

training of monumental painters, which was a priority on the 1920's and at the beginning of 1930's. Special attention is focused on the rivalry between the teachers of different styles, which strengthen the opposition between «realists» and «novators» and couldn't have any good influence of the development of the art school. The Reform of the 1922 reduced academic part of the studying significantly, 1924 and 1930 – was a cause of specialization's conversation on faculties. The reform of 1934 along with the revival of academic system of education and unification of studying programs has a termination of monumental artists graduation as a result.

Conclusion. It was revealed, that those reforms had such consequences as changing the titles, reorganization of structure, teaching stuff, educational plans, pedagogical conceptions, teaching programs and educational methods, with had a significant influence on professional training of the artist of monumental painting. Understanding of the historical experience of the past could be a fundament of contemporary reforms in the sphere of art, optimization of nowadays educational programs, especially in the workshop of monumental painting and temple culture of the National Academy of Arts and Architecture.

Key words: workshop of monumental painting, reform, teaching methods.

Надійшла до редакції 11.11.2016 р.

УДК 130.33

ПРИРОДА І РОЛЬ РЕЛІГІЙНОЇ ВІРИ В ПЕРСПЕКТИВІ ПСИХОАНАЛІЗУ І ФІЛОСОФІЇ ВІКТОРА ЕМІЛЯ ФРАНКЛА

др. **Маріуш Шайда**, доцент факультету образотворчого мистецтва,
Академія мистецтв, м. Щецин
mariusz.szajda@akademiasztuki.eu

Віктор Еміль Франкл у створеній ним антропології часто підкреслював, що одним із важливих аспектів людської особистості є аксіологічний вимір. Людство існує в світі цінностей, які є абстрактними, але важливо зосередити увагу на цінностях, які роблять нас людьми. Серед цих значень – не лише краса, істина, добро і святість, а й принесення себе в жертву і молитва. Філософія часто не може пояснити всі ці значення, але це можна досягнути завдяки релігійній вірі.

Ключові слова: людське життя, антропологія, релігійна віра, релігійна людина.

Viktor Emil Frankl [21] – a famous Austrian physician and philosopher – in created by him anthropology often he emphasized that an important dimension of the human person is – as we can say – axiological dimension. A human exists in a world of values that are abstract universals of sense. It is, among other things, focus on values what makes us human. Among these values are on the one hand beauty, truth, goodness, and holiness, but also sacrifice and prayer. Philosophy often cannot explain all of these values, and therefore it needs to appeal to religious faith [2]. Frankl saw not only the deep structure of human values, but above all he revealed its noetic plane, and with it an unconscious universal spirituality which he considers non-negotiable aspect of the human person. Frankl's concept of human being relatively comprehensive and unified anthropology can serve as a background for discussion about location of religious relatedness of faith and reason, both at psychotherapeutic and philosophical plane.

Psychoanalysis: treatment or manipulation?

The task of psychoanalytic therapy is to restore to human a healthy attitude towards self, others and the world around. And it is not about temporary relief of pain and suffering, but a lasting recovery of the patient's mental balance.

According to Frankl, you cannot keep a permanent mental balance without a sense of the general meaning of own existence. In the therapeutic contact with human, you can easily be tempted to manipulate its psyche. Therefore, you need to ask yourself a question whether psychoanalysis is not a manipulation of weakened internally and mentally ill human? Does the physician, by therapeutic techniques, such as logotherapy, not induce in its patients the affirmation of a particular religion, just because with this affirmation it gets an easy explanation of mental patient's problems? The answer to these questions depends on many factors, but it seems that mainly depends on explicite or implicate of the overall approved concept of the human existence / being, on adopted image of the human ontological-existential constitution.

Frankl believed that the reductionist image of the human existence / being, depersonalizing the human, transforms the psychoanalytic therapy in the art of technical manipulation of the human psyche, which brings to relieve suffering, but at the cost of denial of consciousness of the patient the reflective attitude to life and to itself. For Frankl in his logotherapy «not technique or therapeutic approach is important as such, whether it will be the administration of drugs, or the use of shocks, but the spirit in which it is done» [10]. Nothing in the therapeutic approach can insult the human dignity of the patient, while lowering the level – supported on the vertical transcendence of external and internal determinants – reflective self-knowledge of the patient – it injures its human dignity. Frankl, after years of clinical experience, found logotherapy as an effective method for outputting patients from noogenic, sociogenic and psychogenic neuroses, also found its effectiveness in prevention in relation to psychogenic neuroses [8]. As claimed Petrilowitch: «(...) logotherapy, in contrast to all other schools of psychotherapy, exceeds the dimension of the neurosis itself (...), it follow the human in the specific dimension of its humanity

and uses the resources achievable in this dimension, such as the innate human capabilities of transcending self and forgetting about self» [10]. Logotherapy is not going to take responsibility for the choices, decisions, behaviors and actions of the patients, but it is a method of awakening the patients to their own trans-spiritual dimension, so that the human is greater than its fears, sufferings and frustrations, and as being free against them, is called to take conscious responsibility for them.

