

контексті періхівської теми. І ось чому. Мистецтва є життєві єдності. Технічна мова форм – це не більше, ніж маска самого твору. Згадаємо наполягання О.Шпенглера бачити в мистецтві тільки організм, а зовсім не систему. Рання велична архітектура – мати усіх наступних мистецтв. Вона є критерієм їхнього вибору і обумовлює їхній дух. Античність вибудовує храм тіла подібно до того, як фаустівська музика, особливо у фузі, споруджує собор голосів, що сплітаються. До того ж, відстань між двома видами живопису може бути незрівнєнно більш великою, ніж проміж одночасовим живописом і музикою. У зрівнянні з якою-небудь статуєю Мірона ландшафт Пусена і пасторальна камерна кантата його доби, Рембрандт і органні твори Букстехуде, Пахельбеля і Баха, Гварді і опери Моцарта, належать до одного й того ж мистецтва. Внутрішня мова їхніх форм настільки ідентична, що перед нею зникає різниця оптичних і акустичних засобів, а також засобів їх існування. Абстрактність схеми розподілу видів мистецтв має підґрунтям абстрактне ж допущення "вічних законів мистецтва". При цьому зовсім не береться до уваги, що, скажімо, антична музика – це ніщо інше, ніж пластика для вуха, коли, за висловлюванням Г.Г.Шпета "починають бачити вуха". А, наприклад, західно-європейський контрапункт розвивається водночас з системою розпинок у будівництві соборів і де доречні слова того ж Шпета щодо "очей, які починають слухати". Те, що, скажімо, у XVIII сторіччі зветься колоритністю – гравюри, малюнка, пластичної групи – означає музику. Вона панує у живопису Ватто і Фрагонара, в мистецтві гобелену і пастелі. Чи не є признаною завдяки цьому однорідність цих двох ззовні різних мистецтв? Тим більше, що сам М.Періх мав загострене сприйняття "музичності" кольору і "барвистості" музики взагалі, і зокрема, в творчості М.Римського-Корсакова і О.Скрябіна.

І ще одна тема, яка не може не виникнути в роздумах про Періха. Мається на увазі зовсім інше відношення М. та О. Періхів до людської свідомості, ніж проголошена революційною ідеєю європейця Франца Brentano щодо її інтенціональності. Остання стає наріжною для усієї феноменології, починаючи з Е.Гусерля. М. і О. Періхи ж закликали до відкриття якісної самостійності свідомості, її незалежності від того, на що вона спрямована, до бачення себе у якості тіла, що може мислити, а свідомості як світла, що є в самій людині і яке повинно розширюватися до безмежності.

Yana V. Botsman

STATUS OF CATEGORY "PSYCHIC" IN ORIENTAL CULTURE: "PHILOSOPHY OF THE HEART" AND PHILOSOPHY OF CREATION

Speaking about oriental mystical and philosophical tradition from the Western psychology point of view, K.G.Jung in his work "Psychological Comment on The Tibetan Book of the Dead" came to the following conclusion: "every metaphysical statement is a statement of a soul, ergo it is a psychological statement". However, Jung claims that "cardinal mutual misunderstand and mutual communicative dis-coordination of Eastern and Western traditions are rooted exactly in the different understandings of the term "psychological".

European, that grew up on the ideals of rationality, that were expanded with naturalism and pansexualism of Freud, does not recognize that the term "psychological" is a description of super-individual, i.e. "objective" experience. At the same time man of Oriental culture perceives this term in a context of non-dual Oriental model of the world there opposition subjective/objective, as well as opposition "something that really exists"/"something that is merely philosophical" is not typical.

"Every time them European hears the word "psychological" he apprehends it as "purely psychological". "The soul" seems to him as something insignificantly small, as something that is not worthy his attention, as something subjective, exceptionally personal en so on" [1,7]

That attitude toward the phenomena of psychic, religious and philosophical thought in general, that is deeply grounded in European understanding, makes difficulties for researching the Oriental

religious systems. This attitude represents separate events of Oriental culture as contradictory and incomprehensible. "The Tibetan Book of the Dead" belongs to that range of culture events.

In this sacral text of Tibetan Buddhism, mahayana Buddhism's notions and concepts concerning the nature of consciousness and concerning the structure of unconsciousness are demonstrated with somewhere shocking frankness. Jung fixes his attention on the lines of "The Tibetan Book of the Dead" that uncover the ontological notions of vajrayana Buddhism on the question of the nature of consciousness: "Your Consciousness, shining, empty, could not be separated from the Great Source of Light; it is not born, it does not die, it is an Unfading Light, Amitabha Buddha".

Commenting upon this identifying the soul and the deity (which, if we look at that more attentively, becomes not even "identifying", but, probably, Oriental rejection of separate dualism "individual consciousness" / "absolute consciousness") Jung comes to the conclusion, that in Eastern tradition "the soul or "individual consciousness" is not nothingness, but more – it is the Shining Deity itself. The West either thinks that such announcements are dangerous (or even blasphemous) or thoughtlessly takes them in into circulation, suffering afterwards from theosophical inflation. Regarding this question we always contrive to take up a wrong position." [Ibid. 8]

As in Tibetan vajrayana, Zen-buddhism "confesses" the broadened understanding of psychical, that authority in Tibetan Buddhism exploration Chogyam Trungpa marked with a witty term "spiritual materialism".

It's noteworthy, that Nikolai Berdyaev in his "Philosophy of Freedom" re-determines the term "rationalist" and "empiricist" in the very similar way: "we need to recognize, that as the real empiricists and rationalists, i.e. experience fullness protectors (...) must be seen the mystics and the saints" [2,56]. For Zen-buddhism tradition that got soaked with explanations of all oppositions incompetence (and especially with incompetence of subject/object opposition) the following dialogue between master and pupil is characteristic:

- They say that Buddha Amida lives in Pure Land. If so, where stays Buddha Shakyamuni?
- Both Amida and Shakyamuni stay in your Mind.
- But I heard that Pure Land is situated on the West (in India). Is not it true?
- What are you talking about! There is no Pure Land beyond the bounds of you Mind!" [3,7]

Zen master Takuan, which, according to tradition, is identified with a pupil in this dialogue, in his later years more than once developed the same understanding of a problem in his works, strengthening the idea that vision of the unity between individual and absolute consciousness is a distinctive trait of enlightened ones: "Buddha and all the living things are one and the same wholeness. One, that grasp it, can be called deity or buddha" [4,42].

In the works, that are devoted to cultural interaction between East and West ("Foreword to I Ching", "Synchronicity: An Acausal Connecting Principle", "Preface to "Introduction to Zen-buddhism" of D. T. Suzuki"), Jung persistently emphasized, that Oriental culture, that regarding the question of conscious status and psychic phenomenon took up more radical (from European point of view) position, is more favorable (than European) to the process of human personality individualizing and integration.

While Oriental culture postulates the principles, according to which human being that has not anything to create should create himself (creating this way not less "objective" value, common to all mankind) European culture recognizes almost exclusively the creation of the professional creators and refuses to personality, whose gifts are not evident or displayed in "cultural justification" of creativity.

Consequently, we can claim, that famous Western truism "La method c'est moi" ("Method – this is me"), that sounds in European cultural context as ironical accusation of voluntarism or, probably of egocentrism, gets in Zen art and Zen philosophy of creation its new, non-sarcastic, constructive meaning.

Owing to reasons that were mentioned above, in literary tradition, that formed under influence of Zen-buddhism ideas and concepts, the process of individualization has its own special place. The process of "spiritual maturing" of the writer, that is closely connected with transformational experiences was seen as one of the main factors that come into focus of criticism's and reader's attention.

In contrast to Protestantism, Zen-buddhism does not say no to the people, that "were not selected through "beruf (predestination)" when it goes about their creative power. In Zen it is supposed that the personality can get with a help of Zen practices (like "growing from within", "feeling from within")

on the certain stage of spiritual development the possibility to create. This creative power, being supplied with "technical" skills and with professional, critical look makes possible all creative realizations of the personality not on the amateur level, but on the professional one. So in Zen-buddhism creative power is a derivative of spiritual growth process.

It is not accidentally, that the most of the classics of monochromatic calligraphic paintings were Zen monks: for example, master of a style "zenga" Sessyu, classics of a style "sumie" Sengai and Hakuin (which is also very famous as a poet). Go Zhu-sui, medieval Chinese theorist, that was under a significant influence by chan'-buddhism concepts says: "if someone has lofty properties [of the soul] (that can be achieved through religious practice – Y.B.), his spiritual harmony (Chinese chiyun' – Y.B.) simply could not be in it's turn not lofty".

If "spiritual harmony" is not that high, when the living motion (one of the main categories of Chan' (Zen) esthetic – Y.B.) can not be captured. Every painting, according to Go Zhu-sui must be surrounded by "spiritual harmony". Only when painting can be called "the treasure of the generations". In different case, even when the painter use up all his "skilled tricks", his painting would remain not more then usual craft. "Although people would say that this is a "picture", this would not be a [real] picture" – emphasizes Go Zhu-sui [5,29].

Discussions on Zen methods of creative power's awakening can be illustrated by appealing the figure of Miamoto Musasi (1584-1645). He was very famous until our times as an author of universal manual of fencing and strategy "The Book of Five Rings", as a calligraphic painter and as a poet. Musasi adhered to Zen concepts and notions regarding methods of creation and Universe cognition, according to which all practices "meet each other on the top". Zen point of view expresses well-known aphorism of Chinese master Fen'-yan. Master, keeping in his hands his stick, addressed his pupil at parting with following words: "One of you, who understand his stick perfectly, can over his wandering in the sake of Zen" [6,265].

In "Book of Five Rings" Miyamoto Musasi, that practiced Zen meditation and other Zen training during almost all his life, expressed his confidence in ultimate similarity of all ways of creation. He was sure, that one, who perfectly got control over one of the Ways (he referred here to the way of Buddhism, to the way of Confucianism, the way of strategy (to which the "Book" was dedicated), to the way of poetry, "the way of tea" (i.e. the way of practitioner of tea ceremony tya-no-yu and to the ways of other arts and handicrafts [7,125])) finds the crystal-clear understanding of everything, that is related to other Ways, cause he finds in his own growth the "universal creative principle". To the question of these principle's development and comprehending all cultural (and esthetic) universe of Zen-buddhism is devoted.

Perceiving this "universal principle" in Zen canon is carrying out not through gnosis, not through intellectual of logical approximation, but with a help of intuition, emphatically, as one can say "with a help of a hart". "Buddha hridaya" is one of the Zen-buddhism's names, literally it could be translated from Sanskrit as a "hart of Buddha". In such gnoseological intention we can find the similarity not only with Christian (in Catholic and Orthodox traditions) cult of a hart, but also with the assumptions of Anri Bergson's intuitivism. As it is known, intuitivism thrown off the main assertions of pre-Cantian rationalism and Cantian criticism concerning subject and object disconnection in cognition and adduced an argument that material of knowledge was given to us in immediate experience.

If we would develop the analogy taking into consideration the classification of S. Frank, that picked out three types of intuition (perceptible, mystical and intellectual) so we should determine Zen cognitive strategy as perceptible-and-mystical one. Long ago in Le-Tsi Taoist treatise we can find the same reasoning and argumentation that were taken by Zen-buddhism as a guide to action: "Within the hart another one hart is hidden. Inside the hart there is another one. This hart-in-hart is like a thought, that forestall the words and images. When images appear, the words appear too. When words appear, the action starts to be. And when the action comes, the order arises" [8, 401].

Chuang-Tsu exposes the notion "hart" by the mean of Zen metaphor of "stoppage", "break". He is appealing to buddhism concept of "inner emptiness" (which can be easily compare with Christian concept of "inner purity"). This "inner emptiness" is a guarantee of "correct" sensation as in following words: "Do not hear with your ears, do hear with you hart. Do not hear with your hart, do hear with you spiritual current. In your hearing stop on what you hear, in your mind stop on what is thought. Let your vivid spirit stay empty, let it involuntary respond to exterior things" [9,80].

On our opinion, one of the main obstacles, that make difficult for Western people to research and analyze Taoist and Buddhist doctrines, is understanding the Taoist and Zen-buddhist "heart" as Orient equivalent of biographic unconsciousness (at least in Freudian sense of the term "unconsciousness"). Unfortunately, exactly to that interpretation all newest history of Western psychologically oriented anthropology inclines the researchers and readers of text of mentioned genesis.

D. T. Suzuki insists, that the term "soul" is optimal for translating the Japanese term "heart" (jp. *cocoro* or *seisin*), because "heart" (*cocoro*) as multilevel and polymorphous term, as the term "soul". "Firstly, the word "heart" means physical heart, secondly it means the "true heart" (i.e. it's volitional and emotional basics), thirdly it means "wit" (or intellectual basics), fourthly it means "soul" (i.e. vivifying basics) and "spirit" (i.e. metaphysical ones). In that way Suzuki separates two understandings of the term "heart" the first one is physical heart, so to say, the house of emotions and feelings and the second one is "true", the center of psychic activity and the object of self-cognition [10,75]. So we can suppose, that we can see in the term "heart" unconsciousness of K. G. Jung, i.e. structure of psychic, that units individual unconsciousness and collective unconsciousness.

It's interesting to know, that Suzuki himself leads us to such interpretation of this problem in famous work, that was wrote by him in cooperation with Erich Fromm. In this work two great authors explored the attitudes to the nature and structure of psychic in Zen-buddhism and in philosophy of psychoanalysis and tried to compare one to another. Here in this work we can find the following words about the unconsciousness: "Concerning the content of unconsciousness any generalizations are impossible. Just one assertion can be done: it always represents the man as a whole – with all his own potency of light and darkness; it always contains the basics for various answers, that man can give toward the questions, that existence asks... Unconsciousness is a whole man minus that part of man, which corresponds with surrounding society" [11,50].

Yet equation Zen-buddhist "heart" and unconsciousness of Jung tells us too much and at the same time too less. In our opinion, for showing up the essence of "universal creative principle" in Zen-buddhism we need more delicate "localization" of the notion "heart" parallelism. We think, this localization can be done through bringing into correlation the term "heart" and the term "psyche". In Jung's works "psyche" designates the universal super-individual matrix of culture, that is situated outside of "biographical transcendence".

As we mention above, to the attempts of it's somatic and theoretical localization in structures of endo- and exo-psychic were dedicated more then three decades of researches in the field of analytic, psychedelic and humanistic psychology, but first experimental evidences of it's existence were received only by transpersonal psychology.

It was determined, that for transpersonal area of psychic ("psyche" of Jung, "heart" in Zen-buddhism) one of the main types of emotional experience is experience of "widening or extension of consciousness *within* the ordinary notion of time and space and widening or extension of consciousness *outside* the everyday notion of time and space" [12, 101]. Taking into account the reason about the mode of experiencing the time in Zen-culture, that I discuss in another work and remembering the unsteadiness of the term "evidence", we can consider, that the assumption of mutual equality between the Zen term "heart" and term "psyche" in analytic psychology of Jung is proved.

Inasmuch signification territory of Zen-buddhist "heart" lays in the sphere of transcendent, it would be appropriate to add one more interpretation of this term, referring to the concept of "spirit" in Russian Religious philosophy. In Russian religious philosophy "spirit" is one of the constituent part of human nature, this is a highest capacity of a soul to perceive absolute and transcendent values and events. Ivan Il'in, developing the philosophy of religion on the base of Orthodox axiomatic, more than once pointed out, that spirit, which is "need of sacred" should be the most promising subject of all philosophies in the world. At the same time Zen-buddhism, where "following the heart" is supposed to be the main "virtue", enriched the world culture with methods, that make possible to satisfy this "need of sacred" not only in a field of religious practice, but also in any other field of human activity.

Bibliography

1. Юнг К.Г. Психологический комментарий к "Тибетской Книге Мертвых": Пер. с нем. // Бардо Тедол (Тибетская Книга Мертвых). – М.: Двойная звезда, 1995. – С.5-18.
2. Бердяев Н.А. Философия Свободы. Смысл творчества. – М.: Правда, 1989. – 607 с.

