact suggests that the ontological problem of *architecture* is not stated. So, he was really on the way of solving the metaphysical origins of architecture. But today, more than a hundred years after the revolutionary manifesto, the question – whether the ontological problem of *a house* was in fact really a basic problem of architecture? – is justified. Also, have we, thanks to the evolving period of technological progress, modernized the house (and therefore architecture) in its essential basis, or only in its exterior? Is the problem of the house the problem of the exterior dimensions of the human body or the man has something more than just the body? Have we modernized the space of each house to meet the newly created progressive needs of consumerism, enjoyment, leisure, or men's needs are larger than that? Thus, by sublimating these rhetorical questions, having analyzed the above mentioned problems from today's perspective, it seems that the problem of architecture could not have been in solving the problem of *a house*, as Le Corbusier triumphantly highlighted. And especially not the house as an empty *"do-mi-no"* shell of *"household economics"* for progressive mechanized family and the same kind of man (Le Corbusier, 1999). This is, in

fact, a practical example of relativization of architectural reason for existence. Is it possible that the basic problem question of architecture is *"a house"*? But even if it is, from ontological and gnoseological standpoint, the problem has not been completely solved. Because, what is then the basic truth of *a house*? What is its reason for existence? On what metaphysical and physical foundations will we build that neglected truth of *a house*?

It may sound paradoxical, but sometimes only physics can help the understanding of metaphysics. Newton's third law defines the relationship of action and reaction; or, in more subtle interpretation, it can be said that, if the goal is to understand the reaction, one must first understand the action; or ultimately, the one who initiated the action. In other words, viewed both physically and metaphysically, the problem of *a house*, as a creation, could and should be, in fact, the problem of its creator – *man*. The intelligence which conceived, created the first thought, the idea, the need, the necessity, which in fact, in itself, *is* the very *beginning* of architecture. This *"man's mental, reflective, beginning of architecture"*, in fact, in other words, is the metaphysical problem, the purpose and goal of this paper. So, we are, finally, *forced* to express our opinion and conclusion that *man*, as the creator of the comprehensive (rational) architecture, is its sole and main *raison d'être*. The subject, instead of the object; man, not a house – is the epicentral source of the problem of architecture. Man was, is, and will remain the main subject of (rational) phenomenon called architecture.

For the sake of truth, it should be said that Le Corbusier (1956, 1999) indeed notes that the new architecture must build according to man's needs. However, when he talks about the problem of man he always refers to the man of progress. He never perceives man through his basic metaphysical meaning. And that is the general, initial problem of modern architecture. Because, as modern architecture is not a universal representative of architecture, so the modern man is not a representative of the universal type of man. Thus, it is clear that man should not be perceived against the spirit of the times, progress, or the like, but against the universal understanding, in a diachronic, timeless, metaphysical sense; as much as possible to us. And a redefinition of Le Corbusier's postulates is, therefore, essential here. Instead of thinking *"the problem of the **house** has not yet been stated"*, it should be said *"the problem of **man** has not yet been stated"* Or, in the context of this paper, more precisely: "*the problem of man today, on the epistemological-ontological-axiological-methodological level, has been neglected.*" This is the beginning, and it is an undeniable foundation of any further understanding of the basic truths of architecture.

As much as it seems that the problem of metaphysics of man may go beyond the limits of architecture, it is the metaphysical foundations of *existence* of architecture that give the indisputable legitimacy to the study of man as the main problem of architectural activity. This relationship is inevitable, crucial and all-determining. **Without knowing man there can be no knowledge of architecture**, from the micro to the macro level, from the metaphysical all the way to the practical manifestation. And with this basic truth of demiurgy or architectural creation, we can only confirm the thought of St. Justin from the beginning of the chapter – gnoseological problem, or more precisely the *raison d'être*, must really be reduced to the problem of man's personality; this is the primary question that requires a solution.

3.1. *Raison d'être* of man – god-man

Identification of the problem of *"man",* as the basic question that solves the metaphysical foundations of architecture, practically opens a new architectural research field of incomprehensible proportions. Yet, to investigate *man* is an intention that must be

operationalized. In the context of this paper, that would mean to perceive the *raison d'être* of man. Or, more specifically, to answer the metaphysical questions of gnoseology, ontology, axiology and methodology of man. Accordingly, in order to solve a given problem, it is necessary to choose a research paradigm by which these human problems will be interpreted. According to aforementioned thought of Popović, that knowing a problem is a religious-ethical problem, we leave the choice of a research paradigm to this law. Thus, viewing different strategies through a kaleidoscope of multifaceted religious-ethical refractions, one can see the consequent regularity of differentiating these strategies into two all-determining groups. As indicated in Introduction, these are, on the one hand, anthropocentric (man-centric) paradigms, and, on the other, theocentric (God-centric) paradigms (Gustafson, 1981, 1994; Hoffman & Sandelands, 2004; Sandelands, 2004; Velimirović, 2013d; Eliade, 2003; Popović, 1998b; Harari, 2018). Thus, it is clear, through a prism or determinant, that knowledge is a theological-philosophical problem, the primordial relationship, the conflict between the two most famous historical antipodes (or at least seemingly antipodes): man and God, is practically revealed. Or, as Mircea Eliade (2003) puts it: the profane and the holy (man).

In other words, in the context of Christian understanding of the terminology of man, this relation can also be characterized as a relationship of man-god, that is, god-man. A closer analysis of these concepts and metaphysical definitions will be elaborated later, but for now it is important to note that this paper focuses on the subject of man as god-man. Contemporary literature, both philosophical and sociological, as well as architectural, is full of theoretical and philosophical considerations about the problem of man-god, i.e. anthropocentrism. In practical terms, architecture itself as we know it (since the 18th century) is absolutely man-centred. The aforementioned Le Corbusier and modernism are, of course, the proof of this. On the other hand, research on the topic of god-man and theocentrism is unjustifiably more than neglected. However, what is still encouraging is the fact that, since the last decades of the 20th century, there is also a growing tendency, in various scientific fields, towards the theme of transcendent human determination (Alexander, 2002, 2018; Barrie & Bermudez, 2016; Carroll, 2017; Guba & Lincoln, 1994; Hoffman & Sandelands, 2004; Holmes & Lindsay, 2018; Pallasmaa, 2012; Purzycki et al., 2016; Salingaros, 2016b, 2016a; Sandelands, 2004; Zumthor, 2006). Therefore, science is gradually turning to studies that combine religious and worldly problems in various ways. Thus, this paper, following current scientific trends, but also following its own scientific needs and evidence, which point to the theme of the transcendent, turns its focus to the topic of theocentrism. For, the only potential way to perceive the basic truth of man without being Le Corbizier's *"man of progress"*, that is, man-god, is through the antipodean East Christian Orthodox, holistic concept of man as god-man.