Frankl said that «logotherapy is neither teaching nor preaching» [8; 153]. A logotherapist does not decide on the meaning of life of the patient, it does not say what is good or bad, it is not concerned with taming, as is in the case of the behavioral treatment in which the therapist decides what is good and what is bad behavior, for bad considering all that is a source of suffering for the patient [13; 153–154]. Logotherapy translates colloquial patient experience, especially those that are associated with transcending the world by the human, with self-transcending, manifested in questions about the meaning and value of life, on language of science and from language of science again on the plain language of the patient [7].

Psychoanalytic therapy not only must to deal with the problem of suffering, but also with the problem of death. Frankl's logotherapy is not adjusted only to a complete elimination of human suffering (because this is impossible), or the production of a habit of not thinking about death. Stimulating human self-knowledge and reflectivity, it tries to help find meaning and creative potentials in these fundamental determinants of human being in the world. In short, it does not propose to escape from being human, but urges to the brave, being source of human dignity, conscious embrace the challenges resulting from this existence. Frankl wrote: «in this, how someone takes revealed to him suffering, in this, how it suffers, lies the answer to the question, why it suffers» [6; 134]. And in other place he stated that in «the nihilistic framework primarily there is no place for one, for homo sapiens, for the image of suffering human, suffering sensibly, penitent in suffer, there is no place for the sake of suffering as a full sense of fulfillment» [6; 96–97]. However, the meaning of suffering and death cannot be fully covered by the natural light of reason. Frankl remarked that «the more extensive (overall) is the meaning, the less it is subjected to the understanding» [8; 172]. Questions about the meaning of suffering and death refer to the problem of religious faith. In further discussion, we will talk about recognition of religious faith as the validating base and at the same time complement of reason. It seems that the concept of Frankl can be considered as an exemplification of just such a frame of relationship of religious faith with reason.

Faith as the foundation and fulfillment of reason

K. Tarnowski shows such overall characteristic features of faith:

- 1) Faith is undoubtedly special reference to..., therefore it has an intentional indicator in the broadest sense.
- 2) This reference has immediately a double radius. On the one hand, (...) it is intersubjective relation to some (in singular or in plural) you. In this respect, faith is relying on..., containing some (...) entrusting self. On the other hand, faith is also a reference to certain contents that are accepted because of this first relationship of trust and entrusting self. (...)
- 3) Both rays of faith have keen on, that are in a significant way blind: «I do not fully recognize this, in whom and in what I believe. Have confidence in the other is to trust in its good will, and that means – in the freedom that is unfathomable» [21].

Psychoanalysis of Frankl puts together two concepts: unconscious religious faith and conscious religious disbelief. Unconscious faith manifests itself in the specific – not quite capable of being rationally determine in its genealogy – the desire of existence of a guarantee of comprehensive and lasting sense of consciously awakened existence. According to Frankl, it is impossible to understand the human desire of this sense of to understand the conditions of possibility of the specificity of human existence without the assumption of the existence of, non-indifferent on human (trans-personal), God. For Frankl was obvious that "while it is true that human can ultimately be understood only by God, it is also true that human can come to God starting only from itself, from human» [6; 120].

Religious faith appears in psychoanalysis of Frankl as an expression of human's relationship with God, a bond located in the central layer of the human noetic ontological-existential constitution. Provided, however, that conscious affirmation of this bond and taking the challenges related to it, is a matter of human freedom. Due to the fact that this bond is not rationally provable, there is a human phenomenon of faith. Human is not determined to recognize the existence of God, just as it is not determined to negate this existence. Both, recognition and negation, are a matter of faith, not reason. Therefore, human is responsible for its free yes or not, spoken in the face of the problem of trans-spiritual eternal reality. For Frankl, it is tantamount to saying by human yes or not to the own ontological – existential constitution. So there is no division between those who believe in the existence of God and completely unbelievers. Unbelievers are those who believe (and not – as often they think – they know) in non-existence of God. Both faiths require from human to make a free choice and to take certain decisions for which it bears a personal moral responsibility. Faith itself is possible outside of these issues and problems that are the responsibility of reason. Thus, for example, proofs of mathematical theorems automatically enforce their affirmation, they are chosen on the way of free decisions. To negate it means to be mathematically incompetent. So, does the human can be, in spite of itself, forced into the inner affirmation of a particular faith? Certainly not, it would mean that human can believe in something, in what it does not believe.

