

UDC 130.2

VOLODYMYR FED’

*Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor,
Head of the Department of Philosophy, History and
Socio-Humanitarian Sciences,
Donbas State Pedagogical University
(Sloviansk, Ukraine)*

*e-mail: ddpudoc@gmail.com ORCID 0000-0002-4786-
1313*

MARIANNA SHARNINA

*Senior lecturer of the Department of Philosophy, History
and Socio-Humanitarian Sciences,
Donbas State Pedagogical University
(Sloviansk, Ukraine)*

*email: mariannasharnina26@gmail.com ORCID 0000-
0001-7969-4751*

METHODOLOGY OF CULTURAL CREATIVITY

In this article the role and meaning of traditional theoretical and methodological approaches of philosophy in solution of the problem of cultural creativity are theoretically conceptualized. It is emphasized that available research not fully reveals ontological status of cultural creativity of man and is far from fully use and characterize methodological and in particular traditional methods of research. At the same time, the model of the cultural purpose of man is the most effective form of interaction between ethnic groups and nations in the era of globalization, when the Other (man, nature, nation, culture) arises as an authentic value. The practicality of this model is to cherish hope for the survival of mankind in the near and medium term.

The authors turn to the analysis of historical, dialectical, evolutionary, functional, ethnopsychological research of human cultural activity. Attention is drawn to the importance of applying the system method. At the end of the article, a conclusion about the prospects of using these methods in combination with modern methods and methodologies is drawn. The necessity of developing the methodological "mechanism" of this combination is emphasized. It is revealed that the system method acts as a basic methodology that allows to combine traditional methodologies with each other and to act as a "methodological platform" for combining traditional methods with modern methods, which can have different forms of expression that depend on contextual application of specific cultural issues.

Key words: cultural creativity; method; historical; dialectical; evolutional; functional; ethnopsychological; system

Statement of the problem in general terms and its relationship with important scientific and practical tasks. Modern cultural-philosophical thought appeals to a whole arsenal of the most diverse methods and methodological approaches. Given this circumstance, when studying the problem of human culture creation, attention should be paid to the classification of these methods. In the most general form, methods and methodologies as a set of methods in the study of a particular phenomenon can be divided into traditional (historical) and modern (postmodern). Therefore, **the object** of study is the traditional methods, and **the subject** is the cultural activity of man.

The theoretical model of culture creation receives methodological support from various sciences, as it has an interdisciplinary character, namely: philosophy, cultural history, cultural studies, history, aesthetics, ethics, art, pedagogy, etc. Such a combination of the conceptual content of the subject of research in various fields of human knowledge can enrich each of the sciences and must necessarily be applied within the **integration** approach.

Historical methods allow us to "reread" the tradition and reveal the **heuristic** potential of culture creation.

The model of human culture creation is the most effective form of interaction between ethnicities and nations in the era of globalization, when the Other (man, nature, nation, culture) arises as an authentic value. The practicality of this model is to cherish hope for the survival of mankind in the near and medium term.

Analysis of recent research and publications. It is obvious that culture creation has deep anthropological foundations, which to some extent reproduce human evolution, characterize its ethnic specifications. On the other hand, science distinguishes the ontological approach to the creative act, which was especially explicated in the works of Western European (A. Bergson, A. Whitehead) and Russian (I. Prigozhina, V. Nalimov) schools. Other researchers have argued for the idea of "cultural activity" beyond which the real world is value-neutral (Z. Norkaus); put forward the theory of the cultural mission of human memory (Yu. Davidov); demarcate the dynamics of cultural processes and cultural events (J. Flier).

In Ukrainian philosophical reflection there is a further formalization and actualization of various aspects of the conceptual content of culture creation (V.P. Andrushchenko, Yu. L. Afanasiev, V.N. Leontiev, S.V. Proleev, V.K. Sukhantseva, N.V. Hamitov).

Domestic researchers, relying on the J.-P. Sartre's concept of "being-in-freedom" as a fundamental principle in the formation of social values, explain culture creation as a sphere of freedom and choice (Культура. Ідеологія. Особистість, 2002, с. 82-85).

