

4. Petrukhyn V., Polynskaya M. O katehoryy "sverkhъestestvennoho" // Ystoryko-ethnohrafycheskye yssledovaniya. – S. 167–168.
5. Traditsyonnyye myrovozzreniyya tyurkov Yuzhnoy Sybyry. – Novosybyrsk, 1988. – S. 101.
6. Trusson P. Sakral'noe y myf // <http://nationalism.org/vvv/trusson-sacral-and-myth.htm>. – S. 4.
7. Tshud Shch. Aspekty sakral'nogo // <http://www.proza.ru/2009/06/30/452>
8. Tærner V. Symvol y rytual. – M.: Nauchnaya mysl', 1983.
9. Freyd Z. "Ya" y "Ono". – Tbylysy, 1991. – T. 1. – S. 215.
10. Ælyade M. Myf o vechnom vozvrashchenyy / Ælyade M. Yzbrannyye sochyneniyya: Myf o vechnom vozvrashchenyy. Obrazy y symvolyy. Svyashchennoe y myrskoe / Per. s fr. – M.: Ladomyr, 2000.
11. Yaffe Ya. Symvolizm v yzobrazitel'nom yskusstve // Chelovek y ego symvolyy. K. Yunh. – SPb: Aleteyya, 1996. – S. 347.

Mykhaylo Yuriy

Sacred as a phenomenon of culture

The article refers to the sacred, holy, which refers to the divine, religious, heaven, an accident on our perception of the world and our psychological structure that rooted in the culture.

Sacred concept requires a special definition because it is not identical or archetype, no religion, no culture, no positive, although it has direct relevance to them being probably the root of all these phenomena.

When talking about the sacred, the question of its origin, about what form it might take. Arguably, if the sacred is expressed in cultural terms as myths and rituals that in later times gave way to the outside voice and customs, it also always requires an initial internal state. Thus, the "sacred manifests itself primarily as a direct feeling alive emotion that pours in I kind of strong spiritual energy."

This characteristic of the sacred as an emotional state is complemented by an analysis of the previously mentioned Rudolf Otto, who finds a sense of the sacred and a priori equivalent experience the feeling of the transcendent power. It is in no way associated with any morality or of intelligence, most likely it was understandable numinous feeling that is associated with the impression rather than with consciousness of its conditionality something independent of consciousness and freedom and elusive as a visible object. Two poles that complement each other, describing this numinosity: on the one hand, it is associated with mystery that evokes a feeling of fear of excessive grandeur and the other, with the adoption of Mysteries charming, resulting in extraordinary attraction miracle.

Keywords: sacred, profane, archetypal, divine, cultural.

Надійшла до редакції 17.06.2016 р.

УДК 930.85

**© Semen Abramovich
(Chernivtsi)**

DELIGHT AND HORROR OF FINDING ALL-SEEING EYE (THE CONCEPT OF CONSCIENCE IN DIACHRONIC PROJECTION)

The article deals diachronic format concept conscience, which, however, is treated as a priori to human consciousness, not as historically discrete category. But the opinion, according to which the concept is somewhat "universal" actually does not have a reason, you need a certain level of moral development of society, to empathy and conscience could rise as constants of the human mind.

Pagan society archaic era with their relational morality did not know, except Socrates incident, magnetism categorical imperative and built their moral system solely on the basis of a "culture of shame" (R. Benedict). A clear understanding of the human conscience as the mutual life events "with God" brings to world culture only Bible that affect the formation of a new ethics, new social morality and even partly jurisdiction of the European Communities.

It is the Christian Middle Ages, bringing over all the kingdom of heaven, yet paid much attention Castle and streamline the earth. Ancient Roman law rules were supplemented ethical component; in particular - the concept of "human rights" (Thomas Aquinas), including the right to freedom of conscience.

And in modern times, in parallel with the increase of secularization, the concept of conscience loses sacred saturation, reduced to social or even konventsionalnosti sphere of private relationships and, ultimately, completely loses its meaning, giving the mass despondency and cynicism. Therefore, almost psychological validity of this category is possible only in the form of Christian culture and the religious self-identity.

