

UDC 141(091)

KARPENKO ANDRII,*PhD in Philosophy, Associate Professor of the Philosophy, Socio-political and Legal Sciences Department, Donbas State Pedagogical University, Sloviansk*

HEIDEGGER STUDIES AND THE SHIFT OF PHILOSOPHICAL HISTORIOGRAPHY

The purpose of the study is to shed light on introduction of the concept of reception history to the philosophical historiography, taken within the framework of the current Heidegger studies in Ukraine and worldwide. **The methodology** combines elements of discourse analysis with traditional methods of historical and philosophical criticism. **Scientific novelty** is expressed in the following statements: 1) the problem of the recent history of reception of Heidegger's philosophy worldwide is missing in the Ukrainian historico-philosophical discourse; 2) the concept of *Rezeptiongeschichte* should be included to the framework of philosophical historiography as essential method of bridging the gap between the Ukrainian philosophy and the global intellectual trends; 3) transition of the philosophical hermeneutics from interpretation to reception deconstructs Hegelian notion of history of philosophy as philosophy into a much more pragmatic notion of history of philosophy as a filiation of intellectual history. **Conclusions.** The Ukrainian discourse of philosophical historiography still resists the urgency of the postmodern situation, finding an escape in idealistic metaphysics of history, which conceives the Heideggerian idea of sublime philosophizing as opposed to the mundane practices of calculating mind of science. This naïve Heideggerianism interferes with adequate development of Heidegger studies in Ukraine. However, it can be surpassed by shifting research focus from purist hermeneutics of texts and ideas to reconstruction of various receptions of Heidegger's thought worldwide. Such a shift can be backed by re-interpretation of philosophical historiography in terms of sociology of knowledge or intellectual history rather than hermeneutics and phenomenology.

Keywords: *Heidegger studies; philosophical historiography; Rezeptiongeschichte; discourse; hermeneutics; reconstruction.*

Problem statement

The recent history of philosophy in Ukraine has been dominated by attempts to redefine the very concept of its intellectual identity. These efforts shaped several varying strategies of understanding the history of philosophy as such. The leading strategy conceives traditional approach of close reading and autonomous hermeneutics of philosophical texts. This tendency distracts attention from contextual and situational aspects of historico-philosophical study as they were defined by Vilen Horsky [3], a prominent Ukrainian historian of philosophy. Such distraction resulted in a discourse of rather metaphysical philosophizing instead of scientifically grounded critique of ideologies.

Although techniques of close reading and purist hermeneutics of philosophical texts are essential for history of philosophy in general and Ukrainian Heidegger studies in particular, as it is proved by the works of A. Baumaster [1], A. Bohachov [2], A. Dahnii [4] and V. Kebuladze [5], they should not be taken uncritically as sufficient conditions for reconstructing philosophical process as such, because they imply reductionist approach to philosophy as specific form of human activity.

In this paper I am going to argue that the focus of philosophical historiography can go deeper to reconstruction of the very situation where philosophical thought appeared via redirection of research interest from original texts to series of their use and reception. Such a shift is evident

due to the recent papers of French and American Heidegger scholars [6-9].

Research objective

The objective of this research is to shed light on introduction of the concept of reception history to the philosophical historiography in Ukraine. The possibility and necessity of this introduction shall be defined within the framework of Heidegger studies. The argument will be put forth that the distinction between primary and secondary texts can be surpassed due to the challenges of the Post-Soviet re-orientation of philosophical studies, which demands bridging the gap between the Ukrainian philosophy and the world context.

Theoretical basis and results

Philosophical historiography cannot be bound to text hermeneutics solely; it should strive for reconstruction of understanding, interpretation, appropriation, denial and criticism around the given philosopheme. Thus, the branch of *Rezeptiongeschichte* is a promising direction of historical studies of philosophy. Let us assume that reception is interpretation taken with its consequences both in philosophical and non-philosophical aspects of philosophical thinking.

