

Chelovek vnutri gorodskih sten. Formyi obschestvennyih svyazey. – M.: Nauka, 2000. – 378 s.

8. Uvarov P.Yu. Obschina gorozhan: struktura i konflikty / P.Yu. Uvarov // Gorod v srednekovoy tsivilizatsii Zapadnoy Evropy / Svanidze A.A. T.3. Chelovek vnutri gorodskih sten. Formyi obschestvennyih svyazey. – M.: Nauka, 2000. – 378 s.

Radchuk Y. V., postgraduate student, Department of social philosophy and management, Zaporizhzhya National University (Ukraine, Zaporizhzhya), flori4ka@mail.ru

Characteristics of the phenomenon of the common cause in the Middle Ages

An attempt to explore the features of a phenomenon of common cause in the Middle Ages has been made in this article. It has been revealed that with the change of social relations during the epoch of feudal society system common cause also had been changed: society creates its new model that meets the needs and ideas of society of the period. Common business system during feudalism was of subjective nature and had a lot of economic fundamentals. In the Middle Ages new subjects of common cause such as professional associations are formed, also city guilds, guilds representing the community in a way, organized not by family and neighbor principle, but for territorial and professional. It has been established that the essence and specifics of common cause in the Middle Ages was determined by the dominant values of Christianity and the role of the church in the social and cultural life of the community. The issue of coordination of social needs and personal interests in the development of common cause forms, which brought together European medieval society and define the specifics of the common cause form had been grounded.

Keywords: phenomenon of common cause, subject, interaction, feudal society, system, activity, mutual help, common activity.

Радчук Я. В., аспирант кафедри соціальної філософії та управління, Запорізький національний університет (Україна, Запоріжжя), flori4ka@mail.ru

Особенности феномена общего дела в эпоху Средневековья

Предпринята попытка исследовать особенности феномена общего дела в эпоху Средневековья. Обнаружено, что с изменением общественных отношений в период феодального общества система общего дела также изменяется: общество создает новую модель, которая отвечает потребностям и представлениям социума того периода. Система общего дела в период феодализма носила многосубъектный характер и имела множество экономических оснований. В период Средневековья формируются новые субъекты общего дела, такие как профессиональные объединения, городские гильдии, цехи которые представляют собой в определенном смысле объединение, но организованное не по семейно-соседскому, а по территориально-профессиональному признаку. Установлено, что содержание и специфика общего дела в период Средневековья определялась господствующим значением христианской религии и церкви в общественной и культурной жизни общества. Обоснованно вопрос о согласовании общественных потребностей и личных интересов в становлении форм общего дела, которые объединяли европейское средневековое общество и определяли специфику форм общего дела.

Ключевые слова: феномен общего дела, субъект, взаимодействие, феодальное общество, система, деятельность, взаимопомощь, совместная деятельность.

* * *

UDC 130.1/2

Sakun A.

PhD in philosophy, Assoc. Prof., Leading Researcher in The Institute of Gifted Child of National Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of Ukraine (Ukraine, Kyiv), gileya.org.ua@gmail.com

EVOLUTION OF MODELING AND INTERACTION OF THINKING AND COGNITION

The paper analyzes the problem of the evolution of thinking in the process of interaction with the theory of knowledge. It is shown that in the previous era began to form the doctrine of principles, methods and techniques of scientific knowledge and thinking. The subject-object gnoseology dominated in European culture of thinking and knowledge for centuries, defining influence not only on various philosophical, scientific design, but also on the various techniques in the field of knowledge and education. The "subject-object" problem led to the analysis and interpretation of knowledge in all cognition theories. A subject with all its feelings and attitudes considered as a condition of the truth, the probability and of scientism. The theory of knowledge explicates communication, meanings and norms of mental activity.

Keywords: meaning thinking, cognition, science, theory, truth, knowledge, gnoseology.

