

-
1. Gervais W. Like a camera in the sky? Thinking about God increases public self-awareness and socially desirable responding /Will M. Gervais, Ara Norenzayan //Journal of Experimental Social Psychology. – 2012. – 48. – . 298-302.
 2. Henrich J. Markets, religion, community size, and the evolution of fairness and punishment /Joseph Henrich et al. // Science. – 2010. – Vol. 327. – . 1480-1484.
 3. Norenzayan A. The origin and evolution of religious prosociality /Norenzayan Ara, Shariff Azim F. //Science – 2008. – Vol. 322. – . 58-62.
 4. Randolph-Seng B. Honesty: one effect of primed religious representations /Randolph-Seng Brandon, Nielsen Michael E. // The international journal for the psychology of religion, 2007. – 17(4). – . 303-315.
 5. Roes F. L. Raymond M. Belief in moralizing gods /Roes Frans L., Raymond Michel //Evolution and Human Behavior. – 2003. – 24. – . 126-135.
 6. Schjoedt U. Highly religious participants recruit areas of social cognition in personal prayer /Schjoedt U., Stodkilde-Jorgensen H., Geerts A. W., Roepstorff A. //Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience. – 2009. – 4. – . 199-207.

Summary

Nadurak V. Religion as a Controlling Factor of the System of Social Morality. Religion as one of the factors which influence the evolution of social morality is investigated in the article. The following conclusions can be made: firstly, religion helps to establish norms and principles that are caused by other, more fundamental controlling factors (a need for coexistence, a biological nature of human being); to entrench in the moral consciousness and to function effectively; secondly, religion played an important role in the development of moral orientations, existence of which is caused by other controlling factors of the system of social morality; thirdly, in the morality of different groups norms caused exclusively by the influence of religion exist because their implementation is intended to achieve the goal determined by religion; fourthly, religions and especially the world religions, played a significant role in the universalization of morality. Keywords: religion, system of social morality, controlling factors, moral consciousness, synergetics.

УДК 167:17.021

© Леся Мирутенко

Чернівецький національний університет імені Юрія Федьковича

АМБІВАЛЕНТНІСТЬ ІМПЕРАТИВІВ ЕТОСУ НАУКИ

;

,

- ();

(),

;

- ;

;

“ ” —

“ ” ()

); “ ” “ ”

” [: 5]. “ ”

() () .

: « —

;

» [22, .8].

« —

» [1, .121].

— «

» [, .192].

70-

« »:

« ».

« » [14, .24].

« » [5, .96].

1. ... 1. / ; [...] - ... 1971. - 590 с. - (... .42).
2. ... I. « » - 1997. - 576 . /

3. . . . : /
4. . . . : « », 1999. – 576 .
[] / – :
http://terme.ru/dictionary
5. . . . : [. . . .] /
. . . . : « », 2001. – 428 .
6. . . . : - / . . . ,
. . . . – : . – 2010. – 289 .
7. : 4 ./[- ; ; .
-] . – 2- – : , 2010. – 2806 .
8. : - : 4 . [] / [-
; ;] . – : ,
2000 – 2001. – : http://iph.ras.ru/enc.htm
9. / [.] . – 3- – :
, 2003. – 1280 .
10. : [.] / , , ,
. . . .] . – / : , 2004. – 608 .
11. / [. ,] . – :
; , 2001. – 1040 .
12. : / [.] . – :
1991. – 414 .
13. : [] / [.] . – :
. . . .] . – : - « », 2000. – :
http://www.agnuz.info/tl_files/library/books/filslov/
14. : [.] / [.] . – :
, 2004. – 736 .
15. 5 / [.] . – «
», 1970. – . 5. - – 740 , 1 –
(. . . . - « ») .
16. / [.] . – 7- – : , 2001. – 719 .
17. / [.] , , ,
. . . .] . – : , 1983. – 840 .
18. / [. ,] . – : « »,
2002. – 744 .
19. / [.] . – , 1973. – 600 .
20. / [.] . – -
,] . – ,
- : « » , 2005. – 672 .
21. / // : ,
/ ; [.] ;
. . . .] . – , , 1996. – 448 .
22. / – : « », 1965. – 360 .
23. / [.] . – : « + »,
« », 2009. – 1248 .
24. Merton R. . The Sociology of Science () /R. . Merton. – N.Y, 1973. – .
267-278.

Summary

Myrutenko L. Ambivalence of Imperative of Ethos of Science. *The article investigates the genesis and specific norms and values of ethos of science, their ambivalent nature and ambiguity of moral choices when scientist is responsible for the consequences of his professional activities. Keywords: ethics, morality, ethos, ethics, science, the ethos of science, philosophy of science, ambivalence of value choice of a scientist.*