

DOI: 10.31548/hspedagog13(3).2022.176-184

УДК 394. 2 (477. 6)

INTERACTION OF CULTURES AND PHENOMENON OF TRADITION

LAUTA O. D., PhD, Associate Professor of the Department of Philosophy and International Communication at the National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine

[E-mail: elena.lauta@gmail.com](mailto:elena.lauta@gmail.com)

GEIKO S. M., PhD, Associate Professor of the Department of Philosophy and International Communication at the National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine

[E-mail: svt.geyko@gmail.com](mailto:svt.geyko@gmail.com)

Abstract. *The purpose of the article is to study the interaction of cultures and analyze the phenomenon of tradition in the formation of the main trends in the cultural creation of modern society. The study and critical rethinking of cultural heritage and traditions is due to the need for their practical implementation in modern conditions of state formation. Tradition acts as the element that accumulates the socio-cultural experience of the nation's existence and allows to produce new models for imitation. The phenomenon of tradition holds the nation and each individual in history.*

Key words: *culture, civilization, tradition, model, discourse, heritage, character, cultural identity, national culture, national character, mentality.*

Introduction. The main danger in our time is the possibility of different cultures losing their individuality, their specificity, which leads to the loss of their self-identity by the bearers of this culture, the erosion of cultures and, as a result, to the loss of a factor that is extremely important for the development of any civilization – the factor of diversity.

Ethnocultural diversity is the boundless source of enrichment of the world culture of humanity, without which it inevitably degrades. From this point of view, the preservation of ethnic groups, their life world and historical perspective is of fundamental importance on a global scale.

Ethnic cultures represent historically developed methods of activity, thanks to which the adaptation of different peoples to the conditions of their natural and social environment was ensured and is ensured. Each ethnic group creates its own, universal life world. The life world of each ethnic group is unique, unlike the life worlds of other ethnic groups, and, at the same time, universal, as it enables the solution of all life problems of the ethnic group. It is characterized by a certain integral territory, specific features of

traditional material and spiritual culture, the commonality of the native language, the commonality of religious ideas, certain features of the group psyche. The life world of the ethnos is one of the logically consistent possible worlds of humanity. The life world ensures the coordination of individual life stories with collective forms of life.

The loss of ethnic specificity devastates a person, causes a disorder of internal values. In such a situation, people begin to realize their own and other people's ethnicity as originality, uniqueness, and inner wealth. Therefore, ethnocultural diversity is necessary for the progressive development of humanity.

Analysis of recent researches and publications. It should be noted that the interaction of cultures as a theoretical problem became the subject of research starting from the end of the 19 th century and received the greatest development in the works of diffusionists (F. Graebner, F. Ratzel, U. Rivers, L. Frobenius, G. Child, etc.). Unlike evolutionists, who consider each cultural phenomenon as a link in the chain of evolution, diffusionists proceed from the idea of the spatial spread of

culture or its elements from some center or centers as a result of cultural interaction.

Purpose this work is a study of culture-transmitting factors, their genesis is explained, and the leading methodological aspects of the multidisciplinary study of the phenomenon of culture are highlighted. Considerable attention is focused on defining the worldview and value potential of cultural creation and analyzing and summarizing a number of topical problems that characterize the development of culture in different historical periods and, in particular, in today's conditions. The transformation of the cultural infrastructure under the influence of digital metamorphosis is considered.

Methods. complex of cognitive methods, in particular, scientific methods of historical and cultural research, critical analysis of cultural, historical, literary sources, specific historical analysis and interdisciplinary synthesis, induction and deduction, semantic-semiotic, hermeneutic and comparative methods will serve as the methodological basis of the cultural reflection of this phenomenon.

Of the concrete scientific methods, problem-chronological and system-structural methods were used, as well as the method of socio-phenomenological analysis.