Keywords: conscience, freedom of conscience, civil laws, imperative, social moral, Christian culture.

We live in a space of the Great Disruption – described by F. Fukuyama, which generated social disintegration, dissolution of family, falling out of trust to the social and political institutes, increase of criminality [13, p. 13]. In particular the concept of conscience is put to the tremendous test on the disruption – especially in the context of total loss of moral authority of political and legal culture and furious increase of corruption in the whole world. Therefore, our contemporary is interested in that, how these concepts – *conscience* and, *justice* whose internal interconditionality obvious, were formed.

Usually our people just do not imagine, how that is: *the person has no conscience!* But not only individuals, but also the whole civilizations cannot have any idea about that conscience. However, it is impossible to live without laws, and it is clear even for the most archaic communities. Yes, without conscience... It is difficult for us to imagine “dishonorable” society, but it is a rather typical picture. In the history, we often meet communities where the tough legislation dominates, and people even strictly adhere to it, but about conscience there did not mention at all.

As we know, I. Kant considered that conscience is aprioristic, putted by God, the quality of a person’s consciousness; the person must open it in one's own self and develop. At the same time turns out that it is not so simple. In the R. Benedict’s book “The Chrysanthemum and the Sword”. The productive methodological principle of the analysis of “foreign” culture is established: firstly, the researcher refuses to squeeze it in a habitual framework of own culture; secondly, tries to establish a certain typology, distinguishing a “guilt-culture” and a “shame-cultures” [3, the part “Moral dilemma”].

Nevertheless, as we will see now, it is not the exhaustive analysis of a situation. V. Yarcho’s (B. Ярхо) article “Whether the ancient Greeks have a conscience?” [15] affirms, that the category of conscience was born as a result of disintegration of polis-collective consciousness and increasing of the activity of individualistic and critical commencement. In a traditional value system of antique paganism *not to steal*, for example, is not a moral maxim in the spirit of the Eighth Commandment: the main thing was – not to get, and generally one of the greatest Olympic gods – Hermes was a patron not only of entrepreneurs, but also of the thieves.

In other words, conscience, as it goes out, is not primordial but historical category, which has roots not in the nature, but in the culture? Then, maybe, “in fact” it does not exist at all? Where is a material base for that conscience?

Famous surgeon and orthodox archbishop V. F. Voyno-Yasenetsky (B. Ф. Войно-Ясенецький) – St. Luka of Simferopol, who was awarded with the Stalin prize for a new method of wounds treatment, at one time was subjected to the attack of the prosecutor-security officer: whether he, “the priest and professor”, saw God? The prelate answered the captured by the wit prosecutor, that he worked a lot with a brain through a skull opening, but never saw there, for example, neither mind, nor conscience [1].

The figure of default had to convince that the last ones nevertheless exist, though have no “registration” in physical substance of a brain. However, the science does not stand still: today, seemingly, scientists have revealed a special area in a brain which is responsible for altruism, and good deeds, apparently, directed exactly by a brain [12]. In other words, Kant was right: physically in a brain, there are certain “dens” for conscience and other similar things, but not always there are corresponding social and cultural conditions for their free development and functioning.

However, positivistic and materialistic science (A. Milts, R. Shpeman etc.) is actually lost before a conscience phenomenon today: “A huge number of philosophers, writers, scientists reflected over what is conscience. On a question of an origin, essence and manifestations of conscience thinkers gave the

most various and even opposite answers. This word contains so many meanings that some researchers consider that it must be absolutely excluded from scientific word usage”; in turn, J. K. Veselova (Є. К. Веселова) insists it is necessary to underspend from what sources the concept of conscience appeared in each case – as it is got from Soviet period, it is necessary to build the concept of “education of younger generation”, and save us God to take something “from a wrong” source:

“The development of programs of spiritual and moral education of younger generation is one of the most important practical tasks today, therefore it is very important to understand on what world outlook these programs are based and what place in them is taken by formation of sensitive conscience, which is necessary for moral regulation of behavior” [5, pp. 129, 137]. It demonstrates that in this sphere dominates the same uncertainty, as well as in daily consciousness of our ordinary citizen who, say, can not be defined in any way, – to steal or not to steal?