This turn towards man as god-man is based largely on the fact that in transcendent learning man is viewed as a holistic entity of mind, soul and body; which can never be expected from any non-transcendent anthropocentric teaching. It is simply the fundamental, ontological feature of this paradigm. In it, man will never be a holistic entity that exceeds the limits of the senses, i.e. physicality. Therefore, we share the belief that only in the holistic nature of the transcendent, god-manly, theocentric thought, which perceives man as a spiritual-physical being, has a potential solution to the raised question of architectural *raison d'être*. That is, precisely in man, as a spiritual-physical entity, we find the solution to the *physicality* of architecture, which is the central consequential problem of choosing man-god (anthropo-theocentrism) for the *raison d'être* of architecture. In the following, our goal is to give specific instructions through the analysis of theo-anthropocentric thought on how to transfer this thought to the level of architectural activity. Still, in order to succeed in this,

one must first analyze and comprehend the theo-anthropocentric thought itself in its general form, i.e. through Orthodox teaching of its metaphysical postulates.

4. THE CONCEPT OF GOD-MAN AND THEO-ANTHROPOCENTRISM ACCORDING TO JUSTIN POPOVIĆ

"We stand for god-man, because we stand for man." St. Justin Popović (2005a)

The thought of Justin Popović is always strong and deep, clear and extremely precise. Adherence to god-man, as he says, by no means implies a departure from man; on the contrary, the care for god-man is precisely the most consistent and complete care for man, respect for his integral and deepest personality.

While analyzing the personality of the god-man and the man-god, St. Justin, further on, strongly insists on the term *"personality"*, stating that in anthropo-theocentrism *"personality is impaired and destroyed; what remains is man – thing."* (Popović, 2009a). He based this on the analysis of the contemporary organization of society. The humanist man, having rejected the idea of God, and having put man in the first place (*homo mensura*), had to become an atheist; and with the help of relativization of all transcendent moral values, and for the sake of the most exalted – freedom, man becomes anarchist, as well. Giddens (1998) testifies to these thoughts of Popović, calling this period of modern development "*a century of industrialization of war*". However, if man has become the absolute ruler and founder of values, then, according to Nietzsche (2012), he can also become *ubermensch* (overman), nihilist, man of absolute freedoms.

However, the idea of freedom that the described man so eagerly pursues has become the idea of slavery. For, instead of true freedom in controlling one's instincts, man, due to all of the above, but mostly due to relativization of transcendent moral values, becomes a slave, a captive of his own instincts and desires. This thirst for absolute freedom has in fact become a service to various *"gods"*. Instead of an atheist, man has become a polytheist; and that is through a devotional service to matter, to various idols of science, technology, culture, fashion, politics, and even architecture, and to all their products. So, we should be completely honest; instead of man mastering matter, matter has mastered man. We could even say, mastered in a completely literal sense. Man ceases to be a separate, free personality with his unique identity. The globalist idea is, after all, based precisely on the destruction of individual (thus unique) identities (Giddens, 1998). Man becomes an impersonal and *"soulless thing among soulless things"* (Popović, 2009a).

Accordingly, it is clear that the theme of personality that St. Justin emphasizes, becomes extremely important, both for man and for architecture, which is truly losing its face today (Pušić, 2009). Such a man, overman, or, in other words, god-man is therefore a depersonalized man also (Velimirović, 2013b; Popović, 1998c; Spengler, 2010). The only positive thing is that this problem was noticed by many, for example, at the 2014 Venice Architectural Biennale by Rem Kolhas (2014), among other things, it was dedicated to this very topic – the impersonality of architecture, society, man. Because if a person does not have an identity, neither does society, therefore neither does architecture. Therefore, the purpose of this paper becomes clearer; *"The one, who solves the problem* (of personality) *of man, has solved the problem* (of personality) *of society"* (Popović, 2009a), and thus the personality of architecture.

On the other hand, theo-anthropocentric paradigm, as mentioned above, is an absolute antipode to everything presented, including the attribute of personality. Most concisely formulated, philosophy, i.e. metaphysics of man as a god-man, ontologically relies on the personality of God-man Christ (Popović, 2009a). Thus, this must become the first and foremost, true antipode – **personalism**. In the place of the impersonal, anarchic, relativistic, physical man stands the Absolute, the hierarchical ruler, the spiritual-physical, divine personality of God-man Christ. But it is also important to comprehend that his principal position as God is not despotic, or in any way negatively absolutistic. On the contrary, by appearing among men, God, God-man Christ, calmly offers his divine personality to man. He offers, and does not impose. As St. Justin says, in the personality of God-man Christ *"the closest union of God with man is realized: neither God is underestimated at the expense of man, nor man at the expense of God."* Therefore, God offers man a perfect synthesis, *"not only God, not only man, but God-man."*

And this gives a practical opportunity to override any existing antipodes. **Man receives a call to deification from God himself, and, if the man's will desires it, the opportunity to truly become a deified man, a god-man, god by grace, that is, by the gift of Christ himself.** And this is a major and essential difference from anthropo-theocentrism; where man, by his own will, without the God's calling, and at the same time even overthrowing the true God, elevates himself to the level of some god. In theo-anthropocentrism, God bestows upon man the status of god, but again respecting the will of man, i.e. only if he wishes it and if he respects and accepts the conditions of his arrival to that new status. In other words, if man exerts himself in effort and life in the Church, fulfilling the prescribed axiological laws. Therefore, man as man-god, self-willed, guided by his own ego, becomes depersonalized; and man as a god-man, by God's gift with the consent of man, guided by divine love, is personified. Man, as a man-god, self-willed, guided by his own ego, *"worships"* his corporeality; and man as a god-man, by God's gift with man's permission, guided by divine love, is spiritually and corporally deified and transformed into the holistic entity of god-man.

Accordingly, it can be concluded that the basic reason for the existence of man as a god-man is transformation (gr. – μεταμόρφωσις), **deification** of both man and the entire nature and cultural social production; but not by man's arbitrariness, but by the calling, the grace, the gift of God himself. The only way to do this is through the methodology of god-man, i.e. the methods of **endeavor** and **holy life** in the Church according to its laws and Holy mysteries. That is, through the ascetic observance of axiological evangelical virtues and moral laws, both the innate **conscience**, the Old Testament **Decalogue**, and, most importantly, the New Testament moral law of **love**. More specifically, through endeavor in a large number of axiological values such as love, god-love (worship, philo-theos, gr. – Φιλοθεος), man-love (philanthropy, philos-anthropos, gr. – φιλάνθρωπος), faith, hope, modesty, meekness, kindness, harmony, honor, honesty, respect, mercy, prayer, etc. By embarking on the path of the methodology of endeavor, one becomes a *"devotee of faith"* (Popović), and changes the axiological negatives within himself, i.e. the passions and sins, and thus, by the gift of God-man, he transforms himself and everything around him into god-man. With this he finally reaches, but also attests, the basic ontological truth of Orthodoxy and the theo-anthropocentric paradigm – **God-man** Christ. Shown in a form of table:

Table 3 The metaphysical features of theo-anthropocentrism

ontology of theo-anthropocentrism	**God-man**
gnoseology, the **raison d'être** of theo-anthropocentrism	**deification**
axiology of theo-anthropocentrism	moral laws:
	conscience, decalogue, love
methodology of theo-anthropocentrism	**a feat, a sacramental life**

5. APPLICATION OF THE THEO-ANTHROPOCENTRIC PARADIGM ON ARCHITECTURE

Through evangelical (axiological) *virtues, not only man and humanity are transformed, but also the entire nature* (creation) *through them. St. Justin* (2009)

At the beginning of the discussion of the implications of the theo-anthropocentric thought on architecture and its practical manifestation, it is necessary to remember that this is actually a metaphysical antipode to the contemporary representation of architecture. It is not at all subject to *"standard"* (man-centric) perceptions of architecture; the established rules, criteria, concepts, and the like, of anthropocentric architecture are not applicable to the theo-anthropocentric architecture. Therefore, in order for it to be presented at all and to be understood, it is necessary to, at least for a moment, reject all widely held man-centric beliefs and rules about architecture. The reason is clear, and lies in the diametrical nature of paradigmatic metaphysical settings; which are, clearly, equally opposite, both at the level of organization of society and of architecture.

The solution of the theo-anthropocentric architectural cognition, as in the case of this paradigm in a general sense, begins with the main subject and creator – man. Since he is its main *raison d'être*, it is him who gives all the solutions and answers at the same time. So, since we are discussing man as god-man, we are also discussing a holistically understood man, or a spiritual-physical entity. And this makes the first, initial feature that plays a decisive role in the formation of the architectural manifestation of the theo-anthropocentric paradigm. This division into the spiritual and physical manifestation of man, in fact, also represents the division into the spiritual and physical *needs* of man, and thus, clear directions for the action of architectural production. Logically, from the point of view discussed, spiritual needs are the primary needs to be met. All others, including the existential ones, are dependent on the primary ones. Becoming a god by grace, therefore, is the landmark epicenter of needs. Their external, physical representation, while legitimate, is nevertheless secondary, indirect, and not crucial to the main *raison d'être* of man as god-man, i.e. deification.

It should be emphasized that the stated categorization of values does not in any way mean a complete neglect of physical needs. Such radicalization, while acceptable to the ascetic way of life, is very difficult to imagine in the context of modern lifestyle. Although this paradigm is a counterweight to the contemporary anthropo-theocentric pattern of life, it still cannot completely ignore the context of modern man and his needs. Instead, it aims to replace the absolutist rule of corporeality, or sensuality, with spiritual-corporeal synergy. Therefore, the goal of man who strives for god-man is to find an adequate measure, that is, to put his spiritual needs first, while simplifying, and not necessarily completely rejecting, the physical ones. So, putting one's needs in a balanced order, the cultural production of man, and therefore architecture, must strive for the same. The goal of theo-anthropocentric architecture should thus be to find the right balance between the two extremes; a balance that determines the

needs of the spirit and the needs of the body, and thus the way of its material representation. **The more modest these physical needs are, the simpler the architecture itself will be and closer to the primary spiritual need of deification. At the same time, its connection with the natural architecture in which it is created will become more harmonious, natural and less violently invasive.**

The only way in which man, and consequently architecture, can reach this balance is through the realization of ontological-gnoseological truths, and through practical application of axiological-methodological values of the known truth (Popović, 2009a) (see Table 3). Only by understanding and fully relying on the aforementioned can this architecture potentially be of help to man in the path of fulfilling his main *raison d'être* – the attainment of holiness, i.e. deification.

Of course, considering the limits of the paper itself, it is impossible to analyze all the ontological-gnoseological-axiological-methodological values and the ways of their practical application. This paper, in fact, merely sets out the beginnings of an analysis, the metaphysical foundations, of an extremely large and wide-ranging problem. However, in order to gain a general insight into the possibilities and potential ways of material representation of the theo-anthropocentric architecture, a brief overview of some of the features (modes of transmission) of the values mentioned within the architecture corpus will be given below. More specifically, by analyzing ways of interpretation of these values within individual examples and the limits of function, form, and construction of architecture.

5.1. The function follows the gnoseology of deification

The established metaphysical principles of god-manly, theo-anthropocentric logics are such that they represent the basis for the solution of any problem (Popović, 2005b). So, when we are discussing the practical embodiment of this idea in architecture, primacy and significance of the gnoseological question is the main starting point. More specifically, the gnoseological question of *reason for existence*, from which the clarification of ontology, axiology and methodology is derived, is the most important fact needed. Consequently, the basic architectural postulates of function, form and construction receive their characteristic order. In this case, *the function* must take the place of gnoseology. Because, only *function* can represent the *"source of architectural knowledge"*, i.e. that stronghold that is primary and on which it is built, or from which it originates, all further form (axiology) and construction (methodology). Just as gnoseology (source) builds axiology and methodology (product), so does function (source) build form and construction (product). It can be put this way: axiology and methodology follow gnoseology, and form and construction follow function. Or, function follows gnoseology, and form and construction follow axiology and methodology. Finally, axiology of form and methodology of construction follow the gnoseology of function.

This order is, after all, more than logical, both in philosophy and thus in the very nature of creation, which in fact is metaphysics at work. Architect Louis Sullivan (1896), spending his childhood on the farm, daily studying the nature around him, inspired, he writes:

*"Whether it be the sweeping eagle in his flight, or the open appleblossom, the toiling work-horse, the blithe swan, the branching oak, the winding stream at its base, the drifting clouds, over all the coursing nun, **form ever follows function, and this is the law**. **Where function does not change** (as the gnoseological source, N/A)**, form does not change**. The granite rocks, the everbrooding hills, remain for ages; the lightning lives, comes into shape, and dies, in a twinkling. It is **the pervading law of all things organic and inorganic, of all***

things physical and metaphysical, of all things human and all things superhuman, of all true manifestations of the head, of the heart, of the soul, that the life is recognizable in its expression, that form ever follows function. This is the law."

In other words, and in a practical sense, for the architecture of Orthodox theo-anthropocentrism, *the way*, or *the appearance* of something, is not as important as is *the need* itself that is being built or satisfied, that is, *the function*. So, what is truly essential, ontologically-gnoseologically important, is what is necessary, but not what goes beyond that necessity. So, it is the essence, not the expression of the essence. But also, the very *way* of using that essence; *for what* is this essence, not *how* it is expressed. Or, by analogy, the soul is more significant than the body; or, the sense of the letter, than the sign itself; the function of a tool, than its form; the creator than the creation and so on. Accordingly, the functions of theo-anthropocentric architecture take on a special dimension. Not only is **function more important than its expressive form and construction**, but **all functions are subordinated to that primary need of man – deification**, his main *raison d'être*.