Human in its vision of the world has the ability to perceive overall. So, as John Paul II emphasizes : «it meets (...) the over-sensory truths, or in other words, trans-empirical» [14]. In this way, human experiences another human being, morality or religion. The Pope added that «human recognizes itself as ethical being, talented to act according to the criteria of good and evil, and not only for benefits and enjoyments. It recognizes self also as religious being, capable

of communing with God» [14]. In this recognition, capabilities of reason are essential for the creation of the true concepts of God or of the truths of faith. Humble exploration of human spirituality reveals the new way of life. The life of faith is seen as the most beautiful complement of its struggle with life, it discovers new commitments and a new, more complete way of love.

Faith has in itself an aspect of mystery, so it cannot be something fully knowable. But what means to know, and what means to believe? P. Ricoeur writes: «Religion has importance that the believer itself does not know – it cannot know, because it is in a special way masked and thus escapes the consciousness which cannot penetrate the origins and sources of religion» [18]. If human would like to completely intellectualize faith, then there would appear the danger of perdition of the mystery as essential differentiator of religious faith, reducing the sacred to the profane.

Religious faith is not an escape into a world of dreams and illusions, but a real driving force, motivating human to conscious and responsible acceptance of its being in the world. This faith, allowing to find a comprehensive and lasting sense of human life, saturates with meaning individual human choices, decisions, actions which would not make sense if they would be accompanied by the conviction that human life as a whole is meaningless. Finding meaning in the perspective of religious faith is always done through conscience, as a constant dialogue between this human here (I) and transcendent YOU. Therefore «conscience is not – according to Frankl – an immanent phenomenon, imperative functioning within the reality of the world, but it is «the voice of God», it emerges from the divine reality» [17]. So, Frankl interpreted conscience as a glimmer of hidden (unconscious) God which never can be fully cognitively introduced (objectified and opposed to subject of cognition).

The reality of religious faith appears on the basis of reflection of Frankl as the foundation and fulfillment of reason and as the kind of self-open to own source and to condition of the possibility of a truth-function of the laws of logic and own epistemological standards. Reason open for its own source and condition of the possibility finds, encoded in the human ontological-existential constitution, a bond with the Transcendental YOU, and closed at the reflection of self, must see human and the world as devoid of meaning and purpose, more or less complicated mechanisms of physical, biological, psychological and social, in which all the specifically human's properties and ways of being appear as camouflaging their natural genealogy instruments of fight (ultimately, in the face of overwhelming nothingness of loss) for vital survival – as individual and as species.

From unconscious God to rediscovered God

Does faith in God degrade human, or humanizes it? Does God appear as a ruthless tyrant, or as a source of meaning and love? Does God want to manipulate of human, or gives to human freedom to liken it to himself? And finally, the God of faith is different than the God of philosophy? Frankl assumed that the way to obtain even approximate answers to these questions, leads through the human interior, through the mystery of human spirituality. To understand the presence of God in every human life, Austrian philosopher introduces the concept of unconscious God. At the beginning we have to explain the concept of unconscious God. This term does not refer to God in itself, it does not mean that God itself is unconscious. It applies to constitutive primordially of relation of human existence with God. The concept of unconscious God means on one hand hidden God, on the other – primary, preconscious relationship of human with God. To understand the concept of unconscious God, it should be noted three errors that may deform this concept [6, 58–63]. These are: pantheism [22], occultism, and the identification of unconscious God with unconscious id.

Understanding of unconscious God pantheistically causes deification of all reality surrounding human and human itself. The fact that human senses in itself unconscious spirituality or unconscious religiosity, does not mean that God fills the interior of human, that it is identical to the human unconsciousness. According to Frankl, spiritual unconsciousness in human is not hidden God. The possibilities of the human spirit simply predispose and direct human to the transcendent Being, which is unconscious God.

Another distortion of the meaning of unconscious God, is occultism [22; 317]. It assumes the existence in human an unconscious knowledge of God. This unconsciousness appears to us then as all-knowing, or at least knowing more than knowledge acquired consciously. However, according to Frankl, this unconsciousness is not entitled to any divine attribute, it does not have also any attribute of omniscience. While occultism assumes that id has the bigger knowledge than the ego of human.