As we were accustomed for a long time that morality – is in general a relative concept, that moral is only the fact that at present is comfortable for working class and so forth, one more question arises: whether the researcher can stay in a condition of Olympic and postmodern alienation, from the object of investigation and to put conscience and dishonesty on one axiological level?

Let’s return to the ancient Greece, which was a cradle of European civilizations. It was the typical *shame-culture*. Manifestation of personal spiritual search in polis structure became a subject of surprise and anger. Socrates has been executed for disrespect for traditional gods and the introduction of “belief in demons” [8, p. 287-289].

And Socrates’s δαίμων, his well-known inner voice, which prohibited to the wise man to do something badly, was born in the area which M. Epshtein (М. Епштейн) neatly designated as “philosophical emotions” [6]. And though B. Russell doubts that it is similar to a Christian voice of conscience [10, p.109], it is necessary to recognize that if it is not a conscience as such, then it is something typologically very similar. The antique policy with its archaic beliefs and military-heroic moral values created during a Homeric epoch did not conform to the spirit of the future.

Socrates’s conflict with the Athenian democracy demonstrates the formation of an independent personality, her critical thinking. This situation determines in advance future conflicts caused by balancing between the established standard rate of behavior and freedom of personal conscience.

However, ancient pagans perfectly understood that it is impossible to lead the justice to permission of any conflict only by “strangers”. Let’s remember *God’s Court* at ancient Slavs: if the person couldn’t prove her innocence by the logical and positive proofs or someone else’s testifying, she took in her hands a red-hot iron: there was a belief that the person will be saved from a burn by a will of the gods who know the truth.

And this extreme method, it is necessary to think, worked, awakening an unexpected ability of an organism: in related cultures of Europe, for example, a ritual of barefoot walk across hot coals is known. Actually, in all ancient pagan societies long since in parallel functioned two systems of the right which Romans called *fas* and *jus*, – the divine court and laws created by the people. But the first type of the law over time began to be forced out by second one: for example, the pontiff law at Romans with entering of Laws of XII tables was replaced with *jus civile*. And as in paganism adored all forces of nature (polytheism), the moral criterion weren’t applied to them, and the morality of ancient pagan society was relative: gold supposed the same important source here, as good.

Gods were patrons not only of light aspects of life, but also such things as murders, thefts, wars. In Hinduism at the source of livelihoods there are sons of the Gate Vishnu (Krishna) – god of spring, love, life, and Shiva – god of death, war, adoration of the yoga and so forth.

Foreign and domestic policy and law this outlook actually poured out, in case of official recognition of the high value of the world and tolerance, in a cult of force and aggression. The sign of archaic existence in which passions are not controlled¹ - the leader, who oppresses and tyrannize community. However, the most frequent aspiration to dominion is an expression of a deep mental conflictness. The psychiatry abounds with researches of *μεγαλομανία* (megalomania), painful desire to seem extremely important, and domination of such psychological type is typical for undeveloped society.

¹ However, leaders (early tsars) were in pagan times persons not so omnipotent, as tragic: when the owner became old and ailing, he was usually just killed in favor of younger and dexterous.

Nevertheless, in steadily extreme conditions of the fight against the nature, invasions of strangers and destructive centrifugal inclinations in society such variant was repaid. This model completely revealed in Bronze Age epoch, when the commodity exchange and other contacts between separate communities extend. Constant military collisions for possession of cattle, lands and metal begin. In society appeared military heads, which rely on weapon force, and a cult of the leader, as the most powerful and the cruelest personality, that dictates the special attitude towards him. The socialization of the leader is taking place; it is forbidden even to step on his shadow – on a fear of death; the first monumental doleful constructions – barrows are devoted to leaders; a little later appeared pyramids, mausoleums, etc. As a result, appeared the oldest model of the state and political order of mankind – *centralized the autocratic monarchy*.

It has arisen first of all in Ancient Mesopotamia and was approved in all Ancient worlds. This model consisted in compulsory submission of own society and the greatest number of other people of the individual imperial power, that at first was related with a hope for justice (*kittum-u-mīšarum*) of the “strongest” – the king and was noted in the Babylon Hammurabi code. However, the statement of the imperial power was followed by improbable bloodthirstiness: so, Sargon’s Son I Rimush left an inscription on the rocks concerning his destruction of about 6 thousand war-prisoners, swearing to Shamash and Amal that it is an honest truth.