(стаття друкується мовою оригіналу)

Today it is obvious that gnoseology (or epistemology) in a traditional sense has lost its fundamental position in the structure of philosophical knowledge. Therefore the actual question is whether it should be reformed, or it is the high time to reject such approach to knowledge as an outdated paradigm, and replace it with a range of disciplines and approaches which are different forms of knowledge? The understanding of previous experience and tendencies outlined by its generalizations is the only way to reveal the perspective direction of the philosophy of knowledge as the basis of the cognitive activity. Philosophy of knowledge, as well as philosophy in general, is facing a problem related to the interpretation of the classical tradition and rationality as a way of thinking. Should it be finally overcome and rejected, as some neoclassical and postclassical thinkers insisted on it? Will it exist in the next era and will it be reinterpreted, revalued and significantly supplemented?

A further development of contemporary philosophy requires a revision of the traditional theory of thinking and knowledge, their nature, status, conceptual apparatus and opportunities of modification. In the current philosophical and scientific contexts the realization of these processes occurs with new ideas, images and concepts and offers other interpretations of cognitive activity and knowledge. The application of modern concepts of perfect entities and virtual reality is important for understanding the nature of thinking in philosophy with ancient traditions. In some sense it is unacceptable for traditional epistemological issues, but at the same time it is closely associated with inter-subjective and anthropological vision of thinking and learning, with long discussions about life and reality of ideas. Both thinking and the doctrine of thinking are filled with unusual phenomena – "virtual objects", which are produced not only by the electronic systems that often become the subject of an attention, but also by human interaction in communication in various forms of text and other dialogues [3, p. 22]. It seems that the existence and functioning of some kind of holistic, relatively independent structures of philosophical knowledge of thinking is fixed and time-tested, and they can be seen as a special kind of virtual objects. They are ideal constructs, which philosophical mind has created and the scientific community has accepted. They offer directions and forms of cognitive activity in various forms of mental activity by having independent legitimate status of normative and tool entities.

Classic general theory of knowledge or gnoseology becomes such object. In the history of philosophy it was formed as an abstract and virtual construct, which offers to see and to interpret the activities of people in terms of "subject-object problem" founded on the metaphor of the mind, based on the ideas of reflection and representation. In European culture of thinking "subjective-objective" gnoseology explicitly or implicitly has been prevailing for centuries. It makes a decisive influence both on various philosophical, scientific, theoretical constructs in general, and on a variety of techniques in the field of training and education.

This opposition of subject and object, which personified rationality in its various forms, became the base for systematic philosophy and for its scientific method. All that went beyond this opposition or related to the scope of subject-object distinction was seen as irrational issue, which

was outside the subject field of epistemology, generally of rational philosophy and rational thinking [3, p. 23].

Incompleteness, unreality, inconsistency of this theory as a virtual construct compared with actual events and processes in human mental activity, unapplied nature of its principles and categories directly to the specific knowledge and its history, exist during long time. This intended to many different attempts of explaining the nature of thinking, improving it, or rejecting it. Besides, it offers new ways of understanding and vision of knowledge, development of other doctrines about thinking.

