

UDC 130.2:316.2

DOI: 10.21564/2075-7190.46.213233

Kovalenko Inna Igorivna, Ph.D. in Philosophy, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor of Department of Philosophy, Yaroslav Mudryi National
Law University, Kharkiv, Ukraine
kinna087@gmail.com
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-3156-9254

Meliakova Yuliia Vasylivna, Ph.D. in Philosophy, Associate Professor, Associate
Professor of Department of Philosophy, Yaroslav Mudryi National Law
University, Kharkiv, Ukraine
melyak770828@gmail.com
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-0200-1141

Kalnytskyi Eduard Anatolievich, Ph.D. in Philosophy, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor of Department of Philosophy, Yaroslav Mudryi National
Law University, Kharkiv, Ukraine
kalnitsky@ukr.net
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-1777-9992

SOCIO-CULTURAL REFLECTION IN PHENOMENOLOGICAL PARADIGM: OPPORTUNITIES AND PROSPECTS

Phenomenology can significantly reflect the specifics of cultural of cultural philosophic understanding of modern cultural processes. Without calling for paradigm changes and maintaining the attitude to the value of rational knowledge, phenomenology as a multidimensional and promising research program seeks to understand the depth of changes in the principles of social life.

Keywords: *phenomenology of cultural being, non-classical rationality, social cognition, social life.*

Problem statement. The human-sized-ness as a modern cultural principle enables to understand socio-cultural space not only as the objective given, but also as a meaningful reality interpreted by an individual. In this regard, it is topical to study the methodological potential of the non-classical types of rationality, which allow for adequate reflection of the specifics of the latest socio-cultural transformations.

Background. Modern philosophical discourse is actively discussing new trends that enable to expand the «field» of rationality, activate the principle of trust to the subject of cognition, show the structural role of the categories of life, faith and reliability in cognition. In addition, the focus is set on the categories of «transcendental subject», «empirical subject», «intersubjectivity», as well as to the concept of knowledge itself [1; 2].

The place of the former universal theory ideal has been taken by the new types of methodologies, based on inclusivity, «competitiveness» and communicative rationality, which was demonstrated in the fundamental research by G. Ritzer and R. Merton [3; 4]. These studies were followed by further research into various forms of human communication. In particular, the monograph by A. Antonovsky is devoted to the specifics of modern knowledge in the context of natural everyday communication [5].

In the recent socio-humanitarian studies широко обсуждается «network project» of social studies, or the actor-network theory of scientific knowledge [6; 7]. This theory is a part of the global trend towards «*science and technology studies*» (*STS*) that also includes the full range of philosophical interdisciplinary studies, which was clearly shown in the monograph by S. Sismondo [8], and further analysis and assessment of this field of research were made by I. Kasavin [9].

The abovementioned paradigm changes imply the application of new ways of theoretical explication of different aspects of sociocultural reality. Therefore, modern cultural philosophical studies demand, inter alia, the potential of phenomenology as a non-classical type of rationality [10; 11; 12].

Phenomenological methodology is used among the advanced approaches to knowledge, in particular, to revisit the concept of the truth in the historical-and-cultural knowledge development. For instance, based on the fundamental concepts of modern non-classical cognition, K. Khvostova notes that «a historian deals not with ontology, that is not with the reality of the past as is, but with phenomenology, historical memory, reflected in historical sources», which occurs due to the influence of the values, interests and the overall socio-political situation [13, p. 30].

A special area of modern foreign research is cognitive phenomenology in connection with the nature of thinking. The work published by M. Jorba and D. Moran discusses specific features of cognitive phenomenology and outlines the issues to be addressed in further theoretical research, which confirms positive potential of this philosophical field of study [14]. The phenomenological nature of social cognition has been considered by A. M. Astobiza [15], while T. Fuchs insists on the productiveness of phenomenology in its dialog with empirical sciences, in particular, as a concept of primary social cognition [16].

