Державний вищий навчальний заклад
Донбаський державний
педагогічний університет

ВІСНИК

Донбаського державного педагогічного університету

ВИПУСК 2 (16)

Серія:
Соціально-філософські проблеми розвитку людини і суспільства

ВІСНИК

Донбаського державного педагогічного університету

СЕРІЯ: Соціально-філософські проблеми розвитку людини і суспільства

Збірник наукових праць

Випуск 2 (16) 2022

Виходить 2 рази на рік

Засновано у березні 2013 р.

СЛОВ'ЯНСЬК – 2022

ЗМІСТ

designed to contribute to the increase of the historical and philosophical correctness of the research, since it fundamentally does not orient the author to the choice of one or another methodological template, which allows to get closer to the essence of the problems under consideration.

Of course, this does not mean that the semantic space of the methods and methodology of hermeneutic philosophy is a fundamental chaos, when everything is connected with each other. The task of hermeneutics is most likely not to establish a system between living elements of meaning, but to untangle, untangle numerous roots of meanings and semantic connections between them. However, even in the absence of a clear system in the history of the formation of the hermeneutic semantic space, we sought to give our consideration a systemic character, tracing subtle connections and points of intersection between different methods, authors and concepts, since all of them ultimately added one or another component to the formation whole picture.

***Key words:** hermeneutic method, semantic connection, recursion, interpretation, meaning, hermeneutic discourse.*

ZINCHENKO NATALIA
Ph.D. in Philosophy,
Associate Professor of the Department
of Philosophy and Social Sciences,
Poltava State Medical University, Ukraine
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-3247-3836

SINIAVSKIY ALEXEY
Aspirant of the Department of Philosophy,
History and Social-Humanitarian Disciplines,
SHEI "Donbas State Pedagogical University"
(Sloviansk, Ukraine)

A RETROSPECTION OF FRENCH PHILOSOPHY AT THE TURN OF THE 20TH – 21ST CENTURIES.

__Abstract.__ The article provides a historical and philosophical analysis of French philosophy at the turn of the century, and identifies the main vectors and problematic issues of French thinkers of the late 20th – early 21st centuries. French philosophy has long attracted researchers with its originality and spontaneity, because starting with the apotheosis of reason in the creative legacy of R. Descartes,

passing through the path of materialism, paying tribute to social problems, it was French philosophy that gleamed with new postmodern colors in the past century.

The problems of French philosophy were, to varying degrees, at the center of attention of Ukrainian and foreign researchers (P. Haydenko, G. Zaichenko, A. Zotov, A. Yermolenko, M. Yosypenko, V. Kuznetsov, S. Kutsepal, V. Lektorskyi, M. Mamardashvili, N. Motroshilova, O. Sobol, E. Solovyov, S. Povtareva, V. Pronyakin, O. Khoma, R. Sloterdijk, E. Trelch, Y. Habermas, U. Eco, M. Heidegger, and others).

The aim of the article is to conduct a historical and philosophical analysis of French philosophy of the late 20th and early 21st centuries, to identify the main directions and problems that were the focus of attention of French thinkers.

Key words – *structuralism, poststructuralism, simulacrum, postmodernism.*

However, examining the philosophy of France is not so easy, and the problem is not only the difficulty of translating the original texts. In this context, V. Decombe observes that when considering modern French philosophy, a tradition has developed according to which philosophical texts are divided into several groups: first, these are texts that are quoted by everyone and are considered worthy of citation; secondly, the texts that everyone quotes, but some think they do not deserve it; thirdly, texts that are cited by few or the very few, but are considered to be more important than the texts of the two previous classes; fourthly, texts that are unknown to anyone except their authors [1].

The French thinker also notes that the 20th century in the development of French philosophy is characterized by the transition from the generation that recognized the undisputed authority of Hegel, Husserl and Heidegger to the generation whose idols are declared to be Marx, Nietzsche and Freud. As a consequence, significant attention is paid to the study of the antipode of reason – madness, significant interest in irrational spheres of activity, the central problem becomes the modification of the mind through the mediation of madness or delusion, the disclosure of those irrational factors that precede the achievement of true courage of knowledge and existence.