The concept of *Rezeptiongeschichte* opens up an approach to matching the reality of philosophy in Ukraine to the current discourse of the world intellectual development with its recent history. This revision of how other communities dealt with certain philosophical texts and what

solutions they found for certain philosophical problems will provide us with concrete alternatives for redefining the essentials of philosophy as a social value. It is so urgently needed, because there is no sign of desired re-institutionalization of philosophy. It is still so far from being an independent intellectual practice.

It is obvious that real integration to the world intellectual process will force us to explore the recent findings in the corresponding filiations of scientific work. So, this is a bit suspicious that there have been done so few attempts to reveal the gaps and bridges between Ukrainian philosophical studies and general tendencies of the world philosophy. There are two factors that hinder scientific interest to the current philosophical issues. These are that purist hermeneutics of philosophical text and vulgar metaphysics of history. Due to a treacherous trick of dialectics, accurate and precise explications of philosophical texts go together with fantasies and obscurantism thanks to revival of once oppressed idealism.

Finding out that there is the need for a new beginning, the Ukrainian philosophers of the early Post-Soviet era were lax to offer concrete tasks for re-institutionalization of philosophy. There was no sincere identification of that vast gap between the world philosophy and the Ukrainian philosophical studies. It is only now that this gap becomes visible via huge contrast between our academic writings and the intellectual process worldwide.

Heidegger studies are nothing but one discourse among the rest, where the contours of the aforementioned gap can be clearly seen. Such abstract labels as "existentialist philosopher", "phenomenologists" or "mystic" in their Ukrainian use are taken with all the previous connotations of Soviet origin. The problem with them is that even without the Soviet negative connotations they no longer fit the current hermeneutics of Heidegger's philosophy which has evolved through several paradigm shifts. An exemplary historiography of such shifts is given by Th. Sheehan: "One can also make out at least five overlapping approaches to understanding Heidegger that have emerged in the seventy years since World War II: 1. 1945 to 1963: the existentialist paradigm, focused on human existence (*Dasein*) as elaborated in *Sein und Zeit*; 2. 1963 on: the "classical paradigm" that reads Heidegger as a philosopher of "being" (*Sein*); 3. 1970s on: the Derridean paradigm (if it is that): an assortment of readings inspired by Derrida and directed at select elements of Heidegger's work, such as language and the deconstruction of metaphysics; 4. 1980s on: the analytic/pragmatist paradigm of Hubert Dreyfus, focused on only the first half of *Sein und Zeit*; 5. 1990s on: a growing awareness of the instability of the classical paradigm and of the need for an interpretation grounded in the *whole* of the *Gesamtausgabe*" [8, p. 2].

Th. Sheehan's approach contrasts profoundly with commonly accepted purist hermeneutics of Heidegger's legacy, which has recently become a leading trend in the Ukrainian studies on Heidegger. There is no palpable initiatives to resolve those shifts of the world context within some general concept, for it is obvious that any historico-philosophical research on Heidegger should at least make some reference on this now open history of understanding Heidegger, where we can write our own Ukrainian story.

Heidegger studies have already formed a separate trend in the world philosophical discourse. It is interesting to focus on critical assessment of certain *reflexes*, i.e. definite interpretative strategies providing different transcriptions of the same *referents*, i.e. definite philosophical forms, texts, or problems. In the general contour of Heidegger studies I differentiate the following reflexes: reflex of immanent hermeneutics, reflex of reductive

interpretation, reflex of genetic historiography, and reflex of ideological historiography. There is certainly a possibility to identify transcriptions of Heidegger's thought (the referent of historico-philosophical thought), provided by the reflex of ideological historiography. The recently re-emerged disputes on political implications of Heidegger's philosophy can be developed in the terms of sociology of knowledge, so now it comes to biographical transcription of Heidegger's political engagement. Critical assessment of the methodological inclinations of such approach reveals imposition of biographical objectivity on philosophy discourse, simplification of the complexity of philosophical form, and the pathos of elementary humanism as the ideological criterion of research.