Very similar to the biennial period is a political system in ancient Egypt. At the head of the state was Pharaoh, who, at the same time, was a supreme priest and determined rulers of particular region, which rely on numerous officialdom and military forces. In ancient Egypt the power was also based on cruelty. In one of inscriptions of that time one officer bragged that horrified people. Pharaohs demanded to kill those people who did not obey, to destroy their families and remembrance about such people.

Policy and law of ancient Iran were also imbued with the idea of divine right of a monarch, where tyrannical civilized monarchy was based on a bureaucratic- martial machine. Monarchs were idolized and the all citizens were their slaves.

Politico-legal structure of ancient China doesn’t differ a lot: the power of the emperor – the Sun of Heaven – supposed divined and only the emperor could wear yellow – the color of the Sun. Heaven tells to emperor it will and subjects must apprehend his words as the will Heaven.

Otherwise, the world is bigger than monarchy: However, the world a wedge did not meet on the monarchy: ancient Greeks already created almost all political models known in the history: near *the monarchy* with the concept of tyranny (king’s excess of power) from time to time arose – in the same policy – also *democracy*, *oligarchy*, *ochlocracy* and so forth. Nevertheless, according to Aristotle, any political system shall be based on *the law*. However, even among the most developed policies – middle Athens the sequence is not observed: humane *Solon’s Laws* under certain conditions were replaced by *Draconian laws*. And, finally, this rich political experience was completely dissolved in traditional, eastern-spirit, to monarchic arbitrary behavior: Aristotle’s pupil Alexander of Macedon, who was in love with the Greek culture, tried to establish the world empire with the unique Hellenistic culture which artificially spread among the subdued people. A long life was fated to this idea, in particular thanks to the Roman civilization.

In the olden days Rome also had institute of kings. Figures of the most ancient kings such as Numa Pompilio are spread by myths that adored the ruler. However, when kings have begun to abuse the power, Romans have abolished imperial governing and have proclaimed the republic (*res publica* – “common cause”). The Senate, in which also descendants of aboriginals of the city (patrician) have been presented, and those who have settled here later (plebeians), has begun to rule Rome; both layers competed for their own interests. But when Rome has turned into the world state, which covered huge territories, including ancient center cultures (Greece, Judea, etc.), Romans have felt the taste to the world domination. As Vergilius wrote, destination of the Roman is “to rule the world”, has ended, as was expected, with folding of the world empire, many-sided and multilingual, with the different level of the province’s culture. The Roman Senate could not get along with this variety. On the political horizon commanders who leaned on army and city common people have begun to appear.

Starting with Julius Caesar, who has proclaimed himself the emperor, the Senate stand aside from power and, naturally, adventurers, who more or less turned out well, begin to rule over Rome. But not all of them had talents and charm as Julius Caesar: it was real gallery of sadists, tyrants and debauchees who have personified degradation of ancient art with the maximum completeness. Suetonius in his book “Lives of the Twelve Caesars” represents expressive portraits of emperors-monsters – Tiberius, Nero, Caligula, who were in general deprived of moral feeling. They treated people as dangerous enemy: it was a typical phrase for Caligula, who regretted that the Roman people did not have the only one head which could be chopped off with one blow. The requirement of emperors to consider them gods became the most characteristic feature of an epoch – they followed Alexander of Macedon example, though the vast majority of candidates for divinity had nothing behind their souls, except political cynicism. On squares of the Roman cities appeared grandiose statues of emperors – often in the form of an antique deity – before which the eternal flame flared, and passersby had to throw in it a handful of aromas to testify the belief in the divinity of the emperor. At the same time practical Romans, having convinced that some emperors reign no more than a year, have found the witty solution: they made a grand statue with a head, that could be easily changed on another one: after the next coup the new head was placed on the iron core, which had been embedded in a statue’s neck. When the mentioned Caligula got to know, that in far Judea, which at that times was depending on Rome, was a Temple of the Only God, the owner of the heaven and the earth, he ordered to send and to establish in that temple his own statue: Caesar seriously considered himself the owner of the world. Fortunately, while the statue went by sea to Jerusalem, Caligula was killed. In a word, Rome generated that pagan *cult of the state as such*. However, during time in these difficult conditions had stabilized *the Roman Law*, which was based on the idea of the protection of personality, her private property and immunity, of course if the person didn’t commit a crime. Later, during a Christian epoch, the Roman laws were remade according new moral standards. These principles generally provide a basis of the modern European legislation.