These are the two main characteristics of the function of theo-anthropocentric architecture; the second of which is the highest specificity related to the features of the function of anthropo-theocentric architecture. In practical terms, this can of course be manifested in different ways. One of these practical manifestations of the foregoing, and mainly the second characteristic, is that this architecture can in no way be limited to sacral function, as it might seem at first glance. Because, man, logically, does not live only within sacral buildings. His need for deification neither ceases, nor arises, nor is it related *only* to sacral function; it is ubiquitous at every moment of his existence, and thus in his every existential space. In a man who aspires to become god-man, there is no strict division between the profane and the sacred. Such a person sacralizes all the world around him with his life. Thus, every church, by its function and use, is sacred, and every Christian home, if it is so lived in, is sacred, i.e. suitable for deification of man. Therefore, it is extremely important to note that, as much as it instinctively refers to its application within sacral buildings, the theo-anthropocentric paradigm can by no means be restricted *only* to those spaces. On the contrary, it must be transferred to *every* architectural typology, every function that man uses in his life. If the architecture of anthropo-theocentrism does not know the typological limitations, therefore, the architecture of theo-anthropocentrism also cannot know any typological limitations; which is actually a very logical statement. This is, therefore, an extremely important all-encompassing fact, so far, through history, probably not set up or explored in this way, or at least not at that intellectual-scientific level.

Looking through history, there are not many examples of theo-anthropocentric architecture, and thus the functional determinations mentioned above; first of all, because, such architecture also requires a society whose development focus is on God and religion. However, one potentially relevant example would be the period of the Nemanjić dynasty in Serbia. The rulers then incorporated the Orthodox faith, thought, paradigm into the very ideological foundations of their rule (Debljović Ristić, 2013; Prodić, 2012). The main state-forming idea that built the Serbian empire at that time, and thus architecture, rested on the idea of merging the earthly and heavenly empires, for the sake of deification, salvation of both the rulers and the entire nation. This can also be seen in various examples, from Prince Rastko Nemanjić (Saint Sava) himself, who put this idea into action most consistently, to architectural examples of monastery complexes, rural settlements, individual dwellings and the like.

The most easily readable architectural feature is, the aforementioned typological subordination to that main function, the need of man – deification. The most readable example is that of monastery units where besides chapels and churches, various types of dining rooms, public kitchens, inns, orphanages for children and adults, hospitals, schools, workshops, and the like were also built. In doing so, virtually all of these functions were given a single sacral dimension; through axiological service to people (philanthropy), they served God (worship, philo-theos) and thus reached that sanctum of holiness (deification). So, the very choice of functions, thus typology, utilitarianism, purposefulness, goal and meaning of the buildings, was humane, philanthropic, so as to encourage spiritual growth.

Similar aspirations also prevailed in the interrelations of function – form – construction. There, as already stated, the function had the fundamental role. The emphasis in this relationship is on necessity, what is really needed; there was an architectural modesty that manifested itself both in function and in the form and construction of buildings of that time. There was one formative measure that did not go beyond the boundaries of luxury, comfort, ornamentality, an over-emphasis on sensuality, the banal aesthetics of the outside, and the like. Accordingly, one of the interesting details that rounds out this brief example of the Nemanjić dynasty and their view of society and architecture are the deeds of King Uroš. As we can read in his life (Popović, 1991), although he built it as a personal mausoleum, he used the Sopoćani monastery through his life a place of reception for foreign deputies. From this, it becomes clear that it was more important for him to invest in and emphasize the (functional) beauty of the Orthodox faith as a representation of the country, than to invest in and emphasize the (formative) beauty and luxury of his palace.

His example, in many respects, summarizes the essence of the theo-anthropocentric paradigm and theo-anthropocentric architecture and much could be written about it. However, as the famous Byzantologist Professor Ousterhout (1997), in summing up the Byzantine, that is, Orthodox culture of society and architecture, sums it up nicely: *"In a society where the physical and the spiritual intertwine, everyday life has never been a major concern. Salvation was obtained through good deeds, not large palaces."* In other words, he points to the fact that **salvation** (**deification**), through respect of axiological values, was the primary concern of the Byzantine, orthodox *"everyday life"*, and not how human palaces would be built or look. Referring also to the thoughts of the Byzantine politician and philosopher Theodore Methochites, he continues to state: *"It is not the exterior of buildings that is to be praised, but the display of compassion and philanthropy (mercy)."* That is, it was not the form of the structure that was so important, but the function that was always subordinate to that primary function of deification; and through various other subfunctions, or more precisely, axiological values, first the primary one – love, and through worship and philanthropy. It can be concluded that, if not conscious aid, then, architecture of theo-anthropocentrism must, at least, by no means be an obstacle to that absolute goal of holiness, that is, to the deification of man.

5.2. Form and construction as a visual aspect of deification

Form and construction could also be interpreted as a sensory, mostly **visual aspect** of function. Axiology and methodology as a visual aspect of gnoseology. Altogether, we could say that our quest, in architectural terms, is for *"the sensory, and first of all, the visual aspect of deification"* (Ivanovic, 2010). Although the ultimate goal is deification in a transcendent sense, where the very process of worship begins from the equally

transcendent God's calling, in the very practical context of the materialization of the formerly stated, the process begins from the material man and the surrounding material objects and spaces. Therefore, it is precisely these surrounding objects and spaces that potentially represent that sensory and visual aspect on the path of deification. And, it is important to point out, all objects and spaces from all existential levels; from hand to universe, as stated by Schulz (2000) in his *"existential spaces"*.

It is difficult, of course, to find direct references in the literature on how to reach the sensory or visual aspect of deification. Even with Justin Popovic, we could talk more about indirect instructions, and "readings" of Justin's thoughts, than about really direct allegations. However, Dionysius the Areopagite (according to translation: Prodić, 2012), one of the authors whom Popović mentions in his interpretations of the Orthodox thought, gave the problem of the visualization of deification a special doctrinal foundation. Interpreting the thoughts of Dionysius the Areopagite, Filip Ivanovic (2010) writes:

"Although the ultimate goal of ascension is a formless domain (God, deification – A/N)*, this **journey begins with things that have form**. **Image** and **vision** stimulate the mind in its flight. Thanks to the splendor of beauty, and the inclusion of the emotional-mental as well as the sensory, not just the mental* (spiritual – A/N) *field, an anagogical function is fulfilled: it becomes possible to ascend from a visible domain to an invisible, from a sensory to a spiritual experience; it becomes possible to experience God (...) being overflown with divine grace, and therefore, with salvation. **Symbolic language exceeds the power of discursive language**."*