The last mistake in the concept of unconscious God involves the pushing of the spiritual, religious unconsciousness in domain of id. C.G. Jung claimed that religious ignorance can be attributed to the field of id. Consequently, he pushed unconscious God in the realm of the unconscious id [5]. Therefore, religiosity in terms of Jung always had to remain beyond the reach of responsibility and decisions of ego, functioning at the same level as, for example, libido, sex drive or aggression drive. What united Jung and Z. Freud is the fact that the unconscious impulses in their view would always be the strongest determinant of personal life of human.

Things existing in the world indicates its relativity and conditionality. This indication refers to anticipated ruthlessness and absolute basis for any conditions of existence. The same is with the valuation of things, events, and things of this world. Valuing refers to the absolute measure of value. According to Frankl, this proves that the elementary – cognitive and axiological – relationships of human with the world and itself, assume the reference of human existence to a transcendent and absolute being of trans-personal, that is, to God. In terms of Frankl, God it is not only a moral measure of an order, but «the order of measures himself» [6; 103]; he does not fit in any measurable system, because he is a measure for everything. Human also is not the measure of itself. It can in fact measure / estimate itself and the world only by virtue of its being in a relationship with an absolute measure, that is with God. This means

that human essentially, consciously or unconsciously, is bound with this absolute measure. Frankl tried to show that the self-discovery (above all in deeds) of human can only be made through imitation of God [6; 110].

Human heading toward values and meanings, more or less consciously updates its original link with the absolute source of existence, the absolute measure of value and a guarantee of ultimate meaning. God is not given directly, but permeates all human situations, precisely because of their direction to the value and meaning. Looking basis of values and sources of meaning, human in fact, consciously or unconsciously, looking for God. God, being the goal of human exploration, is for Frankl original, transcendent, over-personal YOU [11]. The fact of immanent relationship of human existence with God can be conscious (refers to a religious human) or unconscious (for atheists) [3]. However, every person must freely decide about the problem of God, stand for or against the acceptance of his existence [23].

Philosophical currents (For example materialism, naturalism, nihilism), trying to prove that there is no God, cannot answer with whom human leads a continuous dialogue on a final, lasting and comprehensive meaning of its consciousness awakening and its inalienable call for moral responsibility in the face of irrevocable finiteness of the human being in the world. Within these currents human seems to lead the dialogue with nothingness. But whether the nothingness with which you constantly run dialogue, does not mean Something, especially that it is Something in the depths of human existence appears as the source and condition of possibility of self-knowledge, of consciousness awakening to the fact of existence, call for responsibility (conscience), hunger for meaning and freedom [19]. As a result, «between nothing and everything there is no great difference» [6; 116]. God, who is radically Other and existing in Other way than the whole order of the surrounding world, appears to humans in the form of Nothingness (in the sense of not-Something), but such, with whom human, as a creature of necessity chasing the sense, must dialogue, must refer to it, or in gestures of worship, or in atheistic rejection, however, cannot be towards this Nothingness – as the absolute You of dialogue – completely indifferent. God, as radically Other and existing in Other way, is hiding under the phenomenal form of Nothingness. This God reveals himself in the internal dialogue of a man constantly searching for its sense of being in the world. Experiencing absolute solitude in the face of death, human turns as if to the emptiness and nothingness. Turning to this emptiness and nothingness with the question about the meaning of its – disturbed by reason and conscience – existence, human in fact reads the nothingness as responding, eternal YOU, as preceding and enabling all questions unconscious God. Summarizes Frankl words: «Not predicting anything, predicting nothing: predicting nothingness – human accepts the existence of God. This nothingness is after all only the negative, only the flip side of being» [6; 117].

When human enters on the path of religious faith may encounter two main dangers: the dangers of anthropocentrism and anthropomorphism. Anthropocentrism is a tendency to giving to human the divine attributes, and to recognize human as the highest value and the stately measure of all things. Depending on how one understands human, whether it is a human-entity, or human-species, or maybe individual or collective human, to the rank of absolute are lifted certain human qualities, abilities, predispositions, or selected targets of activities. However, because human is recognized on the basis of anthropocentrism without its trans-spiritual dimension, all the determinants of humanity are relegated to the role of the variable, ephemeral, finite qualities of inner-worldly being (like Heidegger would say), and thus the being determined by the world and fully subordinated to it.

On the basis of anthropocentrism, it led ultimately to the fact that «renounced a transcendence in explaining the meaning of human life» [9; 99]. The price of this renunciation is the need to recognize as an absolute measure of good and evil, truth and falsehood, or variables, selfish, tearing apart the human community needs and interests of the individual, or so-called social interests which usually turn out to be the interests a group or social class dominant in a given historical moment. Thus, the so-called humanistic attempts of human deification ultimately lead to the subordination of it to all kinds of false absolutes and usually end up with enslaving human, often bloody totalitarianisms. According to Frankl, only the thought pierced up to the spiritually transcendent world reveals the human interior as a place to which «falls the shadow of the absolute» [6; 100].