3. Мищенко А. Предисловие. Такуан Сохо. Миямото Мусаси. // Миямото Мусаси. Книга Пяти колец. / Такуан Сохо. Письма мастера дзен мастеру фехтования: Пер. с японск. – СПб.: Евразия, 1997. – С.5-25.
4. Такуан Сохо. Письма мастера дзен мастеру фехтования. // Миямото Мусаси. Книга Пяти Колец. / Такуан Сохо. Письма мастера дзен мастеру фехтования: Пер. с японск. – СПб.: Евразия, 1997. – С.29-102.
5. Го Жо-сюа. Записки о живописи: что видел и слышал: Пер. со старокит. – М.: Наука, 1978. – 240 с.
6. Нэнгэн Сэндзаки. Железная флейта (100 коанов дзен): Пер. с англ. // Нэнген Сендзаки. Железная флейта / Сэкида Кацуки. Практика дзен. – М.: Рефл-бук, 1993. – С.241-336.
7. Миямото Мусаси. Книга Пяти Колец. // Миямото Мусаси. Книга Пяти колец. / Такуан Сохо. Письма мастера дзен мастеру фехтования: Пер. с японск. – СПб.: Евразия, 1997. – С.121-213.
8. Ле Цзы: Пер. с кит. // Чжуан-Цзы. Ле-Цзы: Пер. с кит. – М.: Мысль, 1995. – С.328-377.
9. Чжуан-Цзы // Чжуан-Цзы. Ле-Цзы: Пер. с кит. – М.: Мысль, 1995. – С.59-287.
10. Судзуки Д.Т. Дзен и фехтование: Пер. с англ. – К.: Путь, 1993. – 96 с.
11. Fromm E., Suzuki D.T. and DeMartino R. Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis. – N.Y.: Harper Colophon Books, 1970. – 369 p.
12. Гроф С. Холотропное сознание: Пер. с англ. – М.: Изд-во Трансперсонального Института, 1996. – 248.

Veronika Leontieva

THE CULTURE-CREATIVE PROCESSES OF "POST-MODERNITY" (PREMISES, TENDENCIES, PERSPECTIVES)

There is a special interest, either for explorers and practitioners, to analyze the processes that have caused transition to "post-modernity" and also the "post-modern" tendencies in culture-creation, and their possible – positive or negative – development. In this case the admitted differences in estimation and behavior stereotypes, outlook and the attitudes towards the world, the self-identification principles that are inherent in different ethnic and cultural communities of Europe (the positions may be diametrically opposite, as, for example, in professional philosophical self-estimation of German and French thinkers [1]) are not essential; on the contrary, the historically integrated "New-European culture type" and presence of structural invariance in the culture-creative processes themselves permit (and demand) to relate to the European culture as to the wholeness trying to save its certain type that has turned out under the threat in the conditions of "the end of Modern Age" and in the epoch of "post-".

In this article we digress from the individual human realization of the culture-creative ability (although culture-creation has no other "ontology" but the individually realized "being-in-culture", that is based on the individual effort "affirmo" [2] – effort to produce/reproduce the cultural phenomena) and consider culture-creation as "a working" of the historically established cultural forms* due to which culture obtains the system's integrity and the social life assumes the characteristics of the historical continuity. The structure of the culture-creative processes (and consequently of a culture-creation system as a whole) takes shape by interaction of three different in quality types of the cultural forms: ostensive, imperative and axiological [3].

The system's foundations of culture-creation in the civilized society can be regarded as interaction – as a dialogue – of the professional culture that is a focus of the institutionalized and purposeful culture-creation's features and of daily occurrence, which, to my mind, can be considered

* Each cultural phenomenon represents a concrete unity of a cultural sense and a cultural form. In this unity form is a dominant of being; in each single act a cultural form determines both a cultural measure of freedom (responsibility) and a creative measure of a responsibility (freedom), i.e. only in form freedom and responsibility join in culture-creative identity, not only "giving birth" to a sense, but also giving the personal measurement (dimension) to the individual being, transforming a human life into the being-in-culture.

as the universal embodiment of the spontaneous, "attributively" syncretic culture-creation, which is therefore mostly related to the personal culture-creative freedom [4]. Daily occurrence always keeps conformity to the historical logic of building of a culture-creative system that is reproduced on the "ontogenetic" level as a logic of forming the individual culture-creative ability. In the everyday life the cultural senses mainly exist in ostensive forms: in examples and samples (models) of activity either integrated in customs (that are defined as "the stereotypes of activity underlying the daily life's structure" [5]) or exceeding "the traditional nature" of the usual behavior/intercourse. But anyway these examples and models of activity introduce the elements of novelty in the living gist of human existence spontaneously and together with their bearers (individuals). In the everyday life the ostensive form keep their "primary" status, although as regards the content (and culture as a whole) axiological forms are more important, because co-ordination, "synchronous work" of both items of the culture-creative process depends, at first, of the senses filling the forms and, secondly, of the real presence of these axiological senses in the spontaneous (daily, ordinary) and the purposeful (specialized, institutionalized) culture-creation.

For the New-European tradition grown out of Renaissance and Reformation where the certain parity of daily-spontaneous and specialized-professional culture-creation was settled, the submission of the spontaneous everyday life to the purposefully supported senses was not typical, but in the institutionalized culture-creative stream (in accordance with that number of social institutes has been increased) the functional dominant of the *imperative forms* was to be obviously observed. The structural and functional opposition of the culture-creation streams has been set; keeping its autonomy but being more and more different from the professional Culture in its structure, daily occurrence gradually lost its cultural significance (and value): the folk arts, that had been the integral, nonseparable part of the daily life, have been transforming into the "level of artistic culture", into the subject of scientific research, into the museum exhibit. And paradox was that those axiological senses which have been institutionalized by professional Culture and related to its imperatives were far from being always affirmed in the everyday life and in the personal "section" of the individual existence as examples and samples (models) of "alive activity", in spite of the fact that there was keeping functional primarity of the ostensive forms (which historically provides stability of the system of culture-creation as such).

The professional culture-creation had reacted to this by the Romanticism (that discovered folklore as a phenomenon), nonclassical styles and a paradigm of existence ("existenz") in philosophy, the well-known art crisis that began from impressionism trying to poeticize the usual person. The spontaneous culture-creation also could only "to alter itself": it was symptomatically, but the events in Paris in 1871 were in occasion of the city's bakers' refusal to work at night "when the bourgeois were sleeping". In essence it was a protest against the senseless daily occurrence consisting of the routine, making dull soul and intellect duties which assumed no culture-creation freedom and therefore were anthropologically hostile to the individual being that was not allowed to become a personal one.

Anyway by the beginning of the XX-th century the formerly balanced correlation between the Culture and daily occurrence in the European culture-creation system was broken. The Culture, presented mainly by institutionalized imperatives or, more correctly, their senses "threaded" on the values of the rationalism, the Progress and the Profit, – this culture having torn away daily occurrence and, at the same time, its ostensive, active layer of culture-creation turned out not only frail, vulnerable, disintegrated to a heap of "-isms", but unprotected before the strictly institutionalized axiological forms filled with values of Italian fascism, German national-socialism, Russian bolshevism. From this point of view the appearance of totalitarian regimes in 20-30-th is possible to understand as a definite objective low bound up with culture-creation systems crisis.

The cultural wholeness (and social life as such) in totalitarian society is based on the penetration of the institutionalized culture forms (and the corresponding senses) into the spontaneous stream of life so deep that daily occurrence seems deprived of its autonomy. Daily occurrence as compared with the professional Culture loses not only its "culture-creative status", but it is not more "The ordinary". By means of the repressive institutes the monoideoological senses are inculcated. The range and cruelty of this repressive mechanism, which resorted to the physical erasure of the people who were not possible "successfully" involved in the total "one-mode-thinking", promoted transformation of culture-creation into monological in essence type and, if it can be called so, into mono-total one. Here

the outward likeness of regulation and institutionalization of the daily occurrence to the traditional culture-creation is deceptive: within the institutionalized stream of the traditional society customs and traditions are mainly presented and consequently the cultural senses born spontaneously and having the ostensive form are affirmed both on the "official" imperatives and in the independent axiological forms without breaking the historical sequence of forming the culture-creation integrity. Just that is why the logical structures of the both streams are similar (ostensive forms > imperative forms > axiological forms), and the space of the culture-creative dialogue is determined by the ritual etiquette answering the same logic: action/perception > its understanding & rationalization > its estimation & evaluation; that's why to assimilate etiquette in the traditional cultures is identical with the mastery of the affirmation skill.

In the culture-creation of totalitarian society the inversion logic is realized: made by the "professional specialists" and at once institutionalized "by birth" principles, ideals, values (whose content may not take into account the cultural senses which were born in the everyday occurrence) turn out to take primary level in construction of culture-creation system integrity. At the same time, for protection and consolidation of this integrity the imperatives, which are being formed in correspondence with these axiological senses besides at once as institutionalized ones, are brought into "alive activity" and interpersonal communication. As a result (because the senses, before to fill the ostensive forms, are already rationalized in the imperatives and yet more earlier (!) estimated in the axiological forms), there does not remain of the sufficient sense and value "space" for the formation of the individual ability and, moreover, the affirmation skill. Therefore in spite of the conscious resistance at times, daily occurrence turns out regulated "according to" the totalitarian regime. Those cultural senses that appeared and were supported out of the social institutions in the totalitarian state and were saved, as the saying goes, "regardless" of them in the spontaneous ostensive forms were contrary to the official values and standards. That was a kind of annihilation of cultural senses affirmed (and transmitted) both in and out of the institutionalized stream. The brightest manifestation of the conflict between the Culture and the daily occurrence, between the spontaneous and purposeful streams is the phenomenon of double-thinking, when an individual in his/her daily life, in non-institutionalized sphere proceeded from one values but in the professional (institutionalized) culture he/she affirmed the quite different ones, and it was the general behavior model at that times [6]. The integrity of human inner world, the personal wholeness turned out under threat.

However, after the World War II, in those European social organisms that succeeded in keeping out of the transformation their culture-creation systems into "mono-total" ones, daily occurrence kept losing its "genetically conditioned property" to be an independent source of the ostensive culture senses. And this can only partly be explained by the fact that a number of the monoideological senses had time to harden, to become stereotypes and in such sort "to penetrate daily occurrence". More essential is considered the fact that as the achievements of the professional Culture (including the science and technology) penetrated the everyday life, daily occurrence was filled by signs coinciding with the imperatives whose observing doesn't need to have what is the essence of culture-creation – a free accomplishment of the "affirmo" effort. The spontaneous stream of culture-creation stopped existing, as it were, at all: manipulation mechanisms of fashion, advertising and everything that can be called a mass-culture have transformed the daily occurrence from the necessary subsystem of the culture-creation integrity into negation of culture-creation. In the middle of the XX-th century an individual in his/her everyday life turned out in the situation when the personal cultural senses are "out of demand" to be perceived – grasped and affirmed; the loss of senses – nonsense – has turned from a metaphor, that formerly was organic for the professional philosophers and the artistic intelligentsia, into a daily experienced state, akin existential ones. Absurdity of the individual being appeared as some everyday occurrence's reality for "an ordinary person".

The challenge (or by A. J. Toynbee's terminology, the respond to challenge) to such everyday occurrence was the counterculture in 60th – early 70th. Being a result of the same culture-creation process/problems that catalyzed beginning and consolidation of the totalitarian societies, the counterculture had basically the opposed meaning: if the mono-total culture-creation systems were a kind of derivatives of Culture subordinated to the political ideology and the institutionalized force be as to "objectifications" of imperatively affirmed senses of "order", "common good", "progress of

mankind", etc., the counterculture tried to overcome the culture-creative crisis from within the system integrity.

And in spite of the fact that the ideas of the counter-culture were articulated by the genuine ideologists (Theodore Rossak, Charles Reich, Philip Slater, Norman O'Brown), these ideas themselves were the derivatives from "the element of the revolutionary action", from the different, as compared with "the old Culture", perception of life and the other way of organizing the reality. Moreover, it is notable that if the mono-total culture-creation systems, having made official forcing out the ostensive forms and spontaneously (freely) produced senses on periphery of the cultural activity, only consolidated the destructive tendencies in the culture-creative processes, the counterculture (which, by the way, was also forced out on periphery by the institutionalized spiritual production) stimulated looking for the new, the other type of the culture-creation systems integrity. It is the new type that forms the *content* of the epoch experienced "here-and-now": this transition epoch is "postmodernity" and realizing impossibility to continue the culture-creation processes according with "the New-European mould" is the "postmodern" itself.

Postmodernity as a transition state can be compared with the historical transition from the archaic culture-creation to the civilized one. At that time the culture-creative process, being completed to the axiological forms, bifurcated, having separated the element of daily occurrence from the professional Culture where production/support of the senses was purposefully fulfilled owing to institutionalization of the corresponding cultural forms. Beginning from the epoch of the ancient civilizations the proportion of institutionalization of the cultural senses and their affirmation (in definite cultural forms) determined a state and a type of a culture-creation system until the epoch of "post-". But now this measure is losing its significance: if in "old" culture-creation system the process of the purposeful translation influenced on the spontaneous everyday culture-creation as "ideological reference", in the forming culture-creation integrity the daily occurrence itself begins to invade in the purposeful stream. Thanks to information computer technologies a modern (postmodern) person independently of gender, i. e. both a man and a woman, has got a possibility to create influence on the purposefully translated experience's content, and not under the outward "necessity", that is according to instructions of a social institute and/or its representative, but under his/her own "free will". Individual has got a possibility literally every day to take part in estimation and selection of the achievements – the cultural senses getting into the value-sense universe, taking his bearings only on his "cultural store" and his personal culture-creative ability. In postmodernity daily occurrence gradually acquires features of the real being-in-culture, the individual section of person's being transforms into "space and time of affirmation", which are not identical neither the classical "spare time", nor "the leisure" of the industrial society [7].

By its status and functions the postmodern daily occurrence is analogous to the archaic one (it is a *source* of cultural senses) and as formerly presents more largely the spontaneous stream of culture-creation than the purposeful one. But since, in contrast to archaic, it is differentiated and there is a free, getting uninstitutionalized, information access to any experience (whose content has got into the computer nets) in it, it is in daily occurrence where "the inversion of raising" that was formerly typical only for the purposeful culture-creative process becomes possible. Here it is meant that not only "ascending" from the ostensive – through imperative – to axiological cultural forms takes place, but the opposite process goes on too: the axiological forms, whose content has been chosen and adopted by an individual spontaneously (out of the institutionalized stream), raise the new for this individual imperative forms' content, which naturally, independently of a state, a church, authorities' instructions etc. is "converted" in the daily produced ostensive forms. Deliberate intention of "postmodernity" to withdraw the hierarchical order of the world conception, strict subordination between the specialized professional culture and daily occurrence, institutionalized and spontaneous, i.e. "freely chosen/produced" senses and, finally, between the imperative and ostensive forms (which by itself can be interpreted as refusal to subordinate the feminine principle of culture-creation to the masculine one), – all of these allows us to assume the possibility of changing the culture-creation system foundations themselves.

The outlined tendencies towards decreasing the level of the culture institutionalization (including the professional Culture) and returning the attributive status to daily occurrence and restoring "balance" between the masculine and feminine principles (since "domination" of the feminine culture-creative principle would mean a literal return in archaic society, but now on the basis of deliberate

"suppression" of "the idea of rational order"; it is not possible and one of the reasons against it is that functions of the imperative forms in the culture-creative processes structure can not be reduced neither to the ostensive forms' functions nor to the axiological forms' ones, which are an original integral of the former and the latter) were displayed. It is these tendencies, through which transition to the different, *new* qualitative state of the culture-creative processes and formation of the new type of integrity of the culture-creation system in "postmodernity" takes place. Eclectic, by the principle of mosaic or kaleidoscope, combination of signs of the different cultures that have already taken place in the culture history, ironical and/or quoting reproducing of some characteristics of the archaic culture-creation testify that most probably the future culture-creative integrity will absorb not only "the best" from the preceding (realized) culture-creative processes, at least if it is estimated from the New-European positions. Time will show what kind this new integrity that has begun being formed will be. But now it is seen a new layer of problems. This is necessity to reduce "the culture-creative arbitrariness", whose temptation is too strong if to relate to the "simulating reality" as to reality of postmodern daily occurrence. Some explorers have already paid their attention to necessity of "protection" the society against a creative, not charismatic, persons [8], i.e. individuals, realizing their culture-creative freedom while all the previous logic was directed to "emancipate" an individual, to provide and save personal autonomy. However it is unlikely that can be a great hope that transition to a new type of culture-creation system will be painless.

