

tative analysis from the mouth of the unbiased media and the expert environment, though not a panacea, but partially negate the "force," "political myth". Myth has an irrational basis, and controls the emotions with the help of stereotypes. The myth creates its own reality and creates the effect of solidarity of the masses. The essence of "political myth" is that he always addressed to specific audiences, takes into account the peculiarities of mentality. A dominant position in the "political myth" plays a stereotype. Any stereotype is formed on the generalizations. What is the difference between the stereotypes and myths? "A stereotype is a label", which is the context, but it there is no story. That is, the stereotype is a form, and the myth is content history. In addition, in this exploration of the role and value of such concepts as "political magic" and "political spectacle" in the context of "political mythology" as applied mythology.

Keywords: myth, political myth, political strategies, constituency, political aims, "conspiracy theory", "political magic", "political spectacle".

UDC 141.319.8

DOI: 10.17721/sophia.2021.17.10

Vitalii Turenko, PhD, Research Assist.
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Kyiv, Ukraine
ORCID: 0000-0003-0572-9119
e-mail: vitali_turenko@ukr.net

Vasyl Semykras, PhD, Assoc. Prof.
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Kyiv, Ukraine
ORCID: 0000-0002-5125-5172
e-mail: semvv@ukr.net

PHILOSOPHICAL LEGACY OF V. G. TABACHKOVSKYI: HISTORICAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL RECONSTRUCTION

Purpose of this article is consists in the complex researche of the many-sidedness of the philosophical legacy of the famous Ukrainian philosopher of the second half of the XXth century, one of the founders of philosophical anthropology in Ukraine – Vitalii Tabachkovskiy (1944–2006). The theoretical and methodological basis of the study is historical and philosophical reconstruction. A number of concepts and conclusions were applied, which take place in the context of the scientific works of Ukriani-an authors on this issue. The author reveals the transformation of Vitalii Tabachkovsky's scientific research during the Soviet period and revealed the specificity and its significance of legacy in the context of Ukrainian philosophical thought of the second half of the twentieth century. Revealed that at the intersection of the 60s and 70s. The twentieth century in the center of attention of V. Tabachkovsky was the problem of the relationship between personal and impersonal, as a result of which her thorough research was the first that critically interpreted the key philosophical and anthropological problems of French personalism. It was revealed that, on the basis of the then official philosophy, the practice phenomenon occupied a significant place, which became a key subject of research for Vitalii Tabachkovsky in the 1970s and until the mid-1980s. The peculiarity of his explication was that the practice was not only epistemological content (in the spirit of the ideology of Marxism-Leninism), but also related to the inner world of man. It was found that in the era of Perestroika and with the proclamation of independence of Ukraine, the scientific interests of V. Tabachkovsky focused on understanding the human perception of the world, alienation, as well as essential and existential in human nature. The practical significance of the study lies in the possibility and necessity of using its results in the context of complex and systematic studies of the history of Ukrainian philosophy in the Soviet period.

Keywords: philosophical thought of the Soviet Ukraine, Vitalii Tabachkovskiy, philosophical anthropology, practice.

Introduction

Research of the legacy of Ukrainian philosophers of the second half of the twentieth century is still a poorly developed topic. The urgency of comprehensive studies of the key representatives of this period in the history of Ukrainian philosophy is due to a number of reasons, namely: a biased view of the Ukrainian philosophy of the Soviet period, the predominance of an essayistic, memoiristic character of the works of researchers on this period. Thus, the expediency of a comprehensive and systematic of the scientific legacy of Ukrainian thinkers of the second half of the twentieth century appears, among which of them Vitalii G. Tabachkovskiy is one of the leading figure.

Sources

Scientific inquiries devoted to the personality of V. Tabachkovskiy and the main problems, which he studied were presented by the articles of Y. Andros [1], A. and I. Bychko [2], S. Vilchinska [3], A. Danylyuk [5], V. Daren-sky [6], V. Ryzhko [9]. At the same time, special attention should be paid to the work of A. Zaluzhna [7], which analysis the peculiarity of the exploration by the domestic Soviet philosophers of the spiritual and moral issues of a person in the conditions of the dialectical materialism's paradigm.