Phenomenological view on the social cognition also implies the research into the correlation between the social (inter-subjective) and temporary cognition.

According to M. Pokropski, this enables finding out the relation between the levels of individual empathy and the levels of inter-subjective temporality as joint experience of time and joint use of the temporary action pattern [17].

Scholars do not unanimously agree on the assessment of cognitive opportunities of phenomenology. S. Spaulding, among others, believes that phenomenological arguments lack such criteria as novelty, reliability and applicability, which, eventually, reduces the role of phenomenology in the discussions on social cognition [18]. We agree with the opinion that phenomenological methods may be successfully applied to develop new ideas and to question and add new details to the existing, frequently more regulated and structure-oriented theories [19].

The aim of the work is to substantiate the prospects of the phenomenology methodological potential феноменології in the interdisciplinary studies of sociocultural processes.

Discussion and Results. Traditionally, the object of phenomenology is cognition, contemplating nature, and it seeks to describe how things and phenomena are presented in human mind. Pointing to the boundaries of the phenomenological semantic field, Edmund Husserl emphasized that «the holistic nature of its (phenomenology) method is given as something that goes without saying» [20, p. 52]. Husserl's well-known saying «Back to the things themselves!» was aimed at the cognitive phenomena, determining the meaning of things, and implies person's deeper experience. Focusing on the meaning, Husserl denied the sameness, or identity, of reality and existence, recognizes the equal power of facts and subjective bases of knowledge – perception, fantasy, recalling and aesthetic feeling. In turn, M. Heidegger stated that the concept of *phenomenology* characterized not only the meaningful *what*, or substance, of the subject matter of philosophical research, but also their *how* [21, p. 27].

The positive prospects of phenomenology as a non-classical rationality are also confirmed by the recognition of the significance of different theoretical descriptions, and the fragmented nature of ontology, represented in individual «horizons» that open to a person according to his or her individual perception abilities. At the same time the cognitive process itself and its results are determined by the inevitable impact of socio-cultural, axiological, anthropological and other pre-conditions. Another «non-classical» sign of phenomenology is apparently its openness, enabling to go beyond standard cognitive patterns, develop various cognitive approaches as well as to set the trends in the development of humanistic, practice-oriented knowledge of culture and society. Phenomenology is focused on purely human, value-based process of sense-forming, namely, on summarizing meanings and sense-making. Thereupon, the idea expressed by V. Kutyrev seems quite interesting. This researcher claimed the similarity of phenomenology and fundamental ecology: «Phenomenology and fundamental ecology, comprising the content of conservative

philosophical reasoning, show the same vector for preserving human existence» [22, p. 72].

The above understanding of the nature of phenomenology enables us to show the significance of this philosophical methodology for the development of social cognition. Phenomenology regards social knowledge as a dynamic form of social being that ensures the connections among individuals and unites them into the intersubjective community. Hence culture and society may be considered as a constituted world of meanings and mutually agreed rules, emerging in human activities.

Applicability and the prospects of the phenomenological way of explaining sociocultural reality are confirmed by the fact that by the mid-twentieth century Husserl's philosophy had already been regarded as a new practice, which is presented as the «universal critics of life and its goals, cultural forms and systems that had already developed in the life of humanity, and those values that, explicitly or implicitly, guide them» [23, p. 311]. This practice must lead to the development of completely new humankind with a high level of self-responsibility, determined by the synthesis of theoretical universality and universal interests of practice.

The phenomenological study of sociocultural phenomena and processes is supported with the sequence of methodological procedures. In particular, phenomenological reduction enables to clear mind from ambiguous premises of scientific and routine nature thus opening the way to axiomatical phenomena. Being oriented on obtaining the primary form of cognitive experience, reduction facilitates finding the meaning of an object, which is not communicated, but deploys and shows itself.