Anthropomorphism, in contrast to anthropocentrism which tries to make from human (understood in various ways) a deity, brings what is divine to this, what is human, that is – tries to recognize God in the image and likeness of human. The awareness that God as the source and creator of existence and being is from his own works radically Other and existing in Other way, is so important that it protects human from ideologisation of God, against equating him with variables of human ideas and extemporary interests, and prevents from recognition of own images / idols of God as the only, sole and absolute truth about him.

God of authentic faith always escapes from human showing interpretations, because in fact in faith he is experienced is a paradoxical way – as infinitely close and infinitely distant at the same time. Frankl wrote: «beside the paradox of simultaneous absolute transcendence and absolute intimacy of God, there comes to the dialectical transformation of transcendence into intimacy» [6; 125]. The intimacy of God is fulfilled in a special way in prayer, «it is the only act of the human spirit which in this mutual relation reveals the presence of God. The prayer reveals God in this meeting, concretizes him and impersonates» [6; 126].

God, found in prayer and other religious rituals, still remains for believer radically Other and existing in Other way – as hidden God. There are many roads leading to the meeting with always infinitely greater than our imagination / idols hidden God. The multiplicity of images / idols of God underlies polytheism. Its modern version distinguishes, for example, God of philosophers from God of nature, or from God of specific religious denominations. According to Frankl, this indicates that there is possible multiplicity of images of a single, trans-personal hidden God. Some thinkers are trying to intimate encounters with God attribute the nature of the scientific evidence. According to Frankl, evidence for the existence of God are impossible, because God as the creator of reason and the guarantor of its truth-function is larger than

this reason, exceeding – as a transcendent source – laws and norms of rational cognition, not towards the irrational freedom, but towards the general and radical validation, legitimacy and give meaning to these laws and norms. In addition, evidence of the existence of God would be contrary to the very essence of faith, there would vanish freedom of choice of faith and the merit of risk of opting for God, and God himself would no longer be transcendent God, that is, essentially hidden, radically Other and existing in Other way rather, than the world created through him. Only in the dimension of eschatology faith disappears and its place takes – unknown in the mundane human being – kind of knowledge, defined in the language of religion as seeing God face to face.

Neither reason, nor human language is not able to fully comprehend God as a condition of own capabilities and own source. Frankl's thought here seems to be close to philosophical reflection of J.L. Marion, indicating that God is infinitely greater than at the same time being and non-being. God/Goodness, incoming from absolute height, is manifested both in the gift of being, but also in the gift of saturating by self non-being / nothingness. Goodness prevails (in the sense of giving each other) over being and over non-being. So we can say that the destiny of nothingness, like the destiny of being, is God / Agape. J.L. Marion stressed that any talk about God in the third person (he) does not really say about him, but about our changing images / idols of God. This means that – encoded in deep existential-ontological layers of human constitution – bond with God can reproduce differently in the individual consciousness and in different ways influence on people's attitudes and actions. It depends, according to Frankl, not so much from external variable conditions and circumstances, but from human effort of self-knowledge and self-understanding and from made on the ground of gained in this effort of self-knowledge free – so caught up in the context of moral conclusions – choices, decisions and actions. Consequently, only individual human bears moral responsibility for what is placed in the center of its personal life, or for what Paul Tillich called ultimate concern. So, it is not excluded to make such the human decision which acknowledges God and associated with him trans-spiritual dimension of existential-ontological constitution of human, as illusionary mirage. However, the price we have to pay for this decision is – according to Frankl – a sense of meaninglessness of human, consciously awakened existence and the suspension of any truth claims of reason and obligatory of any strictly moral (unselfish) standards in total groundlessness.

From religious faith to inner awake

One of the most important theses of Frankl's concepts is the thesis of the original (ontological and existential) existence in every human unconscious (preceding acts of becoming aware) religiousness, demanding its production to light. Resistance to this demand rises a phenomenon called by Frankl repressed religiousness. Cz. Piecuch commented this as follows: «the repressed religiosity leads to neuroses, is «unhappily suppressed», so pathogenic. In this sense, one could perhaps say that an unbeliever for Frankl is sick because it had not yet realized God, its God is still unconscious God, but God of the believer is God already realized» [16]. Of course, psychoanalysis of Frankl is not about to convert people to a specific religious faith, but to restore them access to religiousness as to their own, inalienable ontological-existential dimension.