Bibliography

1. Малахов В.С. Несостоявшийся диалог // Логос: Философско-литературный журнал, №6 (1995). – С. 310-313.
2. "Affirmo" (from Latin "affirmo" – I affirm; first was used by Boethius) – a concept proposed by V.A.Konev for designating both the culture-producing (creative) effort and a paradigm of a modern (postmodern) philosophy. – See: Конев В.А. Философия культуры и парадигмы философского мышления // Философские науки. – 1991. – №6. – С. 20-25.
3. This typology was proposed by V.A.Konev. – See: Конев В.А. Диалектика культуры как диалектика порождения // Диалектика культуры: Сборник. — Куйбышев: Изд-во Куйбышевского ун-та, 1982. – С.36-41.
4. See: Леонтьева В.Н. Личностное бытие как культуротворческая свобода // Вісник ХДУ, 1998, №414. – С. 228-231.
5. Современный философский словарь / Под общ. ред. В.Е. Керимова. – Москва – Бишкек – Екатеринбург. – 1996. – Статья "Обычай". – С.342.
6. See e.g.: Социалистический реализм: мифы и реальность // Филос. и социол. мысль. – 1995. – №7-8. – С.52.
7. For details see: Леонтьева В.Н. Бытие-в-культуре – онтологическая реальность постмодерна? // Постмодернизм в философии науки и философии культуры: Вісник Харківського державного університету № 389'97. – Х., 1997. – С. 69-77.
8. Иноземцев В.Л. Сможем ли мы жить вместе? // Вопросы философии, 1998, №2. – С.191.

О. Марченко

ОЗНАКИ РОМАНТИЧНОГО В ОФОРМЛЕННІ НОТНИХ ВИДАНЬ ХІХ СТОЛІТТЯ

Існують такі культурні епохи, – пов'язані, як правило, із молодістю тих або інших культур, – коли мистецтво, активність якого зростає, втручається в побут, естетизуючи повсякденну течію життя і стаючи його частиною: Відродження, бароко, романтизм, мистецтво початку та кінця ХХ століття. Людина при цьому, на думку Ю. Лотмана, усвідомлює себе крізь призму літератури, живопису, поезії, театру, музики та бачить у цих мистецтвах найповніше виявлення

реальності [7, 209]. Поміж інших видів мистецтва література більшою мірою здатна акумулювати нові ідеї і зміни, що відбуваються в тканині культурного процесу. Саме тому в літературі формування основних методів відображення дійсності, яка постійно змінюється, відбувається швидше. Стикаючись із різними видами мистецтва, і з музикою зокрема, література виступає в ролі своєрідного культурного каталізатора, вносячи і стимулюючи прогресивні зміни. У загальному культурному процесі музика посідає особливе місце, як вид мистецтва, емоційна мова якого викликає безпосередній відгук у свідомості людей із різним ступенем культурного рівня, відмінностях у національності, статі, віці й виступає засобом спілкування людей хронологічно далеких культур.

Щоб зрозуміти мистецтво будь-якого культурного періоду, нам необхідно насамперед уявити собі людину певної епохи.

Відношення різних типів мистецтва до поведінки людини будувалося по-різному. Ю.Лотман вважає, що "виправданням реалістичного сюжету служить твердження, що саме так поведуться люди в дійсності; класицизм думає, що за зразками мистецтва люди повинні поводитися в ідеальному світі". У романтизмі ж життя й ідеал протипоставлені, однак романтична поведінка більш доступна, ніж класицистична, тому що містить у собі не тільки літературні добродетності, але й літературні пороки" [7, 344]. Новий тип людської поведінки, з'явившись на сторінках тексту романтичного твору, переходить у життя. Романтизм, зароджуючись у Європі наприкінці XVIII століття, у вигляді віянь проникає в Росію, а разом із ними приходить, особливо під впливом Руссо, прагнення до природи, до "природності" натури і поведінки. У свідомість людей входить думка, що і добро закладене в природі, що людська істота, створена за образом і подобою Бога, народжена для щастя, волі, краси. На початку XIX століття в Росії під впливом історичних подій, війн, книг і гуманістичної атмосфери сімейного життя дворян складається зовсім нове покоління людей. Протягом сторіччя ми чітко можемо розрізнити своєрідні типи людських характерів.

Для людини початку XIX століття характерні спроби знайти свою долю і реалізувати свою особистість, що буде психологічно обумовлювати різноманіття способів поведінки. Рух століття розривався від протиріч: "регулярна держава" бідувала у виконавцях, а не в ініціаторах і цінувала ретельність вище, ніж ініціативу. Для російського дворянина XIX століття, а в другій його половині й чиновника, характерна строга врегульованість життя нормами світських пристойностей, ієрархії чинів, станової і бюрократичної. Інший бік потреб століття будувався на принципово іншій основі й породжував інший людський тип. Спрага самовираження створила героїв і диваків, характери часто дикі, але завжди яскраві. (Наприклад, орієнтованим на екстравагантність поведінки, що ображає світське суспільство і на романтичний культ індивідуалізму, який набув забарвлення романтичного бунтарства, був дендізм. Очевидний також зв'язок між принципами романтичного світогляду і поведінкою декабристів, що із несвідомої стихії побутової поведінки будували свідому систему ідеологічно значимої поведінки.). Якщо для передової людини початку XIX століття характерна плюралістичність, можливість вибору стилів поведінки в залежності від ситуації, подвійність, що полягає в розмежуванні практичного й ідеологічного, то декабрист своєю поведінкою скасовував ієрархічність і стильове різноманіття вчинку. (Нагадаємо, що для романтизму поетичним була єдність поведінки, незалежність вчинків від обставин і залежність від ідеалу, протиставленому життю). Одночасно декабристам властиве усвідомлення себе як історичної особи, що зумовило оцінку свого життя як послідовності сюжетів для майбутніх істориків, поетів, драматургів.

Все зростаючий культурний розрив між укладом життя дворянства і народу породжує трагічне світовідчуження у висококультурної частини дворянства. Якщо в XVIII столітті культурний дворянин прагнув стати "європейцем" і як можна більше віддалитися від народної побутової поведінки, то в XIX столітті відбувається просочування фольклору в побут. Переплетення "європеїзму" і архаїчних народних уявлень, звичаїв, релігійних обрядів, філософського вільнодумства, західництва додавало культурі XIX сторіччя своєрідних рис.

Особливу роль у долях російського романтизму відіграв світ жінки. Романтична епоха відвела жінці найважливіше місце в культурі. Жінці, яка була піднесена до ідеалу, приділялася область високих і тонких почуттів. (Пройде піввіку, і читачу-різночинцю буде незрозумілою неподільність життєвого і "поетичного" – "непрактичного", яка створила високу духовність

романтичної дівчини початку XIX століття і грала роль, що облагороджує, у російській культурі.)

Зміна стилю культури, що спостерігається в епоху романтизму, позначилася на найрізноманітніших галузях людського життя, зокрема, на музичній культурі. Своєрідним дзеркалом епохи, що дозволяє судити про особливості втілення романтичного світогляду, є оформлення нотних видань XIX століття. Протягом усього цього періоду відбувається завоювання російською музикою рівноправності з існуючою в Росії іноземною музикою. Цей складний процес відбивають літературні альманахи і музичні альбоми, у яких були опубліковані нотні тексти. Найбільш яскравими з них були альманахи "Полярна зірка" і "Мнемозина" (1824), "Російська старовина", "Нариси Росії" (1838), "Драматичний альбом для аматорів театру і музики на 1826 рік", збірник "Веселка" (1830), що представляє собою перехідний тип від літературного альманаху до музичному альбому. Ззовні музичні альбоми відрізнялися від звичайних друкарських нот поздовжним, так званим "альбомним" форматом. [Див., наприклад, альбоми "Подарунок рідним" і "Альбом північного співака", видавець Аляб'єв, Спб., 1832] Російський текст містив численні помилки, тому що його гравірували іноземці. Автори романсів і фортепіанних п'єс, які містилися в музичних альбомах, як і в літературних альманахах, часто ховалися під ініціалами. "Альбомний" період російської музики, пов'язаний з іменами Глінки, і, почасти, Даргомижського, був більш тривалим, ніж "альманачний" період літератури, пов'язаний, в основному, з іменами Пушкіна і його сучасників – літераторів і продовжувався до другої половини XIX століття. Ці збірники відрізнялися тісним зв'язком музики і літератури, що підкріплювалося особистим спілкуванням російських літераторів із музикантами, їхніми зустрічами в літературних і музичних салонах З.Волконської, В.Одоевського, Е.Карамзіної, братів Вільгорських. Творча атмосфера зборів сприяла появі численних творів літератури і музики – віршів, переважно ліричних, побутового романсу і дрібних форм інструментальної, головним чином, фортепіанної музики. Саме в цей час був створений той основний пісенний фонд, що значною мірою визначив характер російської національно-поетичної культури і наклав відбиток на музично-поетичний побут російського суспільства аж до 1917 року.

Белінський розподілив літературні альманахи на три категорії в залежності від достоїнства творів, із яких вони складалися. До вищої категорії – альманахів "аристократів" – він відносив ті, що складали відомі літератори (Пушкін, Дельвіг та ін.). Наступна категорія – альманахів "міщан" – складає збірники, куди цінні твори потрапляли тільки випадково. До останнього розряду він відносив збірники, які наповнювались "готуванням" авторів 15 класу" [2, 505]. Почасти такий розподіл використовується при характеристиці музичних альманахів. Вищу групу – альбомів "аристократів" представляє "Ліричний альбом" 1829 рік, виданий за допомогою Н.И.Павліщева. У 1839 році Глінка склав "Збірник музичних п'єс" у п'ятьох зошитах.

Існували деякі принципи розподілу музичних альбомів на основну, співочу частину, і "додаток". Великою своєрідністю відрізнявся "Музичний альбом із карикатурами", виданий у 1849 році Даргомижським із карикатурами Степанова.

Іноді в музичних альбомах і літературних альманахах літературні і музичні твори доповнювалися оригінальною графікою, або репродукціями малюнків художників. Так, в альбомі Даргомижського і Степанова кожному із восьми розміщених у ньому музичних творів передував аркуш із карикатурою на автора музичного твору і жартівливим надписом. Необхідно відзначити, що карикатури, які були дуже популярні в цей період, були своєрідним проявом романтичної іронії. До альбомів, значних за своєю художньою цінністю, відносяться авторські збірники, де усі твори належать одному композитору. До їхнього числа належать альбоми "Подарунок рідним" і "Альбом північного співака" (1832), укладені Аляб'євим. У 1833 і 1835 роках – музичні альбоми Варламова. Значне місце серед музичних альбомів посідають збірники куплетів із модних у той час водевілів. Однак уже в 30-ті роки музичний зміст водевілів став дрібніти. Погіршилося і поліграфічне оформлення, розраховане на дешевизну і масовий збут.

"Альбомний" період російської музики, розквіт якого припадав на 30-ті роки XIX століття, закінчився в 50-тих роках.

У художньому оформленні музичних альбомів можна спостерігати риси романтичної піднесеності: титульні аркуші альбомів прикрашалися малюнками музичних інструментів або фігур античного світу в обов'язковому оточенні хмар. Саме так оформлені "Драматичний альбом" Верстовського та А. Писарева 1827 року, "Ліричний альбом на 1832 рік" И. Ласковського і Норова (малюнки Ф.Толстого, гравовані А.Мельниковим), альбом "Новосілля" 1834 року, "Аматорів співу" 1837 року та ін. Значно рідше зустрічаються в музичних альбомах літографовані малюнки місцевостей, як, наприклад, в альбомах "Букет" 1832 і 1833 років.

Представляє інтерес зміст літографованих віньєток у "Північному музичному альбомі" 1832 року, виданому Д.Брифом. У ньому 6 картинок: "А.Пушкін", "Сад при Тавричному палаці", "Гафіз, видатний перський віршотворець", зображення селянського танка і малюнок "Ось їде трійка зухвала". Усе це, на жаль, не високої якості. У художньому відношенні виділяються дві гравюри на міді (підпис – А.Петров) у "Дамському музичному кабінеті" 1828 року, видавець Дмитрієв. На загальному фоні виділяються карикатури Степанова в згадуваному вже Музичному альбомі з карикатурами Даргомижського і Степанова. У рецензії Дельвіга (?) на літературно-музичний альманах "Веселка" на 1830 рік ми зустрічаємо пояснення причин посередньої якості художнього оформлення подібних видань: "Альманахи наші не блищать картинками черезтакі причини: ми не маємо ще художників, що присвятили б свої таланти подібній роботі, і продаж альманахів, по незначності своїй, не дозволяє навіть подумати про розкіш видань. Ми повинні клопотатися не про блиск, а про охайність, але і ця чеснота нелегко нам дається"... [5, 73].

Принципи, якими керувалися кращі творці музичних альбомів, були згодом закріплені кращими російськими нотними видавництвами. До їхнього числа відносяться видавництва М.Бернарда, А. Гутхейля, П.Юргенсона, В.Бесселя, М.Беляєва, С.Кусевицько.

На початку ХІХ століття намітилися загальні для російських нотних видань принципи їхнього художнього оформлення, що зберегли силу аж до початку ХХ століття. Основою художнього оформлення став титульний лист, на якому розміщувалась інформація про автора, назва твору і видавництва. Якщо спочатку ноти продавали, як і книги, в обгортках, що охороняли їх від забруднення (частково застосовували обгортки й у нотах у першій половині ХІХ століття), то вже з кінця ХVІІІ століття ввійшла в практику друкарська нотна обкладинка, що містила ту ж інформацію, що і титульний аркуш, який замінив обкладинку в малооб'ємних нотних виданнях. Саме тут містилися і малюнки, що прикрашали ноти. За рідким винятком, коли в оформленні нот брали участь видатні художники, для більшості нот характерні середньої якості малюнки, що робилися тими ж граверами, що працювали над нотним текстом. Залучення здібних художників із боку піднімало ціну на ноти, і видавці рідко на це наважувалися. Все залежало від художнього смаку самого видавця, що звичайно керувався сформованою практикою. Не дивлячись на це, в оформленні нотних видань повною мірою відбилися особливості живопису даного періоду, яка стала якісно новим етапом у розвитку цього виду мистецтва.

Найбільш часто застосовувався мальований або набірний титульний аркуш із рамочкою, іноді доповнений розчерками. Розчерки практикувалися протягом майже усього ХІХ століття, підкреслюючи романтичну увагу до дрібних деталей. Особливо часто вони зустрічалися в середині століття, у нотних виданнях Ф.Стелловського (1826-1875). Типовими є розчерки у виданому їм Скерцо Балакірева. [Див. нотні додатки до 4] До кінця ХІХ століття нотна обкладинка стає стандартною (у виданнях Беляєва) і в ХХ столітті доповнюється художньою віньєткою, що гармоніює з такою ж художньою рамкою (видання "Російського музичного видавництва").

У першій половині ХІХ століття було модно прикрашати нотний титул малюнками романтичного характеру – хмарами, лірами, вінками, фігурами жінок в одязі, що розвивається. Таким, наприклад, є малюнок на виданні романсу А.Аляб'єва "Розлука з милою" (1824), його ж "Пісні Ратибора" (М., 1814) та ін. Нагадаємо, що саме в епоху романтизму неприродність, нарочитість і громіздкість у моді починають викликати негативне ставлення, ідеалом стає природність, зразки якої шукали в жіночих фігурах античності або в "театралізованому" селянському побуті, який був безпосередньо пов'язаним із живою природою, простими людьми, їх працею і способом життя, землею. Одяг стає більш простим, перестають носити розкішні спідниці з фіжмами, корсети, важка парча змінюється на легку тканину [11].

Простота одягу, запрограмована епохою Французької революції, малює нам жінку – дитя природи – проста сорочка, висока талія, відкриті груди, відкриті плечі [7, 52]. Змінюється і стиль зачіски: жінки, як і чоловіки, відмовляються від перук – теж перемагає природність. Зміна смаків стосується і косметики. В епоху романтизму здається красивою і починає подобатися блідість, знак глибини серцевих почуттів. Звідси використання в мальовничих творах колориту, що створює відчуття м'якої освітленості й тонкої нюансировки. Нова манера художнього мислення дозволяє моделювати форму, створюючи відчуття повної волі й життєвої правдивості. І людські фігури, і вираження обличчя, яке освітлене ледь помітною посмішкою, живий погляд виконуються в легкій, невимушеній, вільній манері.

Іноді зустрічаються на обкладинках і титулах нотних видань портрети композиторів або осіб, з іменами яких так чи інакше був пов'язаний музичний твір.