The process of cultural creativity is actualized and self-realized in every single form of art. Relying on this principle, V.K. Sukhantseva emphasized on the importance of the highlighting of cultural creativity function, which creates an atmosphere of unity and continuity of development of national culture (Суханцева, 1990, 2, с. 161).

Among domestic research, the monograph by V.N. Leontyeva “Cultural process: rationale and beginnings” is standed out (Леонтьева, 2003) in which a consistent attempt of an analysis of cultural processes in Russian and European philosophical traditions is made. The work embodies the principle of cultural creativity in the understanding of the world and the affirmation of personal principle as a carrier of meaning in this world.

V.N. Leontieva rightly emphasizes the dialectical nature of culture creation, because the unit of cultural process - a cultural act is the affirmation of a cultural phenomenon - is the denial of its opposite, it is prevention of meaninglessness, formlessness, facelessness in the real existence of a culture. In this sense, the logic of culture can be recognized as the logic of “affirmation-denial” carried out in affirmation” (Леонтьева, 2003, с. 56-57).

Highlighting previously unsolved parts of a common problem. However, the conducted studies do not sufficiently reveal the ontological status of human culture creation and do not fully use and characterize methodological and, in particular, traditional research methods.

The purpose of the article follows out of the lack of development of the problem and consists in identifying the main features of the methodological apparatus of culture creation.

The statement of objectives of the article. The problem statement is caused by the fact that traditional methods do not play the same role in studying the problem of human culture creation, so the task is to identify, study and apply the most “productive” and “effective” methods and methodologies in the study of a specific formulated in the name of the article problem.

Statement of the main material with full justification of received scientific results. The desire to explore the most fundamental origins of culture, to cognize their essence, consequences and patterns of application in specific (historical, ethnic, social, etc.) circumstances has led to the search for the most common methods that could encompass the integrity of culture

creation in all the diversity of theories of culture creation activity. The method involves the presence of an object, a developed system of research operations, technology of application, evaluation criteria, tables, it means that, a toolkit by which objects are studied and results are obtained and checked.

Modern cultural thought has a large arsenal of methods that have different historical relevance. Methodological apparatus of the cultural processes research of the beginning of the XXI century based on classical philosophical methods (historical, dialectical, etc.), achievements of the latest methodologies (synergistic, semiotic, etc.).

As it is known, "without the history of the subject there is no theory of the subject" (M.G. Chernyshevsky). This thought was concretized in relation to the specificity of culture creation development by G. Rickert, who emphasized that despite all the transitional and intermediate forms, scientists use mainly the natural-scientific method in the study of the life of nature, and the historical method in the study of the life of culture (Риккерт, 1998, с. 54).

The historical (comparative) method of cultural research was founded by Giambattista Vico (1668 –1744), but this method contains provisions that are still relevant today. In particular, the fact that mind is a rational, strictly logical thinking applies to the physical world, but the culture creation dimension does not fit into the methodology of rational research. That is why the modern cultural creating process in all the diversity of worldview paradigms and cultural practices becomes the subject of analysis of historical consciousness more than rational (in its Descartes' understanding).

Another provision is related to the fact that the historical method, on the one hand, opens up new possibilities for the study of cultures of different peoples in different historical periods of their culture creating activity, and on the other hand, promotes the self-awareness of the individual in the context of the actual culture. As V.S.Gorskiy noted: "The true nature and level of development of the national historical consciousness is marked not only by the amount of knowledge about the events of the past and the system of their

location on the scale of historical values. Defining here is the sense, the meaning that these facts acquire for a relevant culture, a general vision of history” (Горський, 1993, с. 46).

A significant contribution to the methodological toolkit for the study of cultural processes was made by G. Hegel (1770–1831), who substantiated the universal *dialectical method* of research. At the present stage, this method, reflecting the complexity of the cultural processes that occur in unity and the struggle of their contradictory principles, makes it possible to avoid the dogmatization and absolutization of different approaches, concepts and methods themselves in the processes of culture creation. That is, the dialectical method is used by us as a certain universal and open method of research, which makes it possible to consider concepts and categories in their dynamics and to avoid at the same time vulgarized kinks and ideological and political engagement.

