

УДК 130.2

*Gazniuk L. M., Orlenko O. M.
Kharkiv State Academy of Physical Culture*

CONCEPTUALIZATION OF SOMATIC HUMAN EXISTENCE IN THE SPACE OF CULTURE

The ways of understanding the human being as a universal phenomenon, which is revealed in the unity of its body and reasonable nature are considered. The essence of human, which is determined, inter alia, the dimension of freedom can't be objectified and reduced to a finite structures. "Somatic being" as a specific ontological characteristic is the integration of human corporeality with its socio-cultural form of existence, and an appropriate way of reception of the world, allows to more accurately capture the essence of human, rather than the "classical" theoretical "tools". Also reveals the specifics of the iterative reproduction of human subjectivity, emphasizes its recursiveness and eventfulness. For adequate description of this subjectivity we should abandon the substantial approaches in favor of topical analysis.

Keywords: somatic being, corporeality, iteration, recursiveness, topica.

Розглядаються способи універсального розуміння людини як феномена, що розкривається у єдності його тілесної та розумної природи. Сутність людини, обумовлена, серед іншого, виміром свободи, не може бути об'єктивована і зведена до скінченних структур. «Соматичне» як специфічна онтологічна характеристика, яка полягає в інтеграції людської тілесності з його соціально-культурною формою існування та відповідним способом реєстрації світу, дозволяє більш адекватно зафіксувати сутність людини, ніж «класичні» теоретичні «інструменти». Розкривається також ітеративна специфіка відтворення людської суб'єктивності, акцентується рекурсивність та подійність останньої, для адекватного опису якої необхідно відмовитися від субстантивуючих підходів на користь топічного аналізу.

Ключові слова: соматичне буття, тілесність, ітерація, рекурсивність, топіка.

Рассматриваются способы универсального понимания человека как феномена, раскрывающегося в единстве его телесной и разумной природы. Сущность человека, определяемая, среди прочего, измерением свободы, не может быть объективирована и сведена к конечным структурам. «Соматичность» как специфическая онтологическая характеристика, заключающаяся в интеграции человеческой телесности с его социально-культурной формой существования и соответствующим способом рецепции мира, позволяет более адекватно зафиксировать сущность человека, нежели «классические» теоретические «инструменты». Раскрывается также итеративная специфика воспроизведения человеческой субъективности, акцентируется рекурсивность и событийность последней, для адекватного описания которой необходимо отказаться от субстантивирующих подходов в пользу топического анализа.

Ключевые слова: соматическое бытие, телесность, итерация, рекурсивность, топика.

Modernity is based on the existence of fundamentally different cultural-anthropological ontology, united by existential-willed factors. In the postmodern era we can see an awakening and actualization of Dionysian element, which is released by the whole course of technological civilization that brought humanity to the brink of global disaster. It activates a powerful and forth greeting beginning; thus irrational, unconscious, and the absurd is conceptualized into clear scheme with claims of discursivity in the boundless elements of postmodernism. In the last dominate wrested from the control of utilitarianism Things by themselves and Things with their contents (visual, auditory, haptic), energy and Body, that gives the "place for such existence, the essence of which is not to have any essence" [translated by authors here and below – Gaznyuk L. M., Orlenko O. M] [5, p. 38] armed with sensory, breaking the chain of spirituality.

There is a problem of defining the heuristic possibilities of scientific methodology to describe a man as the subject of investigation. Even the form of the question "what is a man?" contains appeal to the grammar and syntax of scientific discourse, which sets limits and defines the general accentuation of research. Methodological organon of anthropological disciplines is limited to the explanatory procedure, implying the motion from observation to description, systematization, building of theoretical model of a man in search of the empirical sphere where this model is verified. Thematic

reorientation of research on human reality to the method of its comprehension makes questions of how a man proves himself and whom he sees himself more significant for the anthropologist. These arguments are concrete evidence of well-known Gadamer's thesis about constructive correlation between the method and the subject of science in general: "<...> the method is the path to follow. Ability to follow again and again the path that has already been passed, is methodicalness, which characterizes the way of doing things in science. If only the prospect of verification <...> confirms the truth, the scale to which the knowledge is compared, is no longer the truth, but the accuracy" [1, p. 32]. Today the creation of universal model of a man is problematic, and, perhaps, it is more appropriate to speak about the anthropological principle that structures the uncertainty of human representations in unified research field.