However, we can say that at present in the scientific literature there are no systematic studies devoted to V. Tabachkovskiy, which would show the transformation of

his research interests, as well as the specifics of his philosophical legacy during the Soviet period.

Methodology

The theoretical and methodological basis of the study is historical and philosophical reconstruction. A number of concepts and conclusions were applied, which take place in the context of the scientific works of Ukriani-an authors on this issue.

Results

Intellectual area was inherent to philosophical thought "late Soviet Marxism" 60 – 90 years of the twentieth century, which showed the presence of two philosophies:

- as legalized, the official philosophy for the humanitarians of the party nomenclature, fully orientated to the state party ideology;
- the philosophy of the sixties, as the "shadow", which, in the framework of the absoluteization of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, ensured the preservation and renewal of professional philosophy, which grew into the philosophical schools of E. Ilyenkov and A. Zinoviev, P. Kopnin and V. Shynkaruk [7; 20].

Vitaliyi Tabachkovskiy (1944–2006) is a Ukrainian philosopher, who began his scientific career in 1968 and was associated own his life with the NAS H. S. Skovoroda Institute of Philosophy.

The Department of Philosophical Anthropology, which named from 1968 until 1991 as Department of Dialectical Materialism, when he worked all life, from the outset was oriented V. Shynkaruk's understanding the problem of human, its being and ontological foundations of its existence, its value and ideological orientations.

This involved the study of philosophical knowledge, primarily in terms of its specificity as a form of self-determination of man in the world.

He began his scientific work on the critical analysis of the problem of the correlation of personality and transpersonal in the philosophy of French personalism, to which he devoted his PhD-thesis (1971) [11]. Although in it he has already shown his interest in existential-personalistic anthropology, but it was written as a historical and philosophical work, which details the key representatives of French personalism in the context of the problem of personal and individual.

Obviously, that this PhD-thesis had an impact on the transformation of the research interests of the Ukrainian philosopher. An indication of this is the edition of such monographs as "The Crisis of Bourgeois Rationalism and the Problem of the Human Person" (1974). In this book is analysed of the interpretations of the specifics of the social regulators of the person's activity in the European philosophy. The author examines how French personalism and existentialism are trying to overcome the limitations of classical rationalism by means of the idealistic "existentialization" of the mind, which seemed to be the main such regulator. The book shows that the interpretation of history as depersonalizing the process leads to a religious interpretation of the person's life. The social conditionality and methodological flaws of European philosophical concepts are revealed and the author shows the significance of the Marxist principle of socio-historical practice for solving the problem of social regulators of human activity [10, p. 2].

At the same time, his active research on the phenomenon of practice began. Of course this is not an accident. Y. Melkov writes on this following: "The topics of practice as the foundation on which both ontology and epistemology are based is another important distinguishing feature of the Kiev philosophy of the Marxist tradition – as well as consideration of the human world in their development, dialectical contradictions and unity. According to O. Yatsenko, "Marx found in practice a cell where material and ideal, objective and subjective are in inseparable unity", and therefore this "cell" turns out to be the most important subject of the study of human life, thinking and being, spiritual and material. The principle of practical creative activity of a person is to be not only a central but also unifying point of research in the most diverse fields of philosophical thought. This, it explains the flowering, in the Soviet philosophy of the 1960s in general, and in the Kiev school, in particular, along with the world-view thematics and the sphere of philosophical anthropology, the studies of the problems of philosophy and methodology of science" [8, p. 45].

Therefore, Tabachkovskiy published a separate monograph "Criticism of Idealist Interpretations of Practice" [17], chapters in the monographs "Bourgeois Concepts of Culture: the Crisis of Methodology" [16], "Actual methodological issues of modern science" [15].

