

УДК 1:7.035.93

ЛИМОНЧЕНКО Віра – доктор філософських наук, професор кафедри філософії імені професора Валерія Григоровича Скотного, Дрогобицький державний педагогічний університет імені Івана Франка, вул. Івана Франка, 24, Дрогобич, 82100, Україна (volim_s@ukr.net)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4770-7199>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24919/2522-4727.39.139569>

ABOUT THE INTERNAL SELF-DIFFERENCES OF MODERN

ПРО ВНУТРІШНЮ САМОРОЗРІЗНЕНІСТЬ МОДЕРНУ

***Анотація.** Загострення уваги до модерну актуалізовано дискусіями навколо постмодерну: модерн і постмодерн розглядаються як мисленеві стратегії сучасності. Осмислення того, від чого відмовляється постмодерн у модерні, не раз ставало предметом роздумів і декларацій, проте ретельний розгляд приводить до тези – «модерн – незавершений проект», що ставить під сумнів претензії постмодерну на подолання модерну. Схвалення і прийняття стратегій постмодерну, що виходить з того, що модерн не є життєздатним і вичерпав себе, тільки загострило увагу до нього і виявило смислову енергетику, здатну підживлювати нашу сучасність.*

*У статті ставиться **мета** виявити історичну і смислову структуру модерну, звертаючись до проблематики класичного/некласичного типів філософствування, розробленої М.К. Мамардашвілі.*

Спираючись на позицію Габермаса, можна говорити про «короткий» і «довгий» модерн: перший співвіднесений з точкою зору Адорно, початок цього модерну датується 1850 р., що відповідає рефлексіям мистецтва у Бодлера, «довгий» модерн починається з V ст. відділенням нового часу від римсько-язичницького минулого, всередині якого обіцяна новизна бачиться звершеною, коли сучасність («світ модерну») відкриває себе майбутньому – Габермас вказує на 1500 рік, якісна новизна якого була засвід-

чена тільки в XVIII ст. Злам модерну («короткий модерн») – свідчення нової ситуації думки, яка може бути схоплена розрізненням класичної та некласичної розумової установок, що для тематики пропонованої статті продуктивно розглянути при опорі на ідеї М.К. Мамардашвілі. При розгляді модерну як такого дискурсу, який не ідентифікується з якимось конкретним історичним періодом або певним інтелектуальним напрямом, акцент робиться на такому встановленні традиції, коли ніщо більше не має авторитету або значимості, за винятком розуму. При цьому «розум» береться вузько – як «прогресивна, авангардна свідомість». Проведений аналіз дає змогу конкретизувати модерн і виявити його некласичний варіант, співвіднесений з певним історичним періодом, що, по-перше, повертає впорядкованість історичному процесу, по-друге, надає можливість для обґрунтування рефлексії, відмінної від класичної, тобто, не відмовляючись від філософії суб'єкта, уникнути нормуючих й активістських тенденцій.

Ключові слова: модерн, постмодерн, класика, рефлексія, некласична рефлексія.

Statement of the problem. The aggravation of attention to modernity is actualized by discussions around postmodernity: modernity and postmodernism are regarded as contemplative thinking strategies. The nature of their correlation at the level of the primary-superficial (it does not follow that the word «surface» is endowed with negative connotations is just what constitutes the initial manifestation) is seen not merely as an alternative but as exclusive: «His “post-” (modern) and even not only “after” in the simplest chronological sense, but: “on leaving” (modern), “in his (its) absence”, “completely outside it, in another space”» [7], i.e. declared exhaustion and non-viability of modernity. The comprehension of what postmodernism refuses in modernity has often become the subject of reflection and declarations, but careful consideration leads to the thesis – «modern – unfinished project», which calls into question the claims of postmodern to overcoming modernity. The approval and adoption of strategies of postmodernism, proceeding from the fact that modernism is not viable and exhausted itself, only sharpened the attention to it and revealed the semantic energy that can feed our modernity.