Під впливом романтизму, що відіграв значну роль у заглибленні інтересу до людської особистості, портрет стає надзвичайно чуйним до настроїв і проблем епохи. Збагачуючись новим розумінням простору, світлості, форми, портрет не втрачає схильності до декоративної звучності кольору, монументальності композиції, що виражається у великомасштабності зображень, виразності силуету. З'єднанням схем репрезентативного портрету попередніх сторіч із об'ємно-просторовим моделюванням форми відзначені парадні зображення на весь зріст, де підсилюється увага до передачі оточення. Однак найбільшій популярності набувають погрудні зображення, що відбивають процес інтимізації жанру, ствердження в ньому камерної форми, що стає переважним в усіх видах портрета.[10, 8]

Окрім портретів воєначальників на нотах епохи Вітчизняної війни 1812 року (портрет Витгенштейна на титулі видання присвяченого йому маршу Дерфельда, портрет Платова на виданні "Козацького маршу" Долгорукова та ін.), ми можемо зустріти також у "Збірнику російських пісень на слова Пушкіна" 1829 року портрет поета. Портрет повітроплавця Льоді і зображення його повітряної кулі ми бачимо на обкладинці фортепіанної фантазії "Позахмарний політ" (1847). Нерідко зображуються й портрети композиторів – А.Варламова, Ф.Ліста, П.Чайковського й ін.

Найбільш часто зустрічалися обкладинки і титули, малюнки на яких були пов'язані із змістом музичного твору. Тут і романтичні види місцевостей, наприклад, вид Тобольська у виданні романсу Аляб'єва "Іртиш" (1828), і літографована обкладинка ліцейської пісні В.Теппера "Шість років", яка відтворює зал Царскосельського ліцею та ін., не говорячи вже про згадувані нами ілюстрації пісенного матеріалу. У цих зображеннях утілилися романтичні ідеали епохи національного підйому, інтерес до різноманіття і неповторності навколишнього світу, жвавості й мінливості природи. Пейзажним зображенням на нотних титулах іноді характерний не виписмний у всіх деталях ландшафт і зображення не конкретного міста, а неясний, романтичний вид [8].

Зростання якості музичних творів зажадало відповідного поліпшення і їхнього художнього оформлення, за винятком тих випадків, коли переслідувалися суцього комерційні цілі. Принципи ж художнього оформлення нотних видань залишалися до 1917 року такими ж, яким керувалися при оформленні нот на початку XIX століття.

Елементи романтичного світогляду властиві кращим зразкам декорованих нотних видань XIX століття. В них простежується прагнення до вираження лірико-поетичного настрою, до метафори, що випромінює нераціональне і неаналітичне. Цей поетичний світогляд об'єднує художній процес різних століть та розкриває в той же час істотні риси культури певної епохи.

Нотні видання XIX століття мають цінність не лише тому, що вони характеризують особливості розвитку музичної та побутової культури в силу вміщення в них визначеного виконавчого репертуару. Особливості декору нотних видань дозволяють відчувати романтичний образ епохи, у якому відбилися благородні, сповнені романтичного пориву прагнення людини, породжені новою системою цінностей, яка актуальна і в новому тисячолітті.

Література

1. Балакирев М. Переписка с нотопечатательством П. Юргенсона. – М., 1958.
2. Белинский В. Полное собрание сочинений – М., 1955. Т. 8. С. 505.

3. Бессель В. Материалы по истории нотного-издательского дела в России. – Спб., 1895.
4. Вольман Б. Русские нотные издания XIX – начала XX века. – Л., 1957.
5. Декабристы в Москве. – М., 1963.
6. Кунин М. Из истории нотопечатания. – М., 1963.
7. Лотман Ю. Беседы о русской культуре – С-Пб., 1994.
8. Ракова М. Русское искусство первой половины XIX века. – М., 1962.
9. Пушкин и его время. Исследования и материалы. Л., 1962.
10. Рубан В. Український портретний живопис першої половині XIX століття. – К., 1984., С.8.
11. Русские. Историко-этнографический атлас – М., 1967.
12. Скворцова Е. Теория и история культуры. – М., 1999.

Dmitry V. Gordevsky

DEVIATIVE THOUGHT IN CONTEMPORARY CULTURE

The term "deviative thought" was firstly introduced in my work "Deviative Thought and the Cultural Dynamics of Western Christian Civilization". In that work I also analyzed the influence of deviative thought on culture of Medieval Europe, besides there I proposed the following classification of deviative thought: *rationalizing* deviative thought, *dualizing* and *transcending* ones.

Mentioned category of cultural dynamics would not probably be of interest (as well as it's triadic classification), if it would not have any practical usage. However, this category can be applied in researches of the most actual for contemporary humanitarian problematic's area: in researches of world culture of XX century and tendencies of it's development in a period of 1980-90th. It is necessary before turning to consideration of deviative thought in contemporary culture to create a short conceptual characteristics of contemporary culture itself.

The most popular modern schemes of "classic" cultural studies in social studies in XX century describe contemporary (first of all "contemporary" in relation to researcher himself) culture in terms of "decline", "decay" or "crisis" (P. Sorokin, O. Spengler, K. Mannheim). At the same time one notices, that even the fact of culture's existence lies in dependence with results of this "crisis". One insists, that the culture of the second half of the XX century can not be described as domination of one universally recognized system of truth's legitimating. This declaration calls into being such terms as "eclectic", "mosaic", "polyphonic" culture.

At the same time the following arguments appears: In Middle Ages, Church was the one and universal institute, that was responsible to generate the new senses and to verify the thoughts as "true" or "false". Science of Modernity took away this role, but, from easily identifying moment (probably, from the moment of creation and legitimization of "theory of relativity", Hedel's theorems and Heisenberg's "indeterminism principle") the science itself demonstrated its contextual dependence from systems of accepted conventions, i.e. dependence from language and policy in wide sense of these words.

This *contextual* dependence can be expressed in terms like "point of view", while this point all the time moves in a space of generalized coordinates of culture (in particular in value coordinates). In XIX century science, that was based on the uniform principle, constructed one point of view. In contemporary science there are several "points of view" and they simply could not be adequately translated one into another, so their mutual dialogue was always problematic. In theoretical aspect this once more actualizes the classic formula "praxis is criterion of truth".

But what does the word "praxis" means in contemporary culture? What for we need this quite expensive and potentially dangerous "praxis" as a criterion of truth while the truth as a criterion of true praxis is more preferable? In parallel with such processes in science the same processes took place in art. With the appearance of the "Avantguard" art and, especially of "trance-Avantguard"

current, the last ideas of esthetic canon unity are disappeared. The last triumph of these ideas and notions of unity we can see in their pure kind in Classicism époque and, partly, until the end of XIX such ideas can be found in romanticism and realism currents' manifestations.

Finally, all norms and standards of ethics and moral were trampled by social and war catastrophes of XX and, from the other side, they were as much distorted by totalitarian regimes, that even the appelle to authorization of legitimization regarding this or that norm or standard became ambiguous and problematic, because all kinds of legitimization became closely related with personality's reprisal.

These obvious problems of contemporary culture calls into being the question, that is traditional for Eastern Philosophy: the question on correlation of essence and existence. This question can be formulated, for example, in such form: if everything is relative, then what is less relative and what is more relative. In other words, what should we recognize as "essential" in that degree, that makes possible to rely on this "probational" essence as on the guarantee of cultural praxis' correctness?

In our opinion, the answers on these questions, that are presented by contemporary philosophy of culture, have less in common with the answer, that is sounded from the side of politicians from the times of Machiavelli, but if not them than who could be more complete embodiment of cultural praxis as such, if not them than who could represent "collective corporeal" of culture more perfect?

"It is clear, how specific our situation is, the situation of unsecured bodies of industrial culture – writes Michael Riklin. – This is why we happened to be, in relation to the acts of cognition, almost in the same position, that classic philosophy has in relation to illogical and primitive. We as if always perceive the roll of their distant presence and we involuntary, on the level of cultural reflections, feverishly try to avoid the direct collision with the reflection. Collective corporeal, in the limits of which we ourselves are situated within the unique trans-historic situation, seems, so to say, "the center" and is rudely punish all "thinking" periphery, with which philosophical instinct always joined it's notion of center."

In this case, collective corporeal must be understood as a "surface" of Jungian collective unconsciousness and as a simulacra, to which give rise state's institutes with inherent to them discourses of patriotism, national union and legal guarantee of personality's freedom.

The problem is that substitution of religion with ideologies (and of Church with State), that was reflected in Hobbes' "Leviathan" so parspicuously and with rare pitiless cynicism, that exactly substitution became a reason of real "Leviathan" of Nazi Germany, Soviet Russia and Maoist China. Until our days this problem still remains maybe the most serious problem of at least of European culture.

The example of reverse situation, i.e. the example of situation when State usurpates all fullness of power not through the discourse of science but through the discourse of traditional religion can be seen in Iran, there happened unprecedented by it's cultural sense "Islamic revolution" (this term itself uncovers the essence of this phenomenon: ideology "powered 2", ultimate ontologization of cultural reality .at the expense of combination of social revolution futuristic discourse with "eternalist" discourse of total unity of Islam).

In our opinion, the terms "mosaic", "partial", "fragmental" or "eclectical" are quite appropriate for describing the contemporary culture of European model. However, recognizing the convincing character of all arguments in favor of such classification, we would like to point, that along with distinctly presented processes of de-centralization and loss of stable system of value orientations in contemporary world we can follow up the new tendency, coming from the opposite direction. This is a tendency toward the essencialization, globalization and toward forming the new "big style" (O.Spengler), that, however, have no analogies in previous history of human culture.

We suppose, that the most successful, full and correct term for characterizing the contemporary culture is a term "net culture" (this term was proposed by M.Kastels, representative of "new post-industrial wave"[†]). The term "energetic", that was proposed by S.Khoruzhi[‡] is also appropriate.

* Рыклин М. Террорологии. – Тарту, М.: Эйдос-Культура, 1992. – с.147.

† Кастельс М. Становление общества сетевых структур: Пер. с англ. // Новая постиндустриальная волна на Западе. – М.: Academia, 1999. – С.494-505.

‡ Хоружий С.С. Подвиг как органон. Организация и герменевтика опыта в исихастской традиции. // Вопросы философии. №3, 1998. – С.35-118.

The term "net culture" is a modernization of the notion "informational culture", that appeared in 80ties. But this term indicates that the principally important parameter for understanding contemporary culture is incommensurable, in compare with any previous stage, the speed of information delivery and incommensurable density of informational currents.

M. Kastels claims: "Net structure is a complex of mutually connected knots... To their number belongs councils and ministries of various European states when it goes about political net structure of European Community administration. To their range belongs the fields of coca and [narcotic] poppy, underground laboratories, secret airfields, street mobs, financial institutions, that "wash off" the money, when it goes about net of producing and distribution of drugs, that embrace social and state structures all over the world."*

As it is clear from the definition and from the quoted examples, net structures can have either local character or world-wide, global one. Remarkable fact, that in the limits of one net the speed of information transfer between adjoining knots runs to zero.

It's a principally important fact, cause on the number of social stratification levels first time in history appeared the possibility to bring some cultural code to all bearers of mentality, that could perceive the information in a form, that was foresaw by it's author.

The very paradoxical situation arises. In one hand, the real multipoleness of culture can be seen: in European type cultures nowadays comparatively peacefully coexist the subjects of any political views, religious confessions and principles, there any preferences of style are appropriate.

In the other hand we can observe the unprecedented power of informational channels, owing to that groups of interest can successfully manipulate the customer's demands not only toward the goods, but towards the doctrines, ideas and political programs.

As well as USA and Europe, Russia can be seen as an example of informational climate when "enemy's image" can be created in very few days with a help of one or two skillful campaigns in media. Together with de-miphologization of consciousness ("I don't believe in anything, even in "Coca-Cola" advertisements...") the counter re-miphologization is happening ("...though I should confirm, that "Sprite" is really better").

Although the departure from systems of unitarian truth is common nowadays, we can also state, that even now all the populist slogans, that create temporary simulacra of unitarian truth, that expressed in primitive cultural codes, can get control over consciousness of significant number of culture's subject in a very short period of time.

Introducing the notion "energetic culture" we lean on the following reasoning of S. S. Khoruzhi: "Man does not uncover in his "pure interior" no *subjects* for observing. Nevertheless, his "inner life" is not a fiction, it is pithy, substantial and it is comprehensible for his consciousness. But this life's contents are not essences, not subjects, these are actions, intentions, impulses. In terminology that we will use, this contents are not from the discourse of essence, but from the discourse of energy [138, 40].

The same way contemporary culture, trying to realize itself with a help of intellectual efforts from the side of some of it's subjects, steadfastly looks inside itself. And it discovers there a huge volume of isolated actions and outwardly chaotic informational currents – in fact these are the currents partly of material and partly of spiritual energy. But, being unable to recognize it's own essence by this reason culture is also unable to recognize itself as something stable, intelligible.

From similar insights grows and develops the ontology of "pure staying" (Deleuse) and discourse of "end of the history" (F.Fukuyama) and many other projects of classic opposition *essence/ existence* total deconstruction.

Metaphoric of energy refers to the re-reading the history of world culture as consistent transmissions from one energetic level to another and it must be recognized literally (L. White) and to philosophy a la "new post-industrial wave". At the same time it refers to esoteric doctrines, that interpret the spiritual Process as studial transition from one stage of energetic pattern to another, to various holistic approaches in psychology and to the Spectrum of Consciousness theory of Ken Wilber.

* Кастельс М., с.495.

We need to mention here the famous work of Francis Fukuyama "The End of the History". Regarding this work Kl.Friedrich said: "Francis Fukuyama is very excited by the talks about the end of the history. In his public performances he speaks about universal, embracing the whole mankind, tendency of world development, that leads to political "liberalism". He also proclaims the final victory of democracy and the legal state values". If to accept the Fukuyama's concepts, than the essential (and so universal, cause the "tendency of development" really "embrace the whole mankind") characteristics of contemporary culture are "the legal state values" and unprecedented correlation between immanent to man the freedom of will and with it's institutionalized embodiment.

Yet, this is just one of possible views on the problem: the view of liberal intellectual from the Western culture on the destruction of totalitarian system in Eastern Europe.

Finally, let us turn to the article of V.V. Nalimov "Critics of historical époque: inevitableness of culture changes in XXI century". Besides the compact and exact characteristic of contemporary problematic of culture analysis it contains quite actual definition of culture: *culture as social therapy*. This definition in contrast to two structural definitions, that we gave above, can be called "teleological definition".

If the notions "net culture" and "energetic culture" obviously answer the question "what is culture", then definition of Nalimov answers the question "what is culture for?" or probably "what should it be?"

Yet, introducing this definition V.V.Nalimov recognizes, that it assigns some ideal, from which contemporary culture is quite far. "Culture of our days is indebted to contemporary man. Its key-senses, that are enclosed in Faith, Science, Art do not act in collective consciousness. Future historians probably will hardly decide how to determine our culture, where command machines and money: "the culture of machine" or "the culture of money?"[†].

Now let us turn to the position of J. F. Liotar about two types of legitimations: legal legitimation and scientific legitimation. Indeed, despite all aspects of decentralization and fragmentation of culture, that were mentioned above, still exist the institutes that are in charge to standardize the social life and to verify the cultural expressions.

In compare, for example, with XVI century, the situation has really and radically changed i.e. in liberal societies nobody can be condemned to death because this or that scientific hypotheses. However one hypothesis, proved by empirical data can win a Noble Prize and widely invade into culture through consequent "descent" from academic formulas through science-popular brochures to, for example, the scenario for science fiction movie. At the same time another hypothesis may remain the property of very narrow circle of professionals.

The most topical problem of contemporary culture is how to create a cultural situation in that your own voice could be heard, there your voice will stand out against a background culture's "white noise". This is a problem for the people of science and for the people of art, to say nothing about individuals that are repressed by institutes of legitimation, i.e. for the subjects of oppressed social group.

Thus if we really accept the theoretical calculations concerning "deviative thought", that is an invariant of cultural dynamic's processes, we need to point out this thought's presence in contemporary culture. From the other side, if we accept, for example, the argumentation concerning "the end of the history" and other types of "secular eschatologies" (M.S.Malachov) by way of the most principle for contemporary culture, we will have automatically to refuse the notions about "deviative thought" because in situation of cultural homeostasis, that is described by mentioned concepts, the dynamics can be understood only as a process of economical and social indexes changing in the limits of "frozen" system of value orientations (or just of system, that exclusively slowly evolucionates).

Let us consider the last statement in some more detail: in the strict sense of the word, the concepts of "the end of the history" deny the possibility of *singular* changes in culture and say nothing about possible changes in systems of value orientation in wide periods of time.

* Фридрих Кл. О функциях одной мыслительной фигуры. // Вопросы философии. №7-8, 1994. – с.50.

† Налимов В.В. Критика исторической эпохи: неизбежность смены культуры в XXI веке. // Вопросы философии. №11, 1996. – с. 71.