Thus, in particular, in the chapter of the last monographie "The principle of the unity of theory and practice in the development of scientific knowledge", the Ukrainian philosopher summing up the general outcome of the consideration of the problem of the connection of theory and practice in the development of knowledge. He noted that first of all the feature of this connection that the practical conditionality of knowledge manifests itself in various forms. Prac-

tice understood not only as the opposite of the theory but also as the fundamental principle of considering all the scientific and theoretical problems through the prism of their humanistic content allows us to realize the connection of theoretical knowledge with all the variety of ways of mastering the human's being, and reveals the essence of knowledge as a phenomenon of culture, to prove any particular epistemological issue to her connection with the worldwide and socio-cultural foundations of human existence" [15, p. 70–71].

S. Grabovskiy emphasizes for this "V. Tabachkovskiy's studies of the phenomenon of practice has proven its extremely difficult character, which in principle was not given to reduction in the direction of material production or revolutionary activity. According for him, practice acted as the creation of man with all the range of its internal and external contradictions. During the 1980s, it was V. Tabachkovskiy who worked a further transformation of ideological issues – in the direction of post-Marxist philosophical anthropology, in its classical and post-classical forms" [4, p. 123].

As we can see, practice in his studies does not appear to be a purely materialistic phenomenon, in the spirit of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, but in an existential context. As a result, his Postdoc-theses "Practice and Spiritual Development of the World" (1980) appears [14]. In that work we can see the opinion of the Ukrainian thinker that practice is not only an epistemological concept, but a phenomenon that is not only confined to the material world perception and world, but also reflects the transcendental, spiritual aspects of human existence.

Therefore, in this context it should be notes that in the investigates Kievan philosophical school (which representative is V. Tabachkovskiy) is possibility to follow up worldview – anthropological and theoretical and cultural studies trends that are much have broken monopoly active paradigm and are manifested in the following philosophical provisions:

- statement anthropological problem, her nature, worldview and role in the development activities. After all, man was determined not only as a social class subject, as well as being able to create own world, it socio-cultural and spiritual forms. He does not just create own world, but also is over it, because he asks for him goals, forms ideals, exercises moral value regulation;
- appeal to the human's internal world, his sensory-emotional sphere of spirituality (spiritual trinity faith, hope and love in the close connection with the essential forces of man – mind, feelings and will), an reflexive analysis of the concepts "experience" and "lifeworld" stipulated significant renewal the Soviet philosophical discourse in the context updating phenomenon personality and spiritual and moral status of the human being;
- disclosure of aspects human being, whiches concerning the meaning of life and the meaning of activity; it helps to creative character of activity, comprehension human life and opportunity to construct a "semantic net of phenomenons" and "semantic world", whiches affirmation semantic the plane the world in him semantic diversity, where meaning is not reduced to objective certainty of things but assumes individual awareness and understanding knowledge, based personal experience of person;
- realization in the worldview aspect the philosophical analysis of culture, which will understaning her ontological aspect as a universal phenomenon, essentially and fully related to human beingp. Along with that culture at all diversity filling human meanings and values representations in relation to a person appears as objective prefer-

ence "requiring from persone discipline of the ability to self-restraint" [7, p. 27–28].

At the same time, it should be noted that as a scientific employee of the Department of Dialectical materialism, Vitalii Tabachkovskyy's scientific works as his colleagues in the 80's of the twentieth century. the last century were characterized by consolidation, deepening and development of important areas of philosophical and anthropological knowledge and cognition, its philosophical and value-orientation aspects, which proceeded under the conditions of a limited source base (as in the previous decade), but were already marked by a stable, worked out philosophical and anthropological reflection.

In this decade (except, of course, articles), a number of collective monographs were published by etited V. Tabachkovsyyi, based on the results of the planned themes:

- Essays on the philosophy of L. Feuerbach (1982).
- Dialectics of activity and culture (1983).
- Human – Existence – History (1986).
- Heuristic functions of ideological consciousness (1989).
- Formation of the world-view culture of youth (1990).