It should be noted that the full implementation of reduction while studying cultural and social phenomena is impossible. For instance, to clarify social situations researchers inevitably resort to type designs. Therefore, A. Schütz noted that the unique objects and events, given to us in the unique aspect, are unique within the horizon of standard knowledge scope, or preliminary study... Type designs depend on my «issue in question», defining and solving it [24, p. 491].

The following stage of the phenomenological methodology involves the procedures of description and interpretation. Description in phenomenology allows for understanding and generalizing axiomatical properties of an object and also for referring them to a certain typical form. Husserl suggested that description was oriented on two interrelated dimensions of an object – the way the object is given in the intentional experience, and the way it is given in the intersubjective shaping of the *Other*. Thus, description reflects the conditions of cognitive process, the specifics of the subject as well as the structure and features of the given in the lifeworld.

It is to be mentioned that the use of description in the cognitive process might entail «senseless infinity». Consequently, interpretation as sense-construction shows

the problems defined in hermeneutics in the concept of «hermeneutic circle». For this reason, the probability of unconditional understanding is complicated with description as an endless regression of descriptions. According to V. Serkova, «the interpreter is in the situation of «pre-understanding», leading to certain «smuggling of senses» [25, p. 7]. Eventually, due to the lack of methodological techniques of this problem solving, a phenomenologist applies «free imagination», abstract experiments with cognitive images and speech patterns. Moreover, there emerge the grounds to raise the issue of the implied limit of the rational social cognition.

It is to be borne in mind that reduction, description and interpretation, as a result, provide a typified and subjectified knowledge, which does not enable to achieve absolutely true world cognition. Addressing this problem, J. Habermas explained this feature of the social cognition by the specifics of social being. For example, the philosopher states that subjects, acting and communicating, always move within the limits of their life world and they cannot go beyond it. Being interpreters and generating speech acts, they are a part of the lifeworld and correlate to it via the experienced facts and rules. According to Habermas, it is possible to avoid unjustified requirements by setting the criteria and limits of social cognition and not by denying rationality of social actions [26].

What is *understanding* from the phenomenological viewpoint?

It is important to notice that Husserl widely applied the notion of evidence: «Evidence... is the experience of the truth. The truth... is experienced only in to the extent in which the ideal may ever be experienced in a real act» [27, p. 164]. Furthermore, the works by E. Husserl include expression «the fallacy of experience evidence», which testifies to the probability of an error in evidence. The possibility of fallacy refers to the experience evidence and does not reject its fundamental nature or its effectiveness, though evident understanding of the «fallacy» rejects respective experience or the evidence itself [28, p. 69]. Thus, according to Husserl, we move from evidence to evidence, and each following evidence may cancel the precedent. This endless regression of evidence sets the context in action understanding and meaningfulness. It is to be noted that evidence, unlike understanding, does not imply communication, though it does not exclude it, if something becomes evident in the lifeworld.

Philosophical ideas of Husserl also enriched the social cognition with the principle of cognition intentionality, which is the basis for a description of an object and which, according to Husserl's bright remark, is the essence of all metaphysical and cognitive mysteries. Intentionality allows for the coincidence of pure subjectivity and pure objectivity, i.e. mind is burdened with thingness, which, in turn, is the foundation of the unity of consciousness.

N. Smirnova explains the need of introducing the principle of intentionality into the theory of social cognition with the fact that «though we actually live in our

experience, the life of consciousness... normally goes unnoticed, escapes our attention, similarly to our eye-sight, when we perceive a thing but we do not notice the process of watching it» [29, p. 85]. In order to notice it, it is necessary for the *epoch* to act, i.e. to understand own experience. This reveals not only mental structures and mechanisms, but also the main property of consciousness – its intentionality. The principle of intentionality opposes the subject-object setting of the rationality. It indicates that the object is given to the subject as a condition of its existence. The subject's consciousness cannot be separated from the object it is oriented on.