So, a visual representation of form, space, or **images** is one of the more significant features of the deification process. For, humans themselves are sensory, and thus visual beings; in addition to mental, spiritual cognition, they possess that emotional ability of cognition through the senses. Therefore, in the context of ascension to God, and the process of deification, images, or in other words, *"symbols and signals"* (Ivanović, 2010, 2017; Velimirović, 2013e; Prodić, 2012) play a certain, significant role. Dionysius himself, in the following, explains exactly the above (according to: Ivanović, 2010):

*"Our mind cannot otherwise ascend to the heights and contemplation of the heavenly orders except through peculiar material leaderships, that is, through the acceptance of visible reflections in an attempt to explain (understand) invisible beauties, to form non-material enlightenment through the light of material substances; (...) the whole order of visible beauties (ornaments), steadily indicates to the heavens (...). To make it even shorter: **all actions appertaining to heavenly are given to us (because of our nature, most often) through symbols**."*

Accordingly, architecture itself, as well as, among other things, sensory and, first of all, visual activity, should be understood as a potential **symbolic means of man's ascension towards God.** Thus, architecture cannot be a goal for itself, nor should art exist for the sake of art (*l'art pour l'art*) (Arsić, 1976). On the contrary, the architecture of theo-anthropocentrism has a moral obligation, but more broadly ontological-gnoseological-axiological-methodological obligation, to provoke a certain aesthetic, anagogical feeling, experience, which would ascend spiritual-physical man to deified god-man. In short, the goal is to reach contemplation (understanding) of the *"divine aesthetics"* (as Dionysius puts it), through emotional symbols and signals. Similarly, Lidov (1998, 2006, 2012) writes in his *"hierotopies"*; however, it seems unnecessary, confining itself to experience within the boundaries of sacral spaces.

However, one should also know that this crucial aesthetic experience cannot be established without ethical conditionality (Arsić, 1976). Even the ancient Greeks always viewed aesthetics through ethics, that is, collectively as an axiological problem. The proof of this is even semantic in nature. The Greeks used the word *kalos* (*καλός*) meaning both *beautiful* and *good*. As refined observers of metaphysical and transcendent thought, they have found that *beautiful* is only that which is *good*, and *good* only that which is *beautiful*. In other words, aesthetic value is equal and dependent on ethical; and even vice versa. There is no difference between good and beautiful, morality and art, and thus morality and architecture. Even Plato valued the value of art according to its ethical influence; stating that the most important goal of art is to emphasize the value of virtue and to reject vice; which can be seen, for example, in his "*Ideal State*" (Arsić, 1976). This observation can in fact be subsumed as logical legality. That is to say, it is more than clear that given the diversity of ethical views, a work of art, of any kind, and therefore architectural, can potentially have different interpretations. For some, a certain kind of art can be beautiful, and for another, according to its ethical attitudes, it can even look disgusting; as, for example, in the case of Marcel Deschan's very extravagant, questionable, "*ready-made* art" (Bichkov, 2012).

Similarly, Christian thought does not separate one from another; like with most ancient (transcendent and metaphysical) thoughts, Christian teaching is the one that supplements, corrects, and presents in a more comprehensive and subtle, grounded way. So, from the Christian thought standpoint, or against the context of this paper – from the standpoint of Orthodox theo-anthropocentric paradigm, beautiful is what is good and thus, what elevates man's thoughts to God, allowing him to come to his ultimate goal, to fulfill his raison d'être, that is, holiness, or deification (Ivanovic, 2017; Arsić, 1976; Bichkov, 2010; Lazić, 2007, 2008). And as Professor Velimir Arsic (1976) puts it nicely, this value of ethics should permeate all Christian (theo-anthropocentric) creativity; therefore, the entire man's life, in all his segments and productions. And so, it should be concluded that in any religion or philosophy, this subordination of aesthetics to ethics is not as consistent and essential-constructive as in Christianity, and with emphasis, in Orthodox Christianity. And the reason is one – holiness, as the goal of man's life, which is ontologically-gnoseologically dependent on ethics and moral laws.

Therefore, according to aforementioned, it should be concluded that one of the most important goals of the architecture of theo-anthropocentrism is to find ways to transpose these ethical values into emotional, and first of all, visual, spatial aspect (Ivanovic, 2010). Here, too, specifically, according to the teaching of Orthodox thought, it is all about the ethical all-value of *love*, or, in other words, *love for God (worship)* and *love for man (philanthropy)*, which can be further developed into a multitude of other, auxiliary values, which make up the first two. These are values such as: *faith, hope, humility, meekness, kindness, modesty, honor, honesty, respect, mercy, patience, prayer,* etc. Therefore, the main goal is how to transfer all of the above, through a certain symbolic visualization, into a real-space domain, thus providing to man the adequate existential spaces to accompany him to his ultimate goal of deification.

Also, it is extremely important to note here that in laying down the principles of theo-anthropocentric architecture, we cannot in any way fall into concrete materialistic instructions. Giving any exact practical space design tips would mean limiting the unlimited. That is, the metaphysical nature of this paradigm is such that it does not allow for any restrictions and impositions (Popović, 2005b). Any more specific instructions would directly lead to the formation of a new style; which can by no means be the goal. The only practical criterion of

this paradigm is, in fact, of a metaphysical nature, and it is represented throughout this paper through various means. It is, of course, the all-criterion of deification. Therefore, it should be concluded that **every material intervention that contributes to deification**, or at least does not hinder it, **is allowed**. Thus, the *"spirit of the time" (zeitgeist)* as one of the values is certainly acceptable and even necessary; but again, only in the context of subordination of the *"spirit of the time"* to the criterion of holiness, not the opposite.

In particular, the example of modernism shows the aforementioned needlessness of any material limitations of philosophical settings. In addition to those generally known progressive values, there is also a significant metaphysical set that is unknown to everyone today, and advocated for by Le Corbusier (1956, 1999, 2008, 2013) in early modern thought. It is about values like identity, history, folklore, tradition, nature, spirit of the place, etc., which have never found their practical manifestation. The reason is precisely the unnecessary practical limitations embodied in the specific instructions regarding modern materials, technologies, systems, forms, production, forms of individual elements, etc.; which directly prevented the materialization of the mentioned.

According to this more than worthy historical example, but also to its very nature, the paradigm of architecture of theo-anthropocentrism must by no means fall into a similar trap. Its practical representation must remain at the level of metaphysical guidance. Any restriction, or specific instructions, such as those of Le Corbusier, would lead to an identical situation, a crisis in which we see the modernist, anthropo-theocentric, architectural thought. On the contrary, every architect, a demiurge, should have absolute freedom in expressing his creative thought. The only limitation is knowledge of the metaphysical settings of this paradigm, or, more specifically, the tendency to create different existential spaces that would, through different symbolic representations, convey the given metaphysical values in such a way, and with such aim, to provide man with adequate spatial conditions for his journey towards deification.