Yet from our point of view exactly singularity and catastrophic tension of culture run risks to become the most principle characteristic of future, XXI century culture. The problem is that despite the absence the rigid structures of "unitarian truth" in contemporary culture, there the "net" and "energetic" properties are still quite strikingly expressed.

In fact, the basing the innovative doctrine, that was demanded by former cultures with no dependence on real innovative intentions of the doctrine is now not obligatory.

From year to year the possibilities are getting wider. Quickly throw over the grandiose capital from region to region, to confirm some political point of view with rightly arranged media materials, to propose to this or that region some kind of global course or program (not only political, but cultural in any sense of this term) is something very practicable.

So, notorious "American style of life" and artifacts of American culture one by one started to conquer all opened or partly opened cultural markets of the World cultural system.

The same way, correctly using the peculiarities of net cultures, the group from few hundreds of "deviants" could, in theory, successfully deconstruct the state infrastructure of USA if such attempts and such "groups of risk" would not spied on by security services by USA and Europe.

These examples are to emphasize the following assertion: to convert the thought into action and, backwards, to convert the manipulative actions into mental structures in our times is more easy than in any other periods of history. This is why deviative thought starts to be important evolutionary/devolutionary factor of culture.

Everything here depends on what concrete doctrines and with what concrete purposes can be used by what corporate structures (or "nets").

In the light of assertions that made, it seems very interesting to look over the problem of dualizing deviative thought. This "dualistic" pattern of binarization is still dominate in some fields of European mentality. It is still can be actualized (the last evidence of it is the results of last elections in Austria: 20 percents of votes for representatives of party with political program of National-Socialist party).

Rationalizing deviative thought, which sometimes could accompany or precede the actualizing the pattern of dualistic thought nowadays is significantly substituted with technological praxis, in particular with such practices as application of the achievements of science to production, the technical inventory development etc.

In the other hand, as far as the science remains the base legitimated institute in the sphere of truth, the rationalizing thought could hardly be imagined as "deviative" one, cause the culture, in general, is still remains at the mercy of rationality discourses (i.e. discourses of expediency, pragmatics, resources saving, "cost approach" to the objects of art and culture and so on).

Eventually, the transcending deviative thought, as, for example, Russian History of XX century showed, can make conditions upon principally various morphologies of culture, depending on what axiological content was putted into concrete deviative doctrine.

Transcendence of present binaries in culture can be executed in a context of "love ethics" as it was, for example, in early Christianity. In such situation left and right members of binary are not annihilated, but overcome and synthesized.

However, transcending of the binaries can be realized in a context of "hate ethics" (for example, in communism or nazism), when one of the binary's member should be destroyed or at least repressed. In mentioned case transcendent deviative thought (that in this case can be called "substitutive" or "replacing") partially comes into the background of ideas by totalitarian "Bolsheviks" regime, that is frequently called "demonic mystics". So, "the denying the hierarchy principle in accordance with Sartre's theses "as much people as much truths" or the substitution the cosmic hierarchies with hierarchies of mass ideologies, leads mankind to demonization of human existence and to destroying the spiritual basics of culture".

* Блюменкранц М.А. Введение в философию подмены. – М.: Вестъ-Вимо, 1994. – с.50.

РАЗДЕЛ 5. СОВРЕМЕННАЯ ФИЛОСОФИЯ

PART 5. CONTEMPORARY PHILOSOPHY

Irina A. Zherebkina

"BEAUTIFUL LADY" AND JOUISSANCE FEMININE IN FIN-DE-SIECLE RUSSIAN CULTURE

"Beautiful Lady" as a construct of woman's subjectivity

The construction of the *Beautiful Lady*, or *Fair Lady*, or *Eternal Femininity* is one of the major constructions of a woman in the Russian culture at the end of 19 and the beginning of 20 century, which was representing in psychological novels of the famous Russian writer Fedor Dostoevsky and one of the famous Russian poet Alexander Blok in his *Verses to the Beautiful Lady* (*Stihi k Prekrasnoi Dame*).

But what does this construction mean in Dostoevsky writing? First of all this is a construction of a hysterical woman. The problem of women's hysteria is one of the major problems Russian culture faced in the late 19th century. Dostoevsky was one of the first writers to discover this phenomenon. He fixed this phenomenon in his famous novels in various images of the "female Russian soul". Hysterical woman, it turns out, is the "real" Russian woman with her "genuine" female soul. Dostoevsky's novels introduce a whole range of hysterical women's characters, whose world is divided into two major states, those of an extreme despair (and therefore, disparagement) and an extreme exaltation. The inner incompatibility of the *woman's desire* that finds its expression, in particular, in numerous changes of woman's masks is the major characteristic of hysteria. The woman says one thing, does a second one, and desires yet a third one. To take one example, one of the most well-known Dostoevsky's heroines Nastasya Filippovna (novel *"Idiot"*) unceasingly switches from the state of suffering to the state of excitement and challenging destructive behavior.

During the period of symbolism in Russian culture (1890s - 1910s), the notions of the "female soul", subjectivity and body are actively reinterpreted. First of all, the ideology of *Beautiful Lady* rejects the notion of reproduction in sexuality, replacing this notion with the concept of revival, and in the search for its highest forms interprets the variance of sexual practices as an alternative to the traditional family. Adultery narrative plot that exposes the everlasting suffering of the "female Russian soul" became one of the principal love narrative plots of this epoch. For instance, the novel *"Anna Karenina"* by Leo Tolstoy entailed an inescapable temptation of the adulterous transgressive relish provoked by Anna's "female Russian soul", the temptation that by its intensity of pleasure overrides the powers of the social punishing practices employed against it. Although the example of *"Anna Karenina"* simultaneously demonstrates the collapse of hopes in the relationships that shift from the state of adultery to marriage the power and magnetism of the prohibited passion make Anna one of the most popular women's characters of the Russian literature.

Why during the epoch of Russian symbolism did the experiment of love relationships develop so tragically? Why did all the paradoxes and obstacles of the structure of love as a phenomenon come up so plainly no matter who participated in this love and was involved in it?

Lacan in his seminars devoted to courtly love and the figure of Lady in it underlines the *paradox of postponement* that represents the paradox of the courtly love: whereas the desire of sexual relationships is considered to be the "official" desire of love, in reality there is nothing more

frightening for the subject of love then the Lady's intention to realize this desire. In actuality, the single thing the subject expects from Lady is the next command about postponing. That is why the image of *Beautiful Lady* (*Prekrasnoi Damy*) in Russian culture is split into the "Eternal Femininity" on the one hand, and the "Radical Evil" on the other. This is precisely the way in which Russian culture interpreted the main image of the "Beautiful Lady" of the Russian symbolism epoch *Lubov Dmitrievna Blok*, the wife of the famous Russian poet Alexander Blok.

"I cannot love you..."

In the given context let us examine this famous love story from the history of the Russian literature. This story concerns the love towards the "Beautiful Lady" of two poets: Alexander Blok (the husband who devoted *Verses to the Beautiful Lady* — one of the most well-known love cycles in the history of the Russian literature — to his wife *Lubov Dmitrievna Blok*) and Andrey Bely whose love to the "Beautiful Lady"/*Lubov Dmitrievna Blok* was the preeminent love in his life.

At the very beginning of their marital life Blok told his wife that she would not be his only woman, that he will occasionally leave her for others (including prostitutes), but she will stay his "Beautiful Lady" for ever. Moreover, *Lubov Dmitrievna Blok* (L.D.B. in Bely's memoirs and poetry) knew that it was not only herself who had served as a prototype for the "Beautiful Lady" when the famous poetic cycle was being created. It was also true at that period that poetry no longer represented mere love lyric verses for Blok. It became rather the "philosophy of cosmism" that was addressed to the *Woman* generally more likely than to a concrete woman. Nevertheless, everyone in Russian culture interpreted *The Verses to the Beautiful Lady* as a *real* grand story of the poet's love to his young wife. Their wedding as a husband and wife was perceived as a continuation of their extraordinarily unique love story. Consequently *Lubov Dmitrievna Blok* did not disappoint anybody about it. Moreover, in her memoirs *Byli i Nebylitsy o Bloke i o Sebe* (Bremen: K-Press, 1979) that have been written many years after Blok's death, *Lubov Dmitrievna Blok* elaborates on and adjusts the texts of his diaries and verses in the way that would contribute to the representation of their relationships as those of a poet and his *Beautiful Lady*. That is why one can detect a contradiction in her memoirs: on the one hand, she hates the image of the "Beautiful Lady", for it prevented her from being a "woman of blood and flesh" in her relationships with her husband; on the other hand, she carefully relates the real love story to the verses of the *Beautiful Lady*, explaining the *real* crises and rises in the real relationships between them *through the verses*.

What was the meaning of this symbolic predisposition to the "Eternal Femininity" and the ideal of the "Beautiful Lady"? L.D.B./*Lubov Dmitrievna Blok* does aspire to represent herself as the "Beautiful Lady". However, knowing that this is not true "inside of her", she attempts to receive the confirmation of her capability of being loved and of being a *real* love object and not an "empty" one from others. That was what L.D.B. needed Andrey Bely's love for. That is why she needs others' proofs that she *is* the *Beautiful Lady*. So she wishes to receive an assurance of her feminine value through Andrey Bely's love. Thus it is important for her to know whether he loves her "herself" personally as a *real woman* and outside the place of the "Beautiful Lady".

However when he did fall in love with her, her desire was brought to its end.

Here we are confronted with a contradiction in L.D.B.'s position: she wants Bely to love her "as she is" and simultaneously as she is "more than she herself is", that is as the *Beautiful Lady*, the muse of symbolism in Russian poetry. This perverse task creates the impossibility of the culmination scene, i.e. sexual relationships between them: sexual relationships with Bely become unacceptable for L.D.B. once the image of the muse of symbolism, *Beautiful Lady* disappears from these relationships and she appears as a "woman of blood and flesh".

So she rejected him and returned to her husband. Having returned to her husband, L.D.B. chooses nothing, prefers to completely refuse love in her relations with Bely in order to keep her phantasmic place of the poetic Eternal Femininity, *Beautiful Lady*.

However, L.D.B.'s problem lies in her unwillingness to accept the *symbolic* nature of love linking her and her husband. She desires the love in which *real* passions would be present, in which the "emptiness" would be filled and have names from her husband's poetry: the *Beautiful Lady*, *Stranger*, *Solveig*, *Snow Mask*, *Carmen* and others. She desires to be *everything*, she desires to realize herself as

a real object of love. And when she appears unable to do it in her relationships with either Blok or Bely, she utterly quits these relationships.

"Adultery": jouissance feminine?..

Let us compare two types of woman's reflections in the mirror: the first one is that of Valery Brusov, Russian symbolists writer from the story *In the Mirror* (1906); the other one belongs to Lubov Dmitrievna Blok in her memoirs *Byli i Nebylitsy o Bloke i o Sebe*. In Brusov's story the mirror with a woman's mirror image functions as a reflection of woman's subjectivity with all its doubts and weaknesses. Eventually, the "real woman" in front of the mirror changes places with her mirror image having allowed the image to become the *other*.

The mirror image of the self and one's body, which was created by L.D.B. in her memoirs differs in principle. She admires her body, she loves it, she sees no imperfection in it, and the only thing that she regrets is that this naked body with loose hair in front of a mirror with candles in a dark chamber of parents' home cannot be displayed to others. As we see from the memoirs, later it was not displayed as such to Blok as well. It was only much later that L.D.B. fulfilled her dream with a large number of lovers whom she writes about in *Byli i Nebylitsy*...

These two descriptions of woman's subjectivity represent two different women's behavior strategies: neurotic and psychotic. A neurotic is one who is prone to feeling guilty and is therefore never satisfied with him/herself. A psychotic is one who interprets him/herself as a flawless creature (she considers her mirror image equally flawless comparing herself with Botticelli's madonnas) and practically does not need to be appraised by the Other.

Freud interprets the structure of female sexuality through the structure of guilt. The woman is guilty because of her sexuality that is hidden behind the notions of morality and domestication. Female hysteria — a signal of what is suppressed by society and culture — indicates the hidden sexuality. Eventually Freud admits that he is not able to help woman to cease being a hysteric (for he is incapable of helping her to actualize her sexuality overtly; he can only explain it to her). The "Russian paradox" of woman's guilt solution represented in L.D.B.'s memoirs lies in another method: L.D.B. merely realizes her sexuality without any restrictions at least, which liberates her from the feeling of guilt (instead of involving her in this feeling as it should have according to Freud) and from any doubts about her own self. The only thing she regrets in *Byli i Nebylitsy* is that she has not done so earlier and did not couple with Andrey Bely on the notable day when all the hairpins were taken out of the hair...

L.D.B. in this position becomes "the woman that is wanted by all men". After her love affair with Georgy Chulkov to whom she gave herself on the day of her father's (the famous chemist Dmitry Ivanovich Mendeleyev's) death, L.D.B. loses any doubts about whether she is loved as a "symbol" or as a "real" woman and whether she is indeed the "Beautiful Lady". On that night she *did become* the *Beautiful Lady*.

What kind of exchange gesture did she commit? On the night when she gave herself to Chulkov she replaced her spiritual (*symbolic*) status of the "Beautiful Lady" for a *bodily* extra-symbolic status. Obviously, she was strongly impressed by her body and its sensations. She started to experience orgasm, while her closeness with her husband had lasted only during four months after their wedding — very seldom, hurriedly, and had been marked with her husband's reluctance (according to her evidence from *Byli i Nebylitsy*...)

What did it mean to *become* the *Beautiful Lady*, i.e. to occupy this place at this time in a bodily sense? First of all this meant to escape power of "literature", power of poetry and words that were incarnated for her by the poetry of Blok and Bely. Her first lover Chulkov, for example, was a poet and writer too (as Blok and Bely), but his being a man of action was his foremost quality: he was the inventor of the "mystic anarchism" in Russian culture that he tried to realize in his theater and political activities. In comparison with the two previous men of hers he could not possibly bear the title of a "Russian poet".

Let us note that during all her life L.D.B. was excluded from the order and level of language. In her youth, poems are written and conversations are lead by Blok. She is silent as well in the conversations of "Argonauts" who interpreted her silence as mystical. In her *Byli i Nebylitsy*...she

purposefully stresses that she has never been able to chat and flirt unlike, for example, the sisters Kuzmin-Karavaev. All her life she commits bodily gestures: wears rosy dresses, brushes her hair, plays in theater performances and recites her husband's poems. Declamation and gesture replace the word...

What does "adultery" mean in this topology of desire? It means a mere performing of one's natural bodily functions. Characteristically, in her memoirs texts L.D.B. is not afraid of elderliness, female aging: what becomes a tragedy for other woman is not significant to her, because there is no point of the Other that could make an assessment or pronounce a sentence outside her. Having felt that the Other/"Great Russian Poets" Blok and Bely ceased to guard her "real" body and her "real" self, she slipped into this opening. The feeling of guilt was annihilated by the absence of the fear of punishment: the "Beautiful Lady" broke into a simulacr of the *Beautiful Lady* - the main female object of the Russian culture in the beginning of the 20 century - and an adulterous "body without organs" in her life and her memoirs.

However, it is of prime importance that she was *happy* against the background of her *unhappy* and suffering husband's life.

There is no guilt, no doubt, no ambiguity of split subjectivity. Is it this pleasure that embodies the famous feminist utopia: *jouissance feminine*? Is this the authentic woman's subjectivity and "genuine female Russian soul"?...

О.В.Храброва, В.В.Шкода

СОБСТВЕННОСТЬ В ИСТОРИКО-КУЛЬТУРНОМ КОНТЕКСТЕ

Нас интересует смысл собственности. И коль скоро речь о смысле, надобно начать с вопроса о том, как смысл появляется. Вспоминается очень живое обсуждение литературного произведения и фраза, задумчиво произнесенная одним ее участником: "Интересно, а что бы сказал обо всем этом автор, будь он сейчас в этой комнате?". Сказавший сие, может быть, сам того не осознавая, исходил из коммуникативной модели смысла, суть которой в следующем. Автор, возжелав что-то *сообщить* публике, выражает это *что-то* в тексте, и далее перед читателем возникает задача – выявить это, обнаружить, открыть. При таком понимании автор, разумеется, и есть высший судья в дискуссиях об истолковании. Модель эта бедна. Роль читателя здесь подчиненная. В лучшем случае произойдет повторение мысли автора в голове читателя. Не будет, выражаясь в духе М.М.Бахтина, *продуктивного события*. По другой модели смысл рождается при восприятии текста, а автор считается равноправным участником истолкования. Его версия может быть только учтена другими участниками, не более. Эта вторая модель особенно хорошо работает, когда создание текста и его истолкование сильно разнесены во времени. Тогда оказывается, что способ понимания задается культурой.