Among the grounds of social phenomenology it is also necessary to mention the notion of inter-subjectivity and its interpretation as a social phenomenon. Transcendental «*Self*» and its intentional modifications «*You*», «*We*», «*They*» generally form the semantic field of inter-subjectivity or essential interrelations among people. Inter-subjectivity as an a priori ideal unity means that transcendental «*Self*» can think and understand others like itself. This, according to Husserl, in fact should be considered a pre-condition for the existence of the empirical cultural community.

For the development of social cognition, it is very important to consider the idea of the lifeworld, which was the leitmotif in the late phenomenological works by Husserl. The introduction of this concept as a phenomenological term was related to the critics, expressed by Husserl, of the objectivism in the new European science. In particular, the philosopher insisted that it was the lifeworld that served the area of primary evidence, which, in turn, served the bases for the premises and goals of science. The lifeworld is in the forms of principal visuals and primary prepredicative evidence, which Western European culture had blurred with the scientific world view, believing that it would show the real world landscape. Lifeworld is the space of human life and everyday experience, it is the base of any activity, because this world may be indeed visualized, experienced and accessed, it actually embraces all our live events, its structure, its own style of causality stay essentially unchanged regardless of what we do and whether we do that skillfully [30, p. 74].

Considering that the world is equally accessible to everybody, it is possible to state the variety of historical (cultural, professional and other) lifeworlds – «regional ontologies». Nevertheless, lifeworld has a universal structure, integrating and unifying all this diversity. It should be noted that Husserl does not give an answer to the question about the principles of this integration. The philosopher believes that this problem must become an objective to be studied by a new science, which, unlike objectivism, could be universal.

Despite high probability of the emergence of a science, built on the holistic research into the lifeworld, Husserl's ideas have been successfully applied in a number of social-philosophical theories. Therewith, we are to mention the

phenomenology of the social world by A. Schutz, the theory of communicative actions by J. Habermas, the theory of social construction of reality by P. L. Berger and T. Luckmann, and the self-referential systems theory by N. Luhmann.

In this respect, A. Schutz defined the term of «social reality» as the totality of objects and events within the sociocultural experience in both everyday experience of consciousness of the people who live their everyday lives among other people and interacting with them in different ways. From the very beginning we, actors on the social stage, perceive the world we live in, both the world of nature and the world of culture, not as subjective, but as an intersubjective world. In other words, we perceive it as our common world, actually given and potentially accessible for everybody, and this entails intercommunication and language» [24, p. 485]. Thus, determining social reality, A. Schutz regards it as a structure of the lifeworld.

The specificity of the opinion expressed by P. L. Berger and T. Luckmann is in the fact that these authors attend to constructing social reality, unlike nature. It means that the senses inherent in the social reality emerge continuously and are replicated in the interpretations and communication of social subjects. «Society is an objective fact, it forces and forms us. However, it is also true that our conscious actions contribute to the support of the social building and may play their part in its change. The two statements involve a paradox of social being: society forms us, but, we, in turn, form society. The social recognition is required to be people, though preserving own identity. And the society cannot exist, unless recognized by people [31, p. 26]. Thus, the social world is presented as a constructed lifeworld, created by personal senses and socially important meanings. Hence, the problem of dialectics of meaning and sense presents itself as a problem of the nature of cultural and social reality.

In consideration of the foregoing it is fully reasonable to admit the phenomenological conclusion that lifeworld is only possible when recognized. Since lifeworld is the world of numerous realities, different individuals focus on different aspects thereof. Considering that individuals tend to present their partial experience as common, society is comprised of various communications.

Conclusion. The above conceptual provisions allow for showing the opportunities of the phenomenology in studying sociocultural phenomena and processes. The prospects of using phenomenological methodology in social cognition are in the opportunity to change the perspective, namely, to shift the vector of research from social structures and institutions to the fundamental properties of cognition experience and lifeworld.