The historical method of research was rethought and supplemented with new methods during the XIX century. Under the influence of Charles Darwin's evolutionary theory, many researchers of social and cultural processes began to profess the so-called *evolutionary method*, which we consider as a kind of historical. To the supporters of evolutionism belong O. Comte (1798-1857), L. Morgan (1818-1881), G. Spencer (1820-1903), E. Taylor (1832-1917). The heuristic achievement of the evolutionary method in modern conditions of application is that the primordial laws, stages and phases of culture creation can be defined as stable historical trends, they occur according to the logic of transition from simple to complex, are presented as a straight line (or spiral, wavy line with certain branches and small temporary returns to the upward position). This approach makes it possible to overcome the apocalyptic premonitions of postmodern analysis of cultural processes.

The essence of the evolutionist method stems from the unity of the human race and the kinship of the needs of various peoples in the formation of cultural values. In the book “Primitive Culture” E.

Taylor came to the conclusion that the development of each nation proceeds in a straightforward manner - from simple to complex. Culture, he noted, is the result of human activity, a specific way of its adaptation to the environment. Factors influencing such adaptation, he called the climatic conditions and geographical location of the ethnic group. The scientist also examined the forms of functioning of the culture of all peoples: customs, rituals, traditions, beliefs, clothing, food, tools, housing, art, pointing to their universality. However, E. Taylor believed, that culture is based on myth and ritual, that is, culture comes from the internal nature of man.

Exploring the history of primitive society, evolutionists have argued that humankind is homogeneous by its nature, and only peoples, who is found at different stages of cultural development and while living apart from each other, create appropriate means for realization of cultural needs. The rapprochement of peoples, the intensification of contacts between them, the exchange of cultural heritage determines the commonality of cultural values and the assimilation of them by humanity. The basic idea of evolutionism for the straightforwardness of social progress implies a compulsory requirement for every nation to go through all stages of cultural development.

The historical method during the XIX century was supplemented by antievolutionary (cyclical) model of the development of culture creation, in which the history of the development of culture is considered as the history of the coexistence of local, independent from each other, sociocultural types. In the work “Russia and Europe” M. Danilevsky (1822-1885) sets out a typology of culture - the doctrine of the differences of cultural types. In world cultural history, he identified ten distinctive types of cultures: Egyptian, Indian, Iranian, Chinese, Chaldean, Greek, Roman, Arabic, Romano-Germanic, American-Peruvian (as “dubious” type). The scientist predicted the formation of the eleventh type - the Slavic, in which he had high hopes: “... Based on the analysis of the most significant general results of the activities of previous cultural-historical types, -

wrote M. Danilevsky, - and comparing them ... we can cherish the hope that the Slavic cultural-historical type can for the first time present a synthesis of all aspects of cultural activity ... aspects which were developed by its predecessors on a historical field alone, or far from being fully combined” (Данилевский, 2004, с. 138).

According to M. Danilevsky, the source of every culture is the ability of the nation to realize their “vital forces”, and its originality is based on the peculiarities of the soul of the people. Relations between peoples are unable to change either the soul or the national characteristics of the people. Therefore, in opposition to Eurocentrism, he emphasized that progress could not be considered as an exclusive privilege of the West or Europe, and that stagnation could only be identified with the East or Asia. Each cultural and historical type, emerging from "ethnographic material", enters a period of development and prosperity, after which it declines and dies, so that the nation that are in a stage of decline can no longer be saved by anything. Having spent its cultural potential, noted the scientist, humanity is moving to civilization. Thus, the evolution (monoliness) of culture M. Danilevsky replaced by the polylinearity of its development. These methodological ideas in the XX century were rethought by O. Spengler and A. Toynbee.

Gradually, a different direction of critical attitude toward the evolutionary method developed in the research environment. The foreground is the analysis of the causal-functional relationships and conditions of the emergence of cultures, as well as their conditionality by various factors.

