

CULTUROLOGY AS A SCIENTIFIC DISCIPLINE: ACTUALITY, STRUCTURE, SENSES

Tetyana Vorova 

candidate of philological sciences, associate professor,
associate professor of the department of the English language
for non-philological specialities
Oles Honchar Dnipro National University, Ukraine

Abstract

Culturology has firmly become a part of modern humanities as a fundamental science and as an academic discipline in the educational system. Unlike other areas of knowledge, culturology as a system of cultural sciences arose quite recently – about a hundred years ago. A large number of themes is included in its general theoretical framework: knowledge is concentrated in concepts, laws, principles and other scientific forms that are in a systemic relationship.

Outside a specific human community, culture is absent, being an abstraction that does not exist in its pure form. In reality, the researchers are dealing with the specific cultures that belonged to the specific historical eras and successively replaced each other. Culture can be perceived as an objective reality, a way of life of people who realize themselves in diverse cultural forms of existence accurately recorded by science.

Currently, humanity lives in a multicultural world: some individual cultural formations coexist, interact, compete, merge and disintegrate. In this regard, the fundamental questions arise about the typology of cultures, their interaction and internal structure, modeling in the functioning of cultures within different ethnic groups. These and other pressing issues are successfully resolved by culturology helping to avoid a simplified and superficial understanding of cultural material.

INTRODUCTION

There is no doubt that cultural studies is a necessary element of university education. Since ancient times, a man has been aware of the peculiarities of his existence, that allowed him to stand out from the natural world into a specific environment created by himself. For a number of reasons, for a long time a man could not find the required means to describe this specificity, not to mention the selecting of accurate keys for its knowledge and concretization of multiple factors.

A number of objective prerequisites were necessary in order to comprehend the special sphere of human existence, as well as the activities for its creation and development, that ultimately led to the emergence of a new branch of science (in our work, two equivalent terms are used to denote the discipline – cultural studies and culturology). The emergence of cultural studies as an independent field of knowledge was objectively preceded by the long development of the sciences about man and society, which were accompanied by the accumulation of facts and the observations of human spiritual life.

The rapid development of cultural studies was a consequence of the widespread recognition of the fact that, regardless of any type of occupation, activity, profession, a man is not able to live outside the cultural environment. As a result, the investigation and understanding of the patterns of cultural processes, the development of distinct and clear ideas about the cultural prospects of humanity, as well as the recording and study of its main problems make cultural studies a vitally important scientific branch, without which the normal functioning of society in general and individual social groups in particular is impossible. Living in a corresponding cultural environment and not knowing anything about it is criminal, since in this case every human action can be destructive for the culture.

In general, the intensive growth of knowledge about culture – along with the tendency to satisfy the growing interest in specific problems of history and theory of culture – is reflected in the constant deepening into a special field of knowledge and in the breadth of coverage of the manifested problems, in the general increase of the level of world cultural science.

Culture should be considered in the fullness of its multidimensional and multifaceted manifestation, that is ensured by the objective results of scientific research, emphasizing the substantive and functional richness of culture and human cultural life.

A systemic view of cultural studies is provided by a philosophically developed understanding of reality based on a synergetic interpretation of the

dynamics of complicated self-organizing systems, which include culture as well. Synergetics allows us to see culture in the aspect of a steadily preserved functional system, as well as to reveal the mechanisms of the collapse of cultures and the subsequent formation of new stable cultural structures from the chaotic diversity of their elements.

The method of cultural studies is based on the unity of explanation and understanding. Any culture is considered as a system of meanings that has its own essence, its own internal reasoning, that can be comprehended through the rational explanation. Culturology cannot confine itself to explaining, because culture is always addressed to a human subjectivity and does not exist outside of a living connection with it. Therefore, in order to comprehend its subject, cultural studies requires understanding, that is, the acquisition of a holistic intuitive-semantic involvement of the subject in the comprehended phenomenon.

The task of cultural studies is the implementation of a dialogue of cultures, during which we become familiar with other cultures and worlds of meaning, but do not dissolve in them. In culturology there is not only a system of rational knowledge, but also a system of non-rational understanding, and both of these systems are internally consistent and equally important for the scientific and humanitarian comprehension of culture.

The highest achievement of cultural studies is the completeness of understanding, based on the completeness of explanation. This allows you to penetrate the world of other cultures, engage in dialogue with them, and, thus, enrich and better understand your own culture.

Culturology studies not only culture as a whole, but also various, often very specific spheres of cultural life, interacting with anthropology, ethnography, psychiatry, psychology, sociology, economic theory, linguistics, etc., and at the same time maintaining its own identity and solving its own research problems. In other words, culturology is a sophisticated human science.

1. Features of cultural studies as a scientific discipline.

In the profane approach, *cultural studies* sometimes means an interdisciplinary discipline that is not based on fundamental knowledge of specific empirical material and does not take part in its acquisition. In this case, cultural studies performs a theoretical interdisciplinary generalization of materials borrowed from the annals of other sciences (in it there is a similarity with philosophy); with such universalism, there may be a blurring of arguments and an absence of clear boundaries of reliability.

In modern academic discourse, cultural studies correlates with post-non-classical sciences, for which interdisciplinary synthesis of knowledge is an important methodological principle: it allows one to open new perspectives of generalization and analysis of long-known material, to comprehend its meanings, operating with a so-called secondary generalization of knowledge that might reveal the unexpected aspects of cultural foundations in ideologies, cultural platforms of social processes or historical events, etc.

With this approach, cultural studies should rely on the existing range of academic theories (a) to develop the concepts about society and social reality associated with it, (b) to perceive this reality as a system-forming text (in its semiotic aspect) and to decipher the social and cultural meanings hidden in its symbolism, (c) to explore the sociocultural meanings in art, the mutual influence of society on art and art on the public consciousness.

According to this approach, it is also possible to identify the models of cultural structures (1) at the methodological level, (2) at the level of problematic areas of knowledge that can be solved in a specific segment, (3) at the level of the individual disciplines, the foundations and artifacts they study. In general, such a system makes it possible to qualitatively and effectively correlate different levels of knowledge with each other.

Due to the fact that our work is aimed mainly at the sociocultural meanings in modern culturological research (such meanings are also partially presented in the informative monograph «The History of the Development of Fairy Tales. Hermeneutics and Literary Studies. Hermeneutic Paradigms of Fairy Tales in the Works of O. Pushkin» by T. Vorova [4]), and, therefore, the main attention will be focused on this discourse, we consider it necessary only to briefly list the branches, the problematic areas and the subject areas of cultural studies, without going into excessive details. (We refer those who wish to significantly enrich their knowledge in cultural studies to the substantive works of the Ukrainian scientists [1–3; 5–12; 14–16; 19–21]).

The most voluminous branches of cultural studies are considered to be the theory and history of culture, sociology and psychology of culture, applied and humanitarian cultural studies, and the foundations of cultural knowledge.

The problematic areas of cultural studies include philosophy of culture; general empirical knowledge about culture; factual history of cultures (i.e. history, focused on the systematic description); history of symbols of social prestige (i.e. the prestige in attributes of power and status, clothing, hairstyles, jewelry, etc.); monumentology (studying the objects of cultural heritage); fundamentals of the sociology of culture (i.e. the cultural characteristics of

different social groups, their value preferences, lifestyle, etc.); analysis of behavioral culture (the norms of politeness, hospitality, etiquette, etc.); feminist research (the development of social emancipation of women); analysis of social consciousness (the structure and functioning of its main components); analysis of cultural communication (i.e. the parameters of channels during the information exchange); foundations, goals and objectives of the state cultural policy; philosophy of culture (i.e. its essence, structure, patterns of development); textual criticism (i.e. the study of the influence of a variety of oral and written texts on society); analysis of rites and rituals (the search for their origins and connections with the rational foundations, including the study of mythical and religious rites and rituals as a cultural manifestation of dominant beliefs and irrational ideas); theory and methodology of cultural science and education (the development of goals and objectives of cultural studies, analysis of the effectiveness of various research methods).

The subject areas of cultural knowledge are vast, so we will point out only a few of them: the origin of the cultures of different peoples in the historical variability of their forms; the study of status attributes that reflect a position of a person in the social hierarchy of his time (including the history of fashion); the exhibition of cultural artifacts, books, manuscripts, documents; the study of (a) the folk culture, especially the unwritten culture of the peasantry with its characteristic traditionalism, (b) the mass culture, concentrated in the leisure practice of mass consumption of average city dwellers, (c) the elite culture of highly educated and highly specialized city dwellers with their clearly expressed individual beginnings; the study of ethnographic customs and mores, urban social norms of adequate behavior, etiquette norms of an aristocratic society; the study of the historically dominant worldview, scientific and cultural picture of the world, ideology as a system of ideas about good and evil; the study of intracultural communication in the presence of a common language or in the absence of such a language; the formation of a cultural environment with given parameters and monitoring the social control of such an environment; the study of the market for cultural products; the study of fairy tales, mythological, religious, artistic, legal and other texts and their influence on the behavioral stereotypes of people and their general culture; the study of mythological, religious, folk, political and other rites and rituals that reflect the state of public consciousness in different eras; the study of the educational usefulness of cultural knowledge in combination with an analysis of the effectiveness of various pedagogical technologies in the research of cultural studies; some other areas.

In principle, knowledge of culture is based on the same platform that is typical for other phenomena observed in society, although it should be emphasized that more intensive exchange of information is taking place within the framework of the formation and variability of social consciousness.

The greatest problem of cultural studies relates to the content and the factual content of cultural history, as well as to the structuring of the relevant material. Consequently, the aspects of the interpretation of social history from the point of view of certain concepts of cultural history are of great importance, while the various kinds of speculative theoretical considerations about the studied segments of knowledge and the forms (or the processes) of their occurrence are quite acceptable.

We especially emphasize that all areas of cultural studies are interdisciplinary (to one degree or another), and they border on related sciences, in this way deepening knowledge about a man and his social life, and behind it there are the fundamental psychological and social needs manifested in culture. This, in turn, is the foundation for understanding the cultural diversity of humanity and the reasons due to which some peoples are exposed to the cultural influence of other peoples.

Undoubtedly, such serious processes help to identify the patterns of human evolution that is reflected through the dynamic variability of cultural forms.

2. Aspects of understanding the modern culture in a society

Before we begin to analyze and explain the phenomena of culture in a society, it is necessary to define the concept of the subject of culture when analyzing the cognitive operations. A man is a constant initiator of the process of cognition, and he represents the active principle in the cognitive operations; and it is an absolutely necessary moment for justifying the possibilities of human knowledge from the point of view of its reliability. Nowadays, the idea of the socio-historical nature of the subject of cognition, its inextricable connection with culture and its immersion in culture, the interdependence of the processes of cognition (or cultural creation) is considered as undeniable one.

The transformation of the surrounding reality cannot exist without the continuous recreation of cultural forms. Therefore, in cultural studies, a subject can be defined as a bearer of objective-practical activity or knowledge, a source and agent of activity aimed at the world around us in all its diversity. In this case, the subject can be understood as an individual person or a social group.

Very important is the concept of subjectivity as an indicator of the relationship that arises between two parties: the one who performs an operation

of cognition, and the object of cognition itself; the necessary level of subjectivity is a functional activity, because it is in the transformation of the surrounding world or its reconstruction that subjective traits are manifested.

Consequently, the subject of culture is an active creator, a transformer of cultural reality. He is located at the intersection of many factors – both external (objective), predetermining the actions of the creator to one degree or another, and internal (subjective), thanks to which the creator himself invades the culture and changes it through his own functional activities.

A person comes into the world already endowed with certain biological, physiological and psychological parameters. Like any biological integrity, placed in the context of natural reality, this world is subject to certain laws of nature.

Fortunately, a person is determined by those characteristics that allow him to become an active reformer of the surrounding reality. In other words, a person becomes a creator at the moment when the subject of culture manifests itself in him, because it is precisely culture that distinguishes a person from all phenomena of reality. Thanks to culture, it becomes possible to outline the boundaries of human uniqueness, because only from a cultural perspective does a person appear as a sovereign and autonomous being, fundamentally irreducible to other forms of the natural world.

The subject of culture is present only in a cultural person or in a cultural community. Let us look at some of their features in more detail. As a natural being, a man is not completely isolated from the phenomena of the surrounding world – animate or inanimate nature. Like animals, he is a part of the earth's biosphere. Consequently, he lives according to the laws which determine the existence of living matter. This purely physical part of a human life forms the basis of human nature.

In the past, the idea (about what unites a person with the outside world and what distinguishes them) became the reason for putting forward the theory of treating a person only as a biological machine, which reduces a person to the level of animals. Nowadays the naivety of such an idea is obvious. Nevertheless, the attempts to reduce (i.e. to reduce a person only to some natural biological components) have not been stopped yet.

Without a doubt, a person is not limited to the biological or physiological characteristics. He is fundamentally different from animals. However, it is not easy to indicate exactly of what the radical difference between the human and natural worlds consists.

In fact, the expression *a social man* (i.e. a person's living surrounded by his own kind) cannot be considered a decisive argument. It is well known that

many animals live in packs, in which there is a fairly extensive system of specialization (wolves, monkeys, bees, etc.). However, because the human nature has a very definite feature, the associations of people are called a society, and the associations of wolves or monkeys are called the packs.

The ability to transmit some information to other fellow humans using certain special forms (some body movements, sound signals, articulation, facial expressions) does not allow us to call the socializing of one person with another a speech (socializing is the action or practice of participating in social activities or mixing socially with others). However, due to the fact that the sender is a person, the message he sends becomes a speech.

Like animals, people eat, sleep, take care of their offsprings, protect themselves from external enemies, have a rest, get sick, have memory, etc. Animals, like people, invade the world around them and actively act in it (for example, they build nests, dig holes, create dams). The stipulation that animals obey some instincts in all their actions may seem very convincing. However, when it comes to the matters of principle or precision and clarity of definitions, such an explanation does not seem convincing.

It is well known that the instincts can manifest themselves powerfully in a person – many of his actions are fully explained by some kind of instincts. In certain cultures of so-called cradle civilizations of primitive peoples, a human life is completely exhausted by the reproduction of already existing, repeatedly tested forms, which in their appearance are close to «cultural instincts». In addition, the instincts – slowly, but surely – are transformed under the influence of external circumstances. The animal world does not remain unchanged. In most cases the instinctive program predetermines the life of animals, but it also allows some variations and free combinatorics.

An analogue in the animal world can be found for every aspect of human life, almost every human act. Consequently, some individual characteristics of a person (such as his biological autonomy) are not the basis for his separation from the natural world, because the human status has already been given to these characteristics as a result of belonging to a human being.

In modern cultural studies, it is believed that three points are essential for defining a person as a cultural person and as a subject of culture: consciousness, good manners, and creativity.

As for consciousness, any human fact can be identified with some degree of certainty as a human fact – or as a fact that is the opposite of natural one. It is *human fact* precisely because it cannot be reduced to naturalness – it is above the natural level or, it is possible to note, it is supernatural.

A specific human superstructure can be called differently: unreal, transcendental, speculative, intellectual, rational, abstract, spiritual, conscious, etc. In its most general form, it can be defined as the presence in a person of the ability to double the world: to «superpose» the world of unreal entities onto the world of real things and processes; although these entities are connected with the reality of natural phenomena, they have their own autonomy.

So, a human nature in a person is supernatural or ideal one that exists above reality. A person has the «second nature», and thanks to the manifestation of this quality in his actions, he becomes a subject. His acts and actions are determined not only by the material and natural dependencies, but also by his own conscious choice.

This is also one of the typical features of culture, because one of the aspects of natural culture is its complicity with the second nature of man. Consequently, a man is a man insofar as he is immersed in culture, acts as a subject of cultural transformations, has the opportunity to be in two worlds, and combines them in every action in his life.

When it comes to mannerliness, it is understood that people must maintain their physiological existence, therefore in their actions they are often guided by the «call of nature». Nevertheless, in most cases, the human desires and actions are subject to some demands and instructions emanating not from the sphere of natural instincts, but from the spiritual realm.