In the first case methodological principles and category of "human sciences" (culture) were aimed to add to ideas, concepts and principles, which came from the natural sciences, as it tried by existential-hermeneutic tradition. In the second case new ontology of cognition and knowledge was developed, and new principles and categories of understanding and explaining the thinking patterns were proposed. L. Wittgenstein, M. Heidegger, J. Dewey were the most radical for this century, they rejected the traditional theory of knowledge and thinking. They did not consider it reasonable to criticize it because of confusion of "social practices and postulated psychological processes", where "visual metaphor of Greeks" dominated; and the notion of truth as "accurate representation of reality" is "simply an automatic and empty compliment which we pay to those beliefs which are successful in helping us do what we want to do" [4, p. 6]. It should be noted that traditional gnoseology did not originate as general and it was not a theory of knowledge in whole in contrary to the doctrine of specialized scientific knowledge. Studies in the history of science and philosophy show that the doctrines of principles and methods of scientific knowledge began to form in previous epochs, which enlarged on general knowledge. For example, Plato distributed Pythagorean theorizing on the assessment of human mental activity in general and thus turned it into the general concept of epistemological rationalism. In the early seventeenth century F. Bacon developed gnoseology of "empirical" science and J. Locke later considered it possible to extend the principles of F. Bacon's empiricism on human knowledge in general. Thus the first general gnoseological conception of sensationalism was built. At the same time outside of the general theory of knowledge a huge area of extrarational non-scientific knowledge remained, that should be the subject of gnoseology, but it fell out of its sight because "did not meet the criteria of objectivity of natural science, that was a base of theory of knowledge and scientific thinking" [3, p. 24].

This context requires clarification of the use of the term "theory of knowledge" (gnoseology). Increasingly, it is replaced by the term "epistemology" as the theory of scientific knowledge and thinking. Over the past century the combination of words "theory of knowledge" acquired the force of prejudice, and usually no one thought about whether rightly to speak in this case about the theory, and if so, in what sense. In epistemology theory is a developed form of organization of scientific knowledge that ideally involves deductive method of construction and presentation of knowledge, the logical consequences derived from the need of a reliable system of axioms and assumptions. A strict deductive structure of theory meets the requirements of contradiction and completeness in carrying out the main functions – explanation and prediction. However, this kind

of theory takes place in natural, mathematical sciences, whereas humanities use the term "theory" in the broad sense as a certain concept, a set of thinker's views, a certain system of statements which are not connected with a solid deductive sequence, rigorous justification and proof.

Obviously, great difficulties will arise, if in each case we mean the theory in the strict sense, which is characterized by integrity, logical coherence and consistency of the content, it is founded on the original basis (concepts and assertions) according the logical and methodological rules and principles. It is rather "a theory in a broad sense, as a complex of attitudes, perceptions, and ideas aimed at the explanation the interpretation of knowledge, cognitive and mental activity" [3, p. 25].

In "Science and reflection" M. Heidegger conducts the etymologically-hermeneutic research to reach the deep meaning of the word "theory", he revives the "silenced meanings" or, at least, recalls them. He discovers that a "theory" in the early, inherited from the Greeks sense, which is not outdated, is an "attention to the truth", a "gazing at images", and a contemplation. But the modern theory has already arisen as the consideration of reality. Although theoretically it relies on the purity of the reflection of reality, "but in the sense of considering the modern science is the resolute processing of reality", and this processing is primarily in the fact that "real thing fixed in its presence according to the process object confrontation". Science corresponds to the subject opposition of all the available because it as the theory, it brings a reality to the subject confrontation. The reality is seen as a pre-objective plurality ready for the experienced understanding" "[5, p. 244-245], – says M. Heidegger.

These ideas of a thinker are important not only for understanding the nature of scientific theory, but also for "restoring" of the original meaning of the theory of knowledge. Theory of knowledge has received the status of theory in strict accordance with the prevailing ideas of classical natural science and thinking. As a scientific theory, it must demonstrate, according M. Heidegger, "an attention to the truth" and, significantly, in its consideration of the knowledge of reality, it should perform the same processing's thinking, which resulted in all the knowledge and the world, that lies behind it, is in the position of "objective opposition" [5, p. 245].

The latter is a condition for the actualization of thinking. This has led to important consequences, the main of which is an occurrence of opposition "subject-object" and, accordingly, the interpretation of the whole cognitive situation in terms of subject-object opposition. At the same time, the subject itself with its feelings, perceptions, and all other characteristics and relations was also revealed by thinker in the subject-object opposition. It was considered as a condition of the truth, accuracy and scientific.