6. Concluding Remarks

Dura lex sed lex – the law is harsh, but it is the law

This world is based on laws. Many of which are made by different gnoseological legislators. As much as any law is strict, it is its secondary characteristic. More important than that is that the law *is, it exists*. Or that everything around us is, in fact, happening by some law. So, the presented practical paradigm is also a practical law which solves the aforementioned *"art of living",* mentioned at the beginning of this paper. Perhaps at some points it also sounds harsh, or rather utopian, and unreceptive to a modern man. Whatever attribute we use, resolving the basic ontological-gnoseological-axiological-methodological foundations of man and his life, that paradigm inevitably *is* the law. And as the law by which man's life takes place, historically and factually stable, should not and cannot be overlooked (Velimirović, 2013a).

As much as it carries a note of ideological beliefs, i.e. regardless of whether one believes in it, and consequently, in God or not, whether they recognize themselves as spiritual-physical beings, or just physical, science and thus architecture, is obliged to offer all of them a satisfaction of their specific needs. If modernism, or any other definition, a scientific strategy, can aim at the corporeality of man, his sensory needs, there is no legitimate reason for not forming a paradigm that would satisfy the spiritual-physical side of man (Hoffman &

Sandelands, 2004; Holmes & Lindsay, 2018). That is where the freedom of modern man lies. Therefore, the pursuit of this paper was constantly directed towards finding ways for architecture to meet the needs of that spiritual-physical man to whom the concept of the sacred, the sublime inner spiritual values still means something.

Thus, according to the presented analysis of the historically confirmed paradigm, we have revealed that the orthodox paradigm of theo-anthropocentrism is the law of living that firstly recognizes the *spiritual* element in man. Unlike anthropo-theocentric strategy that only focuses on the physical and sensory. This is perhaps the critical difference, or value, by which all other details of this paradigm are defined. Spiritual element offers the possibility of complete redefinition of man, society, cultural production, and thus architecture. By introducing the spiritual, man becomes a spiritual-physical being, the fullest holistic entity, whose needs go beyond physicality and sensuality. His most primary need is of spiritual nature, and that is the transformation into a new man, god-man, or deification (Popović, 1998a, 2009a). Similarly, the architecture for man as god-man must be guided by his primary need for holiness, but also by other physical-spiritual sub-needs, which are further specified by the metaphysical, ontological-gnoseological-ethical-aesthetic values of a given paradigm.

This architecture, therefore, should be a symbolic means of man's elevation to God; or, in the mildest interpretation, it should not be an obstacle on that way. In other words, **the goal of architecture of Orthodox theo-anthropocentrism must be to, by certain symbolic sensory, and primarily visual representation transpose the spiritual, metaphysical ontological-gnoseological and methodological-axiological values into different material spaces and objects; and thereby create adequate existential, material spaces and objects suitable to fulfill man's all-purpose of life – holiness, i.e. deification.** It should be clear that architecture, in the whole process of achieving the aim of deification, is of course, not an absolute necessity, but is potentially useful. Also, due to the nature of the paradigm itself, its material representation cannot be limited nor determined by any material advice. Its only shaping force is the given metaphysical postulate or all-criterion of deification. Or sublimely, **any material intervention that contributes to deification is allowed.**

Of course, all of the above are the starting, basic metaphysical postulates of theo-anthropocentric paradigm and its application in architecture. A complete typological classification, structuralisation of all the above-mentioned values, and their most important interpretations and transpositions to the level of architectural activity, is the most significant and key part which will follow in further research.

What may be added as an indication of the direction in which further research could go, is related to the practical manifestation of the given paradigm in architecture. Perhaps the easiest way this can be presented is on the example of planning the living area of a housing structure. It seems that today, modernist, or even neo-modernist, functional disposition scheme is not being questioned. Is the proposed segregation of space – for example, i.e. separation of the daily zone into subzones actually good? Should the living zone of a modern family cover a living room and living-bedrooms, study rooms, or should there only be only one central zone? Also, should the former function and importance of certain "forgotten" elements, such as the *fireplace* and *dining table* be reactivated (Karelin, 2019)?

Sitting by the fireplace, in the past, or at the dining table, later on, these elements had the function of gathering the family together, thus forming a unique living area. At the same time, they have contributed to the formation of a significant number of axiological values of this paradigm: the family was together most of the time; a feeling and reality of communion was being formed; feelings of closeness, love and harmony; interpersonal problems were

more easily solved; tolerance and calmness were being built; family members used to help each other; communication, intimacy, connection and trust were being developed; and the possibility for greater moral outbursts was lower (as they were all present) etc. Today, the central role of the fireplace and dining table has been replaced by television, computers, mobile phones, and habits and obligations, in general, of members of a modern family (Karelin, 2019); thereby directly forming several daily zones within a single housing structure. This also forms a set of axiological values, but this time, of the anthropo-theocentric paradigm. It is clear that there is a significant loss of time spent together with the rest of the family; members are becoming distant, they communicate less, they are not united; there is a lack of intimacy, love, harmony; potential problems are harder to solve; it is more difficult to build endurance, calmness; intimacy, connection and trust are reduced; loneliness and alienation arise, privacy leads to the possibility of major moral outbursts, etc.

Theo-anthropocentric paradigm would, logically, propose reaffirmation of these neglected elements, as very significant positive axiological catalysts of the above-mentioned axiological values. Of course, even though these elements are generally known and represented in a variety of architectural manifestations, in the context of the theo-anthropocentric paradigm, they get a completely different value and meaning. This in turn leads to the conclusion that all the architectural instructions, which this theo-anthropocentric paradigm suggests, make sense only if the man himself, or the family who live in these spaces establish their life, in general, on this paradigm. For all others, the aforementioned "architectural instructions" will have no special significance.

In addition, in further research, the analysis of specific case studies that potentially have some of the characteristics of this metaphysical paradigm should be carried out. Of course, a completely direct reflection of this strategy does not exist. Some of the closest examples are the periods of social development, when the focus of the society was on God, and thus the aforementioned periods of Serbia under Nemanjic rule or Tsarist Russia, Byzantium, and their architecture can be an interesting starting point. But if we look for examples out of Orthodox thought, i.e. social order structured according to Orthodoxy, then in general terms, potentially significant examples could be the vernacular creations of different nations. This "*traditional, anonymous, folk*" (Rudofski, 1976) architecture is a good example of merging man's spiritual and physical needs with natural architectonics. In this sense, it has perfectly found its place within the paradigm analyzed in this paper, given that it is, as interpreted by Rudofski, *humane, natural, calm,* ***manly, spiritual architecture***.

We should definitely not ignore some modern researchers and architects who have attempted to transpose the notion of the transcendent into the field of architectural activity, both in practice and in their theoretical papers. These include authors like Christopher Alexander (2002, 2018), Nikos Salingaros (2016a), Peter Zumthor (2010) but also a huge group of architects and scientists gathered around a scientific forum ACSF (Forum of architecture, culture and spirituality), led by Julio Bermudez and Thomas Barrie (2016, 2015). All of them have recognized the value of transcendent thought, that is, of man as a spiritual-physical entity whose needs in architecture go beyond mere physicality. Of course, their research does not gravitate toward Orthodox thought, but rather generally toward some vague metaphysical transcendence, but regardless, even as such, this thought is worthy of a general analysis.