Let us consider, for instance, Heidegger's approach to rethinking the category of subject and reveal basic consequences brought by a broader historiographical context. Heidegger sets forth the question of the subject as the prior problem and the obstacle on his way towards asking the question about Being. The German philosopher claims that since the times of ancient Greeks the latter had been abandoned to oblivion, repressed by the figure of the transcendental subject of modernity drawing human thinking away from ontology to essentialist anthropology. In his early works Heidegger proposes existential transcription of the transcendental subject still required by phenomenology of Husserl but meant to get overcome through exposition of *Dasein*'s modes of existence in the world. For Heidegger, attribution of absolute sovereignty to rationalizing subject in modern philosophy breeds anthropocentric ideologies in other spheres of human activities, which are blind and deaf to the light of nature and the call of being. Historiologically Heidegger executes conceptual destruction of European metaphysics aimed at reconstruction of the question of Being suppressed by the viral subjectivity. Despite his constant attempts to overcome the logics of metaphysics Heidegger can be hardly said to have it done so, since his analytic work remains transcendental. Nevertheless his category of subjectivity evidently correlates with successive attempts to conceptualize some ontology without all too humane anthropology.

A. Baumeister offers "a strategy of close reading of Heidegger's texts opposed to A. Dahnii's historico-philosophical hermeneutics" [1, p. 48]. Both Ukrainian philosophers made a worthy contribution to understanding Heidegger by our intellectual community. However, they share certain prejudice against necessity of conceptual construction of their own hermeneutical stances, of those dispositions which determine their own interest to Heidegger's discourse. It looks as if this is only the target text which exists historically, whereas receiving minds of interpreters exist somehow out of history. It is no wonder that the category of "the ahistorical" is so important for V. Kebuladze, another representative of the new generation of Ukrainian phenomenologists [5].

Critical approach to understanding Heidegger's thinking is viewed as a methodological model for the contemporary needs of the historiographical hermeneutics of Heidegger's philosophy. In the terms of ideological criticism Heideggerian conceptuality assumes the form of a jargon, which stylistically derives from archaic tendencies of the late Romanticism. Unlike sociologists of knowledge, ideological critics do not aim to reveal the social background of this proximity between existential philosophy and cultural conservatism of the Weimar epoch, but rather they persist in deconstructing the key concepts of Heidegger's philosophy, so that he would reveal its neutralizing and metaphysical effects. In Adorno's transcription of the

difference between onticity and ontology, the latter appears as a form of reification, and consequently as a philosophical form of ideology preoccupied with the conservative claims to preserve the existing order. The conservative move of Heidegger's logic consists in subjugation of Dasein to being, where being is conceptually charged as a secularized deity. Heidegger's possible response to invectives should certainly avoid Heideggerian language. It is necessary to obtain an outer position to both discourses.

Within the domain of the Ukrainian history of philosophy one can clearly observe symptoms of eclecticism and contamination. Such situation is rooted in continuous insufficiency of the methodological framework of Ukrainian philosophy, split by the demise of Soviet ideological structures. Critical condition of humanitarian epistemology is aggravated by the urgent need to overtake foreign studies in the corresponding field, which constantly increase in number and evolve in character. All of the aforementioned symptoms are indicative for historico-philosophical reception of Martin Heidegger's legacy by the Ukrainian academy.

Findings

The main findings of this research can be formulated in the following statements: 1) the problem of the recent history of reception of Heidegger's philosophy worldwide is missing in the Ukrainian historico-philosophical discourse; 2) the concept of *Rezeptiongeschichte* should be included to the framework of philosophical historiography as essential method of bridging the gap between the Ukrainian philosophy and the global intellectual trends; 3) transition of the philosophical hermeneutics from interpretation to reception deconstructs Hegelian notion of history of philosophy as philosophy into a much more pragmatic notion of history of philosophy as a filiation of intellectual history.