Structuring of anthropological problem by means of philosophical discourse involves radical shifts in methodology of the study. Its limits are defined by Kant: "Physiological humanities implies the investigation of what nature makes from human, though pragmatic – the study of what he, as a freely acting being, does or can and should make from himself" [2, p. 351]. In other words, the origins of anthropological issues are in ontologically rooted acts of transcendence, going beyond the limits naturally given to man. Theming of such acts shall be interpreted as freedom existence in man and through man, and does not require the introduction to anthropological principle. Anthropological problematics can be articulated with ontologically rooted way of human existence.

Thus, philosophical landmark of anthropology is focused on free and universal understanding of a man as a phenomenon. The problem is how to describe a man in terms of freedom if the latter is impossible to objectify. Philosophical discourse is based on this particularity of freedom, being a "grammar" of infinity. In other words, it is built according to the rules of symbols manipulating ("empty concepts"). They do not have subject referents and only point to acts of freedom, derivatives of which together with them constitute the "matter" of understanding (Plato). Symbol is otherness of freedom, and therefore culture is a kind of "trap" and can, under certain conditions, ensure anthropological configuration to freedom.

When it comes to human studying in terms of "life forms" and "situations" that provide them human faces, a space formed by the spontaneity of the force field of culture is meant. Freedom is structured in the form of clusters of semantic fields containing infinity, and can be manifested at the level of empirical as its semantic field, given as a kind of "conditions and plexus" of empiricism, which constitute the meaning [4, p. 214-229]. This kind of symbolic representation produces effects that are called events in philosophy. Events are the "crystallization" of freedom or its structuring in symbolic form, as all other forms of freedom objectification are equal to its disappearance in the structures of subject human extremity. Consequently, this means the recognition of the fact that the event is endowed with the nature of the phenomenon, which has anthropological and cultural modes. Man in measuring of events has no fixed substrate, but has a "form" or *topica*, the unity of which forms a conscious subject. According to the expression of M. Heidegger, constructs which "give picking <...> in a single stay" [7, p. 321], form an anthropological pole of events as "the presence of consciousness or conscious subject" [4, p. 219]. Its second pole – "empty" in the objective sense form ("no man's condition") as the ontological condition of any rationality.

Such understanding of events allows marking the boundaries of anthropology in philosophical discourse. An indispensable condition for analytics of anthropological and cultural focuses of events is usage of such constructs that express ontologically rooted ways of its shaping. As a rule, we use postmodern constructs – iteration and recursion. By iteration (skt. *itera* – other) as a rule, are meant structural possibility of distinguishing, actualization as an ability to be different, while maintaining a certain unity. Neighbor construct difference (J. Derrida) indicates the "distinction of presence" as an opportunity of "repetition without repeating". In the anthropological aspect iteration indicates the possibility of human singularity reproducing, regardless of any substantive extremity structures, i. e., it marks possible space of human freedom. A man can be «gathered» only due to the efforts to reproduce himself. This reproduction has no empirical basis, and is a "crystallization" of freedom. In the form of pure possibility it tends to infinite reproduction. Such "crystallization" is a condition of ideality, articulating the possibility of thinking of infinity within a finite, i. e. consciousness.

Therefore, the functional purpose of the "iteration" construct is in the marking of "possibility conditions" (Kant) of "gathering" a person. To those belong the derivatives of human freedom possibilities of constituting a symbolic topology and temporality. Methodologically, it focuses on the

distinction between the actual situation and human environment, made in natural manner. The subject of the theming in this case is particularly structuring semantic field that allows a person to be the same I, despite the fact that every other paragraph of this field – is the “place” where he proves different. In this perspective it is possible to treat “generating” “life forms” as a form of “rhythm”, “repetition without repeating”, as the field of liberty “crystallization”. Iteration, as an opportunity to be different, acquires its semantic “flesh” (becomes reality) only being a pole of recursive culture. The last by itself, is already implemented idea. It is about an ontological form of organization of the empirical material (“subject organization of a special kind” – according the terminology of Mamardashvili), which is both a way of understanding this empiricism. Such form is a symbolic conceptual apparatus that organizes any event as a kind of “understanding body”. Thereby the space of any possible enforcement of consciousness experience, or the field of cultural tradition, which structures the human behavior, is laid.