An important aspect of the problem of the theory of knowledge and thinking connected with its status and nature. In fact, it had to deal only with specialized scientific knowledge in its theoretical and empirical (also scientific) form. However, as further studies show it is wrongfully exaggerated the importance of theoretical knowledge, the role of ideas, world pictures in a society, where only a few members are occupied with the theoretical production of ideas, but almost all are involved in any knowledge in its various forms, including an everyday knowledge. The last

one is connected with socio-philosophical interpretation of knowledge that deals with the “social construction of reality”, not explained within the traditional theory of knowledge and appeared in this case once again as a “virtual phenomenon” [1, p. 30-31].

Other philosophers have an experience that appealed to the problem the theory of knowledge. Gnoseological and methodological analysis is concerned with scientific concepts, which are explained in terms of the method of construction of these concepts, with premises and assumptions, which are based on the theory of different levels, with links and hierarchy of these levels, with everything that the scientist implicitly or consciously operates, and with everything that is hidden in substantive terms of the science. Explication of these implicit components requires a special extra work and the use of special techniques and exercises that a philosopher (agnoseologist, a methodologist) performs. Actually, one of his main functions is a mental assessment of what and how a scientist conducted in his theoretical work. But in this case an important feature reveals: the traditional “theory of knowledge is a normative or “legislative” theory of knowledge. It explicates connections and meanings that regulate the expression of cognitive formations, and explicates them in terms of what they should be”. Thus, “it sets itself the task to propose some of the norms to the cognitive processes, explaining and summarizing the perfect sense of its objectivity and the connections in which this objectivity is actually achieved, and is understood and interpreted by every consciousness” [2, p. 13-14].

Consequently, we investigate a theory of knowledge, which is understood as a certain set of “ideal-constructive formations” or specific virtual phenomenon created by abstract thinking, which thinks with a mind and has special features. In this role the theory of knowledge is concerned only with ideal entities insight of knowledge, its forming abstractions do not fix “physical” reality, but only those that the philosopher thinks “inside” the concept, being inside its “imaginary essence”. Finally, it “appropriates” the right to recommend the norms and principles of the cognitive process as a process of thinking.

References

1. Бергер П., Лукман Т. Социальное конструирование реальности. Трактат по социологии знания / П. Бергер, Т. Лукман. – М.: Медиум, 1995. – 322 с.
2. Мамардашвили М. К. Стрела познания. набросок естественносторической гносеологии / М. К. Мамардашвили. – М.: Аград, 1995. – 293 с.
3. Микешина Л. А. Философия познания. Проблема эпистемологии гуманитарного знания / Л. А. Микешина. – М.: “Канон+” РООИ “Реабилитация”, 2009. – 560 с.
4. Рорти Р. Философия и зеркало природы / Р. Рорти. – Новосибирск, 1997. – 320 с. [Rorty R. Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature. – Princeton University Press. – 401 p. p.10].
5. Хайдеггер М. Наука и осмысление / М. Хайдеггер / Время и бытие. Статьи и выступления. – М.: Республика, 1993. – С. 238-253.

References

1. Berher P., Lukman T. Sotsyal'noe konstruyrovanye real'nosti. Traktat po sotsyolohyy znanyua / P. Berher, T. Lukman. – М.: Medyum, 1995. – 322 s.
2. Mamardashvily M. K. Strela poznanyua. Nabrosok estestvennostorycheskoj hgnoseolohyy / M. K. Mamardashvily. – М.: Ahrad, 1995. – 293 s.
3. Mykeshyna L. A. Fylosofyya poznanyua. Problema epystemolohyy humanytarnoho znanyua / L. A. Mykeshyna. – М.: “Kanon+” ROOY “Reablytatsyya”, 2009. – 560 s.

4. Rorty R. Fylosofyya y zerkalo pryrody / R. Rorty. – Novosybyrsk, 1997. – 320 s. [Rorty R. Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature. – Princeton University Press. – 401 p. p.10].