Conclusions

The Ukrainian discourse of philosophical historiography still resists the urgency of the postmodern situation,

finding an escape in idealistic metaphysics of history, which conceives the Heideggerian idea of sublime philosophizing as opposed to the mundane practices of calculating mind of science. This naïve Heideggerianism interferes with adequate development of Heidegger studies in Ukraine. However, it can be surpassed by shifting research focus from purist hermeneutics of texts and ideas to reconstruction of various receptions of Heidegger's thought worldwide. Such a shift can be backed by re-interpretation of philosophical historiography in terms of sociology of knowledge or intellectual history rather than hermeneutics and phenomenology.

REFERENCES

1. Baumeister, A. (2012), Origins and Hidden Motives of Fundamental Ontology, *Sententiae*, Vol. XXVII, pp. 46-59 (ukr).
2. Bohachov, A. (2011), Experience and Sense, *Dukh i Litera*, Kyiv, 336 p. (ukr).
3. Gorskiy, V. (1981), Historico-philosophical interpretation of text, *Naukova Dumka*, Kyiv, 208 p. (rus).
4. Dakhnii, A. (2012), Destruction as method of hermeneutical phenomenology of Martin Heidegger, *Herald of Lviv University: Philosophy Series*, pp. 29-37 (ukr).
5. Kebuladze, V. (2013), Phenomenology and Hermeneutics in Contemporary Ukrainian Historic-Philosophical Research, *Sententiae*, Vol. XXIX, pp. 46-59 (ukr).
6. Pettigrew, D., ed. (2008), French interpretations of Heidegger: an exceptional reception, State University of New York Press, New York, 300 p.
7. MacAvoy, L. (2013), Heidegger's Anglo-American Reception. In: *The Bloomsbury Companion to Heidegger*, Bloomsbury, London, pp. 425-432. doi: 10.5040/9781472548313.ch-053
8. Sheehan, Th. (2016), The Reception of Heidegger's Phenomenology in the United States. Unpublished manuscript, available at: https://www.academia.edu/26545151/The_Reception_of_Heideggers_Phenomenology_in_the_United_States.
9. Woessner, M. (2011), Heidegger in America, Cambridge University Press, New York, 308 p. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511777998

Карпенко Андрей,

кандидат философских наук, доцент кафедры философии, социально-политических и правовых наук Донбасского государственного педагогического университета, г. Славянск

ХАЙДЕГГЕРОВЕДЕНИЕ И ТРАНСФОРМАЦИЯ ФИЛОСОФСКОЙ ИСТОРИОГРАФИИ

Цель исследования состоит в том, чтобы обозначить поворот философской историографии к истории рецепции идей, рассматриваемый в рамках текущих исследований Хайдеггера в Украине и во всем мире. *Методология* сочетает в себе элементы дискурс-анализа с традиционными методами исторической и философской критики. *Научная новизна* исследования выражается в следующих положениях: 1) вопрос о современной истории рецепции философии Хайдеггера во всем мире отсутствует в украинском историко-философском дискурсе; 2) концепт *Rezeptiongeschichte* должен быть включен в рамки философской историографии как важнейший способ преодоления разрыва между украинской философией и глобальными интеллектуальными тенденциями; 3) переход философской герменевтики от интерпретации к рецепции деконструирует гегельянское понятие истории философии как философии в более прагматистском ключе истории философии как отрасли интеллектуальной истории. Доказано, что украинский дискурс философской историографии до сих пор не пережил ситуацию постмодерна, находя спасение в идеалистической метафизике истории, которая воспринимает хайдеггеровскую идею возвышенного философствования, противопоставленного исчислению науки. Это наивное хайдеггерство мешает адекватному развитию исследований философии Хайдеггера в Украине. Тем не менее, его можно превзойти, сдвигая фокус исследования от умозрительной герменевтики текстов и идей к реконструкции различных рецепций мысли Хайдеггера во всем мире. Такой сдвиг требует реинтерпретации философской историографии с точки зрения социологии знания или интеллектуальной истории, а не герменевтики и феноменологии.