Therefore, social phenomenology appears as an area in the philosophy of culture and as a non-classical research program. It operates a specific logic of social reality cognition, which gives an opportunity to study social institutions via sense structures. The objectivity of social phenomena and structure becomes clear owing to the lifeworld subjective dimensions.

Being human-sized, phenomenological methodology enables to show cultural-social reality as the result of sense-making, initiated by communicating parties. Therewith, it is to be taken into account that the cultural-social reality has both subjective and objective dimensions. There it is presented as the pre-given, objectively preceding all further interpretations. As a result, the lifeworld space comprises the unity of subjects, the senses, generated by them, and the forms of human activities.

LITERATURE

1. Микешина Л. А. Современные тенденции развития социально-гуманитарных наук в контексте междисциплинарности. *Научный результат. Социальные и гуманитарные исследования*. 2017. Т. 3, № 1. С. 4–10.
2. Микешина Л. А. *Философия познания: полемические главы*. Москва: Прогресс-Традиция, 2002. 624 с.
3. Ритцер Дж. *Современные социологические теории*. 5-е изд. Санкт-Петербург: Питер, 2002. 688 с.
4. Мертон Р. *Социальная теория и социальная структура*. Москва: АСТ: Хранитель, 2006. 880 с.
5. Антоновский А. Ю. *Коммуникативная философия знания: от теории коммуникативных медиа к социальной философии науки*. Москва: ИФ РАН, 2015. 168 с.
6. Латур Б. *Пересборка социального. Введение в акторно-сетевую теорию*. Москва: Изд. дом Высш. шк. экономики, 2014. 384 с.
7. Ло Дж. *После метода: беспорядок и социальная наука*. Москва: Изд-во Ин-та Гайдара, 2015. 352 с.
8. Sismondo S. *An Introduction to Science and Technology Studies*. Second Edition. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ltd, 2010. 257 p.
9. Касавин И. Т. *Социальная философия и коллективная эпистемология*. Москва: Весь мир, 2016. 264 с.
10. Кузнецов В. Ю. Сдвиг от классики к неклассике и наращивание порядков рефлексии в философии. *Вестник МГУ. Серия 7, Философия*. 2008. № 1. С. 3–18.
11. Кемеров В. Е. *Социальная феноменология и социальная философия*. *Социемы*. 2003. № 9. С. 21–56.
12. Зотов А. Ф., Смирнова Н. М. *Феноменология и эволюция самосознания человека европейской культуры*. *Вестник МГУ. Серия 7, Философия*. 2000. № 6. С. 63–70.
13. Хвостова К. В. Особенности истины и объективности в историческом знании. *Вопросы философии*. 2012. № 7. С. 27–37.
14. Jorba M., Moran D. *Conscious thinking and cognitive phenomenology: topics, views and future developments*. *Philosophical explorations*. 2016. Vol. 19, issue 2. P. 95–113.
15. Astobiza A. M. *Phenomenology and Cognition (social): Strange bed-mates?* *Philosophical readings*. 2017. Vol. 9, issue 3. P. 175–181.
16. Fuchs T. *The phenomenology and development of social perspectives*. *Phenomenology and the cognitive sciences*. 2013. Vol. 12, issue 4. P. 655–683.