5. Khaydehher M. Nauka y osmyslenye / M. Khaydehher / Vremya y bytye. Stat'y y vystuplenyya. – М.: Respublyka, 1993. – С. 238-253.

Сақун А. В., кандидат філософських наук, доцент, провідний науковий співробітник, Інститут обдарованої дитини Національної академії педагогічних наук України (Україна, Київ), gileya.org.ua@gmail.com

Мислення і пізнання: еволюція формування та взаємодії

У статті аналізується проблема еволюції мислення в процесі взаємодії з теорією пізнання. Показано, що вже в попередні епохи почали формуватися учення про принципи, методи і способи наукового пізнання і мислення. У перебігу століть в європейській культурі мислення і пізнання в основному панує суб'єктно-об'єктна гносеологія, здійснюючи визначальний вплив не тільки на різні філософські, наукові конструкції, але і на різні методики у сфері пізнання і освіти. Опозиція “суб'єкт-об'єкт” зумовила аналіз та інтерпретацію всієї ситуації пізнання. Суб'єкт з усіма його відчуттями і відносини розглядається як умови затвердження істинності, вірогідності і науковості. Теорія пізнання експлікується зв'язку, смисли і норми розумової діяльності.

Ключові слова: мислення, пізнання, наука, теорія, істина, знання, гносеологія.

Сақун А. В., кандидат философских наук, доцент, ведущий научный сотрудник, Институт одаренного ребенка Национальной академии педагогических наук Украины (Украина, Киев), gileya.org.ua@gmail.com

Мышление и познание: эволюция формирования и взаимодействия

В статье анализируется проблема эволюции мышления в процессе взаимодействия с теорией познания. Показано, что уже в предыдущие эпохи начали формироваться учения о принципах, методах и способах научного познания и мышления. В течении столетий в европейской культуре мышления и познания в основном господствует субъектно-объектная гносеология, осуществляя определяющее влияние не только на разные философские, научные конструкции, но и на различные методики в сфере познания и образования. Опозиция “субъект-объект” обусловила анализ и интерпретацию всей ситуации познания. Субъект со всеми его ощущениями и отношения рассматривается как условия утверждения истинности, вероятности и научности. Теория познания эксплицирует связи, смыслы и нормы мыслительной деятельности.

Ключевые слова: мышление, познание, наука, теория, истина, знание, гносеология.

* * *

УДК 101.1: 316 + 930.1

Тур М. Г.
доктор філософських наук, професор,
професор кафедри філософії,
Київський університет ім. Бориса Грінченка
(Україна, Київ), m.tur@kubg.edu.ua

ДИКУРС ПАРАДИГМАЛЬНОСТІ ФІЛОСОФСЬКО-ІСТОРИЧНОГО ЗНАННЯ: СПРОБА МЕТААНАЛІЗУ

У статті ставиться на меті на тлі узагальнення досвіду застосування поняття парадигми в сучасному філософсько-історичному дискурсі здійснити спробу метааналізу підходів щодо парадигматичної філософсько-історичного знання і на цій основі запропонувати більш зрозумілий і чіткий спосіб розрізнення парадигм філософії історії. Обґрунтовується доцільність виокремлення на основі принципу монологічності/плюралістичності пізнавальних підходів трьох парадигм філософії історії (класичної, некласичної та постнекласичної) та окреслюються їх методологічні матриці.

Ключові слова: філософія історії, історіософська парадигма, парадигма класичної філософії історії, парадигма некласичної філософії історії, парадигма постнекласичної філософії історії, епістема, метапаттерни історії.

У сучасному соціально-гуманітарному дискурсі досить вживаним є поняття парадигми. Хоча це поняття у філософії має досить тривалу історію, яка сягає праць Платона, саме позитивіст Е.Бергман вперше застосував його в контексті філософії науки. Однак, безумовно, пріоритет у розробці цього поняття належить американському історіку науки Томасу Куну у