Depending on certain circumstances, the priority of natural and spiritual impulses can vary – up to a radical refusal to obey the law of one sphere and complete submission to another. In some situations, a person can be completely guided only by his instincts, in others, on the contrary, he can completely ignore the dictates of nature and follow exclusively some spiritual aspirations. However, most often both aspects – natural and supernatural – are taken into account.

Over time, the people's dependence on the arbitrariness of natural elements weakens, and the degree of influence of the supernatural component on one's human life increases. It manifests the progress of humanity, which is precisely calculated by the measure of the increase in unnaturalness or culture in society. Today, it is not physiological, but cultural conditions that play a decisive role in a human destiny; the leading position in the formation of a person's life project (with all possible reservations) is occupied by the supernatural factors.

The undeniable fact is that a man himself – even in his external, physiological contours – is a cultivated being, i.e. a being formed according to the canons of cultural imperatives that filter out naturalness at both the

individual and social levels. In other words, not everything is selected from the world in general, from the surrounding reality, from the natural inclinations given to a person at his birth, but only what is necessary in certain specific conditions. Moreover, the choice is dictated to a greater extent not by natural predisposition, but by cultural expediency.

Regarding creativity, it should be noted that not all human actions can rightfully be called truly human ones. A person can live a long life, but still not declare himself as a person – a subject of culture, i.e. a being endowed with supernatural qualities and capable of projecting these qualities outward. At the same time, he can even consider himself quite happy – successfully ensuring the satisfaction of immediate physiological needs and being content with what has been achieved.

Such vegetation and the complete absence of other desires (i.e. something that is called philistinism) often seem to be a convenient position not only for the agents themselves (or the specific people), but also for their rulers, because the population, which is concerned only with getting its daily bread, can be manipulated quite easily.

In general, this kind of «animal» existence is not only a nightmare of some dystopia; the true reality sometimes surpasses even the most negative prophecies. The existence, that is limited only to the reproduction of the same forms of existence, sooner or later ossifies; such ossified forms are imprinted in the structures of reality and become an analogue of primary nature.

These forms, in fact, fall out of human life, because they do not come into contact with it in any way due to the fact that the supernatural principle is absent in them. Supernaturality differs from naturalness in the aspect that, despite its normativity, the culturality is not immutable. Any absolutization of a supernatural principle introduces it into the kingdom of nature, because the natural phenomena have their own compulsory cruelty.

The human activity itself is not limited to the boundaries of nature. It has a cultural, creative nature and is aimed at transforming the natural and supernatural worlds. In other words, a person acts as a subject of culture only when he creates some new forms of life activity that cannot be completely reduced either to the natural past or to the supernatural past.

A person is not just active, but he is creatively active. The need to take into account the real (or ideal) context or the formation according to value and cultural canons does not prevent the creative activity, although sometimes this may seem like an infringement of rights in the field of individual obstacles in the process of revealing its uniqueness.

Let us pay special attention to the fact that acts of simple destruction or overthrow cannot be considered the signs of subjective cultural activity: the people who committed such actions are rightly called barbarians.

Thus, among the most important characteristics of the subject of cultures are consciousness (the ability and the need to show some supernatural qualities), good manners (the formation within the framework of a real / ideal cultural matrix) and creativity (the ability to produce a cultural product without destroying the great values of the past and, conversely, using them in one's own actions).

A subject of culture is an actively operating entity with its own characteristics and main features of cultural activity, which include symbolism, meaning-making, communication, regulation, and creativity.

Symbolism. As it has been mentioned above, not every activity can be considered the cultural one. However, under certain conditions, any act or word uttered by a person can become a cultural act. This becomes possible when an act is performed by a person as an entity in which some cultural potential is realized and certain ideal horizons are embodied.

What is of fundamental importance is not what is fixed in reality, but what is above the reality of movements, hidden in the ultra-real meanings of each action. Therefore, the first criterion of any cultural activity should be considered the ability to send and perceive transcendental (i.e., ultra-real) instructions, or, more precisely, the symbolism of actions.

Words, sounds, spatial and temporal movements, manipulations with surrounding objects acquire the cultural meanings when they are not confined within the limits of natural objectivity, but when they suggest some other dimensions, and, thus, combine in themselves what appeals to us as the supernatural, cultural beings.

Making sense. The human actions are not evaluated according to the same scheme as the phenomena of surrounding reality. The phenomenon itself of the real (or ideal) world does not predetermine its place in the human culture, but, on the contrary, is determined by it. Of primary importance is the person's attitude to this phenomenon and how it is assessed in the general hierarchical system of values.

Culture endows any fact from the orbit of human life with meaning, essence, significance. Accordingly, the cultural activity must inevitably take this circumstance into account and be meaningful; it should always be remembered that any actions are not performed autonomously, but within the framework of a general value structure.

Communication skills. The activity of a cultural subject is not reduced to some simple human activity for the spontaneous discharge of his energy impulses. Such activity is always aimed at a specific addressee who is capable of responding adequately (that is, at the same level of perception) to the fruits of creative efforts. Thanks to it, a special kind of specific human communication arises between people, and a non-random human community is formed.

Such communicative purposefulness distinguishes a human society from an animal herd. In the herd, some information is also exchanged because the animals communicate as well, but their communication occurs as a result of something real, and this exhausts the need for contacts. There are many other aspects in the society that are not limited to the need for a simple physiological reproduction of life. They arise in the supernatural sphere and, therefore, involve the interaction of different people precisely at this level.

Regulations. A cultural contact is a precondition for all cultural activities. It must take place, otherwise the activity itself becomes meaningless. Consequently, the cultural activities are regulated. If there are no specific forms and channels accepted in a particular community through which the communication chains are built, then communication may be absent.

Any society develops its own forms of cultural activity: outside of these forms, such activity is unacceptable. These forms may vary depending on time and place, so they do not remain unchanged.

To a large extent, the history of culture is precisely the history of such regulated and – at the same time – endlessly changing communicative forms of expression. There are some cases when the regulations of the cultural activities of one people do not correlate in any way with the regulations of others. It once again demonstrates the imperfection of each individual chain. Nevertheless, the regulation is a necessary criterion for any cultural activity.

Creativity. The essence of this criterion of cultural activity is that it always represents a creative act in which a person's creative potential is manifested. Creativity can be extremely traditional and not oppose itself to the existing norms and rules, but intertwine with them, introducing the newest colors and flavors into the whimsical outline of the general pattern of traditional culture.

Creativity can sometimes express an open protest against tradition, become a means of active struggle against the violence of outdated old forms and even their overthrow. However, the cultural activity is fundamentally different from the destructive acts: its impulse is not aimed at destroying the existing world, but at establishing a new one – at creating the other cultural forms, drawing attention to the previously unknown possibilities of a man and a human society, and opening the previously unknown horizons.

Of course, the above criteria do not exhaust the cultural activities; the other aspects are also assumed. The list presents the minimum without which the actions of the subject cannot be qualified as cultural, and the agent of action himself cannot be considered a subject of culture.

An individual – or collective cultural – subject manifests itself only when the supernatural spirituality, the formation or the upbringing (according to a certain cultural model) as well as the creative initiative are tangibly present in it.

The nature of cultural activity is determined by a set of characteristics, the most important of which are symbolism, meaning-making, communication, regulation, and creativity.

3. The relationship between identity and culture.

The concepts of identity or self-identity came to cultural studies from psychology and sociology. In modern language, «identification» and «self-identification» are usually used interchangeably. In scientific literature, identification refers to a complex process of emotional, psychological and other forms of self-identification of a person with other people, a group, an ideal image, an artistic character.

The concept of identification was introduced by S. Freud [25] and became firmly established in the practice of psychoanalysis. In the psychoanalytic tradition, the process of identification is interpreted as a necessary stage of growing up, as well as a mechanism that ensures the ability of ego to self-realization. The child diligently imitates the words and the actions of the parent, trying to reproduce the same type of emotional and psychological stereotypes of the parent in his life.

Such actions are not an idle activity, performing a very important function of protection from the outside world and allowing one to overcome fear of the unknown world. Thanks to the repeated likening of one's ego to a certain idol, a super-ego is formed, which in the future will simultaneously act as a censor of a person's actions, sometimes giving him trouble and sometimes protection from the adversities of life.

According to the scientists, there are three stages on the path of self-identification as a necessary condition for entering the socio-cultural space – imaginary, symbolic, real.

During the first stage, the ego longs to merge with someone who is perceived as another person. The child, who previously accepted his own reflection as another living being, begins to identify himself with it. The mental image of himself is his personal self-identification. Defining it through another person leads to an understanding of social society as it is.

During the second stage, the father can become the symbolic center of gravity, in whose figure the social prohibitions or restrictions are personified. Self-identification with another person or one's father marks an encounter with culture as an institution. At this stage, one can observe integration into the socio-cultural context, emotional and psychological unity with a certain tradition.

The third stage of the real world can simply be considered history, because a particular person practically objectifies his own ego in a real social context. The final stage allows a person to realize his own identity as a single socio-cultural organism, which makes it possible to determine his own individuality and its place in the world around him. At the same time, the importance of an adequate representation of the individual about himself is emphasized, and therefore the painfulness of the identification process itself is pointed out.

In sociology, the term *identification* describes the mechanisms of a person's entry into a certain social space, helping him to master the various types of social activities, to adequately perceive the social norms and values, and to reproduce certain role settings.

The assimilation of certain types of social mechanisms is necessary due to the diversity of forms of identification. In general, three main forms of identification can be distinguished: 1) the emotional identification of oneself with the real or fictitious people, the result of which is the copying of the external signs of activity; 2) the associating oneself with a certain social group that leads to the assimilation of the important socio-behavioral stereotypes; 3) the identification of oneself with a real social group that determines a strong conviction of one's belonging to the norms of a particular social community. In this process of identification, a person gains a sense of identity or belonging to a community, thereby protecting his unique individuality by a certain tradition.

In cultural studies, it is also very important to define the understanding of psycho-social identity, that means the integrity of the individual ego and the image of the world (including the place of the ego in this world) shared by other people.

Identity is the foundation of every personality and an indicator of its psycho-social well-being. In this case, the following positions can be distinguished: the internal identity of a person when perceiving the surrounding world along with a sense of time and space; the identity of the personal and socially accepted worldviews; the feeling of inclusion of the human ego in any community.

One aspect of psycho-social identity is a person's belief that he exists as an autonomous, unique individuality, despite all the obvious changes that occur around him. The normativity of the individual mental development and the

mental well-being is also of great importance – it is also defined as a personal identity. This standard is not necessarily expressed in a set of clearly understood rules. Very often it is felt intuitively on a subconscious level, acting like an imperative launched by someone who is unknown.

The form of individual existence and its belonging to a certain social community, determined by a specific historical time, is another aspect of identity. And the most important aspect, perhaps, is the gaining of fundamental stability in the face of the threat of non-existence or death.

The common point of the listed aspects of identity, as well as the main condition for their formation, is the relationship between the psychological and sociocultural parameters of a person's life. They are accepted as a correspondence between the spiritual content of a specific historical era, realized within a certain group of people, and the internal needs of the individuality in the specific positions and options of identification.

The personal psycho-social identity becomes an awareness of who the person is in the world, a sense of the fact of his concrete existence and a meeting with his real ego. At the same time, the lack of confidence in one's own consonance with the world might prompt a person to take a specific action or become a cause of suffering.

Evaluating oneself in accordance with the opinions of other people about oneself, a person is guided by the cultural attitudes and also relies on his own criteria for self-esteem. Thanks to the continuous comparison of these assessments, the genuineness of the personal and sociocultural identities arises, which serves as a sign of human adaptation to the environment.

The genuineness also plays a leading role in an individual's gaining of the psycho-social balance. In the process of identification, the cultural and ethnic characteristics of the group, to which a person is included, its customs, religious practices, moral attitudes, features of economic activity, forms of organization of everyday life, etc. are of great importance. From these forms of social and cultural activity, a person derives his own social roles, speech patterns and behavioral regulations.

It should be emphasized that the identification itself, as well as the sociocultural identification, does not represent a limited stage in the development that ends when a person reaches a certain state; it is a continuous process of a person's acquiring of the new psycho-social and cultural characteristics as the old ones are lost. At every stage of life, a variety of sociocultural attitudes can become dominant for a person.

It is quite natural that a person reconsiders his opinion about himself and about the world as he grows up and expands his life experience, introducing new

facets and poles of reality into the orbit of attention and communication with other people. The formation of identity and its changes occur through the normative psycho-social crises, which constantly replace each other.

A teenage crisis, a bitter farewell to the «illusions of youth», a midlife crisis, a disappointment in the surrounding people, in one's profession, in oneself are quite standard; each person passes these milestones in one way or another.

Among the most painful turning points, it is necessary to name the youth crisis of self-identity. It marks the time of transition from the stage of the imaginary world and a largely inadequate reflection of reality – to the stage of the symbolic world, the direct entry into culture, the time of the first real clashes with its restrictive mechanisms, when the regulatory requirements may be perceived solely as hostile because they infringe on the individual freedom.

During this period, a person gets the opportunity to consciously gain (or lose) his true ego. He enters the world and comes into the direct contact with the reality of the time and place in which he will live. Therefore, adolescence is considered a very turbulent period of life, causing a lot of trouble for both a young man and a society in which he lives.

It is extremely important that, after the end of the youth crisis, a harmonious understanding of a young man is created about his personal involvement in the leading cultural and historical trend of the era and about his own adequate capabilities: in the future it will allow him to maintain the completeness and integrity of his sense of life despite all changes. Most often, it is during this period that the idea of the socio-historical identity of the group (with which the individual identifies himself) will be created as the only authentic, genuine opportunity in order to realize one's own ego in the process of joining the highest realities, as well as gaining the moral immortality.

By the end of adolescence, the socio-cultural roles are usually consolidated: they will determine the path of a person's life in the future.

There are negative and positive identities. The specific list of possible positive and negative roles is determined by the cultural standards and norms that dominate at a particular time; the list may vary.

The process of identification and acquisition of identity is very important in the sociological, psychological and cultural terms. It expresses one of the most important immanent human essences, which realizes the existential needs of a human being as an independent person.

It is customary to highlight several important needs for communication, transcendence, self-identity, and a system of orientation. The needs are immanent in the human essence and are never fully satisfied, acting as a stimulus for the progressive development. At the same time, it is extremely

important to realize that they are unattainable, because the realization of it contributes to the creativity of the individual.

Each of the needs can be satisfied either naturally or in a neurotic, abnormal way. Depending on it, in a society in which the person's existential needs are satisfied, the normal (humanistic) or unhealthy groups and types of people are formed.

Healthy satisfaction of the need for communication is realized in the altruistic love, based on care and responsibility for other people; unhealthy satisfaction of the needs – through violence, rigid subordination of others (and their obedience) to oneself. The maternal, paternal, brotherly love, love for God and oneself can have both healthy and unhealthy connotations. Replacing one type of love with the other leads to a loss of authenticity.

The need for transcendence (or going beyond the physiological boundaries of one's own ego) is also realized in various healthy and unhealthy forms. If this is realized in a natural form, then the results lead to the constructive creativity, to the desire to expand the boundaries of one's existence through really useful and socially significant work. If this is implemented in an unnatural form, then the results are some patterns of aggression, the acts of vandalism, and different destructive actions.

The need for self-identity is satisfied through the search for an internal center of mental life, an independent structure of worldview and a system of values. From the ready-made arsenal of culture, people often borrow certain assessments of the phenomena of the surrounding reality, weigh them, and compare them with their own life experience. (Although it should be noted that in order to satisfy this need, some individuals with poorly developed self-awareness may be guided by blind imitation, unconscious identification with an idol or a deity).

In the interpersonal relationships within a group there is always an element of mutual identification. This is a sign of unity and monolithicity, an indicator of the ability of the people included in it to feel a group unity as belonging to one superpersonal source.

The need for a system of orientation is expressed through a person's desire to understand and master the world, to comprehend the meaning and logic of the development of the universe. A healthy person chooses the type and form of knowledge himself, making sure from his own experience that a certain cognitive program is correct.

At present, we can state the absence of a comprehensive explanation of world processes that can show a satisfactory picture of the diversity of

phenomena in reality. Both the rational-scientific and the religious-mystical models, taken in isolation from each other, are unable to adequately explain the world.

