

a specific symbolic construct in which the Lady, representing the object of desire, models and transforms the reality of the knight subject. The article uses the lagging theory of J. Heising, the concept of N. N. Bakhtin's Carnival and the structural and psychoanalytical methodology of J. Lacan. A platoon is being made that the space for the representation of the image of the Beautiful Lady is a combination of Christian dogmaticity and carnivalism opposing it. At the same time, there is an undeniable role of the game principle, which demonstrates one of the specific aspects of the courtly cult: the need to obey the norms and rules and the ability of the Ladies to construct not only the subject I but also the space in which the game takes place.

Keywords: Game, Carnival, Beautiful Lady, rules of the game, parody.

* * *

УДК 1:159.954](09)

Sanotska N.,

PhD, associate professor, chair of Philosophy,
National University «Politechnik of Lviv»
(Ukraine, Lviv), sannata@ukr.net

POSTHUMANISM: GENEALOGY, STRATEGIES, PRACTICES

The article attempts to join the discussion regarding posthumanism by stressing that this intellectual trend should be connected not so much to the end of a human or the approaching of a posthuman but rather to the observed, in the second part of the 20th century in particular, weakening of humanism. The author's aim is to show the multifacetedness and ambiguity of the concept of «posthumanism» by singling out its several types, namely the philosophical approach. The article analyzes changes in human way of thinking about human and non-human life under the influence of modern technologies. The essential catalysts for the processes that fit into the trend of philosophical posthumanism have been established as follows: Michel Foucault and his «death of a human», Jacques Derrida and «the ends of a man» as well as the ideas of Friedrich Nietzsche and Ludwig Wittgenstein. Anti-humanism ideas of these authors were attempts to find a way to a common human, not included into great historical narratives, a human in specific historical and geographical context.

Keywords: posthumanism, humanism, anti-humanism, human, non-human, post-human.

(стаття друкується мовою оригіналу)

As humankind has entered the 21st century, dubbed as the biotechnology century, we are witnessing significant changes in realizing the difference between human and non-human forms of life and technologies. These changes are strongly affected by natural sciences, information processes and biotechnologies with their direct impact on the power of life. Nikolas Rose claims that we exist «inside» an important but elusive process and through unnoticeable changes, which we quickly get used to and take as a given, nothing can remain the same [4, p. 5].

The most important transformation which emerges out of discrete dynamics in different branches of theory and practice is the fact that a man stops being what he used to be – the measure and centre of all things. As part of specific biological and technical contexts, a human can now connect things and move forward in situations, which used to be only a source of differences before. Thus, being of a human must not necessarily mean ontic solitude and privileged status – it becomes inextricably linked to the non-human. (We are hyphenating «non-human» to stress the connection between what human is and what it is not. Non-human has an axiological neutral state of genetic belonging to homo sapiens and belonging to what is considered life in general or life in biological sense).

The aim of the article is to join the discussion on posthumanism with emphasis on the fact that this intellectual

trend should be connected not so much to the end of a human or the approaching of posthuman but rather to the observed, in the second part of the 20th century in particular, weakening of humanism. It is important to trace the changes in human way of thinking on human and non-human life under the influence of modern technologies.

In her book *What is Posthumanism?* Woolf claims that posthumanism is not only the historical summary of important intellectual trends of the late 20th century, which studied the continuum between human and non-human, but also a new way of thinking about modern human, a tool that helps re-evaluate oneself critically. «Posthumanism is not just a thematics of the decentering of the human in relation to either evolutionary, ecological or technological coordinates» but rather a discussion «what thought has to become in the face of those challenges» [6, p. xvi].

Thus, it is important to ask and answer the following question – what would we become if we accepted the non-anthropocentric way of world conceptualization?

Yet, it is worth emphasizing that critical posthumanism does not negate all the aspects of humanism but is rather a demonstration of doubt regarding its monopoly. It is multifaceted and ambiguous and according to Rose «we do not stand at some unprecedented moment in the unfolding of a single history. Rather, we live in the middle of multiple histories» [4, p. 5].

In posthumanism perspective, which is a historically determined theory and practice of being in the world, a human does not disappear yet their position as a privileged being apparently weakens in view of the generic affiliation. Accordingly, this is not the limit of a human as such but of a human as we knew them within the framework of humanism. Simultaneously, the human form of life is clearly expressed and accepts itself as part of a world bigger than the human one, which is not a divine world but «an overall gigantic circle of nature herself, where no beginning and no end exist and where all natural things swing in changeless, deathless repetition» [8, c. 214].