Results. Among the problems faced by modern cultures, there is one that is gradually turning into a determining factor of intercultural relations. It is not only about causing misunderstanding. There may not be aliens for the reason that cultures lose their past, clearly defined boundaries, and therefore foreign and own have largely mixed. This does not mean that the Stranger is gone. On the contrary, in a person's life, the meeting with the Stranger happens more often. It's just that the sphere we call our own is losing what used to be called its native ground. The contours of the space of their culture are disappearing. The intertwining of cultures leads to the emergence of a single world

horizon, which characterizes the situation of globality.

The founder of phenomenology, E. Husserl, writes about the crisis, which means, first of all, the crisis of the entire culture, which from the beginning is connected with the idea of European science. Both science and everyday human life have, according to Husserl, the same source – the life world. At the same time, in the course of the history of Western European culture, science is so distant from the world of life that it is opposed to everyday life. Husserl sees the root of this contrast between science and life in a kind of falsification of the ideas of Greek science. This falsification occurs in the New Age, when science begins to appeal not to the things surrounding a person, but to the models of these things, which are achieved by mathematizing our life world. From this it becomes clear that the crisis of science as an idea of science, which gave birth in the Greek world to a very special form of human life, testifies to the crisis of the entire European culture, which is losing the ideal of man, which lay at the very sources of Western European consciousness.

According to Husserl, humanity is always at risk of losing the original fullness of meaning and, in fact, has already lost it.

P. Ricker sets himself the task of creating a holistic concept of cultural interpretation. To some extent, he equates culture with works of art and literature. Integrity and dialectics here means the understanding of cultural phenomena in three temporal dimensions – past, present and future, taken in their dialectical interaction as a simultaneous grasp of the prehistory of the phenomenon, its current state and its possibilities.

According to Ricker, the facts of culture should be studied indirectly, based on the prehistory that is rooted in the individual being of their creators. The surest way to explain our present is to place it in history.

Ricker's temporal characteristic is a specific feature of human experience that

is closely related to the narrativity of culture: there is a deep relationship between the existence of culture in time and its narrativity, between history and its expression in language and, accordingly, in culture. Ricker emphasizes the dialectical nature of tradition and innovation: innovation is possible only on the basis of traditional culture.

It should be said that from the point of view of phenomenology, tradition is not something that someone can learn alone, not a thread that he can choose if he likes it; it is as impossible as choosing one's own ancestors. The one who is not involved in the tradition, but would like to have it, is like an unhappy lover [1, 120].

Under culture, Ricker understands the spiritual life of society, where the formation, self-realization and change of a person takes place, social ties are formed, that is, human history itself is carried out. A person acts as a subject of cultural and historical creativity, in which and thanks to which the connection of times, which is created and maintained by the activity of individuals, is carried out.

According to Ricker, the phenomenon of culture is contemplated at the level of a religiously interpreted tradition of representation. In his philosophy of culture, the representation is endowed with metaphysical characteristics, becomes a synonym for the transcendent movement of the human spirit, which cannot be reduced to a trivial projection of salutary impulses and vital desires. Possessing a prospective research function, representation, in Ricker's understanding, coincides with the constitution of human possibilities, since it is through the representation of his possibilities that a person envisions his own existence. Imagination with its mythopoetic function is also the space where deep spiritual work is carried out, which leads to radical changes in the human worldview, accordingly, changing one's perception, a person inevitably changes his life. Only thanks to the activity of imagination, a person creates these or

those images of his own being, which form the entire reality of culture. Ricker insists that the images of a person have a direct connection with religious myths, they are actually identical to him, interpreting the myth as a meaningful space of human relation to the world, other people and the absolute being. Mythological images of a person are embodied in interpersonal relationships. «They are silent mediators who have penetrated the space between the views exchanged by two people and who have taken root in it; we perceive each other through the images of a person, and culture fills with these meanings the relationships that we consider to be the truest and most immediate» [5, 63].