Separately, we should point out the existence of the ethnocultural identification associated with a person's self-awareness within a particular culture. It is characterized by a subjective sense of personal identity with the typological forms of cultural heritage and cultural tradition. When a person comes into the world, he is immersed in a certain cultural inheritance, which he learns from the surrounding people. In this case, the national and ethnic perspective often plays a leading role.

The national and ethnic consciousness presupposes the identification of a person with a certain historical past of his ethnic group. The worldview of an ethnic community is expressed not only through a statement of consanguinity or the presence of common psycho-physiological characteristics, but also through the development of systems of distinctive symbols (emblems, symbols, myths, legends, fairy tales).

The ethnic uniqueness is a relative category, devoid of any meaning outside the system of cultural and historical relations. An ethnic group is not necessarily characterized by unity of territory or blood relationship. It is broader than consanguinity.

The representatives of the same ethnic group can be separated from each other, undergo migration, live for a long time surrounded by other peoples, but still maintain a clearly expressed ethnocultural identity. In this case, it is the nature of cultural identity that is of fundamental importance. It can be preserved for centuries or, on the contrary, lost quite quickly.

An extreme expression of involvement in the so-called universal or global culture can be an orientation towards cosmopolitanism. This form of cultural orientation is considered tantamount to a lack of true identity. It dooms a person to be cut off from one's roots and traditions, from the source of inspiration and creativity.

Currently, the trends towards globalization associated with leveling the diversity of the subcultural and variable forms are fraught with the unification and standardization of the national forms and the cultural identity.

In modern conditions, the cultural identification is undergoing the greatest changes. The place of birth, that determined the nature and form of cultural identification for many centuries, now no longer dominates a person. Without any doubts, a child still comes into the world as a member of a certain family (or an ethnic group), and is brought up in a specific cultural and historical tradition,

but a choice of cultural identity with the intensification of globalization processes is becoming an increasingly widespread practice.

The emergence of the new cultural identification groups that will function as the subcultural formations is a widespread norm today. The acceleration of the pace of social development significantly affects the processes of the cultural identification.

The forms of cultural identity are becoming more and more mobile and situational, not so strictly predetermining the subsequent life of a person. It can be stated with absolute confidence: regardless of what specific forms the cultural demarcation of certain social groups will take, the very principle of identification as a form of realization of the existential needs will certainly be preserved.

The possible loss of one's individual identity can lead a person to a feeling of alienation from the world around him. Such situations are associated with the rapid changes in the sociocultural environment, when a person does not have time to fully perceive and integrate the metamorphoses happening to him and the world.

Loss of identity is expressed in the alienation, the feeling of destruction of one's existence, the depersonalization, and the antisocial behavior. In such a state, a person cannot find a cultural source that can feed him with the vital forces, everywhere he feels like a foreigner and a stranger.

During the periods of rapid sociocultural changes, the crisis of identity can become widespread, giving the rise to the specific eras of timelessness and lost generations. While this process may be accompanied by the technological advances that facilitate the integration of new traditions and structural changes within a monolithic cultural entity having remained hermetically sealed for a long time, there is ultimately a compelling reason to expand the range of the human adaptive capacities.

4. Culturalization and socialization

Culturalization refers to a process of introducing a person to culture; as a result of the process, he acquires certain habits, norms and behavioral stereotypes. In a narrow sense of the word, the culturalization refers to the child's perception of the cultural norms and values. In a broader sense, the process also includes the assimilation of the cultural stereotypes by an adult. In the latter case, the term is applied to a wide range of immigrants who are adapting to the new cultural conditions. With its help, the complex aspects of adaptation associated with entering a different cultural environment are described.

Initially, immediately after its appearance, this term essentially duplicated the already existing term *socialization*. However, today in the specialized branches of scientific and humanitarian knowledge both concepts are actively used and no longer duplicate each other. Each of them has its own area of application; they are used in various scientific fields, although they are often used as the synonyms. It should be remembered that *socialization* refers to the sociological aspects of human adaptation to the environment, while *culturalization* refers to the cultural adaptation.

The process of socialization also includes the process of formation of one's personality. It occurs through a person's assimilation of values, ethical norms, worldviews, and patterns of behavior inherent in a particular society. Emphasis is often placed on the formation of an active life position of an individual based on the assimilation of one's own social experience.

Socialization can be carried out under the targeted influence that is exerted on a person in the process of upbringing, as well as under the influence of a wide range of other environmental factors affecting a person. In such situations, the following actions can be widely used: (1) various educational, pedagogical procedures that exist in any society within the framework of academic educational institutions; (2) various phenomena and forms of social reality – family communication, art, mass media, joint organization of leisure, etc.

Socialization exists in three main areas: activity, communication, self-awareness. An activity is observed when a person is involved in some new practice, as a result of which the new behavioral attitudes are acquired.

As an activity develops, a person learns how to separate the main goals from the secondary ones, comprehend the nature of his own and others' actions, evaluate results, set boundaries, use recommendations, implement tasks, achieve what he wants, etc.

The communication helps to expand a person's social circle and develop his skills. Self-awareness forms the image of a person's own ego as an active individual, contributes to the understanding of his social affiliation and important role in the society, cultivates an increase in the level of self-esteem.

It is customary to distinguish three stages in socialization. The pre-labor stage covers the period of a person's life from birth to the commencement of work. The boundaries of the labor stage include the mature period of a person, when he actively participates in the creative activities of society. The post-labor stage refers to the retirement period of a person's life.

In modern life, every stage of socialization corresponds to some special institutions: family, academic educational institutions, labor groups,

professional communities, informal associations. The impact of each institution is determined by the system of social relations and regulated by the dominant social attitudes.

The process of entering a new cultural space and assimilating an ethnocultural experience, which always appears in a specific form for a historically established culture, is defined as culturalization. Provided that the cultural space is equated with the social space, it is possible to use culturalization and socialization as the synonymous terms.

The specificity of the process of culturalization is inevitably associated with its independence. Due to the fact that mastery of cultural objects is impossible outside the social structure, the social environment is considered a prerequisite for the culturalization of a person in order to assimilate the symbolic space of culture.

The continuity of cultural development gives rise to a unified process of the assimilation of customs and their implementation in the future practice, the conditions for which are provided by each society. Thus, the result of socialization is the acquisition of the ability to change; the results of culturalization are the qualitative features of the changes that have occurred.

The primary socialization, that everyone goes through during childhood, is an incomplete process in an adult socialized person: it is transformed into the processes of culturalization that occur as a result of changing the usual habitat to a new one.

The mastery of cultural objects and their meanings in the course of socialization is possible only within the framework of a certain symbolic semantic environment. The cultural space, the development of which begins with socialization, performs the function of satisfying needs, allowing one to assimilate the principles of cultural norms, and contributes to a person's self-identification.

The cultural space includes many aspects: nature in its original form, the natural environment transformed by man, the world of artifacts, a unified way of life in a local area, the sphere of social relations, etc.

The structure of the local cultural space is present as a feeling of a small homeland or the roots of ancestors in the soul of every person. These experiences characterize the involvement in his community with which he is associated closely. In the process of identifying with this community, a person finds his own continuation in it.

Inclusion in the social connections determines the sociocultural niche of a person that he inherited from his ancestors. The social connections become a

factor that keeps a person in his native area; in real life, he is getting to take root through these connections.

The cultural space first mastered by a child becomes his home: it is preserved as the world of his childhood, a model, consciously or unconsciously reproduced throughout the subsequent life path.

The identification of a person in a certain social environment determines the nature of cognition; the environment is perceived as an essential characteristic of his social existence. The assimilation of stereotypes of this environment is the assimilation of its symbols, which have the ethnic roots.

In addition to the ethnic uniqueness of cultural space, another determining factor is the demographic one. The density of population is an indicator of the degree of development of the area and its cultivation.

The character of the settlement represents the center of a certain culture and, perhaps, a symbol of a future civilization, its center (for example, Babylon, Rome, Egypt). At the same time, the temple architecture symbolizes the religious beliefs of the population, the organization of urban space reflects the state structure of society and the principles of social relations. Often, an immigrant's immersion in the world of an alien culture when moving to a new place causes a feeling of culture shock.

The spatial and temporal characteristics of a person's living space represent the cultural and historical environment, and a person's individuality is the "emptiness" that is filled with the cultural meanings in one's mature life in the process of culturalization. Thanks to such emptiness, a person absorbs the cultural meanings, because culture is necessary for him as the only conceivable environment for his full-fledged life, for the manifestation of his own human essence.

The knowledge about the habitat acquired by a person is transformed into a natural cultural nature, which is understood as a body of knowledge borrowed by a person from a certain form of culture and freely existing in his soul.

The criterion for the culturalization of a person is his beliefs and the body of knowledge which are trusted because they are inherited from the previous generations and confirmed by the authorities of their ancestors; as a consequence, they are almost irrational. Conviction in the truth of the state of things is supported by their practical application and implementation in everyday life.

The meaning of cultural symbols is revealed in the context of everyday life; the revitalization and consolidation of any kind of cultural and historical experience occurs through the understanding of the cultural symbols. This

information is like organic food: in the process of its assimilation, a person grows and evolves.

The assimilated experience allows one to expand the possibilities for a person in order to express his own qualities, transform the cultural objects in the process of active life, and receive the satisfaction from the feeling of the fullness of life.

The fundamental importance of any cultural symbols forces a person to independently stabilize his personal knowledge and correlate it with his life reality. The personal beliefs and doubts are the driving forces of any kind of the information exchange in culture. The authority of the Holy Scripture, a spiritual guide, a teacher, or an ancestor may be considered such driving forces.

The confrontation with such authority is perceived and experienced as a personal drama, although the cyclical nature of states and phases of doubts is inherent in the cultural development of an adult. At the same time, it should be separately noted that culture itself already contains an alternative principle that destroys its integrity.

The main indicator of the originality of a culture is a language that is a natural mediator in the process of culturalization in the understanding of other people's meanings.. Under the influence of cultural pressure, the old way of lifestyle first changes, and then the new words and expressions are borrowed. The new words are fixed in the language, occupying a strong position in the vocabulary provided that the innovations have been consolidated in everyday practice and reflected in social transformation.

The greatest difficulty when coming into contact with a foreign culture is the inability to master its symbolic space due to ignorance of its cultural code. Having found himself in a state of cultural vacuum, having been deprived of the possibility of communication and exchange of the cultural symbols, a person is forced to simultaneously comprehend the material world and the world of symbolic culture.

Learning about another culture greatly facilitates the adaptive processes. Studying a foreign language and establishing the communication connections help to expand the information exchange and to provide some opportunities for a more objective comprehension of the alien culture. However, even with the complete immersion in an alien type of spirituality, a person does not forget his own (old) worldview and his idea of one's own language.

The role of the bodily identification in socialization and culturalization remains significant, but its functions are completely different. The personal separation from other people in the process of socialization is compensated by

a sense of ethnicity (i.e. belonging to a population group or subgroup made up of people who share a common cultural background or descent) through the body as a carrier of the gene pool.

The world religions reject the determining importance of the factor of nationality, placing the spiritual kinship in the foreground, which rightfully allows any kind of religion to be placed at the center of culture. A person's voluntary, conscious choice of his religious affiliation also determines his cultural affiliation, overcoming his genetic limitations.

In primitive societies, the social life is less differentiated, and the cultural identity is determined by membership in the social structure. The social structural relations express the spatial and temporal ideas that are the keys in determining the individual and collective picture of the world.

The entry of a stranger into a primitive social structure (a new clan, a kinship system) is designated by the concept of adoption (i.e. a fact of legally taking another's child and bringing it up as one's own). A stranger is included in one's clan (or a system of clan relations) with a decrease in status. Subsequently, the social mobility is carried out through appropriate rites and sacrifices.

Thus, the kinship, the social and political connections are synthesized and embodied in different cultural symbols. An entry into the system of social relations occurs through the development of symbols in the cultural space and their appropriation, i.e. through the culturalization.

The processes of culturalization can occur both with an individual and with the specific societies. The relocation of clans with certain cultural attitudes to a new cultural environment modifies the relationships within the clan, destroying ties or, conversely, adapting them to some new social relations.

In general, it becomes obvious that the processes of socialization and culturalization are interdependent and are present at every stage of the human cultural and historical development. The socialization emphasizes the status position of a person in any social relations. The culturalization represents the process of mastering the symbolic space associated with this status and the entire structure of social relations, its historical determinism, expressed in the national culture.

The primary cultural space, which forms the picture of the world, determines a worldview in the future life activity of a person. Children of any cultural community are more similar to each other than to their ancestors, so if a child from Ukraine ends up in the United States, then as an adult he will act and think like the American, not like the Ukrainian.

In intercultural relations, the cultural and ethnic affiliation comes to the fore and determines any kind of interaction, while the position of social status recedes into the background.

The intracultural relations, on the contrary, are distanced by social affiliation, taking place against the background of cultural unity. The differentiation of these processes from the installation of *me* and *alien* allows us to draw a line between the socialization and the culturalization of a person.

5. Culture and human being

The history of mankind, to one degree or another, preserves the impersonality of an individual person throughout the entire existence of the traditional society and the traditional culture (i.e. based on the dominance of traditions and stable forms of thinking, behavior, and activity transmitted from generation to generation).

A new type of culture, that originated in Europe in the middle of the second millennium and determined the fate of the entire Western civilization, is called individualistic because it proclaimed, approved and legally legitimized the individual rights – the person's right to be an individuality without submitting to the power of any tradition. As a result, Napoleon Bonaparte, a simple officer who rose to the rank of Emperor of France, became a recognizable hero of that time. An important social event was the French Revolution, that contributed to the overthrow of the monarchy by the French people, and subsequently returned it in a new capacity: it has been proved that the people (as a collective individuality) can choose their own social system. In art, romanticism became a milestone and an aesthetic phenomenon; romanticism recognized the artist as a person and creator free from the power of the classical traditions, because he had the right to create his own world and his own ideals.

It is necessary to distinguish between the models *culture / person* and *culture / individuality*. The content of the first model is timeless; it consists in identifying the role of a man as the creator of culture and the role of culture as the creator of a man. The content of the second problem is socio-historical, especially relevant in modern conditions in the moral, aesthetic and artistic terms. It consists in establishing the special qualities that give rise to a person's self-awareness and the need for self-expression in culture, because it is precisely these personal qualities that are shaped by the modern culture.

Particular attention should be focused on the general patterns of relationships between any culture and a human existence – on those issues that are at the intersection of the philosophy of culture and philosophical

anthropology. A man creates culture precisely in this mode of his being, while the defining qualities are those that provide intelligence, spirituality, freedom, and creative nature of activity.

If the psyche as a method of cerebral control of behavior is already typical for the higher animals due to the complexity of their behavior (compared to the lifestyle of insects or fish), then intelligence is a level of mental functioning that is inherent only to humans.

Intelligence is formed in the process of a person's practical activity and in accordance with his needs; as a result, intelligence must be recognized as a cultural phenomenon. This conclusion is confirmed by observing a child: a child from birth has a psyche like the higher animals, but his intellect is formed in the process of culturalization (i. e. learning how to speak, read, communicate, etc.).

So, the development of intelligence lies at the basis of the history of culture. This psychic force carried out knowledge of the world and self-knowledge of a man, gave rise to the mythological ideas about existence, and then rose to the level of scientific, artistic and philosophical comprehension of reality, formed an educational system – in a word, raised humanity from primitiveness to the highest level of civilization.

In psychology, intelligence is interpreted from two different positions. The first view defines intelligence as a general mental ability that is innate or inherited, but cannot be trained or taught. The second position represents intelligence as a structure and as the development of human mental processes, which are generated culturally through the historically developing practical activity.

A systematic view of the structure, functioning and development of the psyche allows us to see in it an integrity that unites all its component parts, formed by the interaction of these parts. The study of these connections and the mental effect, that they generate, is carried out within the framework of psychology.

We can conclude that any culture is the result of the activity of the intellect as a systemic integrity due to the fact that the psyche of a modern man differs from the psyche of the human ancestors as a result of the transformation of initial psycho-physiological data by the forces of culture, and the need for different mental energies leads to their embodiment in the cultural objects.