The leading method in cultural studies is the functional method, which has contained provisions that are still relevant at the present stage of the study of culture creation processes, in particular, the provisions about three dimensions of the cultural process and their functional relationship. “The cultural process ..., – wrote B. Malinovsky (1884-1942), – always envisages the existence of people connected to one another by certain relationships, that is, in a certain way organized, in a certain way, turning to artifacts and to

each other through language assistance, or any other kind of symbolism. Artifacts, organized groups and symbolism reveal three closely related dimensions of the cultural process” (Малиновский, 2004, с. 89). In “The Scientific Theory of Culture” B. Malinowski laid the understanding of culture as a product and process, as mean of achieving a goal, that is, instrumental or functional understanding. The starting point of such a statement was the provision that all, even at first glance, meaningless, phenomena and objects of spiritual and material culture have their meaning, and most importantly, their defined function. The scientist insisted on bridging the gap between theoretical ideas about culture and accumulated empirical concrete material, called for creation of a unified synthesized theoretical idea of culture, to form a unified scientific theory. It is also about overcoming disagreements in nomothetic and ideographic disciplines.

B. Malinowski divided the vital needs of mankind into three groups. Primary need is a continuation of the species. A kind of "cultural responses" to them were the emergence of the tribal community, the development of knowledge, education and living and menage conditions. Derivative needs were directed to the manufacture and improvement of tools of production, which resulted in the development of economic relations and a general culture of menage. Integrative needs were manifested in the political organization of public relations.

Generally speaking, a functional methodology for the study of culture creation processes (also called anthropological), this methodology has prospects for development today, because E. Tylor's position about culture as a biological nature of man and its direct adaptation to environmental conditions has not yet lost its relevance. Cultural being includes a socio-cultural environment integrated into the natural world, characterized by the dialectical communication of micro- and macrocosms. And the problem of adaptation of humanity to the current environmental conditions, caused by the activity of humanity itself, can be implemented within the framework of understanding the functional connection between

them through the paradigm of cultural being. According to our point of view, the most productive construct of this kind of comprehension is the development of a humanistic model of cultural being that manifests itself in relation to the Other as a value, where the Other is not only nature but also culture and personality. These conceptual approaches were outlined in the works of B. Malinowski, as well as K. Levy-Strauss, A. Kreber, and others.

The essence of these conceptual approaches to the study of culture creation processes can be reduced to the inseparable connection of culture with the vital needs of mankind. Applying the method of systematic analysis, the anthropological concept of cultural formation was kept up by A. Creber, supplementing it with the theory of styles of fundamental forms of culture. He proved that style is inherent in all great cultures and their basic forms (not only art, but also science, ideology, morality, consciousness, way of life, etc.). According to the scientist, the bearers who determine the style of an era or civilization are brilliant persons who make a significant contribution to the development of any branch of culture. He generalized different styles of local cultures and formulated the concept of styles of common to all mankind civilization. On this basis, we can talk about styles of cultural being, which mark one or another model of culture.

Ethnopsychological method of research consists in identifying the ethnic and national identity of culture creation processes, based on the analysis of psychological factors of awareness of a particular people or nation of a number of historical, economic, political and other factors of formation and development of culture. This method involves a “mental” analysis, which in the Ukrainian tradition has been developed in historical (M. Dragomanov, M. Kostomarov, I. Krypiakevich) and modern (O. Zabuzhko, Y. Lipa) dimensions.

The systematic method of research was proposed by Leslie White, who shared the views of evolutionism and proceeded from the need to create a new methodology that could systematize the diversity of culture creation processes accumulated and simultaneously scattered across different fields of social and

humanitarian knowledge. As the Ukrainian researcher M.S. Konoch noted, in the concept of L. White, an important place belongs to the concept of “evolution”, which he associated with a special methodological approach to the consideration of cultural phenomena in the system of spatio-temporal coordinates. The latter means that the assignment of cultural values to a temporal coordinate implies a historical consideration of cultural phenomena. Assigning cultural values to spatial coordinates implies the study of repetitive processes in the culture of a particular people (Конох, 2004, с. 160).