The quintessence of this approach can be found in the concept by O. Kozhev, who argued that reality is a cruel, uncompromising struggle of people for goals that are not worth anything – people sacrifice their lives to protect the flag, in order to satisfy the insult, etc., and therefore, any philosophy that ignores this fact is declared an idealistic mystification. O. Kozhev formulates a terrorist concept of history, the motives of which are found in many modern studies. For instance, J. Baudrillard focused on this issue, and A. Glucksman even wrote the book "Les maitres-penseurs" (1977), where he accused all philosophers of the fact, that in their works they embodied the desire to rule, that is, they were accomplices of tyrants.

This influenced both the development of French philosophy and the formation of public opinion. "The relationship of philosophy to public opinion in France is, first of all, a relationship to political opinion, and only then to literary opinion, i.e. to literary groups. Since these groups, in turn, also manifest their political preferences,

various positions are combined or opposed to each other" [1, p. 14]. All of the above influenced the formation of the issues studied by French thinkers in the last century, there was a transition from neo-Kantianism to phenomenology, and then to structuralism, semiology, and poststructuralism, which were replaced by postmodernism.

Let us dwell in more detail precisely on poststructuralism, since this trend is becoming a kind of "business card" of French philosophy of the last century. However, it will be appropriate to recall the previous paradigm, which also had a significant development in the French philosophy of the past century – structuralism. "Structuralism is a scientific trend in humanitarian knowledge that arose in France in the first half of the 20th century. The basis of the structural method is the identification of the structure as a set of relations that are invariant under certain transformations. In this interpretation, the concept of structure characterizes not just a stable "skeleton" of any object, but a set of rules by which one object can be obtained from a second, third one, etc., by rearranging its elements and certain other symmetrical transformations" [2, p. 439]. The main provisions of structuralism can be summarized as follows:

1) theoretical knowledge is a discursive form that generates texts (later we will return to this thesis when analyzing the problem of reference);

2) empirical reality, which should be interpreted by theoretical knowledge, is also a set of textual formations;

3) the content of empirical texts depends on the position of which theoretical texts they will be read;

4) the study of empirical texts leads to an understanding of what is happening in the world, more than any empirical research;

5) the world is the way it is not because of some unifying factor, but thanks to the differences that lie in its foundation;

6) the sociologist's task is not to search for unified principles and laws of the existence of this world, but to study its differences (sociological problems were among the leading ones in the works by J. Baudrillard);

7) sociologists should focus on the analysis of the objective structure of society, and not on the role of individual actors who construct society;

8) the main thing for the researcher should be the text, and the main thing in the text is its internal structure, not authorship [3].

In the context of the present study, in the further analysis of structuralism, we will be guided by the definition given in the "Philosophical Encyclopedic Dictionary": "Structuralism is a direction of scientific knowledge based on the system and structural method of analysis. In general terms, humanitarian structuralism can be characterized as a movement in the sciences in the 1950s and 1960s of the 20th century, which applies to various cultural phenomena the methods of system and semiotic analysis borrowed from the arsenal of structural linguistics, and has a clearly defined anti-psychological and anti-subject orientation" [4, p. 612].

Poststructuralism appears as the heir and successor of the structuralist paradigm, since many thinkers in their evolution worked their way from structuralism to poststructuralism. "In its search, structuralism is based on the thesis of the unity of human nature, the existence of a single, structurally organized basis of the unconscious, embedded in the most fundamental layers of the sensual-irrational sphere of the human. To study this area, structuralism addresses the analysis of ordered systems of rules in the constructions of any form of life activity, and the identification of their invariant structures. At the same time, structuralism considers these forms as a kind of language that speaks and thanks to which our subconscious is objectified" [4, p. 612].