Analysis of the last researches and publications. Despite the fact that since the 90's we can talk about the retreat of postmoder-

nism, which is evidenced by the attempts of new terms: «metamodern» (Timotheus Vermeulen, Robin van den Akker), «post-postmodern» (Alan Kirby), «hypermodern» (Gilles Lipovetsky), «supermodern» (Marc Augé), it is still relevant to consider modernity in connection with the opposition to him from the postmodern, which is realized by the example of the polemic Jürgen Habermas and Jean-François Lyotard (I.M. Semashko), in the interpretation of the attitude to tradition both in the space of history, and in the sphere of thought practices of philosophy and art (P. Anderson, A. Bikbov, A. Dugin, O. Sedakova, Matei Calinescu). Invariably draws attention to the philosophy of F. Nietzsche as a break of modernity (G. Iritsyán, V. Kebuladze, T. Liutyi, Yu. Sineokaya). Particularly significant for the problem is the book published in Kharkiv, «Philosophical Reflections on the Situation of Post/Ned/After-Post/Post-Post ... Modernism», which studies modernity as a «potentiated-reflexive modern» (A. Mamalui), i.e. the ways of «returning to the incessant discourse about modernity» (L. Starodubtseva) are analyzed. In the same vein of the actualization of the philosophy of modernity, with the example of Hegel, talks M. Bykova. Various variants of modernism are discussed in V.A. Konev, K.S. Pigrova, E.A. Trofimova.

The **purpose of the article** is to reveal the historical and semantic structure of modernity, referring to the problems of classical/non-classical types of philosophizing, developed by M.K. Mamardashvili.

Statement of the main material research. Lyotard's text «The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge» in 1979, which affirms the alternativeness of the prospects of postmodernity, already in 1980 is recalled by the text of J. Habermas «Modern – unfinished project», which formulated the thesis defining the principle of the ratio of modern/postmodern, thus sharpening attention to modernity. 1985 is marked by his book «The Philosophical Discourse on Modernity», synthesized-integrally ordering the arguments for and against, actualizing the discourse of modernity. So the words of Zarathustra «Gott ist tot» caused the religious revival of the 20th century, which is so expressively represented by the culture of the Silver Age. Habermas argues that the first clear concept of modernity is developed by Hegel, who establishes the characteristic structure of modernity – his relation to himself, called subjectivity, which can be understood through freedom and reflection [7, p. 16]. It is the awakening to self-conscious-

ness that gives rise to the need for self-confirmation, which Hegel interprets as a need for philosophy, since philosophy has the task of comprehending his time in thought, and it is the time of modernity. Hegel is convinced that, outside the philosophical concept of modernity, it is impossible to come to the notion that philosophy is building about itself [7, p. 16].

When Lyotard asserts: «I define postmodern as incredulity to the metanarratives» [8, p. xxiv], it is impossible not to ask the question: «Does distrust of metanarratives extend to metanarratives themselves?», i.e. the consistent implementation of this principle either preserves their legitimacy or the elimination of metanarratives itself becomes a metanarrative, as evidenced by the elimination of the proclaimed. «I will use the term modern to designate any sense of the word, the emancipation of the rational or working sense of the word, the dialectics of Spirit, the hermeneutics of meaning, subject, or the creation of wealth» [8, p. xxiii]. It is significant that the position of «meta», fixing the setting of reflective validity, gets the definition of «Grand», great, in what it is impossible not to feel irony – the great is clearly read as majestic. Most vivid expression reflexive self-justification is represented by philosophy, so that metaphysics is becoming a synonym philosophy (M. Mamardashvili). But rejecting metanarrative, Lyotard speaks of himself as a philosopher («the author of the report is a philosopher, not an expert» [8, p. xxv]), which introduces himself into the space of «meta», which was supposed to be eliminated from the beginning.

He called these things unacceptable dialectics of Spirit, the hermeneutics of meaning, the emancipation of the rational or working subject, or the creation of wealth persist at quality philosophical discourses, because only at such a case perhaps «retrefines our sensitivity to differences and reinforces our ability to tolerate the incommensurable» [8, p. xxv]. Postmodern discourse emphasizes its preference for distinction over identity, but it does this dogmatically enough, without critical analysis, eliminating and ignoring identity and unity, while Schelling already understands identity as living and mobile, internally differentiated. The ability to distinguish presupposes a vision of the base from which discrimination is possible, otherwise blindness arises: the single basis of discrimination is vision, not physiological, not physical, but metaphysical, which constitutes subjectivity.

Most authors working with the concept of «postmodern/modern» make the following distinction: when using the words «modern» and «postmodern», emphasis is placed on the characteristic for a certain historical stage of the cultural situation, the general spiritual and intellectual atmosphere; the word with «-ism» implies style specificity, most vividly represented in art or expressing a common theoretical understanding of contemporary art, philosophy, science, politics, economy, fashion. We should talk about modernity and postmodern as historical and cultural temporary situations, and modernism and postmodernism as artistic-mental stylistic directions. While in living speech this distinction does not always follow strictly, in theoretical constructions it is generally accepted.