17. Pokropski M. Timing together, acting together. Phenomenology of intersubjective temporality and social cognition. *Phenomenology and the cognitive sciences*. 2015. Vol. 14, issue 4. P. 897–909.
18. Spaulding S. Phenomenology of Social Cognition. *Erkenntnis*. 2015. Vol. 80, issue 5. P. 1069–1089.
19. Berglund H. Between cognition and discourse: phenomenology and the study of entrepreneurship. *International journal of entrepreneurial behaviour & research*. 2015. Vol. 21, issue 3. P. 472–488.
20. Гуссерль Э. Идеи к чистой феноменологии и феноменологической философии. / пер. с нем. А. В. Михайлова. Москва: Акад. Проект, 2009. 489 с.
21. Хайдеггер М. Бытие и время / пер. с нем. В. В. Бибихина. Москва: Ad Marginem, 1997. 589 с.
22. Кутырев В. А. Апология человеческого (предпосылки и контуры консервативного философствования). *Вопросы философии*. 2003. № 1. С. 63–75.
23. Гуссерль Э. Кризис европейского человечества и философия. *Культурология. XX век. Антология*. Москва: Юристъ, 1995. С. 297–330.
24. Щюц А. Формирование понятия и теории в общественных науках. *Американская социологическая мысль: тексты*. Москва: Изд-во МГУ, 1994. С. 481–498.
25. Серкова В. А. Феноменологическая дескрипция: монография. Санкт-Петербург: Изд-во СПбГУ, 2003. 320 с.
26. Хабермас Ю. Теория коммуникативного действия (отрывки). *Вопросы социальной теории*. 2007. Т. 1, вып. 1. С. 229–245.
27. Гуссерль Э. Логические исследования. Т. II. Москва: Гнозис: Дом интеллект. кн., 2001. 529 с.
28. Молчанов В. Исследования по феноменологии сознания. URL: https://dom-knig.com/read_237234-69 (дата звернения: 20.04.2020).
29. Смирнова Н. М. От социальной метафизики к феноменологии «естественной установки» (феноменологические мотивы в современном социальном познании): монография. Москва: ИФ РАН, 1997. 222 с.
30. Гуссерль Э. Кризис европейских наук и трансцендентальная феноменология. Введение в феноменологическую философию. Санкт-Петербург: Владимир Даль, 2004. 400 с.
31. Бергер П. Общество как драма. *Человек*. 1995. № 4. С. 20–33.

REFERENCES

1. Mikeshina, L. A. (2017). Sovremennye tendencii razvitiya social'no-gumanitarnykh nauk v kontekste mezhdisciplinarnosti. *Nauchnyj rezul'tat. Social'nye i gumanitarnye issledovaniya – Scientific result. Social and humanitarian studies, Vol. 3, 1, 4–10* [in Russian].
2. Mikeshina, L. A. (2002). *Filosofiya poznaniya. Polemicheskie glavy*. Moskva: Progress [in Russian].
3. Ritcer, Dzh. (2002). *Sovremennye sociologicheskie teorii*. 5-e izd. Saint-Petersburg: Piter [in Russian].