The events of May 1968 in France, massive student and trade union riots played a significant role in the emergence of poststructuralism. "The important role of these events is that their interpretation revealed the limitations of the structuralist approach to man, the impossibility of explaining the resulting conflict of conservative and left-radical mindsets, based on a structural understanding of human consciousness ("Structures do not go outside"). The universalism and academicism of structuralism become the object of total criticism. And although in poststructuralism, the relationship to culture, as to the text, and the orientation towards the analysis and interpretation of the textual phenomena of culture is preserved, but the approach to the text itself is radically changing. The object of consideration and analysis is everything that remains beyond the boundaries of structural understanding. This is first of all the context, whose impact was not considered by structuralists in search of universals, and the set of individual phenomena and features that stands behind the text and defines it. These are the dynamics and variability that are not captured by structural analysis. These are elements of the text that cannot be reduced to a segmental dichotomous division; they appear unsystematic, unique, and inseparable. Finally, this is something that generally goes beyond order, appears as random, embodies freedom, voluntarism, irrationality in human action" [5, p. 351].

Usually, poststructuralism is understood as a set of approaches that were used in the social and humanitarian sciences during the 70s and 80s of the past century and were oriented towards the semiotic interpretation of reality, represented by the well-known thesis that the world is a boundless text. Poststructuralists inherited from structuralism the conviction that the sign (as a structural unit of the text) represents the unity of the signified and the signifier, but, unlike the previous paradigm, they interpreted the essence of the relationship between the signified and the signifier in a new way and focused on the study of "extra-structural" parameters of the structure, analyzing its reverse side.

"Poststructuralism is a trend in the philosophy of science, linguistics, literature, art, and culture. The initiators of poststructuralism deny the possibility of expressing their mindset with the help of any universal "grand theory". They evaluate each such theory as nothing more than a pretentious explanatory scheme leading to unification. Poststructuralists draw their inspiration not from the realm of the mind, but from the unconscious. The principle of rationality in them is only a manifestation of

"imperialism of the mind". Their methodological assessment of the epistemological role of the ideas of "growth," "progress," and "development" in science, history, and culture is just as strict [4, p.503].

Quite often, poststructuralism is represented as a continuation of structuralism and its natural development, while the connecting link is the interest in language problems, which is characteristic of both directions. In the "Newest Philosophical Dictionary" attention is focused on the double problematic of poststructuralism, namely: "1) an epistemological problem: is poststructuralism a simple transformation ("the trajectory of movement, not rejection", according to R. Barthes), mutation or radical revolution?; 2) the "geographical" problem of defining boundaries: if the chronological boundary dates back to 1968, then theoretically poststructuralism intersects with semiotic theory, postmodernism, left-radical currents, various literary practices (for example, with American deconstructivism, for which deconstruction is nothing more than a method of text analysis)" [6, p. 785].

Let us name the main tasks that are solved by poststructuralism:

1) criticism of the logocentrism of Western European metaphysics;

2) demystification of various strategies of coercion, which are hidden under the name of the unconscious and arise at all levels of power relations;

3) search for gaps in freedom that are marginal, thrown out of the structure. In the formation of poststructuralism, the Ukrainian researcher V. Dekhtyar places great emphasis on the following events:

1. Reorientation of some scientists, whose creativity has so far developed within the framework of structuralism, to problems that cannot be solved by structural methods, rejection of the traditional understanding of structurality, symbolism, communicativeness and integrity of the subject.

2. Criticism of the "logic of the signifier", the assertion of language as the "single a priori" of culture, which made it possible to determine the historically changing conditions of cognition and culture.

3. The spread of the methodology of poststructuralism from literary and philosophical practice to humanitarian practice in general, and after the events of 1968 to social and political practice.

4. The emergence of a number of specific concepts within poststructuralism (grammatology, deconstruction, archeology of knowledge, genealogy of power, schizoanalysis, political semiology, etc.) and their emergence beyond the boundaries of the French scientific community.

5. The transition from deconstruction, individual concepts, constructions, narratives of modern philosophical practice to the destruction of the metaphysical discourse of modernism as a whole, awareness of the need to transition to a qualitatively new philosophy in the culture of post-industrial civilization (Postmodern) [7, p.2].

The Ukrainian researcher S. Kutsepal also speaks about the specificity of French poststructuralism: "philosophy focused on text, discourse, language. The consequence of this was the realization that speech is a much more serious

opponent, behind which centuries of existence, a tradition that cannot be destroyed, and the power over the speaker to guide him in a certain way, diverting him at the same time from the objects of discourse. Thanks to the inability of speakers to resist language, the latter enjoys, flaunts its power, forces to satisfy itself" [8, p. 23].