The concept of *culture* is broader in its content than the concept of *intelligence*, because the first concept includes the action of the irrational, subconscious forces, and the second one traditionally designates only the rational, conscious level of mental functioning.

However, there is no doubt that the history of culture owes its main achievements to intellect, and not to some mystical insights and fantasies. This fact is of particular importance in our time, when, due to a number of socio-historical reasons, the human society has entered a time of the severe spiritual crisis: the various manifestations of mysticism are flourishing, the religious and mythological vision of the world is being rehabilitated, and the scientific worldview is being discredited.

The representatives of Western culture call for focusing on the culture of the East; the religion is again starting to take on the role of a leader in the political life of society. In such conditions, the importance of philosophical and cultural apology for intelligence increases. If humanity can save itself from the impending environmental disaster or the dangerous experiments in genetic engineering, it will do so through the power of human intelligence, and not through the religious prayers or mystical fortune-telling.

In the history of culture, in parallel with the intellect, another synthetic energy of the human psyche has also been formed – the energy of the spirit.

The basis of the intellect is rational, the basis of the energy of the spirit is emotional; the development of intelligence is connected with the history of science and education, the history of the spiritual intentions of culture is linked with religion and art.

The modern culture absolutizes the value of individual existence, isolating itself from everything that is socially organizing, scientific, cognitive, transcendental and religious; therefore, the modern culture turns out to be equally distant from both polar directions of human interests. Nowadays the urgent need to study the history of spirituality, which, along with intellect, is one of the two mental platforms of culture, is becoming obvious.

The differences between intellect and spirit are that intellect underlies the knowledge of nature, society, and man in order to translate the acquired knowledge into any practical actions.

The spirit manifests itself in a person's relationship to other people and to the whole reality created by people, when the phenomena of reality are likened to a person and assessed from a human perspective. A poetic sublime attitude towards nature is a characteristic of the true spirituality. Such perception, formed by culture, becomes a cultural phenomenon and shapes the culture of the reader.

Like the human intellect, spiritual feelings, attitudes, and needs are not innate to the individuality, but are developed during life: in the experience of his activities, in the communication with other people, in the development of

cultural heritage that preserves the existential experience of the previous generations.

A man inherited aggressiveness from his ancestors as a life-support instinct, since a destruction for food is a biological law of existence. It also acts during the confrontation between males to gain leadership in the herd. The biological law, therefore, lies in the power of force.

A feature of the human existence, which has become one of the defining signs of culture, is the suppression of aggressiveness by tabooing certain forms of behavior within the tribe. The culture has developed the peaceful, diplomatic ways to achieve goals that are being used more and more widely and more successfully in our time, representing an alternative to the self-destruction of humanity. Their essence is to strengthen morality and spirituality in relations between people, replacing the consumer, pragmatic relations.

Historically, the initial positive attitude towards another person was limited to the community, in which the members of the community were opposed to all strangers as the representatives of other communities. This shape of consciousness has survived till present day in the form of nationalism, chauvinism, racism, religious intolerance, gender and age opposition. But this shape of consciousness is still gradually being pushed aside by the expanding relationship of a person's own ego to the ego of other people outside the group consciousness within the community.

The perception of another person as an equal in his human status gave rise to such a form of value consciousness as morality. It, in turn, was based on spirituality as a selfless attitude towards another person, an equal participant in joint activity in all its forms.

The human spiritual activity was a necessary condition for uniting different people in order to regulate behavior. Without it, humanity could not unite in space and time, and would not be able to pass on the accumulated experience to the future generations.

The reluctance to remain within the narrow confines of a person's inner world and the focus on uniting people into a certain community have become the important differences between spirituality and instinctuality. The spiritual sphere of culture has appeared since the functioning of the human verbal language, that became established as the main means of exchanging the intellectual information.

The religious and mythological consciousness has become a special, transformed form of spirituality, implying the selfless love for the Creator, sometimes reaching the point of fanatical self-denial and self-sacrifice. A

spiritual attitude excludes violence and opposes the egoistic joy of possessing and submitting to one's power.

The natural question is about the reason for the emergence of the ability of a human psyche to produce the spiritual energy. The simple answer is contained in the primitive mythology and the religious philosophy that have recognized it as reality: the human spirituality is a gift from God. The opposite answer is given by the positivist thinking, according to which the basis of a person's spirituality is his altruism.

Both of these explanations may be considered not entirely convincing, because the first explanation can satisfy only the believers, and the second one contradicts such facts as the lack of universality of the altruistic motivation in all human actions. It may be reasonable to explain all aspects of spirituality, including altruism, by the special character of human practice and its historical evolution.

The practice should be understood not as the activity of an abstract person, but as social production and social organizational activity. Throughout the world's cultural history, humanity has dreamed of free labor, the equality of people, regardless of their social status. A reflection of this dream is present, in particular, in the fairy tales about a world in which everyone is equal and freed from hard work.

The formation of this type of consciousness occurred in line with the denial of the real practice: mythology, religion, and art constructed the models of being that were negative in relation to the social reality. In these areas of culture, the human spiritual energy developed, initially associated with the creative action. As a result, the embodiment of human spirituality was the Creator, God.

The displacement of religious consciousness by secular consciousness forced people to think about how to achieve the triumph of the spirit embodied in freedom, equality and brotherhood of all people in the real world.

The scientific approach requires turning to the modern practice in order to highlight the processes that bring to life the spiritual regulators of human behavior.

The capitalist society has proven that its driving forces remain diametrically opposed to the spiritual forces. This is absolutely natural: following the law of competition, the desire to extract the maximum profit, and the egoistic consciousness of a merchant are contrary to the interests of the human spirit.

Humanity is faced with an alternative: either to come to terms with the death of the spirit and the reign of total pragmatism, or to begin to search for such forces in the modern life that are in need of spiritual support in a new

cultural appearance. Such forces are capable of the spiritualizing of science and technology, strengthening the spiritual stimuli of the human existence and social development.

This form of spirituality is morality – the only form of the value consciousness that unites different people regardless of their ideological and behavioral preferences. Political beliefs, religious faith, existential values, aesthetic tastes, artistic preferences, etc. can divide any people, but only a moral imperative can unite the same people.

Morality does not contradict the scientific knowledge; on the contrary, it spiritually unites people with the help of its value language. In our era, the spiritual unity of humanity is vital – this idea has become widespread. The destruction of the world culture and its creators can only be avoided by forces of the united intellect of humanity and culture itself, if the culture is able to impart the necessary energy to its spiritual and moral potential.

Another potential of culture is freedom. This implies freedom as a form of human activity, his self-awareness and self-esteem, as the ability to act in accordance with his own needs and interests, and not on the orders of some external forces.

The freedom of a person or a people inevitably collides with the needs and interests of other people. It deprives freedom of its absoluteness and confronts it with the need to correlate and balance the freedom of everyone with the freedom of others: this is realized with the help of taboos, unspoken customs, norms of life, etc.

Specific historical, social and cultural systems dictate a variety of different ways of establishing the relative freedom, but this process always occurs, since freedom is inherent in human life as well as intellect and spirit, which determines the place of this cultural potential in the complex human existence.

A biological form of life does not know freedom, because this property is not needed by an animal. Any animal has the ability to move at any moment in its life. However, this choice cannot be called free, because it is strictly predetermined by the instincts of hunger, fear, need for rest, etc.

A person's behavior at every moment of his life is determined by a conscious or intuitive choice of activity or passivity. His decisions may be completely unexpected, but if they are made voluntarily, they lead to responsibility for the actions taken. It makes the human choices often excruciatingly difficult. Sometimes various kinds of psychological barriers, that prevent the choice of the right decision, can cause people to completely turn down freedom and making any independent decisions.

However, in general, the value of freedom is very high for humanity. As the history of the 20-th century has shown, despite all the costs of free choice, humanity rejects the totalitarian regimes with their attempts to destroy freedom as a gain of present civilization.

At the same time, in some societies the problem of correlating the individual freedom and the interests of society as a whole remains unresolved; a person's problem leaves the opposition of democracy and anarchy to each other without an acceptable solution.

Another important difference between people and animals, that appeared in the process of cultural development, lies in the sphere of creative potential. The human modeling activity becomes creativity because its programs are developed by each person in the process of his cultural evolution. These programs are constantly updated, modified, and improved.

The differences between a skilled worker, a talented inventor or a brilliant discoverer lie in the level of creativity in their activities. In principle, every person is a potential creator, since the lack of the genetic programming of activity makes it necessary to consciously search for new objects, means, and ways of working with them.

Therefore, the history of mankind demonstrates a slow but constant enrichment of the environment with new objects and technologies for their production, new social institutions and ways of organizing public life, new ideas, theories, artistic masterpieces, etc. We can say that a man is a creature sentenced to eternal creativity.

There is another important component as the basis of the fundamental qualities of culture, this component is the communication between people. Spiritual, material and artistic cultural systems certainly include the communication of people as a way of their self-organization in the collective solution of some complex problems.

However, one should not equate socialising with communication. If communication is a process of transferring some pieces of information from someone who owns it to someone who does not, then socialising is a joint development by partners of information that is common to them. In addition, communication is carried out by intellectual, mainly verbal actions, while socialising involves all possible languages and means of spiritual and artistic culture. Communication is realized as a certain voice from the past, informing about different facts from the past, while socialising with the past is the involvement in the life of people who already passed away: nevertheless, we continue to perceive these dead people as our contemporaries, making them our interlocutors.

One of the inventions of culture is that the past can be turned into the present – albeit illusory, but perceived as real or quasi-present. As for the representatives of the truly present time, they try to consolidate in order to solve their common problems of industrial, organizational, intellectual, artistic, and sports nature. They form a certain community, that can include a family, a friendly group or a national community.

It is not surprising that the term *dialogue*, that back in the 19-th century had a narrow linguistic meaning, has acquired a broad aesthetic, cultural, and philosophical meaning in the 20-th and 21-st centuries. This rethinking has corresponded to the growing awareness by society of the need to form the unity of humanity at all levels of existence as a condition for its survival and cultural evolution. In society, the rethinking has responded to requests for the growth of personal awareness and the need to form the unity of humanity at all levels of existence as a condition for its survival and cultural evolution.

6. Culture and society

The understanding of culture and society is so close to each other that their content often does not differ. Meanwhile, they represent two different systems, each of which is developed according to its own laws.

First of all, it is necessary to take into account the significant differences in the interpretation of the concept of *society*. Any society can be considered either as a sum of certain connections and relationships in which people are in relation to each other, or as a unity of base and superstructure. Regarding the second option, the debates are often conducted about whether a society should be understood as a supra-individual objective social structure or as a human world of life, filled with strictly human culture and strictly human content.

In any case, the human society is a real and always specific environment for the functioning and development of culture. Culture and society live according to extra-natural laws: society – according to the law of the replacement of one state by another, culture – according to the law of accumulation of values, that allows the creations of the past and the present to exist and function in the same era.

However, culture and society have always actively interacted with each other: society has made certain demands on culture, which those (who are called the cultural figures) tried to meet. Undoubtedly, culture has influenced the life of society and the direction of its development, regardless of the extent to which its leaders were aware of it.

Concepts such as citizenship, lack of ideas, art for art's sake, escapism, realism, surrealism quite clearly emphasize the intensity of the relationship between culture and society.

In the history of mankind, there have been three different ways of organizing the life of society: these ways are characterized by different forms of relations between people, society, and different types of culture. In the archaic society, a man was dissolved in the collective consciousness of his tribal group.

The next historical type of culture was based on the clan stratification of society, that required the formation of a state and the emergence of a secular sovereign. This type of society – with its corresponding political and religious culture – existed for several thousand years and then lost its influence.

In our time, the democratic way of organizing the life of society in the democratic self-organizing states of Europe has come to the fore; it is quite obvious that these states are based on a civil society with a corresponding type of culture.

The civil society is a system of social relations that arises in the course of self-organization of members of society. As a rule, all representatives of society recognize themselves as free citizens, while agreeing with certain forms of organizing their joint life and activities, so that chaos does not destroy this orderliness of the social life and its culture.

The definition of «civil» means the highest manifestation of economic, political and legal culture. Consequently, the civil society is the fruit of the joint creativity of society and culture.

The role of culture in this synthetic formation is manifested at the economic, political, legal, philosophical, scientific levels of its existence (with awareness of the peculiarities of its historical being). A complete and adequate understanding of civil society can be obtained subject to the mandatory identification of the role of spiritual awareness in the actual practice of civil relations.

If previously the hierarchical organization of society was based on the forceful domination and subordination (a method of life support that is biological in its origin), then the very achievements of culture acted as the instruments of violence.

However, the civil society has managed to build the relationships between people as the citizens with equal rights in their common activity on the basis of cooperation, communication, dialogue, i.e. the actual cultural practices that were unknown to the biological form of existence of living beings. As a result, our modernity is characterized by an intense search for ways to a democratic

life – it is possible only if there is a foundation of civil society. The problem of the formation and development of the socio-historical formation has acquired particular contemporary relevance throughout the world.

In our time, there has been a kind of inversion in the relationship between society and culture. If in the previous history of mankind the nature of culture directly depended on the social system that governed it, then recently the balance of power between the two sides of the sociocultural sphere of existence has changed: the social relations began to depend on the state of material and spiritual culture.

The stages of the search can be traced by such cultural characteristics as the industrial civilization, the scientific and technical civilization, and the information society. The evolution in the understanding of the term «civilizational approach» to history is that the concept of «civilization» began to absorb the concept of «society».

This can be explained by the fact that the development of science has removed culture from the power of social relations, since the use of scientific achievements no longer depends on the nature of the social system.

Everywhere you can see the signs of integration processes carried out at the scientific, technological, informative levels, i.e. in the general cultural (or civilizational) sphere.

Previously, all scientific discoveries and technical inventions had a geopolitical localization and could be used in the armed clashes between states, providing one of the opponents with victory over the other.

Currently, the possibility of using the thermonuclear weapons has no geographic localization. Given the unprecedented danger to life itself on the planet, the technology can become relatively safe only if people overcome the eternal group egoism and realize themselves as a single humanity.

Understanding the need to overcome the confrontational disunity of the inhabitants on the planet has existed for a long time. However, the proposed methods for solving the problem were perceived as utopian (for example, the teachings of L. Tolstoy, M. Gandhi, utopian socialism, etc.). At the same time, the great hopes were placed on the moral and aesthetic methods in resolving the historical division of humanity.

However, in a society in which the consciousness of people is determined by their selfish material interests, the spiritual factors are capable of determining the behavior of individuals, but not the actions of large social forces that govern different states.

At present, we have to admit that the spiritual teachings have failed to unite humanity, that continues to expand the sphere of political confrontation and ideological conflicts.

The determining factor in the fate of humanity today is not the structure of society, but the degree of its cultural development. Upon reaching a certain level, culture entails a radical reorganization of society and the entire system of social management, giving rise to a different way of resolving the contradictions and conflicts: this way – unknown to the animal world and contrarian to violence – is a dialogue.

A dialogue is a spiritual form of the intersubjective relations, i.e. a way of communication between people in which they treat each other as an equal subject who freely chooses one's values and does not impose them on another person.

The goal of dialogue is to achieve a unity with another person (a partner in a dialogue), a common worldview and a value orientation, which is necessary for successful joint actions. If the unequal relationships between people are usually denoted by the formula «I – he», then the formula of dialogue as a symmetrical form of interpersonal communication is «I – you». If we are talking about a dialogue between large entities (nations, states, generations, cultures), then its formula appears in the form of «we – you».

The destiny of the term «dialogue» itself is indicative: from a private term in linguistics, denoting the conversation of people in life or on stage, the concept has turned into one of the fundamental categories in philosophy of anthropology and cultural studies. (As an example, let us point out the functioning of the UN, that indicates the awareness – of statesmen from all countries in the world – of the need to replace any form of violence with a dialogue as an alternative to war in relations between modern states).

On a more modest scale of the interstate relations, a dialogue has also become a method of communication between diplomats, politicians and lawyers: they understand well that the various kinds of contradictions, that arise in the relations between some individual countries, can be resolved either by force or by reaching the compromises during the dialogical contacts between the leaders of countries.