In the space of Russian (and Ukrainian) language there is a split of meaning, because the word «modern» works as a term of the history of art, denoting the artistic direction in art, the most common in the last decade of the XIX – early XX century. In Western Europe, there is no uniform terminology, in the US, they say «Tiffany» (named after the designer L.K. Tiffany), France – «ar-Nouveau» and «fin de siècle», «Art Nouveau» (Jugendstil) in Germany, «Art Nouveau» (Secessionsstil) in Austria, the «Nouveau Style» (modern style) in England. But a more significant difficulty arises in the situation when the terms «New time» (sometimes both with a lowercase letter) and «modern» work: the first is actively used in the twentieth century to the 80s, the second actively enters the philosophical dictionary from the 90s, in connection with the comprehension of postmodernist repulsion from modernity. Postmodernist rejection of modernity with carefully detailed thinking can be attributed to the criticism of the mental and intellectual principles of the Enlightenment philosophical project with its unequivocal progression and dominance of power, but the identification of the modernist project and the Enlightenment project is problematic: at the same time the concrete multiplicity of modernity is lost, the ability to see own grounds and the flexibility of discrimination is lost.

Based on the position of Habermas, one can speak of a «short» and «long» modernity: the first is correlated with the point of view of Adorno, dating the beginning of the modern in 1850, which corresponds to the reflections of art from Baudelaire, «long» modern begins in the 5th century with the separation of the new time from the

Roman – the past in which the promised novelty is seen completed, when modernity (the «world of modernity») reveals itself to the future – Habermas points to the year 1500, the qualitative novelty of which was attested only in the eighteenth century. Internal self-difference of modern disappears in the absence of translation and use of the form «modern». To identify this internal self-depiction, which appears as a new thinking, then as a modern one, let us turn to semantic analysis.

So, the beginning of the «long» modern is signified by the characteristic new, according to the rules of usage new has a value – still unknown, previously not existing. Corresponding to this time (just such a value has modern) it becomes new, which predetermines the transformation of the new time into the New Time. Habermas mentions the question of R. Cozelleck: nostrum aevum – «our time» was renamed to nova aetas is a «new time» [7, p. 6], which is why the division into the New Time, the Middle Ages and the Antiquity (or a new, medieval and ancient history), accepted today (for example, to designate historical periods) [7, p. 6], i.e. the chronological meaning expressed by the grammatical form of the adjective disappears, and the meaning of the naming is established, the phrase gets the meaning of the noun, denotes the essentiality of the period. The characteristic of the «new» is applied to the philosophy of this period. In F. Bacon is a new method («Novum Organum Scientiarum»), historians of philosophy talk about a new philosophy: Hegel speaks of a new philosophy, K. Fisher and W. Windelband publish «Geschichte der neuern Philosophie», but in English translations is «History of modern philosophy», Geschichte disappears, giving to the past as a whole a certain world-historical quality, as well as neuern, indicating not just adequacy to the modern moment, but a difference from the previous one. I. Kireevsky, V. Soloviev, S. Trubetskoy speak on the new philosophy, thinking about the philosophy of modern times, but do not consider it modern. When Habermas mentioned detail of modern times as a historical period, he cites Hegel's words, separating his time from the previous period, the name of his *latest*, i.e. German philosophy from Kant to Hegel testifies to the changes within the New Times. Only in the space of «long» modern can we talk about Hegel as a thinker of modernity. M. Bykova, when considering the philosophical principles of Hegel in the light of the modernist installations, notes at least «the three most sig-

nificant meanings of this term: modern as a broad concept of modernity, embracing the whole period of a new, primarily Christian, time; modern as a synonym for the New Age (as a historical epoch after antiquity and the Middle Ages), and finally, modern as a kind of world outlook, a spiritual project of the present day, a special epoch of the spirit, or the “Enlightenment” era, which opposes itself to the preceding unenlightened epochs» [1]. She expresses her concern that too broad a definition of modernity ideologizes it, making it a «“progressist” view of the world, which views the past only in terms of success leading to progress» [1]. Moreover, the non-specific interpretation of modernity ignores the difference between paradigms of rationality within modernity itself, without which irrationalism becomes an alternative to the discourse of the mind, while already in Hegel his project of speculative reason goes beyond the mind of the instrumental. The break of modern is signified by a new concept of reason, which becomes the main problem for I. Kireevsky, V. Solovyov, and their heirs.