Focusing on the text, declaring the world textualized, representatives of poststructuralism are convinced of the primacy of linguistic reality, the curse of which in the context of traditional metaphysics is declared to be logocentrism, and therefore truth is considered as the product of logocentric consciousness, which seeks to impose meaning on any manifestations of an individual's thinking activity, but at the same time, it is unable to understand and express the illogical essence of the world. This manifests itself in the text's imposition of its form by the speaking subject, the infamous Cartesian cogito, which imagines itself as autonomous and independent. V. Decombe also comments on this: "The "subject" is the present entity, whose identity is so strong that it allows it to carry change in all senses of the word, i.e. alteration. The subject remains one and the same, while its accidental qualities are modified. Starting with Descartes, the most subjective subject is the one who is confident in his identity, ego from ego cogito: the quality of subjectivity of consciousness is also preserved" [1, p.76].

J. Baudrillard in one of his last works "Passwords. From fragment to fragment" wrote that he perceives words as holders and generators of ideas to a much greater extent than ideas are generators of words. The word has magical power, so words not only transmit ideas and things, but also become metaphorical, intertransition and intertransformation, that is, they become conductors of ideas. Therefore, the philosopher summarizes: "Language conceives, it conceives us and for us, and at the same time, with no less success than we think with its help, a symbolic exchange between words and things takes place" [9, p.9].

Poststructuralism, being the heir of structuralism, cannot avoid the concept of the center, the function of which is performed by the cogito. "This is the "classical center" which, using the privilege of management and structuring, itself at the same time remains outside the structural field. According to poststructuralism, the text is always defined by its own commentary: the interpretation of the literary text, along with its "object" and "subject" belong to the same problem field" [6, p.785].

Speaking about structuralism and poststructuralism, it is impossible to ignore the magazine "Tel-Kel", which was published for a long time from 1960 to 1983, uniting such outstanding thinkers as R. Barth, J. Kristeva, F. Sollers, etc. Thanks to this magazine, polemics about such topics as Marxism, surrealism, communication, and reference begin.

Language is considered by Tel-Kelivians as a tool for constructing cultural meanings, and therefore cannot be characterized as depoliticized, free from powerful influences and orders.

One of the most active authors of the magazine, R. Barth, analyzes the functioning of various myths that exist in society, investigates the system of meanings that are imposed on an individual through various forms of human life.

The struggle of poststructuralism with the classical theory of reference and ideas about being as presence is important. In addition, in his concept of simulacrum, Baudrillard proves that the content of modernity consists of simulacra, copies, ersatz of reality, which blur the boundaries between reality and ideas about it, have no referents, relate only to their own imaginary reality. "The signifier loses its immediate connection with the signified as a result of "postponement", putting off the idea of the signified phenomenon into the future. The sign indicates rather the "absence" of the object, and ultimately the fundamental difference from itself. Poststructuralism asserts the necessity of a playful attitude towards meaning in general, puts forward the principle of "dissemination" (Derrida), i.e. scattering, dispersion of any meaning among the multitude of its differentiated shades, the idea of "difference" must give way to the idea of "discerning", which means the end of the power of some meanings over others" [6, p. 785].

Considering the world only as a game of signifiers, poststructuralism gets rid of many problems of classical metaphysics - these are problems of objectivity, truth, method, provability of scientific knowledge, etc. Poststructuralism aims at only one thing – to find the hidden structures of power behind any cultural phenomena. Language, which functions as a tree-like structure, is declared a symbol of coercive forms of power. The Text is declared an alternative to the tree-like language, the proscenium of the struggle of various discourses, which exists according to the rhizome principle, and its main purpose is to escape from power.

Conclusions.

