

291.3

” . , —  
 , ,  
 , .  
 .  
 , .  
 , , , .  
 .  
 , .  
 .  
 , .  
 , , , , .  
 , , .  
 , , .  
 , .  
 , , .  
 , .  
 , , , , .  
 , .  
 , .

**Paterykina V.**, candidate of philosophical sciences, associate professor, chair of social and humanitarian disciplines of the Donbass state technical university, Ukraine, Alchevsk

### **Desacralization of human in Friedrich Nietzsche philosophy**

The purpose of research is *the study is applied to human beings in the philosophical writings of Friedrich Nietzsche and the proof of the thesis about removal of the human nature mystery in the modernism and postmodernism periods. Desecration of the person of the modern period proceeds during a postmodern period, but with a bigger intensity. The used methods: there were used systematic, historical, comparison, analysis and synthesis, generalization and abstraction methods. The basic principle of premodern period is teotsentrym wich covers creations, final and culmination of mankind. Premoderns' God embodies goodness, love, and truth. So person has the following characteristics, and was created by image and likeness of God. The new revolutions in science led to the crisis of antropnost. During the offensive outlooks Friedrich Nietzsche creates a type of Superhuman. The ordinary person has not withdrawn animal existence, and great masses of people don't have a purpose. Everyone should to bring up in himself a philosopher for the common progress. Christian morality and socialist morality weaken personal qualities. Friedrich Nietzsche gave the ideal of Superhuman, who opposed the mass, is out of all kinds of moral standards, good and evil, free, removes the belief in the principles, ideals, norms and values. Postmodern picks up this set of characteristics based on the slogan of the God death. Person replaces God, but not normal – superhuman. Nietzsche thought that the superhuman is harmony person in spite of «modern person.» That is visible contradiction between the «superhuman»*

and «modern person», namely «superhuman» is the epitome of harmony, that is sacredness; the «modern person» represents chaos, desacralization. There are interesting ideas of Albert Camus about nihilism stimulation of Friedrich Nietzsche. He stressed morality of Christianity nihilistic because it prevents discover the true meaning of life. Hence we conclude that according to Friedrich Nietzsche Christianity desacralized morality, as nihilism leads to the destruction of moral values. Friedrich Nietzsche has the same attitude to socialism because of its unbelief in what is. The death of God is a new comprehension of freedom and responsibility. The subject of morals arose with a new force in the period of global shocks when the value of Christian manuals is reinterpreted. Nietzsche's Nihilism appeared in the strategy of reestimation of all values: life, instinct, mind, luck that determines the equality of two principles – Dionysian (free play of vital energy) and apolonivskoho (regularity, completeness). The main conclusions obtained. The crisis in the anthropic Epoch modernity has led to a revision of the relationship to the person. If the main axis in the time predmoderna had faith in God, the modern slogan death of God. This paradigm has been prepared by the philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche, who declared nihilism in relation to Christian values. In turn, this has led to the desacralization of the person.

**Keywords:** sanctification, Art Nouveau, the anthropic, nihilism, Christianity, God, death.

—

« » « »»

[1, .20].

( ), ( ).

—

, — , —  
. . ,  
, « — » ( )  
)  
( )  
, , . ,  
, ,  
, . ,  
,  
, — ,  
« », « ».

. « »

,  
[2, .31].

, —  
, .  
—  
,  
. ,  
, «  
» « », .  
. ,  
, , ,  
, , ,  
— ,





« ! ! ! ! » [5, .249].

[6, .121].

: «... » [5, .258].

« » « » .

— , .

— , —

... — ,

;

—

;

« ».

—





[7, .172–173].

« ?» –  
« ?»,  
« ».  
[7, .174–  
175].

[10, .73].

[6, .122–123].

:« [ ] , ».

[2, .35].

«  
: = – = ,  
: ( , )  
( , ) [1, .70].

[1, .64].

,  
,  
,

[11, .38].

· , ,  
·  
, ,  
,  
,  
· ,  
,  
· ,  
· ,  
· ,  
· ,  
·

1. ' . . / . . ' , . . . - ∴  
, 1998. - 352 .
2. . . / . . . - ∴  
, 1997. - 188 .
3. . // . :  
. - ∴ , 1993. - 447 .
4. . . . 2- ∴ .2 / . . - ∴  
, 1997. - 864 .
5. . / . . - ∴ - . - ,  
1990. - 302 .

6. . . . . / . . .  
 // . - 1999. - 6. - .121-131.
7. . . . . / . . -  
 ∴ , 1990. - 398 .
8. / . . . . - ∴ - , 1999. -  
 656 .
9. . . . , I  
 - / . . // . - 2002. - 9. - .54-67.
10. . . . / . .  
 // . - 2002. - 2. - .69-80.
11. . . . / . . .  
 - ∴ - , 1999. - 326 .