Если теперь начать разговор о собственности, то предметом исторически вариативного истолкования можно взять понятие "иметь". Что значит *иметь* – вот вопрос, отвечая на который мы вообще проясняем смысл собственности. Воспользуемся исторической схемой, по которой европейская культура новой эры проходит три этапа развития – *христианский, буржуазный и гуманистический*. И попытаемся показать, как *должно* отвечать на вопрос об *имении* в контексте каждой из соответствующих культур. Предложенная терминология, разумеется, не может быть оставлена без разъяснения. Уж очень странно выглядит этот ряд. А дело в следующем. Европейская культура новой эры характеризуется последовательной сменой предмета *всеобщего интереса* – Бога, Природы и Человека. Эти три концепта конституируют три вида культуры.

Христианская культура. "Продай имение твое и раздай нищим" – вот известный совет юноше, спросившему Христа, чего еще недостает ему, если живет он строго по заповедям. "И будешь иметь сокровища на небесах", – добавил Христос. Мы знаем, чем дело кончилось. Не под силу юноше было расстаться с большим имением. Беседу слушают ученики Христа,

наблюдают отошедшего с печалью юношу, и следует вывод Учителя: "Трудно богатому войти в Царство Небесное" (Мф. 19, 21-23). И далее следуют наставления. Не заботьтесь о земном, "ищите прежде Царства Божия и правды Его", а материальное, так сказать, приложится. "Жизнь человека не зависит от изобилия его имени" (Лк. 12, 15). Таким образом, нестяжание материального, сокровищ на земле – важнейший императив христианского учения.

При всей простоте этой позиции не все здесь ясно, и сама позиция, если брать ее крайнюю форму – аскетизм, подвергается критике. "Правила аскетической жизни не могут быть универсально обязательной нормой", – замечает Людвиг фон Мизес. [4, 261]. Иначе говоря, кто-то должен работать, чтобы аскет мог жить подаянием. Но аргумент "а если все станут аскетами", указывающий на невозможность такого состояния и, стало быть, на ошибочность якобы самого учения, не имеет силы. Да, христианство именно к этому призывает, но *все не станут* – вот в чем дело. Не станут, потому что они – люди, т.е. существа, хотя и наделенные духом, но греховные, слабые. Это утверждение, что все не станут, потому что *не могут*, не отражает некую техническую невыполнимость правил аскетической жизни. Оно принципиально, ибо подчеркивает плотскую природу человека.

Евангельский текст о богатстве можно интерпретировать и во вполне подходящем для современного человека смысле. Сказано – "ищите прежде Царства Божия". Это "прежде" открывает возможность такой интерпретации: если жить так, что поиск Царства Божия станет главным, первичным, то все дела будут идти успешно. И будет богатство материальное, но оно не будет целью в себе, мысли о доходе и прибыли не будут целиком захватывать сознание.

Сложнее понять, что *имел бы* тот юноша, продай он имение и раздай нищим? Что это такое – "Царство Небесное", куда трудно войти богатому? По-видимому, имеется в виду обретение особого состояния сознания, когда осуществлена в достаточной мере победа человека над двумя фундаментальными страстями – *алчностью* и *гордыней*. Эти страсти разрушительны, они, как бы объединяясь, делают человека одержимым тем, что отцы Древней Церкви называли *филавтией* (*philautia*). По словам современного богослова Оливье Клемана, речь идет о "самолюбии, эгоцентризме, вырывающем мир у Бога, чтобы завладеть им самому и превратить ближнего в вещь" [2, 132].

Против такого отношения к ближнему, – а заметим, что явным выражением его является рабство, веками существовавшее легально, как социальный институт, и о сих пор существующее не легально, как преступление, – направлено христианское учение. Но, по-видимому, главное здесь – не превратить в вещь себя, т.е. не помещать душу свою в земные сокровища. Или *распредметить* себя, если это уже произошло. Тогда человек "богатеет в Бога". Он действительно *имеет*, но имение это не материально, оно есть "праведность, мир и радость". "Кто их имеет, тот, без сомнения, находится в Царстве Божием", писал Иоанн Кассиан [1, 215].

Буржуазная культура. Понятие "буржуазная" используется здесь не в политическом смысле. Для нас "буржуа" значит – горожанин, бюргер. Город, европейский город, скажем, XVI века, – это особая атмосфера, в которой рождается интерес к *природе*, формируется *натурализм* как мировоззрение. Интеллектуалы такого города, оторвавшись от природы, смотрят на нее со стороны. Только теперь, находясь в условиях *вненаходимости* (забавный вышел оборот), они обретают способность *понять* природу. Они любят все *естественное*. Они видят людей, трудящихся не на земле, а в замкнутом пространстве, причем, из-за многообразия видов деятельности, не важным становится *предмет* труда. От него можно абстрагироваться и сосредоточить внимание на самом *труде*. Появляется *трудовая теория* собственности. Под собственностью в этой теории понимается все, к чему прикоснулся человек посредством труда. Это, стало быть, – материальные объекты, которые выделяются из состава природы и становятся *частью* человека. Посредством труда человек как бы расширяет себя, свое тело, в природу. То, что именно я, через *мой* труд прикасаюсь к природному телу, исключает возможность для *другого* прикасаться к тому же телу.

Здесь уже витает дух права. Можно утверждать, что собственно право, формальное, или, как говорили римляне *jus strictum*, возникает только в городе и только в связи с собственностью. В городе живут по большей части незнакомые друг другу, случайно сходящиеся *лица*. Незнакомство с необходимостью порождает формальные отношения, для которых мораль, обычай как регуляторы становятся неадекватными. Здесь же, с появлением

индивида как лица, рождается собственность в ее подлинном виде – *частная* собственность. Вообще говоря, "собственность" и "частность" – синонимы. Это не значит, что не может быть собственности коллективной или общей. Но только (исторически и логически) после того, как появилась просто собственность или частная собственность. Ее происхождение прослежено классиками трудовой теории собственности, которые исходили из теологической модели исторического процесса. По этой модели Бог дал мир людям в общее пользование или "всему человечеству сообща" (Д.Локк). Это состояние еще не предполагает собственность. Строго говоря, обственность появляется тогда, когда появляется средство *присваивать*, т.е. делать индивидуально своим, то, что дано всем сообща. Таким средством является *труд* – усилие человеческого тела. Это есть то, что только и принадлежит личности, и то, что будучи присоединенным к данному в общее владение, образует собственность.

Натурализм манифестируется в творчестве позднего К.Маркса. Понимание человека как "силы природы", определение труда как воздействия на природу при помощи орудий, попытки вычислить, сколько энергии в калориях потребно телу трудящегося за рабочий день – эти и многие других факты характеризуют натуралистическое мышление. Главным объектом собственности при этом оказываются средства производства. А сама собственность определяется как юридическое выражение производственных отношений.

Гуманистическая культура. Проницательный Д.Локк дал универсальное определение собственности. Собственность человека – это его *жизнь, свобода и имущество* [3, 310]. Гражданское общество – общество собственников, его цель – сохранение собственности. Политическая власть – это право создавать законы для "регулирования и сохранения собственности". Стало быть, собственность у Д.Локка – фундаментальная, и притом единственная, категория, схватывающая всю аксиоматику моральной и политической философии. Определение Д.Локка подходит и для гуманистической культуры, в которой акцент смещается на человека как такового. Здесь человек *имеет* только себя. Все другое – малосущественные подробности, во всяком случае – нечто вторичное. Интеллектуальная собственность, человеческий капитал, инвестиции в себя – эти понятия в дискурсах о собственности в гуманистической культуре начинают вытеснять традиционные натуралистические концепты. В этой культуре доминирует новый тип специалиста. Это – *consultor*, человек, чья собственность – *знание*, оптимизирующее деятельность любого типа. Не грянет ли мир тотального *консалтинга*? Мир, в котором материальное производство, лишенное присутствия рабочей силы, станет придатком индустрии знания, в которой сосредоточится интеллектуальная сила. *Рабочая сила* – концепт натурализма. К.Маркс, не чуравшийся художественных образов даже в "Капитале", не случайно описывает нанятого рабочего, как понуро бредущего человека, который продал на рынке свою собственную шкуру и знает, что ее будут дубить. И цитата из Аристотеля будет здесь уместна: "у бедняков бык служит вместо раба". Сила природы воплощена и в том, и в другом. Но в гуманистической культуре человек задействован и в деловой сфере своими собственно *человеческими качествами*. Эти качества суть его собственность. В условиях, когда доминирует физический труд, человек представляется "*непосредственно природным существом*" (К.Маркс). Гуманистическая культура задает иное видение: человек есть существо духовное во всех сферах своего бытия.

Тот факт, что духовные качества могут быть измеримы в деньгах, коробит иные романтические натуры. Возможно, потому, что в этом таится угроза овеществления того, что овеществляться не должн?, и отождествления человека с вещью – презренным металлом. Однако сегодня по-иному видится природа стоимости и денег. Это изменение хорошо описано в книге японского экономиста Т.Сакайи "Стоимость, создаваемая знанием, или история будущего" (отрывки из книги см. в [5]). Ключевая категория концепции Т.Сакайи – *sika*, как бы составленная из японских слов *chi* (знание), и *kan* (стоимость или ценность), передана на английском выражением "knowledge-value", а на русском "стоимость (ценность), порождаемая знанием". Смысл ее в том, что многие современные потребители связывает со стоимостью товара вовсе не затраты, которые определяются традиционными вещественно-энергетическими факторами производства, а нечто принципиально другое. Они готовы платить, скажем, за "фирменный" галстук в пять раз больше, чем за "нефирменный", хотя *физически* галстуки почти не различимы. С точки зрения натурализма этот факт объяснить невозможно. За что же платит такой покупатель? – За фирменное название, за имидж фирмы – вот упрощающий суть

дела ответ. Упрощающий, потому что за названием фирмы стоит то, что современный человек ценит больше всего – знание, коллективную мудрость. В галстук от "Гермеса" именно это наличествует (потому она и известна), а в "нефирменном" – отсутствует. Покупая "фирменный" галстук, человек чувствует себя приобщенным мудрости или, на языке натурализма, потребляющим мудрость. Иными словами, "фирменный" галстук, так сказать, свидетельствует о том, что его покупатель – человек "умудренный".

Гуманистическая культура обращает особое внимание и на другое *имение* человека – его тело. Человек *имеет* тело, это понятно. Однако можно ли считать, что тело человека – его собственность? Не рабочая сила, которая предполагает телесность, а сама телесность. Пока по отношению к телу не имело смысла понятие "*распоряжаться*", этот вопрос не мог быть поставлен. Сегодня это понятие имеет смысл. Вообще собственность – это форма власти. Там, где власть слабо ограничена правом, в основе которого лежит христианская антропология, там собственность распространяется на человеческое тело и существует в виде института рабства. Христианский проект способствовал всеобщему осуждению рабства в любых его формах. Между тем успехи трансплантационной медицины неожиданно поставили забытый было вопрос о собственности тела. В обсуждение этого вопроса втягиваются широкие круги общественности. Беллетристы, которым доступны метафорические красоты, ставят вопрос так: кто есть человек по отношению к своему телу: полный *собственник* или *арендатор*. Если – арендатор, то он может *пользоваться* своим телом, но не *распоряжаться*. А если полный собственник? Не признает ли государство человека хозяином своего тела, если в стране появляется закон, разрешающий продажу парных органов? Тогда почему от этого "частичного самоубийства" (Кант) не идти дальше – к *эвтаназии*? И еще дальше – к *произвольному* лишению себя жизни? Сегодня от этих вопросов философу невозможно уклониться. Собственность – категория еще недавно как бы несколько подзабытая вновь привлекает к себе внимание.

Литература

1. Иоанн Кассиан Римлянин. Минск – М., 2000.
2. Оливье Клеман. Истоки. Богословие отцов Древней Церкви. Тексты и комментарии. М., 1994.
3. Джон Локк. Сочинения в трех томах. М., 1988, т. 3.
4. Людвиг фон Мизес. Социализм. Экономический и социологический анализ. М., 1994.
5. Новая постиндустриальная волна на западе. Антология. М., 1999.

Nataliya V. Zagurska

AN IMAGE-CONCEPT OF A SUPERMAN IN A CREATIVE HERITAGE OF J.BEME

In understanding of a superman in Early Christianity, Middle Ages has two basic conceptual directions. Firstly, this is a Godman Jesus Christ. Besides the Middle Ages culture this approach is very important to a orthodoxically oriented culture, which, in its turn, has exerted considerable influence to an understanding of superman idea in East-Slavonic philosophical and cultural tradition (V. Soloviev, N. Fedorov, etc.). Secondly, this is just a man or gnostic, this is a man who basing on his outstanding will, intellectual and other qualities, was raising to the position of God.

Peculiar hypertextuality of Middle Ages also presents superfolding metaphors of "form-Superman". Variety of interpretations, reinterpretations and recreations of Bible texts produces peculiar hypertext, from stylistic (in difference from sense) background possessing all distinctive creatures of hypertext by J.-L. Lebrave, if in relation to a hypertext we can talk about any stylistic in

general. Proceeding from this we can assume that discussing of superhumanity understanding in Christian culture is not only possible, but also necessary.

We see, that in spite of domination unfolding operational mechanism and "form-God" in Christian culture, results of overbanding action in this period are also quite sensed. As we say yet, this results can be reduced to two approaches. Overcelestial of Christ realizes the moving to the direction from up to down and then it loses its united. Otherwise, in over-gnoseology of gnosticism source direction radical contrary opposites to this. It's not a God who condenses to earth, but man tries to become like a God. In more contemporary terminology these directions can be signed as a godhuman (in interpretation of Slavonic religious philosophers) and humandivine by F. Nietzsche which representing rather an antitheses to divinity, but antitheses also overnatural – diabolic. It's not an occasion that gnosticism in many cases was being understood as a heretics or even Satanism, but Gnostics' snake was being identified with snakemorph image of Satan.

In pieces of one montanistic anonymous text it's emphasized that a man, entering in a Kingdom of a God ought to be named not just as a man, who was found a saving, but as a superman. But that we must understand on "saving" and stand up for combination of words "Kingdom of a God" makes a sense of this phrase much less obvious than it can seems from the beginning.

Being up to date of Gnostic conception of a overman was clearly expressed in following moments. Firstly, it's a whimsical combination of such appearing manners of scorn to corporeality and, wisely, to material in general as an asceth and unruliness. And, secondly, it's an imagination about maximal dividing, differentiating of ideal and material (this by no means must be confused with neoplatonic uniting of this opposites). In this case "form-Overman" is aspiring to transform in "form-God", but don't subordinate it to himself. Practical impossibility of such a transformation increases a number of attempts to realize this moving and possibilities to overhuman realization.

Other approach prefers to as Areopagith, which works are resaturated of a concepts with prefix *over-*. And it concerns not only to outstanding features of God. Areopagith says not only about "overnatural physiology of Christ" [7, 69], but also about corporeality of God himself in Bible interpretation. Hence if Areopagith writes about "overnatural physiology of Christ", he mystifies a corporeality the same, partial just through it's rising. Here it's happens some moving without a direction between height of overnatural, that's over a world and incorporeal, celestial, divine and angelic to a deepness of physiological. Areopagith don't acknowledge an absolute sin as such. "Thus, sinner, although and is losing a Good because a dumb lust – in Its, why, he don't exist and don't wish a real – nevertheless participates in Good in this week imitation of junction and love itself" [7, 151].

Areopagith bases a thesis that God knows the good as an evil. It's obvious that this basis is falls to thinking as an agreement of evil existence in the world, where dominate almighty and overgood Lord. But, on the other side, this returns us to impossibility of full comprehension of an interrelations of divine and mundane. Why if God possesses an overgood then divine abundance couldn't be understand corresponding to human notion of it and be perceived as own opposite – suffering and evil.

So, we see that so-named "philosophy of life" and anti-Christian immoralism of F. Nietzsche aren't full antithesis to Christianity as it can appear from the first sight. And these partially contrary points of view can be united by an overman idea. Especially this concerns to an overman idea in J. Beme's work.