Today we can talk about several types of posthumanism which differ in their view of the key issues: in what way the status of humankind is privileged and what its relation to technology is. On the one hand, we have those who criticize humanism for its anthropocentricity and on the other hand, there are those who whilst trusting technology immensely are still waiting for a superhuman or posthuman.

The first modern usage of the term «posthumanism», which was understood as the change of thought paradigm about human, can be found in the works of notable post-modernism thinker Ihab Hassan, in particular in his lecture delivered in 1976 and published a year later, which was entitled «Prometheus as Performer: Toward a Posthumanist Culture?» [3]. Hassan claims that humanism ends because a human becomes someone else, different from how they were traditionally interpreted by humanism. The author believes that the process has already begun and the changes that it brings are radical. «We need first to understand that the human form [...] may be changing radically, and thus must be re-visioned. We need to understand that five hundred years of humanism may be coming to an end, as humanism transforms itself into something that we must helplessly call posthumanism» [3, p. 843]. Hassan clearly points to the ambiguity of the term «posthumanism», which was supposed to signify a way of thinking that comes after the period known as humanism.

Neil Badmington warns us against hasty conclusions that humanism is coming to an end as «humanism survives that apparent apocalypse and, more worryingly, fools many into thinking it has perished» [2, p. 11].

Thus, Badmington wonders where and how humanism is present in posthumanism, comparing the vital strength of humanism to the regeneration of a hydra, where each of its heads cut off is replaced with two new ones. The author establishes that for «posthumanism» prefix «post-» does not imply complete departure from the tradition of humanism. He suggests that we interpret posthumanism practices as critical works on humanism, i. e. from the outside, but also as critical practices that occur inside humanism itself. The present time is one in which «hegemony and heredity of humanism feel a little less certain». This motivates us to rework «the trauma of humanism» instead of pretending that it never happened. Hence, as the author stresses only through detailed study of humanism do we have a chance to create an alternative future.

Cary Wolf, the editor of a notable series *Posthumanism* (Minnesota Press) does not separate herself from humanism but rather expects a critical rethinking of the real contexts of humanism values, e.g. tolerance or justice, from posthumanism thinkers. Wolf creates a palimpsest map of posthumanism by drawing different divides. One of the divides lies between enthusiasts, who change drastically under the influence of technology upon human situation, and the supporters of movements, which proclaim apocalyptic visions on the end of humankind or human nature, i.e. between technophiles and technophobes. The other divide, which overlaps the previous one, lies between the «dry» and «wet» orientation in humanism. «Dry» orientation touches upon so called dry technologies, namely digital technologies, whilst the «wet» orientation concerns organic life and stresses upon material and physical foundations of life as well as the environment that each of those forms belong to, including those that exist with the help of biotechnologies. In other words, «wet orientation» has the interrelation of human and non-human bodies as its subject of research.

When analyzing posthumanism through the prism of interest in machines and in view of preferences that deal with the impact of technology on organic life, namely a human, Eugene Thacher points to its two main trends [5]. One of them is connected to critical position as to excessive trust and enthusiasm for technology. The other trend – «extropianism» – emerges from technophilia and the desire to promote a human to the next stage of development. The positive traits of posthuman are expected to be enhanced while the defects and limitations must be minimized or disappear altogether. This is the dream about a superhuman, who in its extreme versions is manifested in the desire to refuse a human body as a dated mechanism in favour of life in silico (a term used in biology, which emerged by association to in vivo and in vitro and informs about conducting research with the help of computer. It does not concern computer simulations but primarily refers to the analysis of genomes with the help of computer programmes).

The most well-known spokespersons for such a view of the future are Hans Moravec, Ray Kurzweil and Marvin Minsky. These researchers work closely with such organizations as World Transhumanist Organization and Extropy Institute, which popularize these ideas through their extensive activities around the world. The researchers declare

the possibility of transferring data from human thoughts to a computer hard drive and continuation of life (eternal) in post-biological form. They believe in future opportunities foreshadowed by the development of nanotechnologies which enable transformation of the material world.