Being aware of the diversity of methods of study of cultural processes and their contradictions, L. White proposed a methodology that is an original combination of different methods and is based on the principle of correspondence: *time process* - the chronological sequence of separate events that study history; *formal process* - phenomena in timeless structural and functional aspects that give the opportunity to verification of the structure and functions of culture, and *formal-temporal process* that corresponds to the representation of the temporal sequence of forms.

These processes should be considered through the prism of culture creation and explored, according to L. White, using historical, functional and evolutionary methods. Thus, the researcher laid the important methodological foundations of cultural studies, which are based on a complex combination of traditional methods: universal (functional and evolutionary) and general scientific (historical), which form a special (systematic) methodology for the study of cultural processes.

According to our point of view, the systematic method summarizes the development of methodologies that we position as traditional or classical. However, the restriction on classical methodologies is of course inappropriate. The systematic method is the logical conclusion of these methodologies.

Conclusions from this study and prospects for further exploration in this direction. Thus, the methods of analysis of culture creation, which have long become traditional, as was seen from the above material, did not lose their relevance and even retained their

own heuristic potential in modern conditions. The historical method makes it possible to consider culture creation as being historical, when cultural and historical processes appear in all their unity and interdependence. The dialectical method makes it possible to consider culture creation in the dynamics of worldview traditions and cultural practices and to avoid their vulgarized and dogmatized interpretation. The use of the evolutionary method makes it possible to point out that there are not many cultural and historical types, but there may be many types of culture and they may have relevant national specificities: ethnic, regional, etc., wherein each type of culture being predetermined by a specific type of culture creation. Functional method, due to the successful synthesis of sociological and psychological methods of research makes it possible to identify functional, such as stylistic, dynamics of culture creation.

The systematic method acts as a basic methodology that allows to combine traditional methodologies with one another and to act as a “methodological platform” for combining traditional methods with modern methods, that may have different forms of expression which depend on contextual application to specific culture creation issues. We plan to dwell on the current methods of research of culture creation and the definition of "priority" methods in the next publication.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. Культура. Ідеологія. Особистість: Методолого-світоглядний аналіз / Л. Губерський, В. Андрущенко, М. Михальченко. К. : Знання України, 2002. 580 с.
2. Суханцева В. К. Категорія часу в музикальній культурі / В. К. Суханцева. К. : Лыбидь, 1990. 184 с.
3. Леонтьева В. Н. Культуротворческий процесс: основания и начала / В. Н. Леонтьева. Харьков : Консум, 2003. 216 с.
4. Риккерт Г. Науки о природе и науки о культуре / Г. Риккерт. М. : Республика, 1998. С. 44 – 128.

5. Горський В. С. Парадокси історичної свідомості сучасної культури / В. С. Горський // Світогляд і духовна творчість. – К. : Наукова думка. 1993. С. 45 – 51.

6. Данилевский Н. Я. Россия и Европа / Н. Я. Данилевский // Хрестоматия по культурологии. Ростов н/Д: Феникс, 2004. С. 125 – 139.

7. Малиновский Б. К. Функциональный анализ / Б. К. Малиновский // Хрестоматия по культурологии. Ростов н/Д. : Феникс, 2004. С. 87 – 93

8. Конох М. С. Розгляд різновидів соціально-психологічної антропології в руслі проблеми філософії освіти / М. С. Конох // Мультиверсум: філософський альманах. К. : Центр духовної культури. 2004. № 42. С.154–165.