Asking about the creative foundations of national culture, Ricker sees them in the ethical-mythological core or a set of integral ideas of the nation, consistently spiritualizing the origins of national culture, finding them in the supernatural life of the human spirit. Emphasizing that in an effort to reach the value core of national culture, one should discover a layer of images and symbols that give an idea of the basis of the people, Ricker claims that from these images and symbols what can be called the revived dreams of the people are created, which create the foundation of national culture as such, prompting the spontaneous views and simple reactions of the people in life situations. Trying to answer the question: how is the coexistence of national cultures possible, which does not lead to their destruction, Riker substantiates the reality of intercultural communication through the idea of axiological translation or transmission of fundamental images that create the basis of national culture. This also applies to international cultural values, which are based on certain religious views or orders of truth. Fruitful communication of international cultural integrity, according to Ricker, is possible only through a deep awareness and development of one's religious and cultural identity: for a representative of European

culture, the problem of global dialogue of cultures is not to join any incomprehensible faith, but to return to own sources. Riker: "Each of the historical communities has its own traditional stories, which consist of folk, literary [2, 63].

By mythologizing a symbol, tradition exhausts itself, but it is revived thanks to interpretation, which again rises to the sources from the time exhausted to the time hidden, that is, in the correlation of mythology with the symbol and its semantic reserves.

We understand that interpretation has its own history and that this history is an integral part of the tradition itself, we do not interpret anywhere; we interpret to illuminate, continue, and thereby sustain the life of the tradition in which we find ourselves. This means that the time of interpretation belongs in a certain way to the time of tradition. Conversely, a tradition understood even as the transfer of a deposit remains a dead tradition if it is not a continuous interpretation of this contribution: the "inheritance" is not a closed package that is passed from hand to hand without opening, but a treasury from which can be scooped up by handfuls and which is only replenished in the process of this depletion. Any tradition lives thanks to interpretation – at this price it continues, that is, it remains a living tradition [5, 43].

Riker is looking for a third, deeper time, which would be inscribed in the wealth of meaning and would make possible the mutual crossing of two temporalities (interpretation (present time) and the time of tradition). This will be, according to Riker, the time of the most meaning. Being burdened with meaning makes it possible for the meaning to fall into the sediment, and – at the same time – it is clarified in the course of interpretation.

«Synchrony» creates a system, and «diachrony» appears as a problem. Desymbolization leads to the loss of a sense of integrability, a common goal, as

a result of which active deformation of identity structures begins in mass society. Mass society is losing touch with the great past. The inevitable need to return to the roots is born. The body of the nation embodies space, the earth.

Stories make individuals different from each other. The answer to the question about the subject's identity, that is, the answer to the question of who he is, is history. Access to the identity of subjects is possible only through history. The identity of subjects includes their entire life world. What a subject is in reality is not based on the permanence of his desire to be so. Identity is not the result of action. It is the result of history, i.e., the result of self-preservation and development of the subject in conditions that are randomly connected with the foundation of this momentary desire.

The phenomenological-hermeneutic tradition of our century can be qualified as an intense search for human mutual understanding. This entire tradition tries to understand the ways of overcoming misunderstanding, to understand the Other better than he understands himself, and thus to overcome the conflict of different interpretations.

Riker: «Memory is always a collective phenomenon. And history is always the history of a nation» [5, 37].

History is one of the ways in which people recreate their belonging to the same humanity; it represents a sphere of communication of consciousness, a sphere divided by methodology into traces and documents, that is, a clearly expressed sphere of dialogue, where the other answers questions, and not a sphere of total intersubjectivity, which has broken up into parts, a sphere that is always open and such, which leads the argument. A meeting within the framework of history will never become a dialogue, since an important condition for dialogue is the other's answer to the question posed: history is such a realm of communication where there is no reciprocity [5, 55].

History is always diversity, multiplicity: there is one thing, followed by another.

It is possible to single out the traditions that existed as traditions of a kind of historical motivation, which, possessing a cumulative ability, gradually gains strength; this impulse can only be destroyed by extraordinary cosmic or historical cataclysms – earthquakes or floods – which destroy the material basis of this experience.

The gap between memory and history is a problem. In integral memory, the past was continuously connected with the present; it was a true memory. Our memory, which is only a history, a trace and a selection, has lost the correspondence between history and memory. Memory is always a phenomenon related to the present, and history is a representation of the past [5, 62].