The main difficulty is that each participant in the dialogue maintains his subjective independence when the participants try to reach an acceptable solution. If the representatives of several states take part in the discussion, then the dialogue turns into a polylogue: this form of communication can extremely complicate the search for a solution to the problem under question.

An obstacle to a dialogue may be the persistent socio-psychological complex «we – they», that determines the chauvinistic behavior of the impersonal crowd and its populist leaders. It is obvious that the path of dialogue is the only promising one in the modern development of humanity.

7. The functioning of culture.

A systematic approach to the scientific consideration of culture involves the inclusion of the functional characteristics in its analysis.

The functional aspect concerns the following important problems: any objective goals that stimulated the historical development of culture as a functional system, as well as the mechanisms of its functioning that ensure the achievement of these goals.

Due to the fact that culture lives and acts in the real existence of humanity, the spatial and temporal dimensions of existence function intensively.

It is believed that the role of culture in the spatial dimension is to satisfy the needs of people that culture generates by itself, and at the same time to form any new needs that ennoble and spiritualize the biological needs (for food, rest, sexual relations). As a result of these challenging, intersecting processes, there may be the fact of the emergence of some new, purely cultural necessities (literature, art, music, science, intellectual communication, etc.). In general, this role of culture can be defined as the consistent and comprehensive humanization of human life.

The importance of such cultural actions is controversial. The dialectics of human existence leads to the development by humanity not only of such forms of behavior (and, consequently, of mediated consciousness), the humanistic value of which exceeds the cruelty of wild animals and their lack of spirituality, but also such forms in which people can manifest certain animal qualities (robbery, murder, torture, etc.).

Sometimes the same actions receive the opposite evaluations in a human society: some people consider them as cultural, while others consider them as barbaric. It can be correlated with faith, lack of faith, the use of profanity, tattoos, makeup, fashion, etc.

Culture evaluates itself, and its evaluations often turn out to be different and diametrically opposed, because they are given from the positions of different social groups, which may be antagonists in their minds. These are, for example, assessments of the Great French Revolution, nazism, religious wars and conflicts.

As a rule, only an ontological approach to culture is not enough, because such situations need to be approached from an axiological position. And yet,

culture achieves its lofty goal of spiritualization and ennoblement of existence, that demonstrates the progress of human society in its highest manifestations.

In the functioning of culture there is also an important aspect concerning the sphere of its self-regulation: this role is played by philosophy (or consciousness of culture) and art (or self-consciousness of culture).

Philosophy as a special worldview system provides culture with holistic information about the world, which is the environment of culture. Art demonstrates the state of culture in a particular time as a single whole for a particular nation.

In a way, art in the diversity of its forms can be called a mirror of culture, in which it is reflected in the integrity of its being (for example, the complete oeuvre of W. Shakespeare as a mirror of the Renaissance, the oeuvres of J.-W. Goethe and F. Schiller – as a transition from the Enlightenment to the Romanticism, etc.).

From this point of view, a fact that has been known since antiquity becomes explainable. This fact is based on the idea that art has an imaginative structure, and philosophy – a theoretical structure.

If in the life of systems there is a law according to which a function determines a structure, then the difference between the structures of art and philosophy is explained by the difference in their functions.

Culture stimulates the unification of spiritual foundations with material ones, rational activity with emotional energy, conscious activity with the unconscious sphere of psyche. Only a figurative system (or a structure within culture) can represent such a fusion in the unity of historical content and psychological specifics of a particular personality.

At the same time, an adequate idea of the external world, its natural and social content can only be given by philosophy in the language of theoretical abstractions.

In some cases, under certain cultural conditions, the special synthetic artistic and philosophical structures are possible (for example, myths), in which consciousness and self-awareness of culture cannot yet be separated. Subsequently, such mythological roots can be traced in the oeuvres of the ancient Greek playwrights, the poets and painters of the Renaissance, the thinkers of the Enlightenment, and the representatives of the existential culture of the 20-th century.

At the same time, already in the 19-th century. there was a tendency to transform philosophy into artistic journalism (for example, the oeuvres of F. Nietzsche [27]), that was opposed to the old form of classical discourse of philosophers (G. Hegel [5], Au. Comte [23], L. Feuerbach [22] et al.).

In the 20-th century the triumph of individual freedom of thought and creativity in the modern and postmodern culture led to a chaotic juxtaposition of various kinds of modifications as well as a combinatorics of the relationship between art and philosophy (from their mutual opposition to special forms of artistic philosophy and philosophical art).

In general, all these tendencies gave rise to a skeptical attitude towards the very possibility of determining the essence of philosophy and art, the platform of their relationship.

It is obvious that the changes in these relationships are determined by the historical dynamics of culture and, most importantly, by the process of disintegration of mythological consciousness. As a result, in the future it is quite possible that a probable scenario will arise that culture in the process of its evolution will formulate its demands in relation to art and philosophy.

The future of culture is connected with overcoming the current chaos and restoring the natural boundaries between philosophy and art for the full implementation of their original functions. With all the variety of forms of their interpenetration, philosophy must remain philosophy, and art must remain art.

The role of culture over time is to transmit the behavioral programs through some object carriers or collectors of the accumulated cultural experience. Such experience covers the basic values and aspects of any human activity, projects and fantasies, forms of communication (which unite people with common knowledge), as well as certain artistic images – they have become inseparable as knowledge-values-ideals-ways of communication.

In the real life of a particular person, culture acts as an integral unity of certain spiritual qualities that are acquired in the course of the historical development of mankind.

In the process of evolution, the fruit of culture becomes its objectivity, that is independent of its creators, and the independent existence of its intellectual and spiritual content: knowledge, values, ideals, skills, needs, interests.

Thus, the cultural objects are capable of not only satisfying the people's needs, but also becoming the memory of humanity, in which the collective experience of people has been encoded.

8. Dynamics of cultural existence

Due to the fact that the socio-cultural systems are strikingly different from the natural systems in terms of historical existence, their study requires a correlation in the synchronic and diachronic terms: it can be realized on the platform of synergetics.

Synergetics forms a methodological program for the theory of systems and the principles of the systemic research based on the study of the patterns in the development of processes in the complex and super-complex self-governing systems, more specifically – the stages of their self-organization and reorganization. Culture belongs to just such systems, so the application of culturologic thought in relation to the synergetic basis turned out to be very promising.

History as a specific way of existence of humanity has a number of fundamentally important features that do not allow a simplified interpretation of the elementary variability of the forms of being.

These features are based on the following positions: firstly, with all the significance of the influence of the natural environment, history is based on the natural processes of sociocultural changes, internally motivated by the actual movement of humanity.

Secondly, the historical form of being is characterized by the development of the system – the movement from lower forms to more complex and more advanced forms from the point of view of the system's connections with the environment and its own life support.

Thirdly, it expresses the objective purposefulness of the process. This process is independent of the extent to which purposefulness is realized within the system itself and how wide the spectrum of its multilinear movement is. A generalizing definition of all the listed features of the historical movement is the concept of self-development, since the changes may occur under the influence of both internal and external causes: if so, then the development is a consequence of internal impulses.

Some philosophers tried to discover the reasons for the metamorphoses occurring in the life of society and in the evolution of culture in space (for example, the impact of solar energy on human activity), comparing the processes occurring in different regions of the globe and at the same time completely different from each other in content, by the speed of implementation, by the ratio of individual energy and mass energy.

There have also been other philosophers who put forward the idea that the development of culture represents a reflection of changes in the economic structure of society. In this context, the economic, productive relations and the forms of property, that embody them, have been interpreted as the generation of a certain level in the development of productive forces, which, at a high level of the civilizational development, were embodied in the corresponding layer of material culture. This idea is based on the fact that with the acquisition of any

new productive forces, people change their method of production; and with the change in the productive method and the means of securing the human livelihood, people also change all their social relations.

Thus, while certainly recognizing the direct influence of a society on the development of culture, it is also necessary to emphasize that its own self-development has a strong impact on the history of culture as well.

The features in the synergetic principle of self-development of a complex system help to realize and come to an understanding of the idea that the existence of local civilizations is quite possible – they might represent the separate branches in the development of human culture.

From a synergetic perspective, the history of world culture begins with the era of the ancient stone age and the subsequent centuries of iron and bronze: according to the archaeological periodization, it was then that a primitive society with its inherent type of culture was finally formed.

The existence of that society was based on three methods of subsistence: hunting, gathering and manual production of the first tools. The main distinguishing feature of that culture was the syncretic nature of existence, in which the spiritual forms of activity were not yet separated from the material ones. The artistic consciousness was mythological: it permeated all spheres of life and governed all forms of activity.

That cultural system was very stable. However, due to the fact that gradually the programs of behavior and activity started to be determined by the developing energy of the intellectual and spiritual stimuli, that system was slowly undermined by certain internal forces which were born from the need to make labor easier and increase its efficiency.

In the long run, after mastering the technology of iron casting and thanks to the equipment of production with the simplest tool mediators, the characteristics of a culture based on handicrafts began to manifest themselves more clearly. In accordance with the favorable natural conditions, humanity followed the path of non-linear progress, testing the possibilities of a new direction that opened up.

A civilization took its first steps in the countries of the Ancient East, where the culture of advanced agriculture rapidly developed along with the growth of cities and the development of monumental art; with the advent of writing and education; with strengthening the foundations of scientific thinking and cultivating the anthropomorphic rather than zoomorphic myths; with the invention of an active stimulator of trade – a money circulation. Finally, to preserve the immensely complicated existence, the classes of priesthood, military staff and officials were formed.

This trajectory of human development turned out to be more promising than the model of life of nomads, therefore it remained the basis of the material, spiritual and artistic existence of the peoples of the East for thousands of years. The extremely strong, stable type of culture that developed in the eastern countries is called traditional and is reflected in the culturological concept of the East.

The trajectory of non-linear cultural development was also laid out in Ancient Greece – the only region where handicraft became the dominant model of production.

The fundamental difference between crafts, agriculture or cattle breeding is that it is an inherently creative form of activity, because it creates something that does not exist in nature. On this basis, a new type of human self-awareness grew that was poetically described by Sophocles for the first time in the history of culture: there are many forces in nature, but there are no forces that are stronger than a man. The ancient philosopher Protogor believed that a man was the measure of all things – those that exist and those that do not exist. These ideas have been embodied by sculptors in the images of ideal people with the divine appearance.

The Greek civilization found its continuation in Ancient Rome, but, unfortunately, subsequently degenerated. The Roman republican system was defeated in a clash with barbarian nomads, since the real level of existence did not yet provide the necessary advantages over the brute force. Over the next thousand years, a new model of society based on agriculture was established and strengthened in Europe (to some extent, it correlated with the culture that was already known in the societies of the Ancient East).

Traditionalism, naturally generated by the entire agricultural system, became the dominant cultural principle. It was expressed in a consistently primitive, conservative technology and in submission to the cyclical rhythm of nature; in consolidating the mythological understanding of natural elements and submission to their power; in the monarchical system of government and its reliance on the armed forces in the form of professional armies; in the concentration of crafts and trade in the cities.

With all the stability of this society and its specific culture, the new trends gradually began to appear in the European cities. These trends caused the collapse of a traditional culture and the formation of a new (or modern) civilization.

Within the boundaries of the new civilization, the individual's right to independent thinking was opposed to the traditional forms of thinking, behavior

and activity. If the previously dominant thinking was based on the Holy Scripture, then the bearers of the new model focused on the scientific knowledge of nature, on the freely chosen values (in all areas of activity: religion, politics, art, philosophy, aesthetics, etc.).

At the same time, the paths of cultural development were divided into three vectors of movement from the old to the new. In the sphere of scientific, artistic and philosophical consciousness, it took shape in a vector that is now known as the Renaissance period: it was partially based on the ancient heritage.

In the sphere of still strong faith, based on the religious dogmas, the human consciousness followed the vector of development, that is now defined as the period of the Reformation. In the sphere of political consciousness, the vector of theoretical and practical republicanism, democratic and utopian ideas was fixed.

In painful contradictions, ideological and bloody conflicts, a parallel and often violent transition was carried out from the traditional culture, based on the established model of mythological consciousness, to a culture of individualism. This culture tried to justify the dominance of its dogmas on the basis of scientific knowledge of the world, the democratic structure of social life and personal freedom (i.e. its absolute independence and activity in the technical, artistic, philosophical spheres of consciousness).

It is known that over the past two centuries the dominance of this type of culture did not mean the end of opposition to it on the part of the bearers of archaic forms of consciousness, deeply archived at the subconscious level. The resistance occurred and continues to occur in various forms and modifications – from the ideological protests to the terrorist acts.

This path is fraught with its own acute contradictions: freedom, democracy, ability to creatively renew the existing world, knowledge of the secrets of nature are not the absolute benefits of civilization. They hide some dangers for their own realization.

Freedom can turn into the criminal arbitrariness and selfish self-will; democracy – the crowd power; the successes of science in the study of nature and man – such a practical use of acquired knowledge that can serve the forces of evil and ultimately destroy the whole life on Earth; creativity – the desire for originality for the sake of originality and, in particular, in the coquetry of the representatives of postmodern philosophy. It means that culture, civilization, and man should not be idealized, turning a blind eye to the ambivalence of their meaning in the history of the universe and material existence.

However, one should not panic in the face of threats of the environmental disaster, the human cloning or the Islamization of the whole humanity. There

are always some ways to save culture, although its modern bearers still need to realize that only culture itself has the ability to overcome its own negative processes and to find some effective ways in order to resolve its own internal contradictions.

9. Subculture and counterculture

Despite the fact that every cultural era has always had a certain integrity and one can easily identify its distinctive features, within its borders such an era is heterogeneous.

In any historical era, along with the mainstream (i.e. the official and politically encouraged culture), there are various subcultures that can differ quite significantly from the orthodox (or recognized as completely correct) practices. It is explained by the fact that culture includes a large amount of heterogeneous material.

It is generally accepted that culture has always had some relative independence. At the same time, the components of the general cultural ensemble include science, religion, morality, art, political institutions, family, education, upbringing, etc., which do not violate the general harmonious platform.

In general, these parts still have their own rhythms of development, history, and a set of characteristic features, in which the leading cultural trends of the era are refracted differently. As a consequence, any form of typification is nothing more than a speculative abstraction, a distraction from reality in order to create certain harmonious models that are necessary in the process of cognition. Accordingly, what is abstractly defined as the culture of Antiquity, the Middle Ages, the Renaissance, etc., is in fact very complex formations, including various trends, styles, traditions, behavioral and mental regulations, forms of positioning oneself in life, etc.

Culture as a single organism is extremely complex, infinitely diverse, and full of direct and indirect contradictions. At any time, specific cultures of the urban formations differed significantly from the rural ones. The differences concerned clothing, speech, and behavior of the urban and rural residents.

The official culture of parades and demonstrations could be opposed by popular culture. Today, in most European countries, along with the Christian culture, more archaic, pagan layers continue to exist. The cultures of children and adults, teenagers and pensioners differ quite sharply. The separate age categories of people practise specific lifestyles and spend their leisure time differently.

A person's cultural appearance is also predetermined by his social affiliation. A businessman, an official, a worker are capable of forming fairly autonomous cultural communities that may either not come into contact with each other or treat other communities with prejudice and hostility.

Initially in their humanitarian consciousness, the Europeans were of the opinion that ancient Greece was a harmonious unity that existed in serenity and balance. However, a work «The Birth of Tragedy from the Spirit of Music, or Hellenism and Pessimism» (1872) by F. Nietzsche [17] significantly shook this idea.

The German philosopher convincingly argued the idea that the Hellenistic era was tragic against the background of a complete lack of unity in the culture. For a long time, two opposing principles can be traced in it – the Apollonian, rational, and the Dionysian, irrational. These principles acted as conditions for the development and improvement of all forms of the cultural structure of the ancient Greeks, permeating all levels of real life.

There is also a persistent idea that the culture of the European Middle Ages was gloomy, thoroughly imbued with religiosity, which did not allow any attempts to disturb the seriousness of the Christian mystery.

At the same time, it is known that, along with the Christian canon, there were other cultural practices that were very different from the official canon. This different set of values is associated with the tradition of the European carnival. The carnival alternative culture acted as the antipode of medieval officialdom, which was due to the essence of folk festive actions, in which the tops and bottoms of life changed places, and the joys of life on the bodily, carnal level came to the fore.