Nevertheless, as we know, the European culture was formed not only on the antiquity. In ancient Israel, firstly, was ascertained that the morality is more effective in public life, than brute force, and that it is more useful to the peace of mind, than fear of the king.² In the Old Testament the central concept of – *justice*, or the Law, which accurately separate the good and evil from the metaphysical point of view. It distinguishes Israelis from other ancient people in whom the good and evil were relative and easily interchangeable – depending on circumstances or a mood. The Israeli spiritual law sharply contrasts with political opinion of the ancient pagan East, impregnated with the idea of a sacralization of “the strongest” in the community – the monarch. Often in Old Testament texts kings are sharply criticized, not excepting the most authoritative of them, David and Solomon, and law’s provisions which limit the power of the king are so essential that the latter seems not the owner, but the hostage of his title.

The European culture was created on the intense dialogue of “natural” (pagan) and bible views of the world. With dissemination of Christianity the situation of rivalry of pagan Rome and new consciousness during three hundred years showed that personal conscience is capable to destroy the greatest empire built on an immoral basis of political violence.

Etymology of the word *conscience* leads to the archetype of *That, Who is major, than you are*, – the Father, and to the common cognition with Him – *сoвѣсть* (Church Slavic language). It was a reconsideration of the Old Testament concept of heart (*leb / lebab*), designation of the internal nature of the person and the center of her consciousness. Establishment of a new sense of the value of *the personality which has a conscience* (Greek: *Συνείδησης*; Latin: *Conscientiam*; English → *Conscience*) became a feat of Judeo-Christian culture. But it meant not only the allocation of individual highest consciousness, but also feeling of presence of an *All-Seeing Eye*, from which Adam and Eve so fondly try to hide in bushes. At a boundary of two epochs such idea was splashed out far of Judea borders. Even in pagan Rome, as the saying goes, the air was saturated with the concepts of conscience. Spreading of the New Testament, in which the word *conscience* was used about twenty times, corresponds to the use of this concept at Cicero and Seneca, who understood

² Strictly speaking, the idea of "life under the law" was created in Akkad society, but has been vigorously rethought by Israel.

conscience as a basis of the inner world of the free person. Let's compare with these words of Christ, who promises to make us *free from the sin*; and the apostle Paul's words: "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom" (2 Cor. 3: 17)

However, the Christianity at first exists as the small commonwealth of people who strive for internal freedom in an animal "kingdom of the Caesar" just as Israel has been spiritually isolated from surrounding pagan society. But when the Christianity became a mass religion, among them, and in society, the question of the *individual right to freedom of worship* has naturally appeared. From now the concept of freedom of conscience becomes the major and integral component of European consciousness.

The fact that huge impact on introduction of legal protection of freedom of conscience was exerted by the Catholic church, which canon law was based, as well as civil law of all Europe, on the Roman right which leaves an innocence presumption can be shocking for us.