The term “recursive” characterizes the orientation of the culture on its “representation in the other” – the human material. Recursive is the way which provides the continuous reproduction and singularity of culture or the field where it can exist as a human tradition. Certainly, a phenomenon is cultural as much as its possibility of reproducing is initially discharged into the matrix of culture itself. Such matrixes are usually called “ideal objects” or “ideas”. These include the absolute scenario of phenomenon (its rational structure or horizon of maximum feasibility and completeness of relations), but at the same time, they can exist independently of a particular man as the “trace” of already implemented idea (J. Baudrillard, J. Derrida). Their purpose is not in the meaningful description of communication freedom acts (that is generally unfeasible), but in the presentation of the ways by which general ideas can be reproduced as the ability of the individual human consciousness. In other words, the idea becomes the “culture machine” only in its recursive dimension, reproducing itself again every time and being personified in a unique way in a particular man. Creating the image of articulation and the material, from which human ideas and concepts about anything are formed, recursion is a forming factor of human discourse. In the same way, philosophical discourse is the modification of recursion, which exists almost in the form of modes of crystallization of its transcending acts in a man. In this aspect, it is a way of infinite reflective duplication and manifestations of freedom in human. The movement of reflection articulates the difference between the method of entity and content of consciousness that creates the possibility of human experience, which is created during the movement of the operationalization of the content of cultural matrixes and states the boundaries where it is possible and feasible for human in practice.

The gist of the operationalization is in the reflexive reconstruction of spontaneous impacts of the world onto controlled by a mantranscending acts formations of consciousness, which can be repeated, i. e. be reproduced in other conditions, modalities and sign systems, transmitted to other, etc. In other words, this is the procedure of introduction of such mode of treatment with consciousness, in which the recursion of culture becomes an opportunity of its own thinking. A man has a fixed and stable experience in the extent to which he is able to state a perfect object in himself, through the prism of which spontaneity of the world acquires the structure of order and harmony. On the other hand, the experience is knowing the limits of its own extremity or own capabilities, which equals the articulation of such person conditions that are not amendable to rational deployment on reflection level. In the philosophy abstraction of practice expresses the fact of existence in any experience of structures, unexplained by content of consciousness, especially those forms which can not be analytically divided into components (ways of inclusion into the world) through which something can be expressed as conscious content. Perhaps, they give continuity of reproduction of cultural phenomena overtone singularity. As for explanation of recursion through abstraction of the operational solution, the practice indicates how transcendence of cultural matrix is “made out” and is replaced in a man by “eternal return” to himself through endless movement, distinction of his practical metamorphosis and their reflexive doubles (F. Nietzsche). Such character of substitution creates dynamics of cultural phenomena. Simultaneously, this is the “scheme” of understanding that any innovation is only possible within the framework of tradition and, on the contrary, the tradition is able to “move” if the manner of its implementation is an innovation as the singularity of human reproduction. And finally, through the iterative and recursive human events can be represented as the space of understanding that can not be explained exclusively in terms of empiricism. Human event is formed at the point of “meeting” of human’s iteration and recursion of culture, manifesting the effect

of their existential and phenomenal commensurability. Therefore, an understanding has no external subject coordinate system: this is a field, which poles are, from the one hand, the human ego, which gathers itself as a thinking and knowing the boundaries of its experience, and from another hand – the matrixes of culture, which potentially contain symbolic schematic execution of any objectivity. In the field of human understanding, iteration of human is iterative phenomenologically complete and recursion of culture is anthropologically centered and existentially executed.

It is clear that such character of anthropological problem structuring has one goal – to outline the conditions under which the difference between the orientation on integrity of a man comprehension and its analogue in the form of limited “systematic and comprehensive” scientific studies becomes obvious. Ontology of integrity is the prerogative of philosophy. And the last is not an “architectural superfluity” on the body of science, but a powerful methodological guideline, that allows to thematize man in semantic horizon of notional universe, where the method of its givenness is spontaneity constructing human singularity. Such an orientation is manifested in philosophy in different ways: dynamically (“efforts to be” M. Scheler), reflexive (Husserl’s transcendental experience) topologically (semantic unit “here” in existential analytics Dasein of M. Heidegger) and others.

Similarity to all these demonstrations gives aspiration to mark analytically irreducible and unique semantic space, where anthropologically centered image I is constituted. If such space of singularity is really possible, than its presence means that in ontological sense a man is the only form that has dimension of Universum, which manifests itself in endless subject manifestation.

Such arguments, in our opinion, provide an opportunity for more precise definition: 1) cognitive needs, which could satisfy the philosophical anthropology; 2) specific tasks and features that distinguish it from all forms of scientific cognition of a man; 3) method whereby its tasks are solved; 4) boundaries separating philosophical anthropology from other philosophical disciplines.