It is enough to doubt the previously accepted instructions, customs, and beliefs once, so that everything immediately shakes, the instability of the moral world is revealed, so that doubt shakes the fundamental foundations on which our activity rests, and our moral behavior changes fundamentally.

Human development is characterized by contradictions. Simultaneously with the increase in the living and cultural level of humanity, the process of universalization is accompanied by destruction; the destruction of not only traditional cultures, but also the disintegration of what Riker conventionally calls the creative core of great civilizations, great cultures; it is from this core that we interpret life. This, according to Ricker, is the ethical and mythological core of humanity. And this is precisely the source of the conflict: we well understand that the formation of a single world civilization is simultaneously accompanied by a kind of depletion or erosion of the foundations of culture, thanks to which the great civilizations of the past developed. This danger lies in the

spread before our eyes of low-quality culture.

It is necessary to rediscover a deep national identity, to re-root it in the past, so that it fuels the demand for national independence. Hence the paradox: on the one hand, it is necessary to re-root in one's own past, revive the soul of the nation and cultivate this demand in the face of colonial identity. But at the same time, in order to keep up with modern civilization, it is necessary to engage in scientific, political and technical rationality, which very often requires a complete rejection of one's cultural heritage. In fact, no culture is able to withstand the onslaught of world civilization and adapt to it. A paradox arises: is it possible at the same time to follow the path of modernization and return to the sources of one's own culture?

When we recognize that there is not one culture, but many cultures, we recognize that an imagined or real cultural monopoly is coming to an end, and as a result our discovery may turn against us; suddenly it becomes possible that there are only others, that we ourselves are someone else among others, that purpose and meaning have disappeared.... Humanity turns into something like a museum: where to go this weekend? One can imagine people who endlessly change their place of residence. This process is like an endless movement without a goal. At this higher point, the triumph of a universally identical consumer culture would correspond to a zero level of culture; it would be the spread of skepticism on a planetary scale, absolute nihilism in a situation of triumph of life's benefits.

Ricker asks the question: what creates the creative core of civilization? Under what conditions can this creativity take place? How does the meeting of different cultures take place?

The first question. The values in question are the life beliefs of specific people, they create a moral system and cannot be questioned by influential and responsible persons.

The people continue their existence based on the established traditions. At a deeper level, these values manifest themselves in traditional attitudes; but these attitudes themselves are only a reflection of the way of thinking, will, and feelings of a separate group of people in a certain historical period. If we aspire to reach the core of culture, we should dig into that layering of images and symbols that give an idea of the basis of the people [3].

Humanity was constituted not at all according to one image of culture, it is the result of borrowing various related and completed historical formations; certain cultures. The fate of a person is such that it is possible to move to another environment.

A cultural tradition lives only because it continuously transforms itself. Humanity moves through time in two ways: civilization in a certain sense is the embodiment of development in time in the direction of accumulation and progress; the basis of the development of the people's culture is the law of constancy and creativity; if culture is not subject to renewal and creative transformation, it dies; the emergence of writers and thinkers who would give a new impetus to the development of culture and who would inspire search and limitless risk is necessary [4].

The second question: under what conditions is it possible to continue the cultural creativity of the people? Only a culture capable of accepting scientific rationality can survive and be reborn; to reunite with one's era can only be faith, which calls for an understanding of the ability to think [4, 123].

The difficulty lies in the fact that it is necessary not only to repeat the past, but also to be rooted in it in order to continuously create something new.

The third question: how is the meeting of different cultures possible? In other words, how is it possible for cultures to co-exist without leading them to destruction? Alienation between people is

never absolute. The fact that one person is a stranger to another person is just as true as the fact that people are always similar to each other. When we get to a completely foreign country, despite the feeling of a significant difference in the way of life, we never lose the feeling of belonging to a single human race; but this feeling remains implicit, if it is not brought to the rank of the principle of conscious affirmation of human identity. It is this weighty principle that was once substantiated by an Egyptologist when, after seeing unfamiliar signs, he declared that, in fact, if these signs were left by a person, then they can be translated. Of course, not everything can be conveyed through translation, but something can always be conveyed. Believing that translation is possible up to a certain limit means asserting that a representative of another culture is the same person as we are, in a word, that communication is possible. One can understand the Other, according to Ricker, through sympathy and imagination. Moreover, I can understand without repeating, imagine, without experiencing, enter the position of the Other, remaining myself. To be human means to be able to move to another center of perspective.