Catholicism with its well-developed social concept naturally influenced on the formation of law system in Europe. The middle Ages formulated, by the lips of the Church, the new legal concept: distribution of spheres of an ideal the Kingdom of Heaven and imperfect the Kingdom of Earth. At the same time the Church couldn't observe willfulness of temporal power detached. Augustine says the power which is not based on Christian values is just a "band of robbers" ("De Civic Dei"). Thomas Aquinas gets back to the idea of the divine law and "natural" law, that is *human* which, unlike the first one, can be enhanced by people. Thanks to the influence of the Church, medieval socio-political doctrines have got an ethical and legal form [7, p. 135]. As a result, the moral authority of the Roman Catholic church grew: here the Pope dictated to emperors, while in the Christian East the ancient piety to the Caesar who manipulated Church on the understanding was stored, and as a result, the last is permanently shaken in the east by waves of heresy, depending on a personal arrangement of this or that emperor to Arianism or iconoclasm. Of course, in the West different things also happened, up to the totalitarian suppression of a free thought by the same inquisition. Nevertheless, Catholicism has raised for the first time the question of the right on *freedom of conscience*. During Modern times Catholicism, in the context of secularization dissemination, having taken into account sad experience of repressions against dissidents, passes to dialogue with secularized society. Responses to this idea are observed, not mention Protestants, even in the Jesuit concept of the Counter-Reformation. But today Catholicism manages to remain in a certain harmony with a liberal view on human rights. There is some characteristic detail: under pressure of Vatican the dictator F. Franco in 1967 signs the law on liberty of conscience.

At the same time, since the Renaissance, in the center of humanistic consciousness gradually appeared problems of earthly living; the question of liberty of conscience finally loses a shade of holiness (*fas*) and pass into state jurisdiction. Again, as it was during an era of the pagan past, there is no place for personal conscience – or it is possible to imagine Machiavelli's follower who consults with God?

Besides, during the Modern "secular religions" were formed – in a format of titanic utopian projects: *of the world reconstruction!* At the same time the Modern persistently introduces a thought, that the person always was a worthless and miserable being [9, p. 54], and time "to enhance" it; the characteristic word is "prometheism" with a help of which we can outline this ideological and psychological complex [2, p. 425]. Most obviously, it was implemented in programs and political practice of the European totalitarian regime of the XX century. It was established for a long time, that fascism and communism – are nothing else as secular religions; and these pseudo religions openly copy Christian models. They can be identified as the travesty translation of the Bible with its pathos of creation of "the new man".

And, eventually, secular religion inherits those totalitarian moments which the same Catholicism tries carefully to disavow today. During an era of Modern the secular religion substitute persistently hates traditional religious and cultural system from which she was allocated. In society, which is under dictatorship of "secular religion" the concept of conscience finally and completely desacralized, goes on a roadside, to the personal relations... about what conscience we are talking about! It is typically that the slogan: "I am freeing men from the wearisome restrictions of the mind, from the dirty and degrading self-mortifications of a chimera called conscience and morality, and from the demands of a freedom and personal independence." was ascribed to Hitler. This slogan was quote by G. Rauschnig in

interview with Hitler in 1934 in the book “The Voice of Destruction” (1940) [11, p. 108]. In turn, in the Soviet society, there is huge number of fine, but mutually exclusive laws, that braid each citizen with network of “presumption of guilt”, and if the government wish – any step can be interpreted as a crime; remains only to buy conscience of the lawyer...

However, these “cool” revolutionary innovations nevertheless are finally something minor in relation to tradition, in the best case – it is rehash, but more often – it is a misstatement and transformation. Substantially, it is an active restoration prebiblical, pagan idea of morality and the law. And the problem of self-conscience in its ratio with, what is noted now by this or that power as the public benefit hangs in the air: as present-day French philosopher O. Bulnua noted, the Christian Middle Ages asked those main existential questions, which Modern and postmodern epochs only transform and reshuffle [4].

That is why the problem of correlation of conscience and the law for the present day’s thinker – is too heavy – especially in the context of a postmodernism which recognizes the value and correctness of any mutually exclusive concepts just as the comical rabbi recognized correctness of both claimants, and on a question of the surprised pupil, how can it be, answered very quietly that he, his pupil, is also right. It is also possible in general to exclude this problem from the scientific address and to sleep well. And in the narrow-minded surrounding a demented and heard by nobody cry of ordinary man beaten by the life doesn't stop: Where is that conscience?! It is necessary to understand that the concept of conscience really works only in that sphere that is spiritually guidance by church. The secular concept of conscience of today’s secularized environment is not implanted in mentality; it is easily leveled, deprived of sacral aura, easily yields to an impact of not pagan values of totalitarianism or consumer society, indifferent to any morality.