Summarizing the analysis of poststructuralism, we agree with the opinion of O. Yosypenko, who is convinced that the general problems of poststructuralism are determined by the modification of the problem field of structuralism. The researcher singles out the main directions along which the transition from structuralism to poststructuralism is carried out:

– a departure is made beyond the linguistic reality of structuralism into political reality (M. Foucault), textual reality (J. Derrida), ontological reality of Desire (G. Deleuze);

- knowledge is deprived of the status of objectivity, the guarantor of which in structuralism was the concept of structure, with the help of which C. Lévi-Strauss tried to solve the problem of substantiation of humanitarian knowledge and make structuralism a "science of sciences";

– the understanding of the unconscious changes, if structuralism, placing a rational and logically cognizable structure in the unconscious, thought of the latter by analogy with consciousness (C. Lévi-Strauss) and reduced its content to what can be expressed in language (J. Lacan), then poststructuralism considers the unconscious

as a transcendental field of Desire that is truly productive. Poststructuralism is known for its radical critique of Freudian psychoanalysis and its Lacanian variant;

– the structuralist a-historicism is replaced by J. Derrida's attention to certain types of historicism and M. Foucault's affirmation of historicity as the main form of existence of thought [10, p. 5].

Poststructuralism had the same fate as its predecessor, since the last quarter of the last century is the period of the triumphant march of postmodernism, which replaced its predecessors, in some ways denying, and in some ways continuing their strategic line in philosophy, inheriting and sacralizing such features of poststructuralism as instability, randomness, contradiction, non-linearity, fragmentation.

The emergence of postmodernism would be impossible without the self-reflection of structuralism (poststructuralism) and phenomenology, which raises the question of the ambiguity of those definitions that appear in the constituted consciousness. Therefore, it is worth turning to the ideas of the existentialist phenomenologist M. Merleau-Ponty, who in a number of works ("Structure of Behavior", "Phenomenology of Perception", "Sense and Nonsense", "Adventures of Dialectic", "Signs", "Visible and invisible" stands against Marx's economic explanation of history. The philosopher creates his own concept, a kind of controversy of existentialism, interpreting the dialectic of freedom and necessity, objective and subjective, in his own way.

The main themes of M. Merleau-Ponty's philosophy are the place of man in being, the relationship between man and the world, man and man, the nature and essence of language, history as a generation and the sphere of human activity.

M. Merleau-Ponty has his own view of philosophy: it appears to the thinker as paradoxical, it is developed by individual scientists, therefore it does not know completion and has no integrity, it is always busy searching for the truth, which is impossible in principle. Truth is always an "imagined system", it belongs to philosophy as a problem to be solved.

Philosophy comprehends existence through the experience of human passions and desires, seeks to find contact with the original existence, therefore, it is an eternal break with objectivism, a return to life itself. This prevents philosophy from plunging into a vortex of introspection or merging with science, which is characterized by numerical measurements.

An important problem of M. Merleau-Ponty's philosophy is the perception and description of by-past experience. The theoretical constructions of M. Merleau-Ponty evolve from the analysis of perception to the idea of corporeality (flesh), as a result of which the contradiction between the subject and the object is removed and the ontological status of the perceived reality is rebuilt.

All the named and analyzed directions of French philosophy can be considered "predecessors" of postmodernism, since it is possible to clearly trace the intentions of structuralism, poststructuralism, and phenomenology of the M. Merleau-Ponty model.

REFERENCES

1. Decombe V. Contemporary French philosophy. Moscow: Ves Mir, 2000. 344 p.

2. Zinchenko N. Jean Baudrillard on advertising and consumption. Humanities Bulletin of Zaporizhzhe State Engineering Academy 2014. № 56. P. 248-254.

3. A short philosophical encyclopedia. Moscow: Izdatelskaya gruppa "Progress", - "Encyclopedia", 1994. 576 p.

4. Basic schools and directions of modern sociology. [Electronic resource]. http: // ref-at.org.ru/index.php.referat=33304&page=5

5. Philosophical encyclopedic dictionary / [sub. ed. V.I. Shinkaruk]. Kyiv: Abrys, 2002. 746 p.

6. Cultural studies of the 20th century: Dictionary. - St. Petersburg: University Book, 1997. 630 p.

7. The newest philosophical dictionary. Text analysis. [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access: http: // enc-dic.com/history_of_philosophy/Tekstovoj-Analiz-526.html.

8. Dekhtyar, V. M. The problem of power in French post-structuralism: abstract of the candidate's dissertation. Philos. N. 09.00.03. Kyiv, 1999. 18 p.

9. Kutsepal S.V. French philosophy of the second half of the 20th century: discourse with the prefix "post-": monograph. Kyiv: PARAPAN, 2004. 324 p.