But what happens to my own values when I try to understand the values of other peoples? Understanding is a risky act, as a result of which the entire cultural heritage is in danger of losing its definition in the chaos of syncretism. And only a living culture, which at the same time maintains a connection with its own sources and possesses creative potential in the fields of art, literature, philosophy, and spirituality, is able to withstand a collision with other cultures and not only withstand but also give meaning to such a collision. Since such a meeting of cultures means a collision of various creative impulses, aspirations, it is creative in itself.

Communication is a tense relationship in which the self alternately asserts itself, relying on its own sources, and is revealed through the representation

of the Other, who lives in another civilization. Human truth is born only where civilizations interact on the basis of what is most vital and creative in them. Human history will turn into a wide field of explanation, where each civilization will develop its vision of the world, interacting with all other civilizations. Perhaps, according to Ricker, this will become a global task of future generations.

Now we are in a transitional state, where we can no longer accept the dogmatism of the one truth, but we are not yet able to overcome the skepticism that has overwhelmed us.

Modern society also faces the problem of language revival. This problem is actually, according to Ricker, a problem of culture. The world of technocracy in which we live and the ability to live in which we have to learn is a world without a past, a world that is oriented towards the future, that tries to destroy its own traces. As for the world of culture, it is the world of memory. If technical renewal destroys the past and turns us into people of the future, a person of culture must constantly resolve the contradictions between the memory of his roots and the project of his own domination. Accordingly, we can be considered true people to the extent that we turn to our own sources and revive our traditions.

We are born into the world of words and must constantly master this world. After all, it is in the linguistic sphere that meaning and meaninglessness are combined, and it is at this level that the prospect perspective is rooted.

The phenomenological-hermeneutic tradition of our century can be qualified as an intense search for human mutual understanding. This entire tradition tries to understand the ways of overcoming misunderstanding, to understand the Other better than he understands himself, and thus to overcome the conflict of different interpretations.

Conclusion. Analyzing the phenomenological philosophy of culture,

in particular, the concepts of such modern phenomenologists as E. Husserl, P. Ricker, B. Waldenfels, we find that the condition for the existence and development of cultural worlds is their otherness, and we also draw the following conclusions:

- the human world is the intersubjective world of culture. A person does not exist outside the community of his own kind. Its validity is the validity of relationships and connections with other people. The reality of culture has a supra-individual nature (although this, of course, does not mean the impersonal nature of culture). Therefore, being in its intersubjectivity forms the basis of understanding human existence as a culture;

- the presence of the Other is a necessary condition for the existence of culture and personality. One of the options for solving intercultural conflicts is the awareness of culture as such, which consists in ethical responsibility and duty towards the Other;

- ethno-cultural diversity is a source of enrichment of the world culture of mankind, without which the degradation of society occurs. At the same time, national cultures continue to exist if they are based on their own traditions. Tradition is the «way of existence» of the cultural world. The past and the present form a continuity in which the hereditary character of any present is constituted;

- foreignness defines both human existence and cultural existence («foreign culture», «foreign country»). Each individual culture becomes distinctive due to its response to the foreign. Relationships between Self and Other, between one culture and another, are built according to the «challenge-response» scheme. Culture is the upward openness of the world, which, although it is understood in the structures of subjective experience, is not identical to these structures.

Changes in semantic evidence from generation to generation are not total

transformations. Broadcasting of cultural heritage takes place through the implication of the «collective cultural present» of the «collective cultural past».