J. Beme suggested a very interesting approach to a problem of a superman, uniting both of mentioning approaches. This approach can be signed as marginal: he combined an apophatic of Areopagith and Eckhart with pathos of gnosticism. Thus constitute specific image of a superman, created from nothingness as a substitute to Lucifer which had fallen. "God created another angel from the same place, which was created and where sat Lucifer; it was Adam, if he merely will stay in clearness" [2, 174] and "soul of man and spirit of angel have unified essence and essentiality" [*Ibid.*, 176]. And although angels are often described with wings, they have the same body as a man with arms and legs, "but only "in a celestial manner" [*Ibid.*, 248] and for the most part of time they are singing, realizing heavenly mercury.

We understand what it was meant under "in a celestial manner" when run into affirmation of the author about conversation between angels on angel's language and reader mustn't comprehend this in a earthly way [see *Ibid.*, 234].

J. Beme insists, that since both angel and man were created in similitude and semblance of God, "in Resurrection we must be alike angels [...] and angels must have the same guise as we have; in otherwise in Resurrections we would expected to take another image, but this would contradict to the first creation" [*Ibid.*]. The difference between man and angel is the effect that man body is separate, whereas a body of angel don't belong to himself properly speaking, why it belongs to God and he can "deduct" from its his own might in a case of insurrection. J. Beme preferred to liken this relationships to the relationships of mother and child [see *ibid.*, 173]. The things which a child receive from mother aren't his property, but mother give that to him through love. If a child will insurrect against mother like Lucifer was resurrected against God, she can excommunicate him from herself.

Thus we acquire an substantiation, that love of God isn't all-embracing. Angel and man must all the time demonstrate that they worthy of it. But this situation had generated of that the world has created in the result of Lucifer's fall and after creation regularly is expose of "deterioration".

Besides might and body of angel belong to themselves not altogether, its aren't something independent yet. Might and body of angels inseparable one of the another and from might of God. A man can't neither feel nor destroy a body of an angel [see *ibid.*, 174], why if celestial qualities react on man trough "deteriorate" earthy air, this celestial qualities react in angel proximately.

And this is a result of that Adam after his fall stop to be quite angelic primary overman. "Adam was separated from celestial world and "have too high opinion of himself" dipping in nature; through that he degraded and go to belong to the earth" [10, 161]. This happened during a dream of Adam – perhaps, this dream can be consider as archetypal. Just about it Z. Freud write his *Interpretation of Dreams*, Just it was signed by M. Foucault as "anthropological dream".

But Adam need in this dream to feel all shades of distinction, which is indefeasible condition of similitude formation, mystical self, celestial integrity: "every star in the sky [but every star by J. Beme represents itself might and high wisdom of God-Father – N. Z.] possesses of other might and other quality, that another one and just this produces such variety of differences in creatures and between creatures on the earth in all creation" [2, 160].

Without comprehension of this integrity in the difference Adam scarcely could be blessed with hope on future angelization due to Christ. But now he is dwelled on the verge between "creatureness" of Lucifer (emulating it) and celestuality of Christ (trying to achieve it): "inside, or cavity, in a body of a man a deepness between stars and earth and signifies it; all body in general signifie sky and earth" [*Ibid.*, 155]. All this transforms Adam in a overman-hero: for realization in such quality he must to pass long way, full of ordeals and seductions.

Therefore image of Adam as a overman in general transforms in image of a superman then he passes from statical in dynamical state, *in actu*, forced to realize himself in struggle. Of course, this, in the most part is the struggle with himself, fitting on victory doesn't lie in it's basis. Just such an approach to overman's force suggested to us by F. Nietzsche: "force, in Nietzsche's comprehension is a clear power, that does not limits itself with some separate, particular desires; power is absolute desire, consisting of any power pathos" [8, 166]. But by J. Beme words "celestial power consist not in a power, but in body, or flesh" [2, 165], in which consist violence and fury of Lucifer as a reason of his decadence. His moral is, of course, a moral of a slave, insurrecting against mastery God-Father.

Appellation of the first work of J. Beme himself – *Aurora, or Morning Dawn Ascension* miraculously assonant with Nitzshe's philosophy, especially with his philosophy of *Morning Dawn* or *Twilight of Gods*, where metaphors of light also became the key concepts: "in this book putted out inhabitant of an underground at work – drilling, digging, undermining [...] Whether he is patiently inured his gloom, remaining misunderstood, indistinct, enigmatic because of he hopes to have *his morning, his expiation, his morning down?*" [5, 3]. Thus F. Nietzsche describes his attempt to get rid of self-denial moral in favour of self-care ethics, neither reputing, of course, complacent self-relation, nor extraneous to compassion oblivion. This is self-care as a work on own self, but work in joy and creation, active (vs. slave reactivity) and bereaved of Spirit of Gravity.

Just this state is arousing summer lightning, illuminating an appearing of superman, free from moral prejudice. Both J. Beme and F. Nietzsche confess, that "meekness in a nature is a mild quiet; but fury in all forces make all moving, running, rushing, but also borning. For aspiring qualities enter to all creatures affinity to evil and good, so as all is wishing each other between themselves, mixing one with other, rising, detracting, becoming splendid, damaging, loving, feuding" [2, 153]. But if J. Beme considers, that meekness as reactivity would stay the only source and would be more

preferable, if created world never be created, F. Nietzsche, doubtless, gives a preference to fury as activity, as clear force, creating, but not destroying. In this its clearness fury, of course, is richen also that traditionally possessed meekness. Why "earth and deteriorate nature was waking all the time from its beginning and to these days to have a possibility to produce sky images" [*Ibid.*, 171].

If angel in his nature and qualities is a small god than man may be considered as small god too: the difference is only in a grading of their celestuality. As far as man is not only small, but also he is scanty and helpless, he forced ceaselessly to prove own celestuality. And Nietzsche's words "God is dead, superman was born" are one of the methods to prove it, but, the other side, they are an attempt to avoid of necessity of such proof. Why if God has dead, then his place has a superman on, but herewith stooped to compare himself with God as far as just an example was disappearing.

Just on crossing of these two interpretations of Nietzsche's "theology" is lain understanding of superhuman by J. Deleuze. Possessing of clear power, power as it is, transform man in God in the time, when transcendental God, unclaimed, is dying. But, in the same time, an aspiration to possessing the clear power appears as a result of comparison of human to celestial, a result of lack feeling (it goes without saying, not only physical) as a source of creativity, although deleuzian remonstrance against such an understanding of wishing and willing. F. Nietzsche don't writes, for example, that "earth God was born", but trumpets about bearing just a superman as a creature, emulating a man, saving with it all human. He is tracing his track from a man, somewhat outside a man (saving with this a possibility of reversion as a (per)version), but not from God, who doesn't exist yet.

On the other side, just through their interrelations God and man are constituted as such, why, on M. Eckhart opinion, world was created "only for that God will born in soul and soul in God" [9, 24]. And that God has let man to awake him (God's) death, is only proof of that he takes a living part in a fate of man, which in this time is expressed by trial of an absolute freedom.

Already Adam-primal(over)man quite realize that an evil wouldn't appear without Lucifer's fall and himself, but without this world wouldn't be created too and also wouldn't be born Christ, wouldn't appear a possibility to show himself as a worthy of celestial love – why it would be all-embracing. All of this go to an old idea that primary fury bears any activity, no matter is this primary activity or reconstructing and reactive activity, which has many reaction features.

In some sense the variant of Bible mythology that was proposed by J. Beme is similar to the legend about Osiris in interpretation of K.-G. Jung [12, 1994], who expanded complex of Oedipus of Z. Freud to complex of Osiris. Aspiration to come back in mother womb as one of metamorphoses of sexuality in its turns become a metaphor of aspiration to a immortality [see details in: 4, 1998]. But coming to a struggle (but under a struggle we can understand even an advent in this world – bearing as a severance from celestial world-eon) Lucifer and Osiris aren't blessed with immortality, but they lose their integrity and they are forced to tribute their lives to its reconstruction. This reconstruction is arising with variable success and just because of that Osiris appear as a God, who is dying and resurrecting permanently.

According J. Beme Lucifer transgressing integrity of a world and his own integrity resurrects in the guise of Adam. He also did not stay the test (but, even though, isn't premediately furious) and was losing his integrity, even primordially relative: "angel or man are the creatures, but not whole being, is only a son of a whole being, which has born by him" [2, 181]. Then Adam, in his turn, is resurrecting in Christ. He becomes a savior at the expanse of his own doom, but then resurrects in God-Son. His numerous followers again and again with variable success are trying to reproduce his sacrifice in straight or metaphoric sense of this word.

J. Beme is convinced, that celestial bearing must boiling in both man and in angel. And that really is persistently happen in human soul, which all the time is in a damage and torment because of unfinished struggle with a devil. But "semidead" body don't always understands a fight of soul. That's why man can be named as "semidead angel" [see *ibid.*, 235-236], qualities of which also "semidead" [*Ibid.*, 213]. But before resurrection it is necessary to die the whole hog. From a J. Campbell's theory of heroism [3], history God-Son incarnations by J. Beme is quite inscribed in the scheme of hero realization.

M. Eliade attracts special attention to that fact, that during the Adam's dream was transgressed his sexual integrity. Just from the moment when his has separated celestial friend, Sophia, celestial virgin, as far as he has wished of mastery on her in his dream. "Man has received his genital parts and also an exit below only in his plaintive fall" [*Ibid.*, 182] to undertake fruitless attempts again and again to get

back Sophia himself and to find losing, although relative, but integrity – J. Beme is assured in that. Thus, special attention of M. Eliade to a separation of Sophia can be explained that this episode can be interpreted as loss on every level of integrity: sexual, psychological, existential, mystical, etc. "Beme compared loss of androgynic nature by Adam with crucifixion of Christ", – writes Eliade [10, 161].

On M. Eliade opinion just creations of J. Beme (and also others theosophers of XVII century — J. G. Hichtel and Gottfrid Arnold) became of a source of revaluation of androgyne role that was being produced by German romantics, which returned to him metaphysical significance and completed it with his superhuman sensuality.

In J. Beme works just sensuality come forward as a pledge on any abstraction. Especially it's concerning of perceptive forms, which not highly traditional for European culture – gustatory and emotional perception. Thus, "qualities" by J. Beme are the perceptive forms.

"All nature consists in a force of seven source spirits, but among these seven one is a nature or understandability of all qualities: it's light and dense as a cloud, but, with this, entirely transparent like a crystal sea that we can see all throughout; but and all deepness is such, above and below" [2, 248]. In this nature angel has its own place, *locused* by J. Beme. But we know that a locus as mobile singularity is one of the superman characteristics.

As for angel, he has this locus from eternity, to such an extent he's received a body and he'll stand in it for staying in celestial love. "Locus, or place of this world, deepness of the earth and over the earth to the sky as a created sky, which was created from surroundings of waters and is flying over stars and which we see our eyes and a deepness of which can't measure by our senses, – all this space and place in them totality was the only kingdom and Lucifer was its king before his exile" [*Ibid.*, 185]

Like an Areopagith [7, 88] J. Beme suggests to us to consider as the most adequate space metaphor of the universe *the wheel*. But this is much more refund image of a wheel, then Areopagethical one. It consist from seven wheels, each of them signs one of the celestial spirits (which sign, in his turn, trough a nave). "These seven wheels one in another, incessantly is bearing one another and going in all sides and besides, hence, no one don't disappears and don't turns, are really seven source spirits of God-Son, bearing in each of seven wheels one nave and, yet, this isn't seven naves, but only one, which suitable to all seven wheels" [2, 263], – writes J. Beme. And if, by Areopagith, man with his necessity in sensation placing on the wheel rim, may be only raised or subverted, here number of his "levels of freedom" considerably increased, simultaneously increasing and his responsibility.

But, this freedom produces the understanding of a world as a game of celestial forces. "There are in seven spirits nothing except loving fight and wonderful birth like celestial game of God" [*Ibid.*, 264; also 233, 253-254]. This game remains a game as fighting for amusement, when one wins a victory over another, but third go to him for a help and so to endlessness, till each spirit keeps own *locus*, as it was before Lucifer transgresses him and thereby transgresses and all non-figurativity, non-qualitativity and monotony of salliter as eternal focus of a nature, eon [see *ibid.*, 254]. So, already angels different by colors and strength (but are equal by perfection), but peoples largely embody all variety of creativity, why a level of their soul in God shine is very different. In this context we have very interesting passage from *Aurora* J. Beme: "But that Turks have a astringent quality and pagans have a bitter quality, then is there concern of you? When the light is shining in astringent and bitter quality, then it also shine" [*Ibid.*, 231].

J. Beme doesn't give an answer to a question why for that Deity will show itself "endlessly and in boundless variety of sorts, colors, forms and joys" [*Ibid.*, 241] it was necessary to Lucifer fall. But from his works it's clear, that the role of a man in the Universe is great, but for realizing his possibilities he must to get over human nature without losing it and become somebody like an overman in Nietzschean meaning.

Bibliography

1. Benz E. Der dreifache Aspect des Übermenschen // Eranos-Jahrbuch. Z., 1960. Bd. 28. S. 92–109.
2. Беме Я. Аврора, или Утренняя заря в восхождении / Экхарт М. Духовные проповеди и рассуждения. Беме Я. Аврора, или Утренняя заря в восхождении. К., 1998. С. 131–429.
3. Кэмпбелл Д. Герой с тысячью лицами. К., 1997.

4. Между Эдипом и Озирисом: Становление психоаналитической концепции мифа. М., 1998.
5. Ницше Ф. Утренняя заря. Свердловск, 1991.
6. Псевдо-Дионисий Ареопагит. О небесной иерархии. М., 1994.
7. Псевдо-Дионисий Ареопагит. О божественных именах. СПб., 1995.
8. Фокин С. Л. Делёз и Ницше // Делёз Ж. Ницше. СПб., 1997. С. 143-186.
9. Экхарт М. Духовные проповеди и рассуждения / Экхарт М. Духовные проповеди и рассуждения. Бёме Я. Аврора, или Утренняя заря в восхождении. К., 1998. С. 7-130.
10. Элиаде М. Мефистофель и андрогин. СПб., 1998а.
11. Элиаде М. Миф о вечном возвращении. Архетипы и повторяемость. СПб., 1998.
12. Юнг К. Г. Либидо, его метаморфозы и символы СПб., 1994.

Olga G. Pirozhenko

CULTURAL VARIATIONS OF THE SOCIAL AND THE WHITE TYPES OF LIE

Lying is a socio-cultural phenomenon that has been a characteristic of every nation, society and individual human being. Some scholars, notably the philosopher Thomas Hobbes and the psychoanalyst Sandor Ferenczi, have even singled out the ability to lie as one of the criteria that distinguish human beings from other animals, though many animals practice other models of deceit, including in some cases, using their voices deceitfully (cit. by Barnes 1994: 3). S. Arendt goes one step further and proclaims that "our ability to lie – but not necessarily our ability to tell the truth – belongs among the few obvious, demonstrable data that confirm human freedom" (ibid.) But strangely enough, it was usually referred to as an antipode of truth and was usually studied in the context of truth, and not as a separate object. Quite a number of researchers' works that studied lie in itself are devoted to defining what lie is, what the differences between such notions as lie and deception are, and what the types of lying are.

The two notions that are often confused are lying and deception, that is why we would like to define them. We chose two definitions to illustrate this difference. D. Buller and J. Bergoon (1996) give the following definition of deception: "*message* knowingly transmitted by a sender to foster a false belief or conclusion by the receiver". According to J. Barnes gives the following definition of lie: "... a lie is an intentionally distorted *statement* meant to mislead the dupe about the state of the world, including the intentions and the attitude of the liar" (1994: 11). These definitions are quite similar, and their core difference lies in the words "message" and "statement". A message can be transferred not only by words or sometimes even without words. A spoken lie may be only one part of an act of deception; the liar may use, consciously or unconsciously, what has come to be known as body language as a means of enhancing the chances of success for the deceit; or, on the other hand, intended body movements may enhance the likelihood that a liar will be detected (the detector of lying is based on this principle). Alternatively, deception may be attempted by body language alone, without a supporting spoken lie. Movements can sometimes be more expressive than words. A fascinating example of the distinction between deceiving by what is said and by the way it is said is provided by Oliver Sacks. Mentally disabled people in an asylum without understanding the words of a politician speaking on TV responded by roars of laughter to his grimaces, histrionisms, false gestures and false tones and cadences of the voice (cit. by Barnes 1994: 18).

Thus the stated above corresponds to the following definitions of lying given by K. Jaspers (1991). He distinguishes lying in its broad and narrow senses. In its broad sense, lie is any behaviour or speech that contains deception by the way of not saying, shifting accents, giving advice in an indirect way (without pronouncing it), creating a tendentious vagueness to benefit from the context, etc. In its narrow sense, lie is intentionally false. This refers to, first of all, the situations in which only definite things are spoken about, secondly, to the situations in which a lie is told when the truth is

known, and despite the truth (in contrast to deception). This article considers different types of lying and it takes into consideration only verbal deception, or lying proper.