References

1. Ахундова И. «Раненые салютовали мне... ногами» <о W. Voyno-Yasinetskom> / Ирина Ахундова. – Электронный ресурс. – Режим доступа: <http://www.pravmir.ru/svyatitel-luka-vojno-yaseneckij-ranenyey-salyutovali-mne-nogami/#ixzz3Geo3Tn00>].
2. Батищев Г. С. Диалектика творчества / Генрих Степанович Батищев. – М., 1984. – 443 с.
3. Бенедикт Р. Хризантема и меч. Модели японской культуры / Рут Бенедикт. – М.: Наука, 2007. – 360 с.
4. Бульнуа О. Що нового? Середньовіччя / Олів'є Бульнуа // Філософська думка. – 2010. – № 1. – С. 114-136.
5. Веселова Е. К. Совесть как психологический феномен / Елена Константиновна Веселова // Вестник СПбГУ. – Сер. 12: Психология. Социология. Педагогика. – 2009. – № 4. – С. 129-137.
6. Эпштейн М. О философских чувствах и действиях / Михаил Эпштейн // Вопросы философии. – 2014. – № 7. – С. 167-175.
7. Жоль К. К. Философия и социология права / Константин Константинович Жоль. – К.: Юринком Интер, 2000. – 480 с.
8. Платон. Избранные диалоги / Платон. – М.: Худож. л-ра, 1965. – 442 с.
9. Пигалев А. Н. Деконструкция денег и постмодернистская концепция человека / Александр Николаевич Пигалев // Вопросы философии. – 2012. – № 8. – С. 50-60.
10. Рассел Б. История западной философии / Бертран Рассел; [пер. с англ.]. – М.: Издательство иностранной литературы, 1959. – 936 с.
11. Словарь современных цитат (изд. 4-е, дополненное) / Сост. К. В. Душенко. – М.: Эксмо, 2006. – 736 с.
12. Ученые выяснили, где прячется совесть. – Электронный ресурс. – Режим доступа: http://www.pravda.ru/science/planet/humanbeing/21-01-2013/1141454-altr_br-0/.
13. Фукуяма Ф. Великий разрыв / Фрэнсис Фукуяма; [пер. с англ.]. – М.: ООО «Издательство АСТ», 2003. – 474 с.
14. Чікарькова М. Ю. Проект Модерну: біблійні витоки / Марія Юрїївна Чікарькова // Схід. – 2023. – № 6 (126). – С. 286-289.
15. Ярхо В. Н. Была ли у древних греков совесть? / Виктор Ноевич Ярхо // Античность и современность. – М.: Изд-во АН СССР, 1972. – С. 251–263.
16. Gentile E. Fascism as Political religion / Emilio Gentile // Journal of Contemporary History. – 1990. – April. – Vol. 25. – № 2. – P. 229-251.
17. Gray J. Czarna msza: apokaliptyczna religia i śmierć utopii / John Gray. – Kraków : Znak, 2009. – 368 s.

Literatura

1. Akhundova I. «Raneny salyutovali мне... nogami» <о W. Voyno-Yasinetskom> / Irina Akhundova. – Elektronnyy resurs. – Rezhim dostupa: <http://www.pravmir.ru/svyatitel-luka-vojno-yaseneckij-ranenyey-salyutovali-mne-nogami/#ixzz3Geo3Tn00>].
2. Batishchev G. S. Dialektika tvorchestva / Genrikh Stepanovich Batishchev. – М., 1984. – 443 с.
3. Benedikt R. Khrizantema i mech. Modeli yaponskoy kultury / Rut Benedikt. – М.: Nauka, 2007. – 360 с.