From the perspective of Christian anthropology, the deep essence of term “person” is revealed when we talk about the person as a man in his deepest essence of union with God and, as a consequence, with other people. From this, it becomes clear how important it is to distinguish between “person” and “individual”. Everyone is divided inside himself, he is torn by controversy between good and evil, division lies between mental perception and expert knowledge. People usually do not understand each other, do not approve of each other, and irritate each other causing enmity and hatred. When it comes to individual, person, things that are unique, holy, precious for each one are stressed. Analyzing the relationship of one person to another let’s use well-known image of the chronicle of Nestor. He speaks about nations, but these statements can be attributed to each individual. According to the thinker, each nation is endowed with its specific qualities, which can not be subject to opposition, which are absolutely unique and unrepeatable, so people can live side by side, without any contradictions. Relationships between persons are similar to interactions between voices singing in total harmony in the choir, where each voice is unique, endowed with its quality – and thus it is not about the difference between, for example, the bass and tenor – but within these differences each voice has its own quality. And every man as a person has uniqueness, which together with the uniqueness of another person constitutes a single stream of generation or gust of mutual affection and respect. Thus, the face is sacral in itself, something that only God knows, it is the image of God, and not as an overlay print, but as human’s life force that changes, transforms and makes a person a participant of the divine nature, when a person seeks to relationships, but can not create them artificially, without overcoming separation of the individual.

Appealing to the biblical story of the division of a man into male and a female as a result of the Fall of Adam and Eve gives arguments to understanding of personality as a set of ego and alter, from which the concept of “individual” originates. Adam and Eve are not two in the unity of the human being. They are two persons, from whom individuality originated. This is a tragic moment, because this pair is destined to be together, and if they do not stay together, they will be separated forever. Separation is always growing, never disappearing itself. “Personality assumes tragic human responsibility for his approach or removal from God, himself and other people. This context of personal responsibility deals with the fact of its aspects that makes a man the subject of law, guilt, remorse, and can therefore be certified as a legal entity, or, in a broader sense, as a person. In the latter case, individual as a person is not only legal, but also existential category. It is clear that a person is not something alternative to personality. This is a particular view of personality, but not its complete

representation. In its entirety personality is a unity of conscious of individual as the self, the person, as the subject of liability and the inner world of man in his moral self-directionality” [3, p. 37]. The body, the soul and spirit play a significant role in the formation of a person and each of these elements has its place and plays a role in the individual being of man. Since each person carries a range of emotions running through his flesh, feelings transform and make personal somatic being unique. Radicalization and deepening of philosophical reflection, attraction of new layers of human experience and rethinking the problem of man’s attitude to the world and to himself led to the emergence of philosophical concepts that turned the problem of human existence in one of the central problems in philosophy. Modern unclassical philosophy focuses on self-sufficiency and isolation of the inner world of man, on psychological experiencing of individual an absolute uniqueness of his being and his own destiny. Many existential categories are derived from self-reflection of own psycho-spiritual life and world. Determining categories of ontological structure of human being became typical for categorical apparatus of psychology and religion categories such as “death”, “suffering”, “despair”, “pain” and “pleasure”.

In recent years, many studies on philosophical postmodernism and gender questions have appeared. There the notion of corporeality is used as one of the key concepts in outlined circle of problems associated primarily with the socio-cultural determinant that leans over the body as physiological object and subject of sensory experience so that sometimes it seems that man as a whole has disappeared with his living as the action and experience being a phenomena occurring not in the head and not in the mind, but somewhere in the depths of the human person. Soma is contrast to the body, which is interpreted from outside. Soma is the flesh and blood of a man and comprehends itself. In contact with external world body turns into flesh. That is why the body as a subjective sensibility (experience) – is rather the flesh. The body as a soma is a I-corporeal, that is the result of activity of the mind. As the Prichepy E. M. says “I <...> has the ability to be “near” to the body <...> it does not grow out of the body as it is an organic component, as it is peculiar to the mind of animals [6, p. 145]. If the body is a visual reality, then in relation to man it is advisable to apply the term “soma”, which is the ontological essence of man.

Thus, the body is just the direct closest reality to the individual, which, being combined with his inner reality and material reality of the external world, forms somatic being, that is lived as the action and is experienced as a phenomenon.