ВОЛОДИМИР ФЕДЬ

*доктор філософських наук, професор, завідувач кафедри
філософії, історії та соціально-гуманітарних дисциплін,
Донбаський державний педагогічний університет
(м. Слов'янськ, Україна)
e-mail: ddprudoc@gmail.com ORCID 0000-0002-4786-1313*

МАРІАННА ШАРНІНА

*старший викладач кафедри філософії, історії та
соціально-гуманітарних дисциплін
Донбаський державний педагогічний університет
(м. Слов'янськ, Україна)
email:mariannasharnina26@gmail.com ORCID ID 0000-
0001-7969-4751*

МЕТОДОЛОГІЯ КУЛЬТУРОТВОРЧОСТІ

У статті теоретично осмислюються роль і значення традиційних теоретико-методологічних підходів філософії у розв'язанні проблеми культуротворчості. Наголошено на тому, що наявні дослідження не в достатній мірі розкривають

онтологічний статус культуротворчості людини та далеко не в повній мірі використовують та характеризують методологічні і зокрема, традиційні методи дослідження. Водночас модель культуротворчого призначення людини є найбільш ефективною формою взаємодії етносів і націй в епоху глобалізації, коли Інший (людина, природа, нація, культура) постає як автентична цінність. Практичність цієї моделі полягає у плеканні надії на виживання людства в найближчій та середньостроковій перспективі.

Автор звертається до аналізу історичного, діалектичного, еволюційного, функціонального, етнопсихологічного, дослідження культуротворчої активності людини. Звертається увага на важливість застосування системного методу, який можна розглядати в якості підсумку вказаних традиційних методів. Мета статті впливає з недостатньої розробленості проблеми методології культуротворчості людини в умовах глобалізації та полягає у визначенні основних рис традиційного методологічного апарату культуротворчості. Адже розкриття його інноваційного потенціалу в сучасних умовах забезпечує діалектичне розуміння культурних процесів та може стати методологічною основою розуміння сучасних методів та методологій як поєднання цих методів, або, принаймні, деяких із них.

Традиційні методи дослідження виконують не однакову роль у вивченні проблеми культуротворчості людини, тому одним із важливих завдань публікації є виявлення, аналіз та застосування найбільш «продуктивних» та «ефективних» методів і методологій при дослідженні проблеми культуротворчої динаміки розвитку сучасної людини. Також важливим завданням є верифікація ідеї про те, що культуротворчість як проблема наукового дискурсу не є суто культурологічною проблемою, однак ця ідея набуває нового смислового наповнення у безпосередньому зв'язку з

філософією, що виявляється на фундаментальному, методологічному рівні.

Наприкінці статті робиться висновок про перспективність застосування цих методів у поєднанні з сучасними методами і методологіями. Наголошується на необхідності вироблення методологічного «механізму» цього поєднання. Виявлено, що системний метод виступає в ролі базової методології, яка дозволяє поєднати традиційні методології між собою та виступити «методологічним майданчиком» поєднання традиційних методів з сучасними методами, що може мати різні форми вираження, які залежать від контекстуального застосування щодо конкретної культуротворчої проблематики.

Ключові слова: культуротворчість; метод; історичний; діалектичний; еволюційний; функціональний; етнопсихологічний; системний

ВЛАДИМИР ФЕДЬ

*доктор философских наук, профессор, заведующий
кафедрой философии, истории и социально-гуманитарных
дисциплин,*

*Донбасский государственный педагогический
университет*

(г. Славянск, Украина)

e-mail: ddprudoc@gmail.com ORCID 0000-0002-4786-1313

МАРИАННА ШАРНИНА

*старший преподаватель кафедры философии, истории и
социально-гуманитарных дисциплин,*

*Донбасский государственный педагогический
университет*

(г. Славянск, Украина)

*email: mariannasharnina26@gmail.com ORCID ID 0000-
0001-7969-4751*

МЕТОДОЛОГИЯ КУЛЬТУРОТВОРЧЕСТВА

В статье теоретически осмысляются роль и значение традиционных теоретико-методологических подходов философии в решении проблемы культуротворчества. Отмечено, что имеющиеся исследования не в достаточной мере раскрывают онтологический статус культуротворчества человека и далеко не в полной мере используют и характеризуют методологические и в частности, традиционные методы исследования. В то же время модель культуротворческого назначения человека является наиболее эффективной формой взаимодействия этносов и наций в эпоху глобализации, когда Другой (человек, природа, нация, культура) выступает как аутентичная ценность. Практичность этой модели заключается в воспитании надежды на выживание человечества в ближайшей и среднесрочной перспективе.