Frankl noticed that institutional religion, seeking the salvation of human often does it by «exposing human on disturbance of mental balance, creating psychological stress or simply throwing it in its internal conflicts» [5; 134]. It seems, however, that Frankl, with his medical and psychiatric experience, bring out a view that religious mental disintegration is creative, because awakening dormant in the spiritual side religiousness, it can restore the disturbed mental balance at a higher, fuller and more self conscious level. According to Frankl, although the mental balance is the goal of religion, religion is conducive to mature – not omitting specifically human ways of being – mental (or broadly speaking – personal) integration of human. Conversely, according to Frankl, the case presents on the plane of psychotherapy. The intended purpose of psychotherapy is to restore mental balance, and the side effect is that «in the course of psychiatric treatment the mentally ill finds the hidden source of its original faith, that unconscious religiousness» [5; 135].

Frankl, as the entire Christian personalistic reflection, placed in the center of human life personal reference to the transcendent reality. For Frankl it meant that in human existence is hidden – never completely subjected to natural light of reason – a secret, manifesting itself in call to moral responsibility as to specific respect for an inalienable dignity of every human person [15]. According to Frankl, source of call for moral responsibility, for obvious reasons, cannot be any natural finite being. Natural finite being can in fact at best call to fight (ending anyway with defeat) for preservation of life, survival, and call for disinterested responsibility for others (Christianity calls it charity) flows against the current of human *conatus essendi*. So, above all, the question about the source of call for moral responsibility (manifested in conscience, guilt and shame) poses for human the problem of God and the problem of religious faith. Therefore, as Frankl claimed, existence of human considering God is primarily ethical existence, and «the essence of this ethics is not a set of orders and prohibitions, rewards and punishments, system of virtues and vices, but the incredible weight of personal decision being with God or against him» [16]. In this decision, human is condemned to freedom, others (including psychotherapists and priests) can here serve only as a facilitator.

A world where people live today, often referred to as disenchantment of the world, that is the world devoid of any ideological illusions and metaphysical delusions. This world supposedly refers only to reason, understood as a sober and cool scientific knowledge. Human functioning in this world is seen as the empirical-rational being, free from all supernatural references and related superstitions. The facts, however, is different, «modernity destroyed the traditional systems of beliefs, but not displaced the belief itself» [12]. Now the place of the traditional religious faith, referring to the trans-spiritual reality, is the faith in the various temporal elements raised to the rank of absolute (for example money, career, film star, physical health, etc.). It turns out that the need for religious faith – or rather para-religious – continues to be in people and it cannot be completely drown out even in the world dominated by anti-religious obsession.

Also, various philosophical currents focused on denial of Transcendence, consciously or unconsciously make absolutization of assumptions and rules enabling and justifying this denial. This treatment is usually accompanied by idolatrous attitude to some deified things, people, events, principles, views or facts.

So different human thoughts, creations, behaviors and actions seems to be permeated by a constant trend to making them religious. Human becomes religious even against self and it does not necessarily relate to God. D. Hervieu-Leger, writing about the possibility of human religious references without reference to God, points to the society in which transcendental values become the point of reference: «The process of political self-destruction begins when the politicization starts to establish a utopia which is its imaginary horizon and its spirit, when it tries to make this spirit became inherent hic et nunc to the political system which presents itself as its visible and total manifestation. It is known that the beginning of institutional formalization of an egalitarian utopia was always authoritative alignment of the society, and its dream was to establish the perfectly free society justified the worst slavery» [12]. For Frankl was obvious that human cannot be fully itself without understanding this trend, that is without understanding that it emerges from – not possible to naturalistic reduce – trans-spiritual dimension of the human constitution of ontological and existential. According to Frankl any attempt to approach the phenomenon of religiousness by thinking which reduces the spiritual dimension of human to the reality of biological, psychological, or social, get into internal logical contradictions (giving birth to the so-called liar paradox) and are not able to either explain or understand any specifically human features, or a specificity of human ways of being in the world.

For Frankl, an instrument for explanation and understanding of the phenomenon of human religiousness is inquiring, critical mind, mind that does not shy away from the question of its own conditions of possibility and the basis for the legitimacy of belief in a truth-function of rational cognition. It is these questions, essentially philosophical, refer to the source unity of reason (scientific and philosophical) and religious faith. However, according to Frankl, the reference of human thought to this source unity exceeds a purely cognitive dimension, as it is above all a moral obligation. The human way to the truth about itself is not only way of theoretical knowledge, but always at the same time process of practical taking responsibility for being human. Today Frankl would endorse probably the question: «are we ready to pay the price of effort and even pain associated with this process. Do we really want the real (...) awakening?» [1].