The break of modern («short modern») is evidence of a new situation of thought that can be grasped by the distinction between the classical and nonclassical mindset, which for the subject matter of this article is productively considered while relying on the ideas of M. Mamardashvili. The classical/nonclassical distinction is applied to the analysis of modernity also by M. Kalinescu [2] what he does in connection with the analysis of art. To understand philosophical discourse, Western thought does not address the concept of nonclassical, albeit in logic, and in mathematics it successfully functions.

A holistic, in-depth consideration of the relation between the classical and the non-classical requires a separate study, in the light of the original goal, we note the aspects that are significant for the topic. First, the illusory nature of the innovation of nonclassical thought, which is characterized by a «high degree of susceptibility to new, non-traditional problems, and from other – an obvious underdevelopment of the rational apparatus, with which helped to solve these problems be mastered and translated into “the language of thinking”» [4]. The phrase «illusory nature of innovation» is read not as an assessment of the qualitative inconsistency of nonclassical thinking, but as a fixation of the preservation of a hidden internal dependence on classics with a demonstrative rejection of it. This corresponds to the ties of modern and postmodern, which Habermas reveals. In other words, the classic

is unfinished and a nonclassically oriented idea «under views innovation <...> time and again next he introduces complex inversions of classical ways of thinking», but this again should not be considered a clever dishonest trick – this indicates a historically delineated whole with which it is genetically related [1]. In the work of 1972, classical philosophizing is outlined much more conceptually than «modern bourgeois philosophy», which is his idea of an attempt to overcome the classical structures of philosophical thinking. According to «classics», rationally allocated obvious education, as a part of the inner experience allows to discern the fundamental characteristics of the world «as it is», whereby it is possible to avoid subjective bias, because of this, «the whole of classical philosophy can be described as philosophy of identity or reflection» [4]. The opponent of the classics is considered in the historical and cultural context, revealing a radically new situation, which is the basis for non-classical thinking. So, in the light of the problems under consideration, nonclassical philosophy can be considered the thinking of modern in a new cultural and historical situation – its origin in philosophy can be correlated with the release of «The World as Will and Representation» A. Schopenhauer, aesthetic reflection, as indicated by Adorno, is represented by Baudelaire. This is the Modern nonclassical sample and represented the culture of the end of the XIX – the first half (in some variants – one-third) of the XX century, more and more often referred to as the Silver Age. The concretization of modernity, realized in the classical and non-classical versions, deepens the understanding of the originality of this phenomenon.

It should be noted that the philosophy nonclassical modern manifested in the first half of the XIX century. K.S. Pigrov draws a parallel between Philosophy A. Schopenhauer (it is called the «first constellation of modern», i.e. takes the narrow concept of modern) and the manifestations of modern in art (impressionism, avant-garde, futurism) and politics (socialist and nationalist movements, socialist and conservative revolutions of a «new type») [5, p. 138]. If the main installation of the classics is an idea of an impersonal natural order, an infinite causal chain that permeates all being, transcendent in relation to person, but rationally comprehensible, this is the image of the world «as is», independent of human and humanity, living its natural life [4], then since Schopenhauer the world order is not is thought to be irrelevant to man, as a result of which classical reflexivity acquires a

new, «non-classical meaning»: «“It’s about ...” clarification of the consciousness “abandoned” in the social world that is undergoing its massive impact. Internal authenticity (“truths”) appear simply as basic education of this consciousness, providing it strength, integration, its ability to resist external manipulation, socially organized coercion to illusions» [4]. This testifies the task of philosophical discourse, which ceases to be a purely enlightening or ideological project, but actualizes the measurement of self-consciousness as the dominant «business (matter) of philosophy» (V. Soloviev).

Conclusion. When considering modernity as a discourse that is not identified with any particular historical period or a certain intellectual direction, the emphasis is on such an establishment of a tradition where nothing else has authority or significance, except mind. At the same time, «reason» is taken narrowly as «progressive, avant-garde consciousness». The analysis allows us to concretize modern and reveal its nonclassical version, correlated with a certain historical period, which, first, returns order to the historical process; second, it provides an opportunity to substantiate a reflection that is different from the classical, that is, without giving up philosophy of the subject, avoid the normalizing and activist tendencies.