It should be noted that the majority of thinkers, ideas and concepts of whom are involved in the study, use the term “body” and not a “soma”, but in fact in their works they are talking about the somatic being, which is the ontological base for self-realization of a man in ambivalence of felt and experienced existential situations. Body, visible from the outside (the body-as-thing), operates indirectly, soma – visible from the inside to the outside (I bodily being), endowed with phenomenological ability to complex “inner vision” of somatic world. Research of somatic being requires a holistic approach to a man as a person (natural-social formation) and application of the “concept body” of a man as individual (socio-cultural formation), endowed with corporeality and such image of the body or the way of talking about the bodies, that are possible in cultural space.

In general we can say that in modern philosophical thought problem of man is integrated in a rather wide range of different perspectives and approaches, which can not be subsumed under the general methodological denominator. When we speak about comprehending the organic integrity, science must turn from discursive and rational figures into intuitive, dialectical philosophizing. Philosophizing thinking allows to go beyond its own limits of mere contemplation to the horizon of being, outbalancing all features, being the most general and principled. This approach highlights the scientific knowledge of the procedures of interpretation that reveal the subject of study by a lot of models and pluralism of assumptions. Contradictory, but always intense psycho-somatic ideas about human existence develop in space, being given by the structural opposition of nature and culture. Explicitly, this classical opposition has been the object of attention in French intellectual tradition from Jean-Jacques Rousseau to C. Levi-Strauss. In the personal somatic being one and the same categorical opposition persistently was returning in various terminological incarnations as both spirit and flesh, Apollo and Dionysus, conscious and unconscious, the environment and cultural heritage, psychological and biosocial. Forming the opposition of nature and culture, the idea sought to overcome it in many ways, each of them makes unique overtone of somatic human existence.

Nature and culture always meet, intersect and in different ways interact in the human psyche and conditions of his somatic being. At the level of current knowledge about man it is almost all what can be said with certainty: the real mechanisms of this interaction are so complex that are still on the edge of understanding in modern science with its computer models and research methods.

The era of modernity destroys the border between nature and culture. Natural and obvious manifestation of the personal somatic being seems imaginary and secondary. They pose a deeper reality, have essential meaning. The main task is understanding of this reality, which lies in the life and is unknown to the common man, but his state of health and happiness depends on this understanding. This reality does not belong to the man of the world of nature – nature of God, human nature, the nature of things. It is conceived as phenomenon of culture that is created by the history of mankind and by the activities of the individual. It depends on intellectual preferences and sociocultural trends of the time to what elements of nature and culture crucial importance is given in the personal somatic being; respectively, the second element is denied. Some thinkers have opinion that the mind is completely exhausted by culture, and human nature is its culture. Other researchers confidently assert the opposite – that psychology is no more than a part of nature, and the differences between the culture and nature are fictitious. In the first, radical, version the culture is romanticized; respectively, all associated with the power of man over the nature, and, in particular, its own nature, exposed to excessive exaggeration. In the second variant, on the contrary, nature is romanticized, and with it – the present state of things to which man can not have any noticeable effect. Perhaps the essence of the personal somatic being is in the formation of the opposition between nature and culture, constant attempts to its neutralization, theoretical and, most importantly, practical search of auxiliary units, which help to realize the opportunity of the uniqueness.

REFERENCES

1. Гадамер Г.-Г. Что есть истина? / Ганс-Георг Гадамер; [пер. с нем.] // Логос. – № 1. – 1991. – С. 30-37.
2. Кант И. Сочинения : [в 6 т.; т. 6] / Иммануил кант; [пер. с нем.; под общей редакцией В. Ф. Асмуса, А. В. Гулыги, Т. И. Ойзермана]. – М.: Мысль, 1966. – 743 с. – (Философское наследие).
3. Кримський С. Б. Запити філософських смислів / С. Б. Кримський. – Київ : Парапан, 2003. – 240 с.
4. Мамардашвили М. К. Необходимость себя / Мераб Константинович Мамардашвили // Лекции. Статьи. Философские заметки. – М. : Лабиринт, 1996. – 432 с.
5. Нанси Ж.-Л. Corpus / Ж.-Л. Нанси; [пер. с фр. Е. Петровской и Е. Гальцевой]. – М. : Ad Marginem, 1999. – 255 с.
6. Причепій Є. Феноменологія рецепції у Східній Європі / Є. Причепій. – К.: Тандем, 2001. – 242 с.
7. Хайдеггер М. Время и бытие : [статьи и выступления] / Мартин Хайдеггер; [составление, перевод, вступительная статья, комментарии и указатели В. В. Бибикина]. – М.: Республика, 1993. – 447 с. – (Мыслители XX века).