10. Baudrillard J. Passwords. From fragment to fragment. Yekaterinburg: U-Factory, 2006. 200 p.

11. Yosypenko O.M. French Poststructuralism: A Critical Analysis of Representation: Diss. Ph.D. Philos. Sciences: specialist 09.00.05. Kyiv, 1999. 16 p.

12. Dubinina V. Conceptualization of the rhetoric's teaching traditions in the post-industrial society (using USA example). Skhid 2014. Vol. 2. P. 131-136.

БІБЛІОГРАФІЧНИЙ СПИСОК:

1. Декомб В. Современная французская философия. Москва: Весь мир, 2000. 344 с.

2. Зінченко Н. О. Жан Бодрійяр про рекламу та споживання. Гуманітарний вісник Запорізької державної академії 2014. № 56. С 248-254.

3. Краткая философская энциклопедия. Москва: Издательская группа «Прогресс», – «Энциклопедия», 1994. 576 с.

4. Основновні школи та напрямки сучасної соціології. [Електронний ресурс]. http: // ref-at.org.ru/index.php.referat=33304&page=5

5. Філософський енциклопедичний словник / [під. ред. В.І. Шинкарука]. Київ: Абрис, 2002. 746 с.

6. Культурология XX век: Словарь. – СПб.: Университетская книга, 1997. 630 с.

7. Новейший философский словарь. Текстовый анализ. [Электронний ресурс]. – Режим доступа: http: // enc-dic.com/history_of_philosophy/Tekstovoj-Analiz-526.html.

8. Дехтяр В. М. Проблема влади у французькому постсруктуралізмі: автореферат дисертації канд. філос. н. 09.00.03. Київ, 1999 .18 с.

9. Куцепал С.В. Французька філософія другої половини ХХ століття: дискурс із префіксом „пост-”: монографія. Київ: ПАРАПАН, 2004. 324 с.

10. Бодрийяр Ж. Пароли. От фрагмента к фрагменту. Екатеринбург: У-Фактория, 2006. 200 с.

11. Йосипенко О.М. Французький постструктуралізм: критичний аналіз репрезентації: дис. канд. філос. наук: спец. 09.00.05. Київ, 1999. 16 с.

12. Дубинина В. Концептуализация традиций преподавания риторики в постиндустриальном обществе (на примере США). Схид 2014. Выпуск 2. С. 131-136.

ЗІНЧЕНКО НАТАЛІЯ
кандидат філософських наук,
Доцент кафедри філософії та соціальних наук,
Полтавський державний медичний університет, Україна
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-3247-3836

СИНЯВСЬКИЙ ОЛЕКСІЙ
аспірант кафедри філософії,
історії та соціально-гуманітарних дисциплін,
ДВНЗ «Донбаський державний педагогічний університет»
(Слов'янськ, Україна)

У статті здійснюється історико-філософський аналіз французької філософії на зламі століть, визначаються основні вектори та проблематичні питання французьких мислителів кінця ХХ – початку ХХІ століть. Французької філософії здавна приваблює дослідників оригінальністю та спонтаністю, адже розпочавшись апофеозом розуму у творчому спадку Р. Декарта, пройшовши шляхом матеріалізму, віддавши данину соціальним проблемам, в минулому столітті саме французька філософія засяяла новими постмодерними барвами.

Проблематика французької філософії різною мірою опинялася в центрі уваги як вітчизняних, так і зарубіжних дослідників (П. Гайденко, Г. Заіченко, А. Зотов, А. Єрмоленко, М. Йосипенко, В. Кузнєцов, С. Куцепал, В. Лекторсь–кий, М. Мамардашвілі, Н. Мотрошилова, О. Соболь, Е. Соловйов, С. Повторєва, В. Пронякін, О. Хома, Р. Слотердайк, Е. Трельч, Ю. Габермас, У. Еко, М. Гайдеггер та ін.).

Мета статті *– здійснити історико-філософський аналіз французької філософії кінця ХХ – початку ХХІ століття, виявити основні напрямки та проблеми, які були в центрі уваги французьких мислителів.*

Ключові слова *– структуралізм, постструктуралізм, симулякр, постмодернізм.*