References

1. Bykova, M. (2001). Gegelevskii fenomen sovremennosti, ili Naskolko Gegel blizok k modernu [Hegelian phenomenon of modernity, or How close is Hegel to modernity]. *Logos – Logos*, 5–6 (31), 96–111. Retrieved from http://www.ruthenia.ru/logos/number/2001_5_6/11.htm [in Russian].
2. Kalinesku, M. (2016). Ideia sovremennosti [The idea of modernity]. *Khudozhestvennyi zhurnal – Art magazine*, 98. Retrieved from <http://moscowartmagazine.com/issue/31/article/541> [in Russian].
3. *Kakoi modern? Filosofskie refleksii nad situatsiei post/nedo/after-post/post-post... modernizma: kolektivnaia monografiia, posviashchonnaia 70-letnemu iubileiu d. fil. n., prof. A.A. Mamalua* [What modernity? Philosophical reflections on the situation of post/ned/after-post/post-post ... modernism: A selective monograph, dedicated the 70th anniversary of the Doctor of Philosophy Sciences, prof. A.A. Mamaluy]. (2010). (Vols. 1–2; Vol. 1). Kharkiv: HNU imeni V.N. Karazina [in Russian].
4. Mamardashvili, M.K. (1972). Klassika i sovremennost. Dve epokhi v razvitii burzhuaznoi filosofii [Classics and modernity. Two epochs in the development of bourgeois philosophy]. *Filosofia v sovremennom mire –*

Philosophy in the modern world. Moscow: Nauka. Retrieved from <http://gtmar.ket.ru/laboratory/expertize/5599> [in Russian].

5. Pigrov, K.S. (2016). K issledovaniu kontcepta vremeni vostochnoevropeiskogo moderna: pafos i ironiia [To the study of the concept of the time of Eastern European modernity: pathos and irony]. *Nauchno-tekhnicheskie vedomosti SPbGPU. Gumanitarnye i obshchestvennye nauki – St. Petersburg State Polytechnical University Journal. Humanities and Social Sciences*, 3 (250), 137–147 [in Russian].

6. Sedakova, O. (n.d.). *No soul more. Pri uslovii otsustviia dushi. Postmodernistskii obraz cheloveka [No soul more. Provided there is no soul. Postmodernist image of a person]*. Retrieved from <http://www.olgasedakova.com/Moralia/279> [in Russian].

7. Habermas, J. (1987). *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity: Twelve Lectures*. Cambridge: Polity in association with Basil Blackwell [in English].

8. Lyotard, J.-F. (1984). *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge Theory and History of Literature* (Vol. 10). University of Minnesota Press [in English].

LIMONCHENKO Vera – Doctor of Philosophy Sciences, Professor of the Philosophy Department named after Valeriy Skotnyi, Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, Ivan Franko str., 24, Drohobych, 82100, Ukraine (volim_s@ukr.net)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4770-7199>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24919/2522-4727.39.139569>

ABOUT THE INTERNAL SELF-DIFFERENCES OF MODERN

Abstract. The aggravation of attention to modernity is actualized by discussions around postmodernity: modernity and postmodernism are regarded as contemplative thinking strategies. The comprehension of what postmodernism refuses in modernity has often become the subject of reflection and declarations, but careful consideration leads to the thesis – «modern – unfinished project», which calls into question the claims of postmodern to overcoming modernity. The approval and adoption of strategies of postmodernism, proceeding from the fact that modernism is not viable and exhausted itself, only sharpened the attention to it and revealed the semantic energy that can feed our modernity.

The **purpose of the article** is to reveal the historical and semantic structure of modernity, referring to the problems of classical/non-classical types of philosophizing, developed by M.K. Mamardashvili.

Based on the position of Habermas, one can speak of a «short» and «long» modernity: the first is correlated with the point of view of Adorno, dating the beginning of the modern in 1850, which corresponds to the reflections of art from Baudelaire, «long» modern begins in the 5th century with the separation of the new time from the Roman – the past in which the promised novelty is seen completed, when modernity (the «world of modernity») reveals itself to the future – Habermas points to the year 1500, the qualitative novelty of which was attested only in the eighteenth century. The break of modern («short modern») is evidence of a new situation of thought that can be grasped by the distinction between the classical and nonclassical mindset, which for the subject matter of this article is productively considered while relying on the ideas of M. Mamardashvili.

When considering modernity as a discourse that is not identified with any particular historical period or a certain intellectual direction, the emphasis is on such an establishment of a tradition where nothing else has authority or significance, except mind. At the same time, «reason» is taken narrowly as «progressive, avant-garde consciousness». The analysis allows us to concretize modern and reveal its nonclassical version, correlated with a certain historical period, which, first, returns order to the historical process; second, it provides an opportunity to substantiate a reflection that is different from the classical, that is, without giving up philosophy of the subject, avoid the normalizing and activist tendencies.

Keywords: modern, postmodern, classics, reflection, nonclassical reflection.

Одержано 25.04.2018