Ключевые слова: хайдеггероведение; философская историография; *Rezeptiongeschichte*; дискурс; герменевтика; реконструкция.

Карпенко Андрій,

кандидат філософських наук, доцент кафедри філософії, соціально-політичних і правових наук
Донбаського державного педагогічного університету, м. Слов'янськ

ГАЙДЕГГЕРОЗНАВСТВО І ТРАНСФОРМАЦІЯ ФІЛОСОФСЬКОЇ ІСТОРІОГРАФІЇ

Мета дослідження полягає в тому, щоб окреслити можливість повороту філософської історіографії до історії рецепції ідей, розглянутого в рамках поточних досліджень Гайдеггера в Україні і в усьому світі. Методологія поєднує в собі елементи дискурс-аналізу з традиційними методами історичної та філософської критики. Наукова новизна дослідження виражається в наступних положеннях: 1) питання про сучасну історію рецепції філософії Гайдеггера у всьому світі відсутнє в українському історико-філософському дискурсі; 2) концепт *Rezeptiongeschichte* потрібно включити в рамки філософської історіографії як найважливіший спосіб подолання розриву між українською філософією і глобальними інтелектуальними тенденціями; 3) перехід філософської герменевтики від інтерпретації до рецепції деконструє гегельянське поняття історії філософії як філософії в більш прагматистському ключі історії філософії як галузі інтелектуальної історії. Доведено, що український дискурс філософської історіографії досі не пережив ситуацію постмодерну, знаходячи порятунком в ідеалістичній метафізиці історії, яка сприймає гайдеггерівську ідею піднесеного філософування, протиставленого науковому мисленню. Це наївне гайдеггеріанство заважає адекватному розвитку досліджень філософії Гайдеггера в Україні. Проте, його можна перевершити, зрушуючи фокус дослідження від умовляної герменевтики текстів та ідей до реконструкції різних рецепцій думки Гайдеггера у всьому світі. Такий зсув вимагає реінтерпретації філософської історіографії з точки зору соціології знання або інтелектуальної історії, а не герменевтики і феноменології.

Ключові слова: гайдеггерознавство; філософська історіографія; *Rezeptiongeschichte*; дискурс; герменевтика; реконструкція.

© Карпенко Андрій

Надійшла до редакції 17.10.2016

УДК 101.1:316

МУЛЯР ВОЛОДИМИР,

доктор філософських наук, професор, завідувач кафедри гуманітарних і соціальних наук
Житомирського державного технологічного університету

СТРАХ: МЕТОДОЛОГІЧНІ ОСОБЛИВОСТІ АНАЛІЗУ ФЕНОМЕНУ

У статті аналізується страх як один із сутнісних вимірів людини та актуальна проблема соціальної філософії. Обґрунтовується низка фундаментальних особливостей людського страху. Доводиться внутрішній, органічний взаємозв'язок страху і свободи людини, зокрема страху в умовах скutoї свободи за необхідністю та страху в умовах скutoї свободи в собі самій. Дається характеристика страху західноєвропейської середньовічної людини, а також людини епохи Відродження. Зважаючи на основні тенденції та риси сучасного світу, формулюється висновок про сучасну епоху як епоху страху, а також про сучасну людину як людину страху.

Ключові слова: страх; людська природа; свобода і страх; напруження цивілізації; страх західноєвропейської середньовічної людини; страх та епоха західноєвропейського Відродження; епоха страху; людина страху.

Постановка проблеми. Серед величезної мозаїки проявів людського як такого феномену страху, безсумнівно, посідає особливе місце. Очевидно, це зумовлено не просто чуттєвістю як значущою властивістю людини. Ідеться й про таку природну її сутність, як страж-

денність. Людина - істота страждання і страждуюча, цей зріз її фізіологічного, емоційного, душевного і в цілому духовно-світоглядного буття характеризує людину саме як істоту за визначенням. Саме цим і зумовлюється особлива увага науковців до феномену страху.