4. Merton, R. K. (2006). *Social'naya teoriya i social'naya struktura* Moskva: AST: Hranitel' [in Russian].
5. Antonovskij, A. YU. (2015). *Kommunikativnaya filozofiya znaniya: ot teorii kommunikativnyh media k social'noj filozofii nauki*. Moskva: IF RAN [in Russian].
6. Latur, B. (2014). *Peresborka social'nogo: vvvedenie v aktorno-setevuyu teoriyu*. Moskva: Izd. dom Vyshej shkoly ehkonomiki [in Russian].
7. Lo, Dzh. (2015). *Posle metoda: besporyadok i social'naya nauka*. Moskva: Izd-vo in-ta Gajdara [in Russian].
8. Sismondo, S. (2010). *An Introduction to Science and Technology Studies*. Second Edition. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
9. Kasavin, I. T. (2016). *Social'naya filozofiya nauki i kollektivnaya ehpiistemologiya*. Moskva: Ves' Mir [in Russian].
10. Kuznecov, V. YU. (2008). *Sdvig ot klasiki k neklassike i narashchivanie poryadkov refleksii v filozofii*, *Vestnik MGU. Seriya 7. Filozofiya – Herald of MGU. Series Philosophy, 1, 3–18* [in Russian].
11. Kemerov, V. E. (2003). *Social philosophy and collective epistemology*. *Sociemy – Sociemy, 9, 21–56* [in Russian].
12. Zotov, A. F., Smirnova, N. M. (2000). *Phenomenology and evolution of human self-consciousness in European culture*. *Vestnik MGU. Ser 7. Filozofiya – Herald of MGU. Series Philosophy, 63–70* [in Russian].
13. Hvastova, K. V. (2012). *Osobennosti istinnosti i ob»ektivnosti v istoricheskom znanii*. *Voprosy filozofii – Problems of philosophy, 7, 27–37* [in Russian].
14. Jorba, M., Moran, D. (2016). *Conscious thinking and cognitive phenomenology: topics, views and future developments*. *Philosophical explorations. Vol. 19, issue 2, 95–113*.
15. Astobiza, A. M. (2017). *Phenomenology and Cognition (social): Strange bed-mates?* *Philosophical readings. Vol. 9, issue 3, 175–181*.
16. Fuchs, T. (2013). *The phenomenology and development of social perspectives. Phenomenology and the cognitive sciences, Vol. 12, issue 4, 655–683*.
17. Pokropski, M. (2015). *Timing together, acting together. Phenomenology of intersubjective temporality and social cognition*. *Phenomenology and the cognitive sciences. Vol. 14, issue 4, 897–909* [in Polish].
18. Spaulding, S. (2015). *Phenomenology of Social Cognition*. *Erkenntnis. Vol. 80, issue 5, 1069–1089*.
19. Berglund, H. (2015). *Between cognition and discourse: phenomenology and the study of entrepreneurship*. *International journal of entrepreneurial behaviour & research. Vol. 21, issue 3, 472–488*.
20. Gusserl', EH. (2009). *Idei k chistoj fenomenologii i fenomenologicheskoy filozofii*. Moskva: Akad. Proekt [in Russian].
21. Hajdegger, M. (1997). *Bytie i vremya*. Moskva: Ad Marginem [in Russian].
22. Kutyrev, V. A. (2003). *Apologiya chelovecheskogo (predposylki i kontury konservativnogo filozofstvovaniya)*. *Voprosy filozofii – Problems of philosophy, 1, 63–75* [in Russian].
23. Gusserl', EH. (1995). *Krizis evropejskogo chelovechestva i filozofiya*. *Kul'turologiya. XX vek. Antologiya*. Moskva: YUrist, 297–309 [in Russian].

24. SHCHyuc, A. (1994). Fomirovanie ponyatiya i teorii v obshchestvennyh naukah. *Amerikanskaya sociologicheskaya misl'. Teksty*. Moskva: Izd-vo MGU [in Russian].
25. Serkova, V. A. (2003). Fenomenologicheskaya deskriptciya. Saint Petersburg: Izdatel'stvo SPbGU [in Russian].
26. Habermas, J. (2007). Theory of communicative action (fragments). *Voprosy social'noj teorii – Problems of social theory, Vol.1, issue. 1, 229–245* [in Russian].
27. Gusserl', E.H. (2001). Logicheskie issledovaniya. Vol. II. Moskva: Gnozis, Dom intellektual'noj knigi [in Russian].
28. Molchanov, V. (2007). Issledovaniya po fenomenologii soznaniya. URL: https://dom-knig.com/read_237234-69 [in Russian].
29. Smirnova, N. M. (1997). Ot social'noj metafiziki k fenomenologii «estestvennoj ustanovki» (fenomenologicheskie motivy v sovremennom social'nom poznanii. Moskva: IF RAN [in Russian].
30. Gusserl', E.H. (1999). Kartzianskie razmyshleniya. Saint Petersburg: Nauka, YUventa [in Russian].
31. Berger, P. (1995). Obshchestvo kak drama. *CHelovek – Person, 4, 20–33* [in Russian].