Список використаних джерел

1. Вальденфельс Б. Топографія Чужого: студії до феноменології Чужого / Вальденфельс Б. : [пер. з нім. В.І. Кебуладзе]. – К.: ППС, 2004. – 206 с. – (Посібн. з філос. дисц.).
2. Богачов А. Філософська герменевтика / Богачов А. – К.: Курс, 2006. – 406 с.
3. Кошарний С. Феноменологічна концепція філософії Е. Гусерля : критичний аналіз / Кошарний С. – К.: Український Центр духовної культури, 2015. – С. 44–51.
4. Кошарний С. Філософія і культура в контексті онтологічного вчення класичної феноменології (Е. Гуссерль) / С. Кошарний // Філософська думка. – 2018. – № 4–6. – С. 118 – 145.
5. Рікер П. Інтелектуальна автобіографія. Любов і справедливість /

Пер. із фр. – К.: Дух і літера, 2002. – 114 с.

References

1. Val'denfel's B. (2002). Topografiya Chuzhogo. Studii k fenomenologii Chuzhogo. [Topographie eines anderen. Studien zur Phänomenologie des Fremden]. S. 206.
2. Bohachov A. (2002). Filososfs'ka hermenevtyka. Kurs. S. 406.
3. Kosharnyy S. (2015). Fenomenolohichna kontseptsiya filosofiyi E. Husserlya: krytychnyy analiz. Ukrayins'ky Tsentru dukhovnoyi kul'tury. S. 44–51.
4. Kosharnyy S. (2018). Filosofiya i kul'tura v konteksti ontolohichnoho vchennya klasychnoyi fenomenolohiyi (E. Husserl'). Filososfs'ka dumka. S. 118 – 145.
5. Riker P. (2002). Intelktual'na avtobiohriya. Lyubov i spravedlyvist'. Dukh i litera. [Paul Ricœur. Autobiographie intellectuelle. L'amour et la justice]. S. 114.

ВЗАЄМОДІЯ КУЛЬТУР І ФЕНОМЕН ТРАДИЦІЇ

Лаута О. Д., Гейко С. М.

Анотація. Метою статті є дослідження взаємодії культур і аналіз феномену традиції у формуванні основних тенденцій в культуротворенні сучасного суспільства. Вивчення та критичне переосмислення культурної спадщини та традицій обумовлене потребою їх практичного втілення в сучасних умовах державотворення. Традиція виступає тим елементом, який накопичує соціокультурний досвід буття нації та дозволяє виробляти нові зразки для наслідування. Феномен традиції утримує націю та кожного індивіда в історії. Наразі ми перебуваємо в перехідному стані, де більше не можемо приймати догматизм єдиної істини, але ще не здатні подолати скептицизму, що нас захлеснув. Перед сучасним суспільством також стоїть проблема відродження мови. Ця проблема є в дійсності, за Рікером, проблемою культури. Світ технократії, в якому ми живемо і вмінню жити в якому ми маємо вчитися, це світ без минулого, світ, який зорієнтований в майбутнє, який намагається знищити власні сліди. Що стосується світу культури, то це – світ пам'яті. Якщо технічне оновлення знищує минуле і перетворює нас в людей майбутнього, людина культури має постійно розв'язувати суперечності між пам'яттю про свої коріння і проектом власного володарювання. Відповідно, ми можемо вважатися істинними людьми перспективи тією мірою, в якій ми звертаємося до власних джерел і відроджуємо наші традиції. Ми народжені у світі слів і маємо неперервно освоювати цей світ. Зрештою саме в мовній сфері поєднуються смисл і безсмысленість і саме

на данному рівні вкорінена перспектива перспективи. Феноменологічно-герменевтичну традицію нашого століття можна кваліфікувати як напружені пошуки людського взаємопорозуміння. Уся ця традиція намагається досягнути шляхи подолання непорозуміння, зрозуміти Іншого краще, ніж він розуміє сам себе, й тим самим подолати конфлікт різних інтерпретацій.

Ключові слова: культура, цивілізація, традиція, модель, дискурс, спадщина, характер, культурна самобутність, національна культура, національний характер, ментальність.