In general terms, in addition to the aforementioned ones, there are many authors who associate architecture with society and man. It is precisely in their thoughts that this paper, although largely theological and philosophical, has found evident architectural justification.

Thus, for example, architect Bruno Zevi (1966) highlights the inevitable connection of architecture and society, by stating: "*space (...) is (...) a consequence of social reflection*." Or, even better, in Rossi (2008) we find: "*The city is a great show that in reality reflects the living conditions.*" Gogol' claim is literary picturesque (1991): "*Architecture is human history written in stone*." However, maybe the famous Wright (by: Pfeiffer & Nordland, 1988) is the one who, against the context of our work, most closely and concisely concludes:

"I know that architecture is life; or at least, it is life itself taking form and therefore it is the truest record of life, as it was lived in the world yesterday, as it is lived today, or ever will live. So, architecture I know to be a Great Spirit."

So, it is clear, and we believe, justified, that the problem of architecture should be sought more deeply than its material, constructional foundations. The problem is in society and man's life in general; or, looking at the breadth and depth of theological and philosophical thought of Orthodox theo-anthropocentrism, we would like to make the conclusion with the words of Justin Popović (2009), *solving the problem of man* (in an essential, metaphysical sense) *resolves the problem of society*, and thus certainly, the problem of architecture.

REFERENCES

1. C. Alexander, The Nature of Order: An Essay on the Art of Building and the Nature of the Universe, Center for Environmental Structure, Berkeley, 2002.
2. C. Alexander, A Pattern Language: Towns, Buildings, Construction, Oxford University Press, 2018
3. T. Barrie & J. Bermudez, Architecture, Culture, and Spirituality, VT: Routledge, Farnham, Surrey, England, 2016.
4. J. Bermudez & B. Julio (Eds.), Transcending Architecture: Contemporary Views on Sacred Space, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington, D.C, 2015.
5. T. Carroll, "Theology as an Ethnographic Object: An Anthropology of Eastern Christian Rupture", Religions, 8(7), 114, 2017.
6. L. N. Groat, Architectural Research Methods, 2nd Edition, Wiley, Boston, Amsterdam, 2013.
7. E. G. Guba & Y. S Lincoln, Chapter 6: "Competing Paradigms in Qualitative Research", In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research (pp. 105–117). Calif: Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, 1994.
8. J. M. Gustafson, Ethics from a Theocentric Perspective 1 (1st Edition edition, Vol. 1), University Of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1981.
9. J. M. Gustafson, A Sense of the Divine: The Natural Environment from a Theocentric Perspective (First Printing edition), Pilgrim Pr., Cleveland, Ohio, 1994.
10. A. Hoffman & L. Sandelands, "Getting Right with Nature: Anthropocentrism, Ecocentrism and Theocentrism", Organization & Environment, 18, 2004.
11. C. Holmes & D. Lindsay, "In Search of Christian Theological Research Methodology", SAGE Open, 8(4), 2018.
12. F. Ivanovic, "Vizuelni aspekt oboženja po Dionisiju Areopagitu". Zbornik Radova Vizantološkog Instituta, 47, 2010.
13. F. Ivanovic, "Nevidljiva ljepota i njene vidljive predstave: Estetika Dionisija Areopagita", Humanističke Studije, 3, 2017.
14. R. Koolhaas, Fundamentals: 14th International Architecture Exhibition - La Biennale di Venezia. Marsilio Editori, Venice, 2014.
15. E. G. Guba & Y. S Lincoln, Naturalistic Inquiry, Calif: SAGE Publications, Beverly Hills, 1985.
16. R. Ousterhout, "Secular Architecture", In H. Evans & W. Wixom (Eds.), The Glory of Byzantium: Art and Culture of the Middle Byzantine Era, A.D. 843–1261. 1997.
17. R. Ousterhout, "The Holy Space: Architecture and the Liturgy", In L. Safran (Ed.), Heaven on Earth—Art and the Church in Byzantium, The Pennsylvania State University Univerity Park, Pennsylvania, 1998.
18. J. Pallasmaa, The Eyes of the Skin: Architecture and the Senses (3 edition), Wiley, Chichester, 2012.