Philosophical posthumanism is connected to criticism of various myths about humanism itself as well as the belief that a humanism construct that is a human has never existed in a perfect ideal form. Jill Didur calls such a mindset critical posthumanism, which does not acknowledge the big hierarchical divides like: nature/culture, human/machine, human/animal etc. and is characterized neither by technophilia as transhumanism nor by technophobia as neoliberal bioconservatism. Attempts have been made within the realm of critical posthumanism to find positive and productive ways of balanced coexistence of humans, non-human life and machines, which in its turn is connected to criticism of immaterial colonial treatment of theory/practice of the existing biotechnological research.

Thus, facing criticism are the specific interpretations of «irresponsibility» of humanism or lack of answer to the question of what non-human is. This entails serious ethical consequences and brings about the belief that «trust for humanism equals trust for unfairness» [1, p. 264].

Within posthumanism framework everything that is non-human plays a vital role, i.e. exceeds the limits of the field prohibited by humanism doctrines, which according to Charles Taylor may be «accused of praising something that is inextricably human, giving a daring description to human abilities, which rejects the basic dependence of a human on the non-human» [7, p. 123]. Within this context, it is worth stressing that in Western culture non-human was traditionally interpreted as divine (supernatural) and/or natural. In the first case, dependence of a human on non-human resembles the dependence of a human on God and from this viewpoint humanism manifests itself as an atheistic trend characterized by «self-destructive audacity» toward God. In the second case, non-human is identified with nature from which a human was separated or even thrown out and recognized as the perfect form of life. It meant ousting of the animal element from human being and simultaneous lack of respect for the world of animals, plants and other forms of life. Such determination (based on Christianity) required a more impersonal view on nature in which living beings became objects designed to be used by humans.

Among the principal catalysts of processes that fit into the philosophical trend of posthumanism, a separate place is occupied by anti-humanism of the 20th century. At that time Michel Foucault proclaims «the death of human», Jacques Derrida writes about «the ends of man» and Roland Barthes muses about «the death of the author». Anti-humanism beliefs of these thinkers emerged from concerns or even unwillingness with respect to historically and geographically dependent humanism ideas as well as the painful experience of their own generation. After war period gave rise to many humanism preachings, in which opposite positions called themselves humanism. This does not compromise humanism but lets us understand that at the time French intellectuals could not think using the same categories any more. An anti-humanist and simultaneously a nihilist was someone who not only doubted their own right to measure everything with human parameters but also doubted the possibility to discover the world and oneself. A human, author and

subject existed only as a function of certain structures and mechanisms.

Yet, the mastermind behind the anti-humanism of the 20th century was Friedrich Nietzsche. He made the impact not so much by his statement about the death of God but by the idea of super-human. When there is no one to vouch for the values and sense, we come to the end of what is universal in favour of what is individual and equals the concept of individual that is devoid of any objective foundation, belongs to oneself and faces eternal uncertainty and, consequently, is devoid of communication with the world, oneself and others. Even though it is a feature of dogmatism, absolutism and paternalism, individualism interpreted in this way does not promote development of a human but rather serves as a testament for their death. Foucault says that, «Rather than the death of God, what Nietzsche's thought heralds is the end of his murderer: it is the explosion of man's face in laughter and the return of masks...» [9, p. 85].

We cannot speak about anti-humanism of the 20th century without mentioning the role that reflection about language and the linguistic turn played in it. A human would not have become a rhetoric figure, a metaphor, a language construct, if it was not for the language play of Ludwig Wittgenstein and the structuralist beliefs concerning thought and language. Such views resulted in weakening of metaphysics and subjectivity. It appears from these discourses that a human does not think and speak by themselves but is thought of and spoken about. This is the end of a man that Foucault described as «invention with short history and a possibly near end» [9, p. 71]. Such interpretation of the death of human is the death of a certain construct in its essence, which according to critics of anti-humanism has the signs of nihilism. Yet, it should be stressed that this theoretical nihilism did not prevent «prophets of anti-humanism» from engaging in a battle for human rights. So we may be talking rather of attempts to reach a common human, not included into great historical narratives, a human in a specific historical and geographical context. On other words, we are speaking of the perception of marginalized people, not present on social and political scene, or those ousted from the visible sphere.

Thus, anti-humanism, like posthumanism, should not be interpreted as a solely modern phenomenon, since humanism, in every shape of its existence, always has the potential of outdoing itself. Deconstructionalism, postmodernism and poststructuralism were only certain forms of anti-humanism, which may reveal itself in other forms as well.