4. Bulnua O. Shcho novogo? Serednovichchya / Oliv'e Bulnua // Filosofska dumka. – 2010. – № 1. – S. 114-136.
5. Veselova Ye. K. Sovest kak psikhologicheskii fenomen / Yelena Konstantinovna Veselova // Vestnik SPbGU. – Ser. 12: Psikhologiya. Sotsiologiya. Pedagogika. – 2009. – № 4. – S. 129-137.
6. Epshteyn M. O filosofskikh chuvstvakh i deystviyakh / Mikhail Epshteyn // Voprosy filosofii. – 2014. – № 7. – S. 167-175.
7. Zhol K. K. Filosofiya i sotsiologiya prava / Konstantin Konstantinovich Zhol. – K. : Yurinkom Inter, 2000. – 480 s.
8. Platon. Izbrannye dialogi / Platon. – M.: Khudozh. I-ra, 1965. – 442 s.
9. Pigalev A. N. Dekonstruksiya deneg i postmodernistskaya kontseptsiya cheloveka / Aleksandr Nikolaevich Pigalev // Voprosy filosofii. – 2012. – № 8. – S. 50-60.
10. Rassel B. Istoriya zapadnoy filosofii / Bertran Rassel ; [per. s angl.]. – M.: Izdatelstvo inostrannoy literatury, 1959. – 936 s.
11. Slovar sovremennykh tsitat (izd. 4-e, dopolnennoe) / Sost. K. V. Dushenko. – M.: Eksmo, 2006. – 736 s.
12. Uchenye vuyasnili, gde pryachetsya sovest. – Elektronnyy resurs. – Rezhim dostupa: http://www.pravda.ru/science/planet/humanbeing/21-01-2013/1141454-altr_br-0/.
13. Fukuyama F. Velikiy razryv / Frensis Fukuyama: [per. s angl.]. – M.: OOO «Izdatelstvo AST», 2003. – 474 s.
14. Chikarkova M. Yu. Proekt Modernu: bibliyni vitoki / Mariya Yuriivna Chikarkova // Skhid. – 2023. – № 6 (126). – S. 286-289.
15. Yarkho V. N. Byla li u drevnikh grekov sovest? / Viktor Noevich Yarkho // Antichnost i sovremennost. – M.: Izd-vo AN SSSR, 1972. – S. 251-263.
16. Gentile E. Fascism as Political religion / Emilio Gentile // Journal of Contemporary History. – 1990. – April. – Vol. 25. – № 2. – P. 229-251.
17. Gray J. Czarna msza: apokaliptyczna religia i śmierć utopii / John Gray. – Kraków: Znak, 2009. – 368 s.

Семен Абрамович

Захват і жах обрiтєння всевидючого ока (поняття сумлiння в дiахронiчнiй проєкцiї)

Статтю присвячено дiахронiчному формату поняття сумлiння, яке, втiм, трактується як апрiорне для людської свiдомостi, а не як iсторично дискретна категорiя. Але й погляд, згiдно з яким це поняття є чимось «загальнолюдським», фактично не має під собою підстав: потрібно певний рiвень морального розвитку суспiльства, аби емпатiя та сумлiння могли пiдвестися як констант духовного свiту людини.

Поганські суспiльства архаїчної епохи з їхньою релятивною мораллю ще не знали, за винятком хiба казусу Сократа, магнетизму категоричного iмперативу й будували свої моральні системи виключно на базисі «культури сорому» (Р. Бенедикт). Чiтке усвiдомлення людського сумлiння як спiврозумiння життєвих явищ «разом з Богом» вносить у свiтову культуру лише Бiблiя, що впливає на формування нової етики, нової суспiльної моралi й навіть почасти юрисдикцiї європейських спiльнот.

Саме християнське Середньовiччя, пiдносячи понад усiм Царство Небесне, усе ж таки придiлило величезну увагу й впорядкуванню Граду Земного. Старовинні норми римського права було доповнено етичним компонентом; зокрема – поняттям «прав людини» (Тома Аквінат), в тому числі й права на свободу совiстi.

Та у Новий час, паралельно з ростом секуляризацiї, поняття сумлiння позбавляється сакрального насичення, зводиться до соцiальної конвенцiональностi або навіть сфери приватних стосункiв, й, у кiнцевому результатi, повністю втрачає змiст, поступаючись масовій зневірі й цинiзму. Тому практично-психологiчна дiєвiсть цiєї категорiї можлива виключно у форматi християнської культури та сферi релiгiйного самовизначення особистостi.

Ключові слова: сумлiння, свобода совiстi, громадянські права, iмператив, суспiльна мораль, християнська культура.

Надiйшла до редакцiї 26.09.2016 р.