Коваленко Інна Ігорівна, кандидат філософських наук, доцент, доцент кафедри філософії Національного юридичного університету імені Ярослава Мудрого, м. Харків, Україна

Мелякова Юлія Василівна, кандидат філософських наук, доцент, доцент кафедри філософії Національного юридичного університету імені Ярослава Мудрого, м. Харків, Україна

Кальницький Едуард Анатолійович, кандидат філософських наук, доцент, доцент кафедри філософії Національного юридичного університету імені Ярослава Мудрого, м. Харків, Україна

СОЦІОКУЛЬТУРНА РЕФЛЕКСІЯ У ФЕНОМЕНОЛОГІЧНІЙ ПАРАДИГМІ: МОЖЛИВОСТІ ТА ПЕРСПЕКТИВИ

Постановка проблеми. Вивчення новітніх тенденцій у взаємодії соціальних та гуманітарних наук є актуальною темою сучасного філософського дискурсу. Визнання пізнавального потенціалу неklasичних підходів дозволяє розширити поле раціональності за рахунок нових типів методологій.

Аналіз останніх досліджень і публікацій. Указані парадигмальні зміни передбачають використання нових способів теоретичної експлікації різних аспектів соціальної реальності, зокрема феноменології, що відображено в дослідженнях сучасних суспільствознавців.

Мета роботи полягає в обігруванні евристичних можливостей феноменології як неklasичної методології дослідження соціокультурних процесів.

Виклад основного матеріалу. Методологія дослідження заснована на інклюзивному використанні методологічного потенціалу неklasичної філософії культури, загальнонаукової методології (компаративний та аналітичний методи), міждисциплінарного синтезу соціально-філософського та феноменологічного способів пізнання. На основі аналізу гусерліанської традиції у філософії визначена специфіка феноменологічної рефлексії соціальної реальності. Зокрема, показано, що процедури редукції, дескрипції та інтерпретації дозволяють осмислювати соціальне пізнання та структурувати його. Наукова новизна роботи полягає в уявленні феноменології як неklasичного дослідницького проєкту, що дозволяє об'єднати в інтегроване ціле фундаментальний та інструментальний аспекти пізнання культури.

Висновок. Феноменологія з її неklasичними пізнавальними установками здатна значною мірою відобразити специфіку культурфілософського осмислення сучасних культурних процесів. Здатність бути продуктивним дискурсом в умовах радикальних соціокультурних трансформацій зумовлює перспективи подолання методологічної кризи, що має місце в сучасному соціальному пізнанні. Не закликаючи до парадигмальних змін у теорії соціального пізнання і зберігаючи настанову на цінність раціонального пізнання, феноменологія як відкрита, багатовимірна й перспективна дослідницька програма прагне до усвідомлення глибини змін у принципах улаштування соціального життя.

Ключові слова: феноменологія буття культури, неklasична раціональність, соціальне пізнання, соціальне життя.

Коваленко Інна Игоревна, кандидат філософських наук, доцент, доцент кафедри філософії Національного юридичного університету імені Ярослава Мудрого, г. Харків, Україна

Мелякова Юлія Васильевна, кандидат філософських наук, доцент, доцент кафедри філософії Національного юридичного університету імені Ярослава Мудрого, г. Харків, Україна

Кальницький Едуард Анатольевич, кандидат філософських наук, доцент, доцент кафедри філософії Національного юридичного університету імені Ярослава Мудрого, г. Харків, Україна

СОЦИОКУЛЬТУРНАЯ РЕФЛЕКСИЯ В ФЕНОМЕНОЛОГИЧЕСКОЙ ПАРАДИГМЕ: ВОЗМОЖНОСТИ И ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ

Феноменологія способна в значительной степени отразить специфику культурно-философского осмысления современных культурных процессов. Не призывая

к парадигмальным изменениям и сохраняя установку на ценность рационального познания, феноменология как многомерная и перспективная исследовательская программа стремится к осознанию глубины перемен в принципах устройства социальной жизни.

Ключевые слова: феноменология бытия культуры, неклассическая рациональность, социальное познание, социальная жизнь.