In this context, S. Vilchinska notes that researchers of Soviet philosophy often write that Soviet Marxism at the time of totalitarianism (and post-totalitarianism) is a kind of religion (ideology), and therefore it is necessary to treat her not as a philosophy. Taking active part in the worldview and anthropological reorientation of Marxist theory, VG Tabachkovskyyi was able to prove that this is not quite the case. Subject field of philosophical anthropology, in his deep conviction, created that verbal space, in which only a true philosophical thought can move. Therefore, the philosophical culture of the Ukrainian SSR should not be reduced to "official dogmatics" of Marxism-Leninism. Historical and philosophical study of the evolution of anthropological ideas by V. G. Tabachkovskyyi influenced the destiny of the country's culture in a decisive way, since it was the embodiment of the "philosophy", which was not needed by the authorities, desacralized. In this direction, philosophical and epistemological reorientation was carried out in Kyiv in the 1960's. However, V. Tabachkovskyyi belonged to the generation of scientists who managed to bring the humanization of Marxist theory to the final stage and to adopt new principles in the reading of problems, in particular, this concerns a new branch of philosophical science – anthropology – was introducing her concepts, principles, assessments, conceptualization techniques in Ukraine, and so on [3, p. 108].

In November 1991, the name of the department was brought in line with what he really for more than 20 years was engaged. The department of Dialectic Materialism became known as the Department of Philosophical Anthropology. Work on planned researches themes, based on a substantially expanded source base at the time, was focused on the elaboration of the fundamentals of the current vision of philosophical and anthropological issues. This is on the one hand. And on the other hand, it allowed a new understanding of the spiritual situation of the nowadays, Ukrainian realities in the difficult conditions of the development of the Ukraine and the formation of civil society in Ukraine.

Accordingly, the following researchears interests of V. Tabachkovskyyi have centered on there philosophical problems:

- 1) alienation;
- 2) human world attitude;
- 3) essential and existential in human being.

Let's consider the specifics and features of explication of each of them in more detail.

The peculiarity of understanding the notion of alienation by V. Tabachkovskyyi is the rejection of the classical Marxist understanding of it. He considers him not in the social, but in the personal aspect, in particular, denationalization, depersonalization, world-view confusion, loss of leading ideological orientations of personal attitude and freedom. Again, before a person raises the question of choosing its further fate, a principle of interacting with the world, the restoration of the key orientations of world perception and worldview.

The most significant in its consequences is the alienation of a person of its generic nature, one of the prerequisites which manifests itself in the loss of the creative nature of human that contradict the essence of man as a creative-active being. Another reason for the alienation of the generic entity is the loss in mental activity of such an important sign as integrity that makes it impossible for a person to become a universal, versatile personality. Another prerequisite for alienation from a person of his generic nature is the alienation of the individual from culture, that is, from the accumulated human experience of social relations. As an option, the solution to this problem V. Tabachkovskyyi proposed is the idea of appropriating vital activity and understanding of the world [18, p. 68].

At the same time, talking about the problem of Tabachkovskyyi's understanding of human world-attitude, the monograph "Human world attitude: reality or problem" (1993) became the central work here. In this book is disclosing of ambivalence, the intrinsic contradictions of the human world-attitude. It is shown that such contradictions are represented by the reincarnated forms of world-attitude. However, these forms always contain layers of non-reincarnated content, which ensures the natural history of self-development of man and the means of practical and spiritual understanding of the world.

According to V. Tabachkovskyyi, finding out the problem of world-attitude helps to show the mutual determination of its two levels: objective-impersonal and subjective-personal, to trace the cross-transference of these levels, which has still been given insufficient attention. There is also the opportunity to overcome the linear interpretation of the process of self-development of man, the subordinate approach to different levels of self-organization of existence [12, p. 2].

The problem of explication of human world-attitude became for Ukrainian philosopher a link with understanding the essential and existential in personality.

Y. Andros emphasises on this: "One of the central topics of the Vitalii research" is the analysis of the conflict of the essence and existence of human, the essential and existential. He considers the well-known classical philosophical metanarratives: hyperactism, panlogism, reductionism, that is, the reduction of the essential definitions of a person to a one-dimensional one and, on the basis of this analysis, introduces the fundamental principles of the approaches of non-classical philosophizing. First of all, it is said that each of the analyzed substantive definitions of a person – and somewhere around fifty – is correct in itself, but reflects only one of these 50 facets of human nature, human nature, the summation to which each of them can not give panoramas of human nature as a whole. What is the conclusion? The result is fully refusing from the understanding person only as an adult (but not old), physically healthy, actively active, characterologically one-dimensional (and hence devoid of endogenous ambushes), an ethnocultural-neutral person [1, p. 6–7].