19. B. B. Pfeiffer & G. Nordland (Eds.), Frank Lloyd Wright: In the Realm of Ideas (1st edition), Southern Illinois University Press., Carbondale, 1988.
20. B. G. Purzycki, C. Apicella, Q. D. Atkinson, E. Cohen, R. A. McNamara… J. Henrich, "Moralistic gods, supernatural punishment and the expansion of human sociality", Nature, 530(7590), 2016.
21. N. Salingaros, A Theory of Architecture. Vajra Publications, 2016.
22. N. Salingaros, (Ed.), Anti-architecture and Deconstruction: The Triumph of Nihilism. Vajra Publications, 2016.
23. L. E. Sandelands, Man and Nature in God, N.J: Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick, 2004.
24. L. H. Sullivan, The tall office building artistically considered, J.B. Lippincott Co, Philadelphia, 1896.
25. P. Zumthor, Atmospheres (5th Printing. edition). Birkhäuser Architecture, Basel, 2006.
26. P. Zumthor, Thinking Architecture (3rd edition). Birkhäuser Architecture, Boston, 2010.
27. V. Arsić," Etika i estetika (Moral i umetnost)". Teološki Pogledi, IX(3)., 1976.
28. V. Bičkov, Estetika otaca crkve (1st ed.). Službeni glasnik, Beograd, 2010.
29. V. Bičkov, Kratka istorija vizantijske estetike (1st ed.). Službeni glasnik, Beograd, 2012.
30. N. Vasiljevič Gogolj, Sabrana dela (Vols. 1–6). Jugoslavijapublik, Beograd, 1991.
31. N. Velimirović, Nauka o zakonu (nomologija). Sabrana dela, knjiga 5 (1st ed., Vols. 1–12). Glas crkve, Šabac, 2013a.
32. N. Velimirović, Niče i Dostojevski. Sabrana dela, knjiga 2 (1st ed., Vols. 1–12). Glas crkve, Šabac, 2013b.
33. N. Velimirović, Razni članci, besede i studije. Sabrana dela, knjiga 9 (1st ed., Vols. 1–12). Glas crkve, Šabac, 2013c.
34. N. Velimirović, Sabrana dela (1st ed., Vols. 1–12). Glas crkve, Šabac, 2013d.
35. N. Velimirović, Simvoli i signali. Sabrana dela, knjiga 5. Glas crkve, Šabac, 2013e.
36. E. Gidens, Posledice modernosti. Filip Višnjić, Beograd, 1998.
37. N. Debljović Ristić, Istočnohrišćanska trijadologija u arhitekturi vladarskih zadužbina srednjovekovne Srbije. Beograd, Univerzitet u Beogradu, arhitektonski fakultet, 2013.
38. R. Dinulović, „Ideološka funkcija arhitekture u društvu spektakla", Međunarodna konferencija Arhitektura i ideologija, Beograd, 2012.
39. M. Elijade, Sveto i profano, IK Zorana Stojanovića, Novi Sad, 2003.
40. B. Zevi, Kako gledati arhitekturu. Klub mladih arhitekata, Beograd, 1966.
41. R. Karelin, „Liturgijski i duhovni život", Sveti Knez Lazar, 33/34(99/100), Beograd, 2019.
42. M. Lazić, Teologija lepote. Otačnik, Beograd: 2007.
43. M. Lazić, Srpska estetika asketizma. Zadužbina Svetog manastira Hilandara, 2008.
44. Le Korbizje, Savremena kuća dostojna ljudi, Građevinska knjiga, Beograd, 1956.
45. Le Korbizje, Ka pravoj arhitekturi, Građevinska knjiga, Beograd, 1999.
46. Le Korbizje, Putovanje na istok, Karpos, Loznica, 2008.
47. Le Korbizje, Razgovori sa studentima arhitekonskih škola, Karpos, Loznica, 2013.
48. Lj. Miletić Abramović, Paralele i kontrasti: Srpska arhitektura 1980-2005, Muzej primenjene umetnosti, Beograd 2007.
49. N. Mirković, Prepodobni Petar Koriški, Manastir Prepodobnog Justina Ćelijskog, Beograd, 2019.
50. F. Niče, Volja za moć, Dereta, Beograd, 2012.
51. J. Popović, Žitija Svetih, Naslednici oca Justina i Manastir Ćelije, Beograd, 1991.
52. J. Popović, Dogmatika Pravoslavne Crkve I. In Sabrana dela svetog Justina Novog u 30 knjiga, knjiga 17 (Vols. 1–30), Naslednici oca Justina i Manastir Ćelije, Beograd, 1998a.
53. J. Popović, Sabrana dela svetog Justina Novog u 30 knjiga (Vols. 1–30), Naslednici oca Justina i Manastir Ćelije, Beograd, 1998b.
54. J. Popović, Filosofija i religija F.M. Dostojevskog. In Sabrana dela svetog Justina Novog u 30 knjiga, knjiga 6 (Vols. 1–30). Naslednici oca Justina i Manastir Ćelije, Beograd, 1998c.
55. J. Popović, O duhu vremena. Narodna knjiga, Politika, 2005a.
56. J. Popović, O suštini pravoslavne aksiologije i kriteriologije. In O duhu vremena, Narodna knjiga, Politika, 2005b.
57. J. Popović, Pravoslavna crkva i ekumenizam, Manastir Hilandar, Sveta Gora Atonska, 2009.
58. J. Popović, Gnoseologija Svetog Isaka Sirina. In Isak Sirin, Podvižnička slova (3rd ed.), Pravoslavna misionarska škola pri hramu Svetog Aleksandra Nevskog, Beograd, 2016.
59. S. Prodić, Uticaj spisa Dionisija pseudo Areopagita na razvoj vladarske ideologije Nemanjića. In Dela, Corpus Areopagiticum, Istina - Eparhija dalmatinska, Šibenik, 2012.
60. Lj. Pušić, Grad bez lica, Mediteran, Novi Sad, 2009.
61. A. Rosi, Arhitektura grada, Građevinska knjiga, Beograd, 2008.
62. B. Rudofski, Arhitektura bez arhitekata, Građevinska knjiga, Beograd, 1976.
63. J. N. Harari, Homo Deus: Kratka istorija sutrašnjice, Laguna, Beograd, 2018.

64. S. Ševkušić, „Osnovne metodološke pretpostavke kvalitativnih istraživanja", Zbornik Instituta Za Pedagoška Istraživanja, 38(2), 299–316., 2006.
65. L. Šestov, Potestas Clavium, Logos, Beograd, 2002.
66. O. Špengler, Propast zapada, Utopija, Beograd, 2010.
67. K. N. Šulc, Egzistencija, prostor, arhitektura, Građevinska knjiga, Beograd, 2000.

METAFIZIČKE POSTAVKE ARHITEKTURE PREMA TEANTROPOCENTRIČNOJ PARADIGMI JUSTINA POPOVIĆA

Osnovne istine arhitekture su danas zaboravljene. Ovaj rad rešenje traži u spoznaji metafizičkih postavki arhitekture. Bliže određeno, metafizičkih aspekata ontologije, gnoseologije, aksiologije i metodologije; što skupa predstavlja osnovne kriterijume jedne naučne paradigme. Polazno pitanje mora biti gnoseološko, odnosno – šta je to raison d'être arhitekture? Analizom se dolazi do pretpostavke da bez poznanja metafizike čoveka nema ni poznanja metafizike arhitekture, odnosno zaključuje se – problem metafizike čoveka u arhitekturi nije postavljen. S toga, čovek mora biti glavno pitanje i arhitekture i ovoga rada. S obzirom da problem saznanja u opštem smislu, pa time i čoveka, jeste i teološko-filosofske prirode, problem čoveka se u ovom radu shvata kao gnoseološki izbor; i to: između čoveka kao čovekoboga (čovek je izvor saznanja) i čoveka kao bogočoveka (Bog je izvor saznanja). Odnosno, nameće se izbor između istorijskih antipoda, paradigme antropoteocentrizma i teantropocentrizma. U ovom radu zastupam mišljenje da pitanje bogočoveka i paradigme pravoslavnog teantropocentrizma, u tumačenju Justina Popovića, jeste potencijalno najcelovitiji odgovor na postavljeni problem raison d'être čoveka, a samim tim i arhitekture koju on stvara. Raspravom i analizom je ustanovljeno da se u ovom obrascu čovek shvata kao holistički, duhovno-telesni entitet čija je primarna potreba koju treba zadovoljiti i njegov raison d'être – oboženje. Time, arhitektura pravoslavnog teantropocentrizma dobija ne samo telesnu, već i najpre duhovnu, time holističku dimenziju; i može predstavljati simboličko sredstvo (kroz čulnu i vizuelnu reprezentaciju) uzdizanja čoveka ka Bogu. Teantropocentričnom paradigmom se rešavaju metafizičke osnove i potencijalno formira holistički ustrojenija arhitektura koja odgovara isto tako holističkim, duhovno-telesnim potrebama čoveka. Njena materijalna manifestacija je određena samo jednim svekriterijumom – oboženja.

Ključne reči: *arhitektura, raison d'être, čovek, teantropocentrizam, istočno-pravoslavno hrišćanstvo, Justin Popović*