The picturesque appearance of the late Middle Ages is presented in the work «Herfsttij der Middeleeuwen» (or «The Waning of the Middle Ages») by J. Huizing [26]. The researcher believes that the colorfulness of everyday life was characteristic of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, therefore these eras were devoid of gloom, contempt for the carnal pleasures, ostentatious religiosity. It is indicated that the Christian doctrine was violated everywhere, and the ideological religiosity coexisted with the secular courtliness.

Another example of the peculiarities of European culture up to the Renaissance is the following fact: children did not represent a separate cultural and age formation. The child of that time was seen as a small adult who was obliged to follow the same standards in his behavior as his parents. It came from a lack of awareness that the worlds of adults and children were radically different from each other. Only much later (due to definite political and

sociocultural circumstances) were these two worlds separated from one another. Thus, a subculture of a different age category appeared within the previously unified cultural space.

Using the category of subculture, it is possible to discover that within the dominant education there are always certain sovereign cultural experiences with their own distinctive characteristics (their own customs, norms, behavioral scenarios, stylistic regulations).

The subcultural formations reflect the social, ethnic and demographic features of cultural development. They manifest themselves in language, consciousness, ethical and aesthetic attitudes, and also sufficiently demonstrate the features of stability and autonomy.

The subcultural tendencies are often determined by the desire of any culture with an official status to fill in all the segments of life in order to become universal and total. However, any unification always gives rise to an alternative.

Traditionally in cultural studies, the problem of subcultures is considered within the framework of socialization, because it reflects the diverse processes of integration of the cultural values by different strata of society. Introducing to the leading cultural standard of the era, entering into the system of dominant cultural values, identifying oneself with a large-scale cultural complex are the extraordinary difficult processes (and often painful ones for some individuals or groups). This is what fuels subcultures.

It is also permissible to talk about the internal space of subcultural formations. The subcultures are closed (or hermetically sealed) and stable, because they are capable of reproducing themselves for a long time.

It should be noted that despite the alternative nature of subcultural complexes and their rejection of the dominant culture, they, as a rule, do not try to replace the dominant culture. It happens because the subcultures are still involved in the process of adapting to the dominant cultural norms.

The subcultures contribute more to the gradual evolutionary and peaceful transformations than to the revolutionary and abrupt changes from one cultural orientation to another. The cultural creative impulses emanating from subcultures are integrated into the mainstream of the leading trends of the era, acting as a kind of modulation of the general cultural panorama

Depending on the level of generalization, the same cultural formation can be defined as dominant or subcultural. For example, the modern American culture demonstrates the striking features of a monolith, shows the signs of autonomy, includes both the dominant official components and the subcultural ones. At the same time, the European culture (from an American point of view)

also has a set of unique characteristics that will act as a subculture in relation to the American culture. If we rise to the next level of comparison of the leading modern global trends, then the American cultural standard will appear as nothing more than a subcultural fragment.

10. Types of subcultures

Subcultures can be determined by the characteristics of historical development, as well as by the methods and forms of cultural identification of particular people.

Let us consider, for example, the ethnic subcultures, which can be vividly illustrated by two modern American cities – New York and Los Angeles. A huge number of people live and work here, and along with the Americans, who make up the majority, there are also the representatives of other nationalities on the city streets, no less considering themselves the indigenous inhabitants of these megacities. It is obvious that the life of the American part of the population differs from the life of the Chinese, Indian, African, Mexican, Latino, etc.

Some ethnic communities actively unite, create their fraternities, and have the clearly expressed distinctive features, while others, on the contrary, prefer not to focus on their foreignness. Many ethnic groups live completely separately, are jealous of their traditions, preserve their language, celebrate their holidays together, and practically do not assimilate. The ethnic subcultures of big cities are both in contact and not in contact with each other. In current conditions, they, as a rule, do not interfere with each other's development (allowing the ethnic groups to exist on the basis of their own laws), although the different codes of moral imperatives are practiced in each individual subcultural community.

Corporate subcultures. Different social groups differ not only in the nature of work in the general system of labor division, but also in their lifestyles. The life of a scientist is different from the life of a journalist, of a businessman – from a teacher, of a salesman – from a janitor, etc.

The manner of dressing, the habit of spending free time, the set of behavioral standards, thoughts and feelings, the material and existential values, the place of residence largely depend on what social stratum a person belongs to. The corporate principle underlies many subcultural formations, which rarely enter into confrontation with each other, preferring to coexist peacefully without violating certain boundaries of behavior.

Religious subcultures. Religious sects can be considered a clear example of a subculture in the modern world. These cult associations are often called authoritarian. They are led, as a rule, by some charismatic personalities.

Strict discipline, unanimity, intolerance to other cultural traditions, asocial orientation of demands – these specific features cause a lot of trouble for the authorities. Very often, the sects enter into an open confrontation with the dominant culture. If so, the strict legislative measures are applied to such subcultures, which, nevertheless, do not give the desired result.

Not all subcultural formations built on some religious principles are aggressive. Many of them coexist peacefully with others. In European cities where the majority professes Catholicism or Protestantism, such subcultures are often represented by adherents of other religious doctrines. Muslims, for example, celebrate their holidays, read the Koran in Arabic, make pilgrimages to the Kaaba, etc., while being considered the Europeans.

Age subcultures. Different age categories also have a clear tendency to form the subcultural compact groups. The world is different for people of different ages, even if they work in the same department of an organization, belong to the same gender, nationality, or specialty.

Young people (under 30) tend to accept rather than reject the values and norms of adults. Therefore, it is typical for the youth subculture to gravitate towards the culture of adults. However, the youth subculture is not an exact copy of the adult subculture. Young people have the opportunity to act and think without the rigid constraints of an adult life.

Currently, there are a number of features of the youth subculture due to the following circumstances: the high demands on the role of enterprises in social support; the degree of adaptation of young people to the market conditions – such adaptation largely determines their economic, professional and labor priorities; the gap between the exaggerated growth of material needs and the limited possibilities for their satisfying; the high protest potential; the dominance of values of private life over the priorities of public life.

In general, three contradictory groups for the youth subculture can be noted. Firstly, it is a group of hard workers, who are characterized by an impatient desire to quickly start the building of their career, so they are ready to work efficiently and productively.

Secondly, it is a group of rebels who see no practical connection between their studies, diligence and future destiny. They most often come from lower social strata and can be the sources of constant anxiety in the staff.

Thirdly, it is a group of conformists, who are characterized by irresponsibility or apathy in relation to the generally accepted norms. This group of youth is characterized by a passion for entertainment and is criticized for a lack of seriousness and strict obligations.

In recent years, the group of older people has grown in number and is trending towards further increase. The representatives of the group are characterized by established social and professional stability. They managed to socialize. They are characterized by a system of behavioral assessments and values that were instilled in the family.

The dominant values of the older generation are: (1) a high assessment of professionalism and education (in contrast to the subculture of young people, in which the emphasis is placed somewhat differently: a high assessment of earnings and having a diploma); (2) a desire for material and social stability; (3) an attentiveness to any official status and authoritarian personality.

The counterculture stubbornly rejects what society as a whole wants to achieve. In many societies, overtly or covertly, there is a problem of equality between men and women, that clearly predetermines the presence of two informal, biologically determined subcultures – male and female.

In the process of their development and interaction, all subcultures line up in a certain way in relation to each other: they might be isolated, be built into some kind of hierarchy or begin to establish connections with each other.

The term *counterculture* refers to a subculture that not only differs from the dominant culture, but opposes it, being in conflict with the dominant values.

The emergence of any counterculture is, in fact, a common and widespread phenomenon. The dominant culture, that is opposed by the counterculture, organizes only a part of the symbolic space of this group (because it is not capable of covering all the diversity of phenomena).

Countercultures usually appear when people find themselves in conditions which cannot provide the usual or desired satisfaction. Among the countercultures, the following types can be distinguished: (1) a direct opposition to the values of the dominant culture; (2) an opposition to the structure of power within the dominant culture; (3) an opposition to the patterns of relationships and interactions supported by the dominant culture.

Sometimes it is difficult or impossible to make clear distinctions between subculture and counterculture. In such cases, both names are applied to one phenomenon on equal terms.

Counterculture demonstrates a significant influence on further cultural evolution. The world never remains the same after a counterculture emerges and openly declares itself. However, the face of official culture is also changing. In general, the goal of any countercultural formation can be defined as a desire to show the inconsistency of dominant frame of mind.

Every counterculture, even if it does not occupy, in fact, a dominant position, strives to create a new universal vocabulary, use the new terms in the

cultural interaction, draw the new channels of cultural communication and ultimately create a new person and a new social reality. This is rarely possible: the official culture, as a rule, owns a greater potential for sustainability than a counterculture and is based on a diversified system of social coercion.

It is known that the confrontation between early Christianity and Hellenistic culture, humanism and Christianity lasted for centuries. Even when the countercultures triumphed and supplanted their competitors, the latter still remained – in the form of quietly operating subcultural complexes that continue to influence the cultural development. Thus, they are still present in our society today.

11. Mass and non-mass cultures.

A modern era can be called, without exaggeration, an era of mass culture. It is enough to take a closer look at the world around us to recognize the immutability of this fact: on television screens, on theater stages, on the radio, on advertising billboards, at work and on vacation – the omnipresent mass culture sets the tone everywhere.

The radical socio-political changes, taken place in the world over the past three decades, have confronted the global community with those cultural forms that would previously have been characterized as the forms of degradation. The attitude towards mass culture is mostly negative, although there is an opinion that the form of culture is, perhaps, a forced measure, inevitable in the current socio-historical conditions, but not a harmful by-product of the «wrong» development.

There is an endless number of articles about the mass (or popular) culture. Meanwhile, nowadays in cultural studies, the essential theoretical and practical aspects related to the functioning of mass culture remain unclear. There is no consensus on what might be considered the mass culture and how to determine its time boundaries: whether it was present in all historical types of culture or in the majority of them, acting as a subcultural or countercultural formation, or it is an exceptional feature of our era.

The mass culture is a set of certain types, genres, trends, styles, in other words, simple and primitive forms. The migration of cultural forms from one category to another (from mass to non-mass and vice versa) occurs continuously.

Therefore, in order to determine – at least in general terms – how the mass culture differs from other forms of culture, one should turn to the conditions under which a particular phenomenon becomes an object of mass culture, i.e. to the human mass.

The category of mass (or the unification of the consciousness of the certain number of people) is not the most widespread in the humanities. For the first time, the experts started talking about the masses as a social form that was worthy of attention at the end of the 19-th century. It was then that the concept of mass was given a sociological status: the term *mass* denoted a phenomenon with a strictly defined set of characteristics.

In the 90s of the 19-th century, the work of the French psychologist, anthropologist and archaeologist G. Le Bon «Psychology of Peoples and Masses» [13] was published. According to G. Le Bon, the mass changes a person in the following way: 1) having united into a certain multitude, people feel a surge of extraordinary power; 2) a person in a mass is instantly infected by a common emotion, and the personal interest is often sacrificed to the general; 3) a person in the mass becomes surprisingly suggestible, deprived of his own sovereign will. G. Le Bon's conclusion about the mass is negative, because the mass is in opposition to a man, and it is a man who acts as an unconditional positive principle in the modern European culture.

A person is absorbed by the mass, the mass plunges a person into a state in which he voluntarily renounces his individuality. The founder of psychoanalysis S. Freud in his article «Massenpsychologie und Ich-Analyse» (or «Mass Psychology and Analysis of the Human Self») [25] also came to the disappointing conclusion that the loss of individuality, the return to a pre-individual state is the actualization of archaic layers of the psyche, characteristic of all people.

Later, the scientists of various professional orientations turned to the analysis of the phenomenon of the mass, and in general their conclusions confirmed the conclusion of G. Le Bon and S. Freud: the mass is a specific form of community of people, that is characterized by aggressiveness, herd archaism, destructiveness, primitiveness of aspirations, reduced intelligence and increased emotionality, spontaneity, readiness to obey a strong-willed order, changeability, lack of rootedness, etc.

In order to create the possibility of uniting the people into the mass multitudes, a need arises for the appearance of the so-called «man of the masses» in a society: it is he who becomes the bearer of a special type of consciousness – a mass consciousness. The work of the Spanish thinker J. Ortega y Gasset «La rebelión de las masas» (or «Revolt of the Masses») [18], published in 1930, is devoted to an analysis of the characteristic features of such a person. «A man of the masses» is a supra-social characteristic, indicating a person outside of traditional classes in society. The main determinant of a

man of the masses is an ordinariness, because the mass is a mediocrity. In our time, it is precisely such mediocre personalities who dominate.

The ascension of the average person is the result of those socio-cultural shifts that occurred at the turn of the 19-th and 20-th centuries. According to the Spanish thinker, along with the positive consequences, the three great achievements of the 19-th century also gave rise to negative ones – liberal democracy, experimental science and industry. It was they that determined the psychological traits of today's man of the masses in the form of unbridled expansion of his own nature, reluctance to work, and selfishness.

Consequently, a man of the masses is a special socio-psychological type. The average person who embodies it is a product of previous socio-historical development. The appearance of a mass man was programmed. He is as inherent in the modern civilization as the progressive conquests.

It is now possible to define the mass culture based on an analysis of the categories «mass» and «mass consciousness». It is important to note that the popular culture is not a quantitative indicator. It is incorrect to classify a certain phenomenon as the mass culture based on the mass distribution of it. By itself, a cultural fact (or event), considered in isolation from the surrounding social context, cannot tell anything about itself. It is also incorrect to approach the analysis of the mass culture from the position of a pre-established hierarchy, i.e. to regard such a form of culture as something secondary, uncomplicated or primitive.

Consequently, the mass culture is a state of culture corresponding to a certain form of social structure, in other words, indicating culture in the presence of the masses. It is an evolutionary stage to which the modern European culture approached at the beginning of the 20-th century and which became dominant by the end of the 20-th century; it should be noted that other competitors were successfully eliminated in one way or another.

In order to be able to talk about the presence of mass culture, it is necessary that its representative – a historical community called the mass – has appeared on the historical arena, and also that the corresponding type of consciousness – a mass consciousness – has acquired a dominant significance. The mass and mass consciousness are connected and do not exist in isolation from each other. They act as an object and a subject of mass culture at the same time. It is around the masses and mass consciousness that the whole intrigue revolves.

Accordingly, the mass culture is present only where the rudiments of the above-mentioned social and mental attitudes exist. As a result, the history of

mass culture does not go beyond the framework of the modern European past. Any European historical community (and the corresponding type of culture) that existed before the emergence of the new European community cannot rightfully be considered a model or a form of manifestation of the mass culture.

The ultimate goal of mass culture is not to provoke the mass spontaneous movements. On the contrary, the mass culture performs a very important social task related to the neutralization of threat emanating from the masses, its dissection and dispersal. In general, any culture is a system of prohibitions voluntarily imposed by society on itself, so as not to perish in the war of all against all. The mass culture is such a system – a mechanism of protection against those destructive tendencies that have become threatening in recent times.

The question of restrictions of the existence of mass culture in the historical dimension is limited to a period of one hundred years, during which such a form of community – the mass – appeared in the social arena. The cultures of social favorites and outsiders can be contrasted. But the mass culture is not interfaced with any other social form of community except the mass one. It is not developed in the folk, peasant or aristocratic environment, because it exists in addition to these social formations.

The formal boundaries of mass culture are limitless, since it permeates the entire cultural space, although from a formal and logical point of view it is quite difficult to distinguish between the mass and non-mass cultures. Despite the fact that the popular culture has become dominant today, just fifty years ago the situation was completely different. The culture of the masses and for the masses was opposed by other cultures that differed from it not only formally, but also socio-historically.

Both the mass and non-mass cultures are based on certain archetypal forms present in humans and in society. However, the archetype works differently in the popular culture. It stands out here in the form of a condensed formula or an unambiguous order.

The mass culture operates with transparent, seemingly elementary forms of archetypal states that act openly and aggressively. It is difficult not to succumb to their charm, because they bring into play the deep, archaic structures of man. At the same time, the practice of non-mass culture is based on the messages that have undergone the preliminary communicative processing.