Therefore, one of the key conclusions of V. Tabachkovskyyi in the book "Man in Essential and Existential Dimensions" relates to the lesson of the totalitarian XX century,

which Chantal Delsol very aptly described in her book "Praise of the Personality. Essays on the Late Modern"(2000). This lesson is in the radical rejection of the thesis "Everything is possible". In everything that is happening to mankind, "everything is not possible", because who has the right to sort people and what criteria? "All is not possible", because none of us is the owner of the final definition of a person. Perhaps this justifies the postmodernist irony of any of the definitions [13, p.78-79].

Hence, it arose in him the need to write the last of his work "Polysemantic homo: philosophical and artistic thought in search of "non-Euclidean reflectivity"" (2005). It should be also noted that V. Tabachkovskiy, as a teacher, was the author of a number of textbooks both on philosophy in general and philosophical anthropology in particular.

Discussion and conclusions

Thus, having made a historical and philosophical reconstruction of the philosophical legacy of V. Tabachkovskiy, we can draw the following conclusions:

1) At the intersection of the 60's and 70's of the XX century in the center of attention of the Ukrainian philosopher there was a problem of the correlation of the individual and the personality, and as a result his the investigation was the first time in our country researched and critically comprehended the key philosophical and anthropological problems of French personalism.

2) Based on the then official philosophy, the phenomenon of practice occupied a significant place, which became for Vitalii Tabachkovskiy the key subject of the study in the 1970s and until the middle of the 1980s. The peculiarity of his interpretation was that the practice had not only epistemological, in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism ideology but as concerning the inner world of man.

3) In the era of Perestroika and with the achievement of Ukraine's independence, V. Tabachkovskiy's research interests focus on understanding human world-attitude, alienation, as well as the essential and existential in human nature.

4) Thus, we can say of the multidirectional philosophical legacy of the Ukrainian philosopher, whose work was not limited to philosophical and anthropological developments, but studies on the history of philosophy, epistemology and methodology of science.

Список використаної літератури

1. Андрос Є. Про творчу спадщину В. Г. Табачковського / Є. Андрос // Філософська антропологія і сучасність (пам'яті В. Г. Табачковського), Філософсько-антропологічні студії-2008. – К. : Стилос, 2008. – С. 4–11.
2. Бичко А. Віталій Табачковський: антропофілософська візія / А. Бичко, І. Бичко // Філософська антропологія і сучасність (пам'яті В. Г. Табачковського), Філософсько-антропологічні студії-2008. – К. : Стилос, 2008. – С. 21–57.
3. Вільчинська С. В. Г. Табачковський як дослідник філософської антропології / С. Вільчинська // Університетська кафедра. – 2013. – №2. – С. 92–108.
4. Грабовський С. У пошуках істин: український неомарксизм 1960–1980-х / С. Грабовський // Філософська думка. – 2009. – №3. – С. 90–102.
5. Данилюк А. Відчуження людини та агресія (до аналізу проблеми відчуження у творчості В. Табачковського) / А. Данилюк // Філософська антропологія і сучасність (пам'яті В. Г. Табачковського), Філософсько-антропологічні студії-2008. – К. : Стилос, 2008. – С. 457–464.
6. Даренський В. Філософія мистецтва в спадщині В. Г. Табачковського: спроба систематичної реконструкції / В. Даренський // Філософська антропологія і сучасність (пам'яті В. Г. Табачковського), Філософсько-антропологічні студії-2008. – К. : Стилос, 2008. – С. 436–443.
7. Залужна А. Світоглядно-антропологічні тенденції духовно-моральних пошуків у вітчизняній філософії другої половини ХХ ст. / А. Залужна // Наука, Релігія, Суспільство. – 2010. – № 1. – С. 19–29.
8. Мелков Ю. Київська філософська школа: основні ідеї та характерні особливості / Ю. Мелков // Вісн. нац. авіац. ун-ту. Серія: Філософія, Культурологія. – 2008. – № 2(8). – С. 43–47.