Bibliography

1. *Augustyn J.* Daj mi pić. Rozważania rekolekcyjne oparte na drugim tygodniu Ćwiczeń duchowych św. Ignacego Loyoli [Give me to drink. Recollection considerations based on the second week of Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius of Loyola, Kraków 1996. – p. 227.
2. *Chudy Cf. W.* Prawda człowieka i prawda o człowieku [Human truth and truth about the human], in: K. Popielski (ed.), Człowiek-Wartości-Sens. Studia z psychologii egzystencji [Human-Values-Meaning. Studies of the Psychology of Existence], Lublin 1996. – P. 143–144.
3. *F. De Hovre,* Das Werk Viktor E. Frankls, «Gloria Dei», No. 6 (1951). – P. 72.
4. *Frankl V. E.* Nieuświadomiony Bóg [The Unconscious God], ed. cit. – P. 58–63.
5. *Frankl V. E.* Psychoterapia dla każdego [Psychotherapy for everybody, orig. Psychotherapie für den Laien Rundfunkvorträge über Seelenhellkunde], trans. E. Misiótek, Warsaw 1978.
6. *Frankl V.E.* Homo Patiens, trans. R. Czerniecki, Z.J. Jaroszewski, Warsaw 1998. – P. 103.
7. *Frankl V.E.* Nadać sens życiu [Give Meaning to Life], „Życie i Myśl” [“Life and Thought”], 4 (1973). – P. 22.
8. *Frankl V.E.* Nieuświadomiony Bóg [The Unconscious God], trans. B. Chwedeńczuk, Warsaw 1978. – P. 141.
9. *Frankl V. E.* Psychoterapia dla każdego [Psychotherapy for everybody, orig. Psychotherapie für den Laien Rundfunkvorträge über Seelenhellkunde], trans. E. Misiótek, Warsaw 1978. – P. 134–135.
10. *Frankl V.E.,* Redukcjonizm [Reductionism], trans. E. Życieńska, «Więź» [«Bond»], 9 (1970). – P. 13.
11. *Frankl V.E.* The Will to Meaning, New York 1969. – P. 8.
12. *Hervieu-Leger D.,* Religia jako pamięć [Religion as a Memory], trans. M. Bielawska, Kraków 1999, – P. 109–163.
13. *Frankl V. E.* refers here to the statements of L. Krasner, J. Wolpe and A.A. Lazarus. – P. 153-154.
14. *John Paul II.* Przekroczyć próg nadziei [Crossing the Threshold of Hope], Lublin 1994. – P. 45.
15. *Maritain J.* L'educazione al bivio, Brescia 1984. – P. 22.
16. *Perkowska H.* Filozoficzna interpretacja doświadczenia religijnego. Główne wątki filozofii religii P. Tillicha [Philosophical Interpretation of Religious Experience. The Main Topics of Religion Philosophy of P. Tillich], in: Wiara i rozum na progu trzeciego tysiąclecia [Faith and Reason on the Threshold of the Third Millennium], Szczecin 1999. – P. 71.
17. *Piecuch Cz.* Człowiek metafizyczny [Metaphysical Man], Warsaw-Kraków 2001. – P. 115.
18. *Ricoeur P.,* Egzystencja i hermeneutyka. Rozmowy o metodzie [Existence and Hermeneutics. Talking About the Method], Warsaw 1985. – P. 33.
19. *Sartre J.P.* L'etre et le neant, Paris 1943. – P. 516.
20. *Szajda M.* Od transgresji do transcendencji [From Transgression to Transcendence], Szczecin 2012. – P. 10–11.
21. *Tarnowski K.* Wiara i myślenie [Faith and Thinking], Kraków 1999. – P. 49–50.
22. *Waldenfels H.* (ed.) Leksykon religii [Encyclopedia of Religion], trans. P. Pachciarek (ed.), Warsaw 1997. – P. 321–317.
23. *Zirdum J.* L' antropologia personalistica nel pensiero di Viktor Frankl. Uno studio in prospettiva teologica, pedagogica e pastorale, Roma 1984.