Often, many phenomena of mass culture continue to be classified as the genuine works of art and the world of eternal values. Albums with reproductions

of paintings, popular science programs and cycles, classical music concerts in large stadiums are contrasted with the mass culture. It is not entirely correct, since in the listed cases the mode of presentation and perception is disrupted.

Culture is not only the cultural forms, but also the corresponding channels of communication through which these forms circulate: it can be a special point of view about a particular subject, some norms and rules for its perception, as well as the normative meanings with which this subject is endowed. Violation of any of the components of a cultural ensemble immediately entails a transformation of the entire appearance of culture.

While remaining seemingly the same as a hundred years ago, the objects begin to circulate differently, perform different functions, generate new meanings, when the socio-cultural context changes. Various metamorphoses can occur with objects not tailored to the fabric of mass culture: they are either dismembered into the separate fragments, which, as a result of technological processing, are combined into other sequences, or they are brought to a state of hyperreality, turning into a kind of one-dimensional duplication of themselves.

In principle, the mass culture is not much different from the non-mass European culture of the modern era; both forms of culture are archetypal in their own way and purposefully communicative during the process of circulation among human communities. The difference concerns the nature of their impact on humans.

The non-mass culture was based on information that was subject to the preliminary communicative processing, and thus left quite a lot of space for the human being's initiative and assumed his active intervention. Metaphorically speaking, the non-mass culture operated at the level of «general instructions». The mass culture painstakingly monitored every human action, helpfully suggesting the only correct decision or prescribing how to act, think, feel, and react in specific cases.

It can be argued that the mass culture literally guides a person through one's life: by depriving him of the opportunity to choose, the mass culture relieves him of the torment of doubt. Difficulties of choice are fraught with the threat of social chaos, while the mass culture relieves a person of doubts, acting as a guarantor of social peace.

12. Evolutionism and cultural studies.

In the middle of the 19-th century in European science the ideas of evolutionism became widespread, covering the diverse researches in various areas of scientific activity, including the history of culture. The central concept

of this direction has become the concept of *evolution*, that gradually leads to a more complex level of organization in various types of systems.

The ideas of evolutionism in the history of culture made it possible to restore the continuity of times and show the dependence of modernity on the past. Based on numerous facts, evolutionism acquired the necessary evidence in its conclusions. For this purpose, a great number of expedition diaries and observations in different countries of the world were brought into requisition, and the comparative historical method was widely used in analyzing the history of culture.

In a very condensed form, the theoretical platform of evolutionists can be presented as follows: the unity of humanity creates the basis for the universality of its culture as a necessary condition and way of life.

With all the diversity and originality of the life of peoples, certain common elements can be traced in their cultures: the presence of an economic way of life, the creation of tools, unification into families, the transference from generation to generation of legends, myths, customs, moral norms – that is, what constitutes culture as a necessary attribute of the very existence and universality of cultural forms of humanity.

All cultures are equal in rights, equal in value, each of them is unrepeatable, unique. The forms of culture evolve and develop, although different peoples may stand at different stages of the process. By looking into the past, one can reconstruct the path of cultural change, revealing many connecting threads in the present.

No stage of evolution is completely rejected. Ancient forms of traditional culture are used in subsequent eras: they can relate to folk healing methods, teaching children, getting to know myths and legends, enriching the spiritual life of contemporaries.

Evolutionism gave a new impetus to the development of cultural studies: many adherents appeared who studied the cultures of different peoples. Numerous works devoted to the new direction covered the problems of the evolution of religion, family, property, and morality. Within the framework of ethnology, the study of the cultural history of peoples and ethnic groups received the rapid development in the works of E. Tylor (1832–1917), H. Spencer (1820–1903), G. Frazer (1854–1941) et al.

In the 19-th century the popularity of evolutionism was accompanied by the organization of scientific societies, the publication of journals and monographs in different countries. However, by the end of the 19-th century its popularity began to fade. The critical judgments appeared about progress in the history of

culture, the progression from simple to complex. But criticism could not diminish the positivity of evolutionism in the creation of cultural studies – it has become especially obvious at the present time. The ideas of evolutionism remain relevant, saturating the spiritual needs of contemporaries with the knowledge and values of cultures of different peoples.

We believe it appropriate to briefly consider one of the fundamental works that has left a noticeable mark in cultural studies: it is the work «Primitive Culture» (1871) by E. Tylor [29], in which it was analyzed the culture of about 400 ethnic groups.

In his research, the author formulates the basic principles of cultural studies: any culture is composed of knowledge, beliefs, art, morality, laws, customs, even abilities and habits acquired by a person in a society. No matter how different the cultures of peoples are, since they are united by the common similarity of human nature and the circumstances of his life. This fact determines the possibility of mutual understanding and dialogue between cultures.

All cultures are connected into a continuously developing process. Evolution occurs gradually, when one cultural layer is superimposed on the other. Discoveries, inventions, and works of genius are also gradually included in the fabric of cultural life, acquiring their own cultural significance.

The stability and general similarity of cultures lead us to a conclusion that the whole world can be considered as one country. When turning to the artifacts of primitive culture, the striking similarities are revealed in tools, methods of making fire, myths about sunrise, eclipse, earthquake, flood, the custom of initiation of young men, wedding and funeral rites, etc. All these facts confirm the idea that there is a universal path for all peoples, although the peoples themselves may be at different stages of the path.

E. Tylor analyzes mythology, sacrificial rites, fetishism, and belief in predictions imprinted in the traditional culture of the peoples of the world. In these special sources of historical knowledge, the author sees a reflection of the ancient customs and rituals, some of which retain their significance even in modern culture.

The scientist considers mythology as a valuable monument of the spiritual culture, a historical evidence of the development of creative imagination and human cognition. Many myths contain memories of some life events, enhanced by fantasy. Some mythological stories are a source for recreating the cultural history of peoples.

The scientist also explores animism, widespread in the ancient cultures – the endowment of souls in nature and humans. Birth and death are always

associated with the existence of the soul, therefore the primitive animism had a great influence on the actions of people, keeping them from evil. Worshipping the elements, plants, animals, and totems testified to the diverse forms of the human spiritual world.

E. Tylor believes that culture represents a certain special mechanism for improving the human race with the aim of developing morality, increasing human strength and happiness. The general progress of civilization is the pursuit of the well-being of the human race. However, modifications do not always lead to the positive changes, so decline and crises are possible in the history of culture.

Destructive actions are capable of ruining the civilizations of individual countries, but are not able to ruin the culture of the entire world. Through the process of cultural diffusion, the customs and inventions of disappeared peoples can remain the property of those who survived the vanished nations. Any civilization is moving forward, although various kinds of deviations are possible along the way. But going backwards is contrary to the nature of civilization. Consequently, the obvious fact is stability in culture, historical continuity, and transfer of cultural heritage from generation to generation.

The ancient history of man is alive in the present and influences many aspects of everyday culture. Which is why the studies of the past must extend to the deepest layers of culture – it will help to imagine the modern development of the material and spiritual life, its ups and downs. As a result, the scientist believes that the science of culture is primarily a transformative science.

In general, the work by E. Tylor represents a significant contribution to the theoretical foundation of cultural studies as a science since the history of human culture is presented in unity and diversity, which gave impetus to the search for common phenomena of different eras.

13. Problems of culture in the «philosophy of life».

«Philosophy of life» represents a direction in the Western European philosophical thought that emerged at the end of the 19-th century. Within the framework of this direction, the idea was put forward that in philosophy the priority should be given to an artistic vision, that, to a greater extent than the exact sciences, was capable of capturing the variability of the world and the movement of life itself. In general, the «philosophy of life» might be seen as a reaction to the rational age of the Enlightenment: the main emphasis was on the opposition of intellect and the forces of life itself, which were understood as irrational and inaccessible to the rational comprehension.

The representatives of the direction set themselves the task of building a holistic worldview, relying solely on the concept of *life*. With the help of the concept, its adherents created an idea of the world as something integral and of the ways to comprehend this integrity.

Due to the fact that the concept of life is rather vague, various interpretations have arisen: biological, psychological, cultural. Since the direction under consideration represents an irrationalistic worldview, the non-rationalistic forms of knowledge of the world, which are close to the Eastern worldview in many ways, have become particularly attractive.

«Philosophy of life» had a huge impact on the European culture and identity in the 20-th century. The direction is represented by the names of F. Nietzsche, W. Dilthey, G. Simmel et al.

The most prominent representative who laid the foundation for a new philosophical direction was F. Nietzsche (1844 – 1900). He believed that the world of life was unified, integral, eternal, that implied its permanent current and formation.

In the study of F. Nietzsche, the concept of two worlds, characteristic of many movements of philosophy, is negatively assessed. The philosopher considers it incorrect to divide the world into true and apparent, because the apparent world is the only one, and the true world is only attached to it. Within the framework of this initial idea of the world, the scientist analyzes knowledge, truth, science, art, and culture.

In 1872, the philosopher published «Die Geburt der Tragödie aus dem Geiste der Musik» (or «The Birth of Tragedy from the Spirit of Music») [17], an aesthetic treatise in which the author outlined his view of the dualistic origins of art. In 1886, the treatise was republished with the preface «The experience of self-criticism» and the subtitle «Hellenism and Pessimism». Nowadays, the work is known as «The Birth of Tragedy, or Hellenism and Pessimism». F. Nietzsche turns to the analysis of the antique culture: he interprets art as a full-blooded embodiment and manifestation of true life; its manifestation is spontaneous, not determined by anything except the will and instincts of an artist. Historically, art arose before science, therefore the being and the world are manifested in eternity only as an aesthetic phenomenon.

An appeal to the antique culture is necessary for the philosopher in order to understand the modern culture, the peculiarity of which is a deep hostility to life, because culture now relies on a schematizing mind, deeply alien to the fundamentally instinctive life. The philosopher proposes to abandon the cult of science and the scientific truth created in a society, since the world, as a result

of the persistent progress of science, has appeared to us as the result of many errors that are inherited by humanity.

In the above-mentioned work, the ideas of the Apollonian and Dionysian principles are developed, which are considered as fundamentally different fundamental forces: functioning, active and antagonistic, reactive. These principles break out from nature itself (and without the mediation of an artist-man): they are manifested as the artistic forces in which the artistic appeals of the nature receive their direct and immediate embodiment.

In the European culture, the philosopher sees a continuation of the antique tradition; the Dionysian art becomes for him a kind of symbol of vitality. These views were the best taste of artists and were expressed in the strengthening of the natural, spontaneous, unorganized principle in an artistic creativity at the turn of the 19-th – 20-th centuries.

F. Nietzsche associates the emergence of nihilism and decadence with the Christianization of Europe. Rejection of the Christian God is a revolt against Europeanism. The Aryan God, who helped the first man to create the «The laws of Manu», is assessed differently: it promotes the manifestation of the idea of power and vitality, the idea of existence. The philosopher sees other orientations in the Eastern religions and therefore contrasts them with Christianity.

In the philosophy of F. Nietzsche, the dualism of soul and body is removed. The proclamation of the unity of soul and body is credited to antiquity, as a result of which the Greeks became the first cultural event in history, while Christianity, that despised the body, was the greatest misfortune of mankind. The inseparability of soul and body is emphasized; as a consequence of this principle, it is necessary to study the joys of life through the human body. The dominant role of the material (physical, corporal, fleshly) means the fact of a person's direct presence in the world. The phenomenal, living body attracts the philosopher with its ability to «think» on a pre-verbal level, opening up a new type of mental activity – thinking in motion.

The processes of human improvement are diverse; they are based on the energy principle, manifested in the spiritual practice. With the help of spiritual practice, a person goes through a certain hierarchical ladder, that consists of higher and lower types. According to this model, evolution consists of a stepwise progression towards a superman; such an ascent to a superman is also interpreted as the result of the selection of nature. In general, the task of cultural improvement of a man is formulated: it is aimed at the emergence of a new type of human being, superior in moral and intellectual qualities to modern people.

Another fundamental concept of F. Nietzsche's philosophy is his idea of the will to power, that constitutes the main feature of all things –

the nature or essence of a person. The essence (or the being) is not a forward movement towards a specific goal, but a constant self-renewal of the will to power, restoring itself in its nature. The concept of the will to power and other ideas of F. Nietzsche received further life in modern cultural studies, philosophy and art criticism.

W. Dilthey (1833–1911) also joins the representatives of the movement of «philosophy of life» [24], but his key term *life* is interpreted rather as the *life of culture*.

Culture precedes thinking and science, therefore thinking is secondary – it is a derivative of the spirit. Thinking cannot understand feelings, as well as art, religion, philosophy. This position became the starting point in the W. Dilthey's formulation of the problem of different types of knowledge, of the distinction between the concepts of *explanation* and *understanding*.

W. Dilthey denies the possibility of explanation in the humanities, since the scientists usually try to explain *nature*, whereas they first need to understand *man*. Understanding is achieved through empathy. However, it is one thing to understand the modern culture, and completely different – to comprehend the dead cultures of ancient peoples. To comprehend the cultures of the past, the new techniques and methods of interpretation are needed, which the philosopher calls hermeneutics or the art of explaining texts with various contents.

Before W. Dilthey, no one attached the great methodological importance to the hermeneutic methods. The philosopher puts forward hermeneutics as a general methodology for the sciences of spiritual activity. He pays great attention to understanding, which he associates with the subjective psychological interpretation of the results of human spiritual activity. The interpretation is achieved by getting the interpreter into the spiritual world of the author of a work of art with the help of intuition.

Thus, the understanding of modern man and his ancestors can only be achieved through the psychological interpretation, since *life* must be interpreted from *life itself*. As a result, the hermeneutic methods for the interpreting of life are proposed, and they differ from the analytical methods that have been developed in philosophy.

The hermeneutic understanding, based on psychological interpretation, is an intuitive process of grasping meaning; it plays an important role in understanding a work of art as a product of spiritual activity. In this case, the role of emotional mood without the participation of logical analysis is significant, because the logical analysis only complicates the holistic perception. It is the

hermeneutic method used in literature and art that serves as an effective method for interpreting and understanding the masterpieces of art.

Some ideas of W. Dilthey's theory are shared by G. Simmel (1858–1918), the author of works on philosophy and sociology of culture [28]. He wrote the articles about the contemplation of nature and the meaning of travel, about religion and a personality of God, about love and fate. G. Simmel was more of an initiator of the philosophical understanding of culture than a consistent analyst, focusing on the following issues of interest to cultural studies: the historical changes in cultural forms; the conflicts and cultural crisis; the social meaning and significance of fashion in the history of culture; the relationship between tradition and innovation.

The philosopher notes the polysemy of the concept of culture. The creative element of human life creates many cultural forms: social structure and works of art, religious beliefs and moral norms, technical inventions and scientific discoveries, etc.

The scientist believes that the cultural forms are only a shell for the creative element of life. Life is too dynamic to be satisfied with a form once created. Therefore, the vital forces come into opposition, resist the constancy of previous values and strive for their own renewal.

The evolution of cultural forms is the subject of history. The continuous variability of the content of cultural phenomena reflects the infinity of human creative efforts in the creating of culture, because a life moves from death to being and from being to death.

Just as the old political regime prevents the manifestation of progress and the innovative development of political life, in the same way the old cultural forms are exhausted and empty of their content. However, a life protests against the relict, archaic forms, as it strives to establish the new cultural norms and values.

Each era puts forward its own ideological dominants, that acquire the special significance for intellectual life and become ideals in the creation of a cultural style. Ideals can have different ways and forms of expression in art, science, religion, morality and – at the same time – remain the rulers of thoughts for particular time (for example, the plasticity of forms in antiquity; God as the ruler of man in the Middle Ages; the ideal of nature and imitation of it in the Renaissance; the meaning of society as a true reality in the 19-th century; the understanding of life as the highest value in the 20-th century, etc.).

Art, science, and politics should contribute to the development and affirmation of these ideals. If these values are opposed, they must leave as not

corresponding to the humanistic ideals of the time. The dynamism of cultural development lies in overcoming this contradiction.

The paradox of culture is that it is capable of moving away from the life's content and turning into an empty form, devoid of meaning. In such cases, these forms of culture might become alien and even hostile: social roles were transformed into the lifeless masks, political struggle took the form of a theatrical performance, love devoid of sincerity was formal in nature.