Jaspers argues that lies differ according to the situation in which they occur and to the goals they pursue. He distinguishes conventional lie, white lie, and purposeful lie. A *conventional* (or social – O.P.) *lie* is a lie, the purpose of which is to make communication between members of a society easier. By means of such a lie, people do not deceive one another, but draw a veil over something undesirable. A *white lie* is the name of a lie which is thrust upon someone in order to protect against some threat. A *purposeful lie* is a lie with a definite goal that it pursues. Such a lie is used when either an individual wants to benefit from it, or s/he wants to bring someone down or to get some profit without any losses.

E. Sweetzer's work adds to this classification. She states that "*white lies* and *social lies* are generally like lies, but they occur in settings in which information might harm rather than help. They are still called lies: even nonreprehensible, deliberate misinformation counts as a lie. In these cases, the entailments of speaker's knowledge, evidence, and intent to be believed (seriousness) still hold; likewise the supermaxim "Help don't harm" holds; but the usual helpfulness of truth cannot be assumed" (1987: 53-54). The third type of lie in Sweetzer's terms is a prototypical lie, which corresponds to Jaspers's purposeful lie. The three components of this lie proposed by Coleman and Kay are:

Speaker believes statement is to be false.

Speaker said it with intent to deceive.

The statement is false in fact (Sweetzer 1987: 48).

S. Bok also singles out the "white" (or harmless) lie. She defines the "white" lie as a falsehood not meant to injure anyone, and of little moral import" (Bok 1989: 58). But in contrast to the mentioned scientists, Bok argues that all lies defined as "white" can be easily dismissed. She states that, in the first place, the harmlessness of lies is notoriously disputable, and what the liar perceives as harmless or even beneficial may not be so in the eyes of the deceived. Secondly, the failure to look at an entire practice rather than at an isolated case often blinds liars to commutative harm and expanding deceptive activities.

Societies vary not only in their recognition of the ubiquity of lying but also in the way they evaluate different kinds of lies. Probably there is in every culture a recognition that some lies are relatively malevolent and others relatively benign. Because of culturally bound peculiarities of lie, the attitude to it differs in different cultures, especially when we think about the social and the white lie.

One of the best examples of social lie cultural differences is provided by H. Lerner (1994). She describes a following situation: the author deliberately increased the number of people who came to her lecture when she told her father about it. A friend of hers, Sue, disapproved of this and considered this to be a lie. In another situation Sue answered the question of her occupation in a manner that implied that she worked as a nurse, though she was a doctor. When the author pointed out that this lie was similar to hers, Sue answered that she was trying to make the people with whom she talked comfortable and not to make a barrier between her and them. The author explains these two situations in the following way: "While I veered from truth telling by exaggerating my accomplishments to my father, Sue minimized hers to the world. Our different ethnic backgrounds were probably at play here. Sue's Anglo-Saxon Protestant family thinks it sinful to boast, even about distinguished ancestors. In contrast, my Jewish family considers it sinful for children not to give their parents to boast about. In my family, hitting the winning home run was far more important than being the good team player Sue was expected to be" (Lerner 1994: 69).

A common example of social lie in our country is the lie in an educational institution, when students being not ready with their homework co-operate and persuade their teacher that they haven't been given the task. Even those students who are ready with the homework usually join their classmates because of the feeling of false solidarity. Quite opposite is the situation in many other countries, and the USA in particular, where a lie in this case is considered a violation of norms. The following quotation from the Academic Bulletin of the University of Cincinnati (1992-94) titled "Academic Honesty" gives proof to that: "Academic dishonesty in any form is a serious offence and cannot be tolerated in any academic community. Dishonesty in any form, including cheating, fraud, deception of effort or unauthorized assistance may result in a failing grade in a course and/or suspension or dismissal from a graduate program".

Views on the white lie are more homogeneous and less depended on a society than those on the social lie. Jaspers gives a classical example of a white lie – to tell lie about the whereabouts of friends to criminals. This situation will be considered the white lie in every society. But still there are situations in which white lie can be thought of as inappropriate. For example, in Ukrainian culture it is a norm not to tell a mortally ill person the truth about his/her disease. This is done in order not to spoil the person's last days with the thoughts of death. On the contrary, in the American culture of today doctors are explicit about the time left for patient to live in order for them to complete some things that they may have and they should know how much time they have. We can say that in the context of American culture such a lie is not considered as a white (or harmless).

Socio-cultural context is one of the factors – and one of the most powerful – that has the ability to regulate communication and thus it influences our perception of lie as being social or white or, on the contrary purposeful (prototypical) and its evaluation. The examples of such divergences are vast, and numerous, and it makes a research into the problem necessary and timely because it helps to avoid misunderstanding between the representatives of different cultures.

Bibliography

1. Barnes J.A. (1994). *A Pack of Lies*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
2. Bok S. (1978). *Lying: moral choice in public and private life*. – New York: Pantheon Books.
3. Buller D.B., Burgoon J.K. (1996). *Interpersonal Deception Theory// Communication Theory*. – № 6-3, August. – P. 203-241.
4. Jaspers K. (1991). *Von der Wahrheit*. – Zuerich: Piper.
5. Lerner H. G. (1994). *The Dance of Deception: pretending and truth-telling in women's lives*. – New York: HarperCollins Publishers.
6. *Cultural models in language and thought* (1987) (ed. By D. Wooland and N. Quinn)// Sweetzer E. *The definition of lie*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. – P. 43-67.

Volodymyr Navrotsky

SOCIAL INTERACTION ANALYSIS: SOME NEW PERSPECTIVES*

It is widely admitted in recent theories of social action that interaction is not guided by norms but by communicatively achieved understanding, that the norms limit the actions, but not determine them, that the basic rules of description of the people's behavior are the rules of ascription of the status of norm and values to the social phenomena.

So we need to practice an interdisciplinary approach to the analysis of social interaction, the mutual usage both cognitive and normative approaches to description of the interaction processes. To achieve this aim we can, for example, exploit various modes of the rational explanation of social action in the context given in [6, 7].

In accordance with the task of the given paper the basic attention is concentrated on rationality, which is understood as an evaluation of action. The most developed model of action rationality is the game-theoretical scheme of interaction [1]. It was shown in the series of publications that the one essential shortcoming of this model is an implicit presupposition, that the interaction participants have full knowledge of interaction situations and the perfect reasoning ability. Therefore the model of rationality which fixes both normative and cognitive constraints on the agents would be more acceptable. To elaborate this idea we need a more subtle characterization of the main game-theoretic notions and cognitive conditions of interaction.

* This work was supported by the Research Support Scheme of the Open Society Support Foundation, grant №: 101/1998.

I am sure that these refinements will allow explicating two main aspects of the basic notion of the theory of communicative action, namely the aspect of goal achievement and the aspect of interpretation of situation. The description of communicative action as founded on the mutual interpretation of the interaction circumstances ascends to the idea of phenomenological sociology that any co-operative communication presupposes the intersubjective typification of the interaction circumstances: the understanding of the people's behavior is a typification process through the interpretative schemes. I think that the recent analysis of the cognitive systems of the communication participants can contribute to the description of the typification.

Another mode of rationality is connected with decision making. And again, I suppose that in the discussion of choice phenomenon as the central point of decisions making the leading role must be ascribed to the description of cognitive systems of the agents. First of all, it is necessarily to research the phenomenon of the cognitive systems ascription emphasizing the special status of beliefs in decision-making procedure and proceeding to detailed consideration of the belief attribution. To realize one of the conditions of minimal rationality, namely the absence of the constraint to remove always the contradictions from the agent's belief system, it is possible to use paraconsistent semantics to construct a formal representation of the belief systems [4].

Because choice is one of the aspects of the intention to act some more attention must be paid to the intention description. In the eighties the considerable results in the modeling of the intention forming were gained in the theory of practical inferences [2].

To develop this approach we need focus on the relations between decision making and commitments of agents. It is obvious that decision making is connected with the commitment revision, so I conclude that the decision making model ought to represent both the cognitive states dynamics and the dependencies between the cognitive states changes and the commitment forming. As a starting point here I propose to use the analysis of rational balance which exists among the cognitive states, commitments and actions [5]. In real communication rational balance has dynamic nature: the agents revise their intentions. So far as a commitment is included into number of conditions of the goal dropping, the intention revision is reduced to the commitment revision.

As a new direction in the analysis of the social commitment we can consider the analysis of collective intentions. Following to the approach proposed in [5], the content of collective intentions can be defined through the mutual persistent goals. By analogy with the idea that some commitment is included in the content of a persistent goal, I admit that an interpersonal commitment enters in the content of a mutual persistent goal. Hence, the interpersonal commitment to some mutual action is included into the content of collective intention to such action. That's why it is necessarily to analyze mutual beliefs, collective intentions, and interpersonal commitments regarding them as the basic sociological notions.

Accepting the idea that the theory of interaction needs to be placed within the theory of planning, we can establish the stable interdependencies among the cognitive systems, commitments and plans of the communicants. I hope the investigations in this area can contribute to the decision of the collective will-formation problem [3].

One of the main tasks of the contemporary philosophy of social action is to formulate some preconditions for transition from static models of the human action explanation to dynamic ones. To this aim it shows, particularly, the effectiveness of the cognitive systems dynamic models and the discourse models.

Discourse theory is the constituent part of any rational theory of interaction. The real process of reasoning and the procedure of formal representation of such reasoning are studied under the game-theoretical paradigm. To overcome its shortcomings the special attention should be concentrated on the conceptions of discourse structure and discourse plans recognition discussing the dynamic aspects of discourses on both propositional and text levels.

In order to provide a basis for the formal discourse theory I propose to summarize the main results concerning explication of the reasoning dynamics starting from temporal logic and dynamic logic of computer programs and compare the newest achievements in the dynamics of cognitive systems with the approach to the belief dynamics modeling proposed in [8].

To my mind, it is possible to apply the theory of the cognitive state changes to the discussion of the law philosophy problems and ethics, especially to the adoption and the annulment of norms, to the description of the normative character of cognitive systems. In this respect it would be promising to

elaborate the notion of the individual normative system and represent such system by the beliefs of some special sort. It will allow applying the methods of analysis of the cognitive state dynamics to the modeling of the normative system functioning.

Bibliography

1. Carlson L.: 1994, Logic for Dialogue Games, *Syntheses* 99, P. 377-415.
2. Clark D.S.: 1985, *Practical Inferences*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.
3. Habermas J.: 1989, Towards a Communication Concept of Rational Collective Will – Formation. A Thought Experiment, *Ratio Juris* 2, n 2, P. 144-154.
4. Navrotsky V.: 1999, Paraconsistent Description of Change, *Theoria* 14, n 34, P. 83-94.
5. Cohen P.R., Levesque H.J.: 1990, Persistence, Intention and Commitment, *Intention in Communication*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, A Bradford Book, The MIT Press, P. 33-69.
6. *Rationality in Science and Politic.*: 1984, ed. G. Anderson, Reidel Publishing Company, Dordrecht, Boston, Lancaster.
7. *Rationality in Thought and Action.*: 1986, ed. M. Tomny and K.D. Irani, Greenwood Press, N.Y., Westport, Connecticut, London.
8. Alchourron C.E., Gardenfors P., Makinson D.: 1985, On the Logic of Theory Change: Partial Meet Contraction and Revision Functions, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 50, P. 510-530.

ЗМІСТ
CONTENTS

РАЗДЕЛ 1. ФИЛОСОФИЯ НАУКИ	
PART 1. PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE	3
Igor Biletsky	
PHENOMENOLOGY AND LEGITIMATION OF TRUTH.....	3
Jakov V. Tararoyev	
THE PROBLEM OF CAUSALITY IN QUANTUM COSMOLOGY.....	6
Tamara Bulavina	
HANNAH ARENDT AND SITUATION WOMEN IN SCIENCES.....	11
Irina I. Tsekhmistro	
TO THE CONNECTION BETWEEN FIRST AND SECOND PROBLEMS OF HILBERT	15
РАЗДЕЛ 2. ФИЛОСОФИЯ ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ	
PART 2. PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION.....	18
Moshe Schneider	
INTER-CULTURAL BRIDGING IN ISRAELI SCHOOLS	18
Haim Fraiman	
THE CONNECTION BETWEEN TEACHER BURNOUT AND STYLE OF CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT	22
Aliza Cohen	
DEFINING "SOCIAL DEPRIVATION" IN ISRAEL	33
Anat Sandler	
TALKING AND LISTENING: FACTS AND RULES.....	41
Habib Nasser Geries	
COUNSELOR'S DUTY: THE COUNSELOR'S PERCEPTION ACTIVITY DUTY WITHIN GALIL HIGH SCHOOL PUPILS.....	44
А.В. Донцов	
ОБОВ'ЯЗОК І СОВІСТЬ ЯК МОРАЛЬНІ МЕХАНІЗМИ ПОВЕДІНКИ ОСОБИСТОСТІ	47
Yael Nissenbaum	
WOMEN'S PHYSICAL ACTIVITIES: LEISURE & RECREATION	53
РАЗДЕЛ 3. СОЦИАЛЬНАЯ ПЕДАГОГИКА	
PART 3. SOCIAL PEDAGOGIC	61

Viktoria Sukovataya	
THE FEMINIST POLITICS IN UKRAINIAN EDUCATION: TOWARD THE LIBERTY AND DEMOCRACY VALUES?	61
Moshe Schneider	
A UNIQUE PROGRAM FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF ETHIOPIAN YOUTH	66
Aliza Cohen	
GUIDING TEACHERS IN TREATING "SOCIALY DEPRIVED" PUPILS	73
Anat Sandler	
CREATING AN EFFECTIVE CONVERSATION.....	78
Yael Nissenbaum	
PHYSICAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM FOR WOMEN OR GIRLS ONLY	82

РАЗДЕЛ 4. КУЛЬТУРОЛОГИЯ И ТЕОРИЯ РЕЛИГИИ

PART 4. CULTURAL STUDIES AND THEORY OF RELIGION.....86

Ivan Z. Tsekhmistro	
UKRAINE: FROM GEO- TO CULTURAL POLICY	86
Mikhail A. Blumenkrants	
GLOBAL TRENDS IN THE MODERN CULTURAL PROCESS	95
Mazal Karakookly	
PORFIRI USPENSKI: THE PIONEER	98
Olga K. Burova	
М.РЕПІХ І КУЛЬТУРА: НАРИСИ РОЗДУМІВ.....	103
Yana V. Botsman	
STATUS OF CATEGORY "PSYCHIC" IN ORIENTAL CULTURE: "PHILOSOPHY OF THE HEART" AND PHILOSOPHY OF CREATION.....	106
Veronika Leontieva	
THE CULTURE-CREATIVE PROCESSES OF "POST-MODERNITY" (PREMISES, TENDENCIES, PERSPECTIVES).....	110
О. Марченко	
ОЗНАКИ РОМАНТИЧНОГО В ОФОРМЛЕННІ НОТНИХ ВИДАНЬ ХІХ СТОЛІТТЯ.....	114
Dmitry V. Gordevsky	
DEVIATIVE THOUGHT IN CONTEMPORARY CULTURE	119

РАЗДЕЛ 5. СОВРЕМЕННАЯ ФИЛОСОФИЯ

PART 5. CONTEMPORARY PHILOSOPHY.....124

Irina A. Zhrebkina	
"BEAUTIFUL LADY" AND JOUISSANCE FEMININE IN FIN-DE-SIECLE RUSSIAN CULTURE.....	124

О.В.Храброва, В.В.Шкода	
СОБСТВЕННОСТЬ В ИСТОРИКО-КУЛЬТУРНОМ КОНТЕКСТЕ	127
Nataliya V. Zagurska	
AN IMAGE-CONCEPT OF A SUPERMAN IN A CREATIVE HERITAGE OF J.BEME	130
Olga G. Pirozhenko	
CULTURAL VARIATIONS OF THE SOCIAL AND THE WHITE TYPES OF LIE	135
Volodymyr Navrotsky	
SOCIAL INTERACTION ANALYSIS: SOME NEW PERSPECTIVES	137
ЗМІСТ	140

Підп. до друку 15.01.2001. Формат 68x84 1/16. Папір офсетний. Друк офсетний.
Умовн. друк. арк. 9, 56. Тираж 400 прим. Ціна договірна.

Харківський національний університет ім.В.Н.Каразіна, Харків, 61077, пл. Свободи, 4.
ПП Є.В. Титов