9. Рижко В. Екзистенція буття і дослідження / В. Рижко // Філософська антропологія і сучасність (пам'яті В. Г. Табачковського), Філософсько-антропологічні студії-2008. – К. : Стилос, 2008. – С. 108–115.

10. Табачковський В. Криза буржуазного раціоналізму і проблема людської особистості / В. Табачковський. – К. : Наукова думка, 1974.

11. Табачковський В. Критичний аналіз проблеми співвідношення особистого і індивідуального в філософії французького персоналізму : автореф. дис. ... канд. філос. наук / В. Табачковський. – К. , 1971.

12. Табачковський В. Людське світо відношення: данність чи проблема / В. Табачковський. – К. : Наукова думка, 1993.

13. Табачковський В. Образ людини: від "загальної універсальності" до "повного індивідуального існування" / В. Табачковський // Людина в есенційних та екзистенційних вимірах. – К. : Наукова думка, 2004. – С. 8–83.

14. Табачковський В. Практика і духовне освоєння світу : автореф. дис. ... д-ра філос. наук / В. Табачковський. – К., 1980.

15. Табачковський В. Принцип єдності теорії і практики в розвитку наукового пізнання / В. Табачковський // Актуальні методологічні проблеми сучасної науки. Київ: Вид-во політичної літератури, 1983. – С. 48–71.

16. Табачковський В. Проблема "практики-культури" в класичній буржуазній філософії / В. Табачковський // Буржуазні концепції культури: криза методології. – К. : Наукова думка, 1980. – С. 15–78.

17. Табачковський В. Критика ідеалістичних інтерпретацій практики / В. Табачковський. – К. : Наукова думка, 1976.

18. Шевченко Г. Поняття "відчуження" та "привласнення" в українському інтелектуальному дискурсі / Г. Шевченко // Вісн. Ін-ту розвитку дитини: Серія: Філософія, Педагогіка, Психологія. – 2013. – № 28. – С. 67–72.

References

1. Andros, Y. (2008). About the creative legacy of V.G. Tabachkovskiy, *Philosophical anthropology and modernity (in memory of V.G. Tabachkovskiy)*, *Philosophical-anthropological studio'2008*, Kyiv, Stylos, 4-11.
2. Bychko, A., Bychko, I. (2008). Vitalii Tabachkovskiy: anthropophilosophical vision, *Philosophical anthropology and modernity (in memory of V. Tabachkovskiy)*, *Philosophical-anthropological studio'2008*, Kyiv, Stylos, 21-57.
3. Daniluk, A. (2008). Alienation of man and aggression (to the analysis of the problem of alienation in the work of V. Tabachkovskiy), *Philosophical anthropology and modernity (in memory of V. Tabachkovskiy)*, *Philosophical-anthropological studio'2008*, Kyiv, Stylos, 457-464.
4. Darensky, V. (2008). Philosophy of Art in the legacy of V. G. Tabachkovskiy: the attempt of systemic reconstruction, *Philosophical anthropology and the present (in memory of V. Tabachkovskiy)*, *Philosophical-anthropological studio'2008*, Kyiv, Stylos, 436-443.
5. Grabovskiy, S. (2009). In search of truths: Ukrainian neo-Marxism 1960-1980's, *Philosophical thought*, 3, 90-102.
6. Melkov, Yu. (2008). "Kyivan School of Philosophy": the main ideas and characteristic features, *Visn. National aviation University Vol: Philosophy. Cultural Studies: Sb. sciences works*, 2(8), 43-47.
7. Ryzhko, V. (2008). Existences of human being and study, *Philosophical anthropology and modernity (in memory of V. Tabachkovskiy)*, *Philosophical-anthropological studio'2008*, Kyiv, Stylos, 108-115.
8. Shevchenko, G. (2013) The concept of "alienation" and "appropriation" in the Ukrainian intellectual discourse, *Bulletin of the Institute for the Development of the Child. Ser: Philosophy, Pedagogy, Psychology*, 28, 67-72.
9. Tabachkovskiy, V. (1971). *Critical analysis of the problem of the correlation of personal and individual in the philosophy of French personalism*: PhD-theses.
10. Tabachkovskiy, V. (1974). *The crisis of bourgeois rationalism and the problem of the human person*, Kyiv, Naukova dumka.
11. Tabachkovskiy, V. (1980). *Practice and spiritual mastering of the world: Author's abstract*. Dr. of Science (Philosophy).
12. Tabachkovskiy, V. (1980). The problem of "practice-culture" in classical bourgeois philosophy, *Bourgeois Concepts of Culture: The Crisis of Methodology*, Kyiv, Naukova dumka, 15-78.
13. Tabachkovskiy, V. (1983). Principle of the unity of theory and practice in the development of scientific knowledge, *Actual methodological issues of modern science*, Kyiv, Publishing House of Political Literature, 48-71.
14. Tabachkovskiy, V. (1993). *The human relationship: a given or a problem*, Kyiv, Naukova dumka.
15. Tabachkovskiy, V. (1976). *Criticism of idealist interpretations of practice*, Kyiv, Naukova dumka.
16. Tabachkovskiy, V. (2004). Human image: from "generic universality" to "total individual existence", *Man in Essential and Existential Dimensions*, Kyiv, Naukova dumka. 8-83.
17. Vilchynska, S. (2013). V.G. Tabachkovskiy as a researcher of philosophical anthropology, *Department of the University*, 2, 92-108.
18. Zaluzhna, A. (2010). Worldview-anthropological tendencies of spiritual and moral searches in the Ukrainian philosophy of the second half of the 20c, *Science. Religion. Society*, 1, 19-29.