Авторы обращаются к анализу исторического, диалектического, эволюционного, функционального, этнопсихологического исследования культуротворческой активности человека. Обращается внимание на важность применения системного метода, который можно рассматривать в качестве обобщающего для указанных традиционных методов. Цель статьи следует из недостаточной разработанности проблемы методологии культуротворчества человека в условиях глобализации и заключается в определении основных черт традиционного методологического аппарата культуротворчества. Ведь раскрытие его инновационного потенциала в современных условиях обеспечивает диалектическое понимание культурных процессов и может стать методологической основой понимания современных методов и методологий как сочетания этих методов, или, по крайней мере, некоторых из них.

Традиционные методы исследования выполняют не одинаковую роль в изучении проблемы культуротворчества

человека, поэтому одной из важных задач публикации является выявление, анализ и применение наиболее «продуктивных» и «эффективных» методов и методологий при исследовании проблемы культуротворческой динамики развития современного человека. Также важной задачей является верификация идеи о том, что культуротворчество как проблема научного дискурса не является чисто культурологической проблемой, однако эта идея приобретает новое смысловое наполнение в непосредственной связи с философией, что проявляется на фундаментальном, методологическом уровне.

В конце статьи делается вывод о перспективности применения этих методов в сочетании с современными методами и методологиями. Подчеркивается необходимость выработки методологического «механизма» этого объединения. Выявлено, что системный метод выступает в роли базовой методологии, которая позволяет совместить традиционные методологии между собой и выступить «методологической площадкой» сочетания традиционных методов с современными, что может иметь разные формы выражения, которые зависят от контекстуального применения в отношении конкретной культуротворческой проблематики.

Ключевые слова: культуротворчество; метод; исторический; диалектический; эволюционный; функциональный; этнопсихологический; системный

REFERENCES

1. *Kul'tura. Ideologiya. Osobistist': Metodologo-svitoglyadnij analiz [Culture. Ideology. Specialty: Methodological worldview analysis]* (2002)/ Eds. L. Gubers'kij, V. Andrushchenko, M. Mihal'chenko. Kyiv: Znannya Ukraini. [In Ukrainian]

2. Suhanceva V. K. (1990). *Kategoriya vremeni v muzykal'noj kul'ture [The category of time in musical culture]*. Kyiv: Lybid'. [In Ukrainian]

3. Leont'eva V. N. (2003). *Kul'turotvorcheskij process: osnovaniya i nachala [Cultural-making process: foundations and beginnings]*. Kharkiv : Konsum. [In Russian]

4. Rikkert G. (1998). *Nauki o prirode i nauki o kul'ture [Nature sciences and culture sciences]*. Moscow : Respublika. P. 44 – 128. [In Russian]

5. Gors'kij V. S. (1993). Paradoksi istorichnoi svidomosti suchasnoi kul'turi [Paradoxes of the historical consciousness of modern culture] In *Svitoglyad i duhovna tvorchist' [Worldview and spiritual creativity]*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka. P. 45 – 51. [In Ukrainian]

6. Danilevskij N. Ya. (2004). Rossiya i Evropa [Russia and Europe] In *Hrestomatiya po kul'turologii [Chrestomathy in cultural studies]*. Rostov n/D: Feniks. P. 125 – 139. [In Russian]

7. Malinovskij B. K. (2004). Funkcional'nyj analiz [Functional analysis] In *Hrestomatiya po kul'turologii [Chrestomathy in cultural studies]*. Rostov n/D. : Feniks. P. 87 – 93. [In Russian]

8. Konoh M. S. (2004). Rozglyad riznovidiv social'no-psihologichnoi antropologii v rusli problemi filosofii osviti [Consideration of the varieties of socio-psychological anthropology in line with the problem of philosophy of education] In *Mul'tiversum: filosofs'kij al'manah [Multiversum: philosophical almanac]*. Kyiv: Centr duhovnoi kul'turi. No. 42. P.154–165. [In Ukrainian]