References

1. Badmington N. Cultural Studies and the Posthumanities / New Cultural Studies: Adventures in Theory. – Edinburg: Edinburg University Press, 2006.
2. Badmington N. Theorizing Posthumanism, Cultural Critique 2003, Winter, №53.
3. Hassan I. Prometheus as Performer: Toward a Posthumanist Culture? Georgia Review 1977, Winter, Vol.31.
4. Rose N. The Politics of Life Itself. Biomedicine, Power, and Subjectivity in the Twenty-First Century, Princeton University Press, 2007.
5. Thacher E. Data Made Flesh. Biotechnology and the Discourse of the Posthuman, Theorizing Posthumanism, Cultural Critique 2003, Winter, №53.
6. Wolf C. What Is Posthumanism? – London, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010.

7. Taylor Ch. Humanizm i nowoczesna tożsamość / Człowiek w nauce współczesnej. Rozmowy w Castel Gandolfo. – Kraków: Wydawnictwo Znak, 2006.

8. Арендт Г. Становище людини. – Львів: «Літопис», 1999. – 254 с. // Arendt G. Stanovyshe ludydy. – L'viv: «Litopys», 1999. – 254 s.

9. Фуко М. Слова и вещи. Археология гуманитарных наук. Перевод на русский язык: В. П. Визгин, Н. С. Автономова. – М.: «Прогресс», 1977. // Fuko M. Slova i veshhi. Arheologija gumanitarnykh nauk. Perevod na russkij jazyk: V. P. Vizgin, N. S. Avtonomova. – М.: «Progress», 1977.

Саноцька Н., кандидат філософських наук, доцент, доцент кафедри філософії, Національний університет «Львівська політехніка» (Україна, Львів), sannata@ukr.net

Постгуманізм: генеалогія, стратегії, практики

Стаття є спробою включитися в дискусію на тему постгуманізму з наголосом на те, що ця інтелектуальна течія треба пов'язувати не стільки з кінцем людини, чи наближення постлюдини, а перш за все з спостережуваністю – особливо у другій половині ХХ століття – послабленням гуманізму. Автор ставить перед собою мету показати багатовекторність і неоднозначність поняття «постгуманізм», виокремлює декілька типів постгуманізму, зокрема філософський підхід. Проаналізовано зміни, що відбуваються у людському способі мислення по відношенню до людського і не-людського життя, під дією новітніх технологій. Встановлено, найістотніші каталізатори процесів, що вписуються в течію філософського постгуманізму: Мішель Фуко і його «смерть людини», Жак Дерріда і «кінець людини», Ролан Барт і «смерть автора», а також Фрідріх Ніцше та Людвіг Вітгенштайн. Антигуманістичні ідеї цих авторів – це спроби добратися до звичайної людини, не включеної в великі історичні нарративи, людини в конкретній історичній і географічній ситуації.

Ключові слова: постгуманізм, гуманізм, антигуманізм, людське, не-людське, постлюдина.

* * *

УДК 1.147

Сластенко Е. Ф., кандидат философских наук, профессор, Национальный авиационный университет (Украина, Киев), filosof@nau.edu.ua

Ягодзинский С. Н., доктор философских наук, доцент, Национальный авиационный университет (Украина, Киев), sophist@nau.edu.ua

Философия медицины: ФОРМИРОВАНИЕ ПРЕДМЕТНОГО ПОЛЯ

Рассматривается вопрос соотношения философии и медицины как человекомерных практик. Показано влияние медицины на становление предмета философии. Опираюсь на компаративный исследовательский подход, выполнен анализ формирования основных медицинских школ Античности, Средневековья, Возрождения и Нового времени. Авторы пришли к выводу о неоспоримости исторического характера связи философии и медицины. Показано, что заложенные этими направлениями человеческой мысли основы диалектического и гуманистического подходов к проблеме личности в единстве ее социальных и биологических свойств нашли отражение в современных теориях общества.

Ключевые слова: философия медицины, античная философия, философия Средневековья, философия Нового времени, предмет философии медицины.

(стаття друкується мовою оригіналу)

Вопрос взаимосвязи философии и медицины в современном мире представляет определенный интерес как в контексте развития теорий социальных теорий, так и для общественно-исторической практики в