В. Е. Туренко, канд. філос. наук, мол. наук. співроб.
Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка, Київ, Україна

В. В. Семикрас, канд. філос. наук, доц.
Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка, Київ, Україна

ФІЛОСОФСЬКА СПАДЩИНА В. Г. ТАБАЧКОВСЬКОГО: ІСТОРИКО-ФІЛОСОФСЬКА РЕКОНСТРУКЦІЯ

Мета статті полягала у ґрунтовному та комплексному висвітленні багатогранності філософської спадщини відомого українського філософа другої половини ХХ ст. – Віталія Табачковського.

У результаті було розкрито трансформацію наукових досліджень Віталія Табачковського в радянський період та виявлено специфіку та його значення спадщини в контексті української філософської думки другої половини ХХ ст. Виявлено, що на перетині 60-х і 70-х років ХХ століття в центрі уваги В. Табачковського була проблема співвідношення особистості і надособистісного, в результаті чого її ґрунтовне дослідження було першим, що критично осмислювало ключові філософсько-антропологічні проблеми французького персоналізму. Розкрито, що на основі тодішньої офіційної філософії феномен практики посідає значне місце, що стало для Віталія Табачковського ключовим предметом дослідження в 1970-х і до середини 1980-х років. Особливістю його тлумачення полягала в тому, що практика мала не тільки гносеологічне забарвлення (у дусі ідеології марксизму-ленінізму), але й мало стосунок до внутрішнього світу людини. Встановлено, що в епоху перебудови та з проголошенням незалежності України наукові інтереси В. Табачковського зосереджені на розумінні світосприйняття людини, відчуження, а також есенційного й екзистенційного в людській природі.

Ключові слова: філософська думка радянської України, Віталій Табачковський, філософська антропологія, практика.

В. Э. Туренко, канд. филос. наук, мл. науч. сотр.
Киевский Национальный университет имени Тараса Шевченко, Киев, Украина

В. В. Семикрас, канд. филос. наук, доц.
Киевский национальный университет имени Тараса Шевченко, Киев, Украина

ФИЛОСОФСКОЕ НАСЛЕДИЕ В. Г. ТАБАЧКОВСКОГО: ИСТОРИКО-ФИЛОСОФСКАЯ РЕКОНСТРУКЦИЯ

Цель статьи заключалась в основательном и комплексном освещении многогранности философского наследия известного украинского философа второй половины ХХ в. – Виталия Табачковського.