The tragedy of culture consists in the constant emergence of cultural forms generated by man and the desire to overcome them in order to create some new cultural models. The main meaning and internal impetus for the development of culture lie in overcoming the obstacles on the path to the general movement.

In G. Simmel's philosophy of culture, the concepts of culture and culturality are differentiated. Various norms of behavior, etiquette, refinement of taste, etc. constitute an external sign of culture, expressing only the degree of required courtesy. This is the required expression of culture, that must be compared and assessed depending on the extent to which the external forms of behavior correspond to a person's state of mind, his motives and goals. The main purpose of culture and its forms is to improve the individual, to harmonize a person in whom all elements of culture are balanced.

Regarding the discourse of culture, G. Simmel also focuses on the theme of the relationship between creativity and imitation, tradition and innovation. Any form of culture shows a desire for unity, a demand for change and creation of unique features in the cultural objects and personal appearance. Each of these trends is manifested in the cultural history.

Imitation maintains the stability of culture; it gives confidence that a person in his actions is based on the life-tested traditions. In everyday life, imitation frees us from the necessity of making choices and defines the boundaries of community. In any human individuality one can always detect the interconnection of the general, the particular and the individual.

While exploring the mechanism of the relationship between creativity and imitation in culture, G. Simmel turns to the phenomenon of fashion. Not only the external appearance of a person is affected by fashion, but also architecture, interior of buildings, household items, lifestyle, printing design of publications, etc. It is also well known about the existence of fashionable poets, artists, musicians, etc.

Fashion has its own stages of origin, culmination and decay, or, in other words, the patterns of development based on repetition and cyclicity. Fashion satisfies a person's need for the social support and renovation, because it helps

a person as an individual to be identified with the group, belonging to which is perceived as a special value.

Along with imitation, fashion satisfies the need for difference, standing out from the crowd. The fashion of the upper class is always different from the fashion of other social strata. Thanks to a fairly dynamic change of samples, the yesterday's fashion is always different from the modern one, although in everyday life they may coexist without contradictions.

Fashion in the history of society always reflects a social division: the unification of a certain social community and, at the same time, its separation from others. Therefore, fashion means both joining one's peers and being different from those who do not belong to that group. The iconic fashionable labeling emphasizes this mechanism of unity and differentiation.

The new fashion not only must meet the changing needs, but it is also specially created on demand, becoming a part of the social fabric.

According to the scientist, the differentiation of society is supported by fashion as well, because it is the most convenient form for establishing the external differences. Mastering fashion does not require as long time as it is necessary (or even inevitable) when one studies science, religion, art, and education. Fashion may be easily «purchased» with money, and in this way it becomes possible to join the circle of the elite. However, fashion is not as democratic as it seems at first glance. In fashion, the exotic items of a high price category are extremely valued, because this factor immediately creates a barrier of inaccessibility for the vast majority of people.

In fashion as a cultural phenomenon, there is an important aspect associated with a renewal. New clothes not only change one's appearance, but also influence one's behavior, require the new impressions, and make a person more open to metamorphosis, innovation and transformation.

Despite the fact that fashion as a social phenomenon has a group character, it is not identical to the entire group. Fashion is always accepted only by a part of group, but as soon as it is fully accepted by all members of a group, its patterns are changed, completely losing their symbolic properties.

The more people accept a new fashion pattern, the faster it is changed. In fashion, the inconsistency of trends, the desire for novelty and stability are surprisingly woven together. But novelty is transitory, and permanence is illusory. Fashion orients people to the short duration of its cycle and teaches them to throw away the old-fashioned things. Thus, the dominance of fashion involves a huge number of goods and services in its circulation.

The fashionista is opposed by a principled opponent of fashion, who resists all fashion trends. Denying fashion also creates an individualizing effect.

Unfashionability is a sign of internal protest, that is based on the desire to have some special differences. Fundamental unfashionability can also become a fashionable difference, demonstrating a rejection of the generally accepted fashionable brand and a desire not to be mixed with the crowd.

Thus, fashion helps to free a person from responsibility for his taste and emphasizes his involvement in a certain group; fashion plays a special role, indicating a symbolic affiliation with the standards of modernity. In any case, while in the history of society the social differentiation quite clearly divided the upper and lower strata, the upper strata of society were wary of changes in fashion if they were regarded as the dangerous attacks on power. As a result, the members of high society have always carefully guarded the fashion of their group as a symbol of loyalty to its values. This kind of conservative style is referred to as the timeless classics in the whirlpool of fashion. The ageless classics represents a relatively stable concentration of fashionable elements around a single center. Classics is harmonious, balanced, holistic, as it happily avoids the momentary impulses.

Fashion as a social phenomenon is not only native in life, but also completely natural, because it corresponds to a person's aspirations for renewal, originality, manifestation of individuality and belonging to a certain group. Fashion has a broad impact on culture, bringing different layers into the circle of changes and, thus, becoming a symbol of novelty in the routine of the everyday world.

CONCLUSIONS

In the 21-st century culturology plays a huge role in understanding the trends in the evolution of human society. It is generally accepted that the moral problems are becoming the real foundations of human culture. The question of the high cultural assessment of a man arises with particular insistence, because it is the modernity that will determine how humanity will live in the third millennium. Morality and spirituality are intended to fulfill the peculiar role of prohibitions in relation to any actions that destroy the idea of the intrinsic value of human life. Unfortunately, there is a real threat that a man may become spiritually mortal. It is obvious that in the absence of moral principles, the spiritual degradation of the individual inevitably occurs; if so, there will be a final replacement of the meaning of existence after reaching a certain level of development, and happiness will be replaced by consumption, highest ideals – by pragmatism, spirituality – by dry rationalism. Modern civilization presupposes the integration of many countries and peoples into a single world structure, and, therefore, – the development of understanding between the representatives of different communities. Culturology will help to open and explore the true horizons of human creativity, making a man a true creator of culture.

ЛІТЕРАТУРА

- [1] Багацький, В. В., Кормич, Л. І. (2007). *Культурологія. Історія і теорія культури ХХ століття*: навч. посібник для студ. вищ. навч. закладів. К. : Кондор, 304.
- [2] Білик, Б. І (2004). *Культурологія*: навч. посіб. для студ. вищ. навч. закл. К.: КНИГА, 408.
- [3] Бокань, В. А. (2000). *Культурологія*: навч. посіб. для студ. вищ. навч. закл. К. : МАУП, 134.
- [4] Ворова, Т. П. (2023). *Історія розвитку казок. Герменевтика та літературознавство. Герменевтичні парадигми казок у творчості О. Пушкіна. Modern Teaching Methods in Pedagogy and Philology: Collective Monograph / Azarenkov V. – etc. – International Science Group. Boston: Primedia eLaunch, 580 p. Available at: DOI – 10.46299/ISG.2023.MONO.PED.1 – P. 323-394. References: 564-568. <https://isg-konf.com/uk/modern-teaching-methods-in-pedagogy-and-philology/>*
- [5] Гегель, Г. В. (2000). *Основи філософії права*. Київ: Юніверс, 336.
- [6] Гіоргадзе, Г. В. (2011). *Культурологія для вищих мистецьких навчальних закладів*: навч.-метод. посіб. Л. : ЗУКЦ, 135.
- [7] Гончарук, Т. В. (2004). *Культурологія*: навч. посіб. Т. : Карт-бланш, 214.
- [8] Донцов, Д. І. (2016). *Культурологія*. Х. : Бібколектор, 604.
- [9] Закович, М. М. [та ін.] (2007). *Культурологія: українська та зарубіжна культура*: навч. посіб. К. : Знання, 567.
- [10] Іщенко, М. П. (2009). *Культурологія*: навч. посібник для студ. ВНЗ. Черкаси: [б.в.], 292.
- [11] Кормич, Л. І. (2002). *Культурологія (історія і теорія світової культури ХХ століття)*: навч. посібник для студ. вищих навч. закл. Х. : Одисей, 304.
- [12] Кравець, М. С. (2008). *Культурологія: підручник*. Л. : Новий Світ-2000, 320.
- [13] Лебон, Г. (2020). *Психологія народів і мас*. К.:АНДРОНУМ, 290.
- [14] Матвєєва, Л. Л. (2005). *Культурологія: курс лекцій*: Навч. посібник для студ. вищих навч. закл. К. : Либідь, 512.
- [15] Матвієнко, Л. В. (2007). *Культурологія*: навч. посібник. К. : КНТЕУ, 285.
- [16] Мачульський, Б. Г. [та ін.] (2007). *Культурологія*: навч. посібник. К. : КНЕУ, 376.
- [17] Ніцше, Ф. В. (2004). *Народження трагедії. Невчасні міркування I–IV. Твори спадку 1870–1873. Повне зібрання творів. Том 1. Львів: Астролябія, 769.*
- [18] Ортега-і-Гассет, Х. (1965). *Бунт мас*. Н.-Й.: 158.
- [19] Парахонський, Б. О. [та ін.] (2003). *Культурологія*: навч. посібник / упоряд. О. І. Погорілий, М. А. Собуцький. К. : Видавничий дім «КМ Академія», 314.
- [20] Подольська, Є. А., Лихвар В. Д. (2003). *Культурологія*: навч. посіб. для студ. вищих навч. закл. Х. : Видавництво НФаУ: Золоті сторінки, 247.
- [21] Стеценко, В. В. (2006). *Культурологія*: навч. посіб. Л. : ВЦ ЛНУ ім. Івана Франка, 284.
- [22] Фейербах, Л. А. (1998). *Сутність християнства*. Л.: РІПОЛ Класік, 432.
- [23] Comte, Au. I. (1974 reprint). *The positive philosophy of Auguste Comte freely translated and condensed by Harriet Martineau*. New York: AMS Press. (Original work published in 1855, New York: Calvin Blanchard, 480.
- [24] Diltney, W. L. (1996). *Hermeneutics and the Study of History*. Selected Works, Vol. IV. Princeton University Press, 432.
- [25] Freud, S. S. (2009). *The Origins of Psychoanalysis. Letters to Wilhelm Fliess: Drafts and Notes 1887–1902*. Kessinger Publishing, 498.
- [26] Huizinga, J. (2018). *The Waning of the Middle Ages*. Cluny Media LLC, 406.
- [27] Nietzsche, F. W. «Чтиво» у е-бібліотеці. https://chtyvo.org.ua/authors/Nietzsche_Friedrich/
- [28] Simmel, G. (1997). *The Philosophy of Fashion* (transl.). Simmel on Culture. Selected Writings. London-Thousand Oaks- NewDelhi: Sage Publications, 302.
- [29] Tylor, E. B. (2010). *Primitive Culture*. Cambridge :Cambridge University Press, 440.

REFERENCES

- [1] Bagatskiy, V. V., L. I. Kormich L. I. (2007). *Kul'turologiya. Istoriya i teoriya kul'tury XX veka*: ucheb. posobiye dlya stud. vyssh. ucheb. zal. K.: Kondor, 304.

- [2] Bilyk, B. I (2004). *Kul'turologiya: ucheb. posobiye. dlya stud. vyssh. ucheb. zakl. K.: KNIGA*, 408.
- [3] Bokan', V. A. (2000). *Kul'turologiya: ucheb. posobiye. dlya stud. vyssh. ucheb. zakl. K.: MOUP*, 134.
- [4] Vorova, T. P. (2023). *Istoriya rozvytku kazok. Hermenevtyka ta literaturoznavstvo. Hermenevtychni paradyhmy kazok u tvorchosti O. Pushkina. Modern Teaching Methods in Pedagogy and Philology: Collective Monograph / Azarenkov V. – etc. – International Science Group. Boston: Primedia eLaunch, 580 p. Available at: DOI – 10.46299/ISG.2023.MONO.PED.1 – P. 323-394. References: 564-568. <https://isg-konf.com/uk/modern-teaching-methods-in-pedagogy-and-philology/>*
- [5] Hehel', H. V. (2000). *Osnovy filosofiyi prava. Kyiv: Yunivers*, 336.
- [6] Giorgade, G. V. (2011). *Kul'turologiya dlya vysshikh khudozhestvennykh uchebnykh zavedeniy: ucheb.-metod. posobiye. L.: ZUKTS*, 135.
- [7] Goncharuk, T. V. (2004). *Kul'turologiya: ucheb. posobiye. T.: Kart-blansh*, 214.
- [8] Dontsov, D. I. (2016). *Kul'turologiya. KH.: Bibkollektor*, 604.
- [9] Zakovich, M. M. [i dr.] (2007). *Kul'turologiya: ukrainskaya i zarubezhnaya kul'tura: ucheb. posobiye. K.: Znaniye*, 567.
- [10] Ishchenko, M. P. [i dr.] (2009). *Kul'turologiya: ucheb. posobiye dlya stud. VUZy. Cherkassy: [b.v.]*, 292.
- [11] Kormich, L. I. (2002). *Kul'turologiya (istoriya i teoriya mirovoy kul'tury XX veka): ucheb. posobiye dlya stud. vysshikh ucheb. zakl. KH.: Odissey*, 304.
- [12] Kravets, M. S. (2008). *Kul'turologiya: uchebnik. L.: Novyy Mir-2000*, 320.
- [13] Lebon, G. (2020). *Psykhologiya narodiv i mas. K.: ANDRONUM*, 290.
- [14] Matveyeva, L. L. (2005). *Kul'turologiya: kurs lektsiy: Ucheb. posobiye dlya stud. vysshikh ucheb. zakl. K.: Lybid'*, 512.
- [15] Matviyenko, L. V. (2007). *Kul'turologiya: ucheb. posobiye. K.: KNTEU*, 285.
- [16] Machul'skiy, B. G. [i dr.] (2007). *Kul'turologiya: ucheb. posobiye. K.: KNEU*, 376.
- [17] Nitsshe, F. V. (2004). *Narodzhennya trahediyi. Nevchasni mirkuvannya I-IV. Tvory spadku 1870-1873. Povne zibrannya tvoriv. Tom 1. L'viv: Astrolyabiya*, 769.
- [18] Ortega-i-Hasset, KH. (1965). *Bunt mas. N.-Y.: 158*.
- [19] Parakhonskiy, B. O. [i dr.] (2003). *Kul'turologiya: ucheb. posobiye / sost. O. I. Pogorelyy, M. A. Sobutskiy. K.: Izdatel'skiy dom «KM Akademiya»*, 314.
- [20] Podol'skaya, Ye. A., Rostovshchik V. D. (2003). *Kul'turologiya: ucheb. posobiye. dlya stud. vysshikh ucheb. zakl. KH.: Izdatel'stvo NFaU: Zolotyye stranitsy*, 247.
- [21] Stetsenko, V. V. (2006). *Kul'turologiya: ucheb. posobiye. L.: VTS LNU im. Ivana Franko*, 284.
- [22] Feyyerbakh, L. A. (1998). *Sut' khrystyianstva. L.: RIPOL Klasik*, 432.
- [23] Freud, S. (2009). *The Origins of Psychoanalysis. Letters to Wilhelm Fliess: Drafts and Notes 1887–1902. Kessinger Publishing*, 498.
- [24] Comte, Au. I. (1974 reprint). *The positive philosophy of Auguste Comte freely translated and condensed by Harriet Martineau. New York: AMS Press. (Original work published in 1855, New York: Calvin Blanchard*, 480.
- [25] Diltney, W. L. (1996). *Hermeneutics and the Study of History. Selected Works, Vol. IV. Princeton University Press*, 432.
- [26] Freud, S. S. (2009). *The Origins of Psychoanalysis. Letters to Wilhelm Fliess: Drafts and Notes 1887–1902. Kessinger Publishing*, 498.
- [27] Huizinga, J. (2018). *The Waning of the Middle Ages. Cluny Media LLC*, 406.
- [28] Nietzsche, F. W. «Чтиво» у е-бібліотеці. https://chtyvo.org.ua/authors/Nietzsche_Friedrich/
- [29] Simmel, G. (1997). *The Philosophy of Fashion (transl.). Simmel on Culture. Selected Writings. London-Thousand Oaks- NewDelhi: Sage Publications*, 302.
- [29] Tylor, E. B. (2010). *Primitive Culture. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press*, 440.