**ПРИРОДА И РОЛЬ РЕЛИГИОЗНОЙ ВЕРЫ В ПЕРСПЕКТИВЕ ПСИХОАНАЛИЗА
И ФИЛОСОФИИ ВИКТОРА ЭМИЛЬ ФРАНКЛА****Мариуш Шайда**, др., доцент факультета изобразительного искусства,
Академия искусств, г. Щецин

Виктор Эмиль Франкл в созданной им антропологии подчеркнул, что одним из важных аспектов человеческой личности является аксиологическое измерение. Человечество существует в мире ценностей, которые являются абстрактными, но стоит обратить внимание на ценности, которые делают нас людьми. Помимо всего прочего – красоты, истины, доброты и святости, также и принесения в жертву и молитва. Философия часто не может объяснить все эти значения, но это возможно принять через религиозность, веру.

Ключевые слова: человеческая жизнь, антропология, вера, религиозный человек

UDC 130.33

**NATURE AND ROLE OF RELIGIOUS FAITH IN THE PERSPECTIVE OF PSYCHOANALYSIS
AND PHILOSOPHY OF VIKTOR EMIL FRANKL****Mariusz Szajda**, dr Mariusz Szajda, Associate
Professor Faculty of Visual Arts Academy of Art in Szczecin

Viktor Emil Frankl in created by him anthropology often he emphasized that an important dimension of the human person is – as we can say – axiological dimension. A human exists in a world of values that are abstract universals of sense. It is, among other things, focus on values what makes us human. Among these values are on the one hand beauty, truth, goodness, and holiness, but also sacrifice and prayer. Philosophy often cannot explain all of these values, and therefore it needs to appeal to religious faith.

Key words: human life, anthropology, religious faith, human religious.

Надійшла до редакції 22.11.2016 р.

УДК 745/749:398.332.12(477.83)+(477.86/.87) «18/19»

**ТИПОЛОГІЯ ТА ХУДОЖНІ ОСОБЛИВОСТІ ПИСАНКАРСТВА ОПІЛЛЯ ТА
БОЙКІВСЬКОГО ПІДГІР'Я КІНЦЯ ХІХ – ХХ СТОЛІТТЯ****Лосик Галина Іванівна**, кандидат мистецтвознавства,
Калуський міський центр первинної медико-санітарної допомоги, м. Калуш
martaly@yandex.ru

Висвітлено художню виразність писанок Опілля та бойківського Підгір'я. Проведено класифікацію творів за технікою виконання. Розглянуто технологію виготовлення, колористичну гаму, орнаментальні мотиви. Надається пояснення символів та знаків зображених на писанках. Виявлено, що писанки досліджених теренів споріднені з аналогічними творами інших регіонів, що проявилось у символіці й орнаментіці виявляючи при цьому характерні локальні відміни.

Ключові слова: писанкарство, технологія виготовлення, символіка, орнаментика, локальні відміни.

Постановка проблеми. Сьогодні, коли цивілізований світ переживає процес тотальної глобалізації, грубого і безцеремонного змішування регіональних та національних культур важливо знати про реальний стан народного мистецтва в Україні, його своєрідність і багатство. Саме тому є своєчасною тема, спрямована на висвітлення надбань національного народного мистецтва а, зрештою, на утвердження української культури і мистецтва. Тому на часі постає завдання глибше пізнавати декоративну творчість рідного краю. Дослідження народного писанкарства Опілля та бойківського Підгір'я також є актуальним з огляду на те, що писанкарство заявленої території найменше вивчене у порівнянні з сусідніми Гуцульщиною, Покуттям, Поділлям і вивчення цієї проблеми дає можливість заповнити існуючу прогалину в історії українського народного декоративно-прикладного мистецтва.

1) *Аналіз останніх досліджень.* Першими працями, що торкаються народної творчості Опілля та бойківського Підгір'я є дослідження І.Червінського [18], І.Франка [14]. Унікальність українського писанкарства відзначав Ф.Вовк [3]. Вагомі відомості знаходимо в дослідженні М.Кордуби [7] та Н.Сумцова [11]. На початку ХХ ст. тема писанкарства висвітлюється в праці В.Щербаківського [15], С.Таранушенка [13], Д.Горняткевича [4]. З польських дослідників про українські писанки писав К. Мошинський [17] та Й.Грабовський [16]. Дослідженням писанкового орнаменту займалася І.Гургула [5], М.Бабенчиков [1], О.Соломченко [9]. Розповсюдження, регіональні особливості та орнаментика писанок розглядається в працях Л.Сухої [12], Е.Біняшевського [2], С.Колос [6].

Мета статті полягає у визначенні мистецької своєрідності писанок Опілля та бойківського Підгір'я кінця ХІХ – ХХ століття.

Виклад основного матеріалу. Про розвиток писанкарства на території Опілля та бойківського Підгір'я свідчать результати польових досліджень автора та цікаві з мистецтвознавчого боку зразки, збережені у музейних колекціях.