В результате была раскрыта трансформация научных исследований Виталия Табачковського в советский период, а также выявлена специфика и значение его наследия в контексте украинской философской мысли второй половины ХХ ст. Виявлено, что на рубеже 60-х и 70-х годов ХХ века в центре внимания В. Табачковського была проблема соотношения личности и надличностного, в результате чего ее обстоятельное исследование было первым, в котором критически осмысливались ключевые философско-антропологические проблемы французского персонализма. Раскрыто, что на основе тогдашней официальной философии феномен практики занимал значительное место, что стало для Виталия Табачковського ключевым предметом исследования в 1970-х и до середины 1980-х годов. Особенность его толкование заключалась в том, что практика имела не только гносеологическую окраску (в духе идеологии марксизма-ленинизма), но и имела отношение к внутреннему миру человека. Установлено, что в эпоху перестройки и с провозглашением независимости Украины научные интересы В. Табачковського были сосредоточены на понимании мировосприятия человека, отчуждения, а также эссенциального и экзистенциального в человеческой природе.

Ключевые слова: философская мысль советской Украины, Виталий Табачковський, философская антропологія, практика.

УДК 165.62

DOI: 10.17721/sophia.2021.17.11

В. І. Якуша, асп.

Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка, Київ, Україна

ORCID: 0000-0002-3552-9866

e-mail: viktorija.profi@gmail.com

ПРОЄКТ "НЕПОМІТНОЇ (НЕЯВЛЕНОЇ) ФЕНОМЕНОЛОГІЇ" ДЖЕЙСОНА АЛВІСА В КОНТЕКСТІ РЕЛІГІЙНОГО ДОСВІДУ

*Проаналізовано роботу "The Inconspicuous God: Heidegger, French Phenomenology, and the Theological Turn", Jason W. Alvis, Indiana University Press, 2018, а також рецензії на неї Деніела Кокса, Джоєрі Шрайверса, Бернарда Прусака. Дж. Алвіс бере за основу гайдегґерівську концепцію *eine rhäphenologie des Unscheinbaren*, яку намагався застосувати до феноменологічного дослідження релігії і релігійного досвіду. Таким чином, синтезуючи концепцію Мартіна Гайдегґера з надбанням французьких філософів, дослідник розвиває власну ідею непомітної (неявленої, англ. – *inconspicuous*) феноменології.*

Долаючи етапи аргументації для власного проєкту непомітної феноменології, Дж. Алвіс порушує вічно актуальну тему діалектичного сприйняття та зрештою закликає відмовитись від застарілої метафізичної діалектики. Доволі провокативна теза, але саме таким чином дослідник пропонує вийти на твердження про те, що "феноменологія релігії" – це не оксюморон.

Ключові слова: феноменологія непомітного, релігійний досвід, феноменологія релігії.

Вступ. Тема релігійного досвіду набуває все більшої популярності серед представників сучасної аналітичної філософії. Водночас, на перший погляд, дослідження Мартіна Гайдегґера не мають жодного стосунку до теми релігійного досвіду. Але так здається, поки ви ще не знайомі з аналітичною роботою сучасного феноменолога Джейсона Алвіса "The Inconspicuous God: Heidegger, French Phenomenology, and the Theological Turn", адже цей дослідник буде свою аргументацію щодо проєкту непомітної (неявленої) феноменології, спираючись на гайдегґерівський концепт та конотації цього концепту у працях французьких феноменологів.

Релігійний досвід здебільшого розглядається в аналітичній традиції у широкому розумінні поняття, що тим чи іншим чином передбачає усвідомлення або відчуття присутності Бога або трансцендентного людині, містичний досвід видіння божеств, досвід переживання єднання людини зі світом як із творінням Бога тощо. Дж. Алвіс одразу використовує презумпцію, що передбачає те, що автор не буде заглиблюватись у власні релігійні переконання, а його дослідження стосується загального феномену релігійного досвіду, який, утім, буде ілюструватись за допомогою контексту християнства. "Феноменологія релігії" загалом описується дослід-