

УДК 008

The Transition State of Culture: Problems of a Scientific Reflexion

Tatiana A. Yakovleva*

*South-Ural State University,
76 Lenin, Chelyabinsk, 454080 Russia ¹*

Received 14.08.2009, received in revised form 21.08.2009, accepted 28.08.2009

Transition states of culture are the most interesting to scientific research. However in a cultural science has no uniform rationally built concept of transitivity. The theories of transitivity developed within the limits of natural sciences not can be complete applied to a cultural reality owing to its specificity. Therefore it is necessary to investigate specificity of culturological understanding of transitivity, to estimate possibilities of cultural science in development of adequate knowledge of a modern reality of transition.

Keywords: transition state of culture, transitivity, metasystem transition, Self-reflexion, existential unity, «time-and-place» of culture, «mythology» of culture.

The modern culture passes through a condition which modern thinkers define as «crisis», «critical», «interepoch-making», «threshold», «transgressive» or «transitive». Already increase of such quantity of synonyms testifies to the raised research interest to this condition of culture and a society.

This situation in culture possesses own difficult, original, inconsistent characteristics, and can be considered as a special transition state of culture (or as the transitive type of culture). In this condition dynamism and the internal logic of development of culture is shown. It makes given similar conditions the most interesting and significant for cultural research.

The transitional state of culture is such fragment of cultural-historical process when the cultural reality has already overstepped the bounds of a former qualitatively certain cultural condition (culture type), but has not reached still

the characteristic of integrity of the new type, new system level, definiteness and self-identity of new quality. The culture endures such situation today, and thus, the modern cultural condition can be comprehended only in its logician of transitivity.

However it is possible to assert that there is no general theory of transitivity in a modern science. In a theoretical reflexion of a transition state of modern culture there is a situation which can be named «a hermeneutical circle»: on the one hand, initial plurality of concepts of «crisis» of the culture, increasing interest to studying of typologically similar cultural epoch, on the other hand—absence complete, rationally built the concept of transitivity or universal explanatory model, and, as consequence, absence of fundamental proceedings, monographies in this field of a science. Especially, it is possible to assert that the modern science does not own the mechanism of management of transients. Thus necessity of

* Corresponding author E-mail address: estania@list.ru

¹ © Siberian Federal University. All rights reserved

scientific, rational, objective understanding of the validity of transition for the purpose of mastering by management mechanisms by this process does not cause doubts.

But it is difficult, because a science (and especially science of culture), passing together with culture a transition state, gets to an extraordinary situation. This situation is expressed in a «crisis of true». The science is in «interparadigm» space. Criteria of scientific character and rationality are not established or washed away. The irrational and mystical way of thinking gets into a science. Accents in understanding of the objective and subjective have changed.

From the point of view of a classical science, the objective understanding of a transition state of culture is connected with necessity of theoretical abstraction from this condition. For reception of objective knowledge it is necessary to refuse subjective and emotional empathy to culture. However the condition of a finding of the researcher within the limits of a studied cultural condition calls possibility of such abstraction into question. Transitivity of modern culture leaves the mark on scientific thought

The science of culture is becoming sphere of knowledge and is the form of a self-reflexion of culture. Thereby it incorporates, reflects and expresses all contradictions of a condition of modern culture. The science of culture should comprehend a reality of a modern transition state and itself in this transition, should realise own possibilities in a rationalistic reflexion of a phenomenon of transitivity and a condition of development of practical knowledge about it.

**Revealing of a problematics
of transitivity in a context of complete vision
of cultural-historical process**

Modern researchers understand the importance of transitive conditions for culture

development. But several decades ago the similar point of view was not general. Own problematic of transitivity has appeared only in the XX-th century in which gnoseological space principles «classical», «nonclassical» and becoming «postnonclassical» paradigms are interfaced. To track history of its formation, we will address to corresponding concepts of cultural-historical process.

The idea of development or evolution became unconditional achievement of classical European thought. Putting forward the concept of cultural-historical process as developments, the European philosophical thought builds two basic conceptual models: evolutionary model and dialectic model.

Both these models inevitably built the vision of movement of history of a society and culture according to concept of «future» and mythologeme of «the end of way». The first model is yet capable to allocate transitive conditions as independent and self-valuable fragments of cultural history, that is why and as significant objects of a philosophical reflexion.

From the point of view of evolutionary model all cultural-historical process appears as huge gradual transition from a wild primitive condition through barbarity to civilization tops. The second model allocates transitive conditions as the independent moments of development and defines them as dialectic jumps, however they contact the future condition which should be inevitable better, «more absolutely» previous that is why both «past» and jump lose own importance.

«Nonclassical» cultural philosophy does not reject idea of development, tries to clean idea of «ending» and «purpose» from vision of cultural-historical process. It considerably expands and enriches understanding of cultural-historical process, first, forcing to include in area of cultural and philosophical reflexion spatially-geographical

aspect and to consider real variety of cultures, and secondly, helps to realise convention of any schemes created by scientific consciousness.

Within the limits of a «nonclassical» paradigm the general principle «seizing» of reality in its «temporality» (V. Diltey), variability, dynamics is formulated. On this way are created the concepts which presented in proceedings of O. Spengler (the concept of cyclic development of local cultures) and A. Bergson (the concept of «a vital impulse» and a stream continuity of «pure duration»).

Analyzing their ideas from the point of view of a transitivity problematics, it is possible to notice that the circuitry of cultural-historical process offered by the concept of local cultures, does not provide existence of «transitive forms» as independent, localized in time and space as «transitivity» is perceived only in categories of Evolutionism. Model of «creative evolution», the absolutising continuity of development, also does not recognize objectivity of transitive conditions, considers as their costs of human perception: transition is represented as an empty interval in a tape of «shots» of human perception as a concession of inability of daily and scientific consciousness to perceive pure duration, a life stream is direct.

The nonclassical philosophical thought could not realize «transitive states» as independent yet, the moments of cultural-historical process possessing own maintenance owing to the specificity. But this transition state has been given the European consciousness in a first-hand experience of crisis of culture.

Experience by culture of a transition state turns around dissociation, a fragmentariness of human consciousness, loss by the person and culture of self-identity, self-identity, self-concentration. The complete sight at the world is necessary to the person and culture for the self-identity maintenance. The cultural science is born

as one of answers to necessity of understanding of a transition state of culture and restoration of complete vision of a reality. The culturological knowledge gets to action of a force field of a becoming «postnonclassical» paradigm.

The modern model of culture is built on the basis of principles of the system approach, cybernetics and synergetics. She allows to reveal transitive conditions as the necessary moments of cultural-historical process and to present them as the significant objects of research possessing own maintenance.

If to be based on this model, it is possible to define a culture transition state as a phenomenon of a cultural reality which existence is caused, on the one hand, specificity of human perception (ability simultaneously to articulate and complete reflexion of the validity), and on the other hand, objective laws of the development of culture, as a phenomenon which visually embodies a remedial associativity previous, the past and the future, projective condition of culture. Such definition of a transition state allows to establish that connection (-distinction) between structural levels, temporal conditions of culture which is necessary for, dynamically-complete vision of cultural-historical process.

The basic methodological approaches to research of transitive states of culture Aspects of studying of a phenomenon of transitivity

The recognition of a phenomenon of transitivity as significant object of research has caused of its versatile and multidimensional studying. The most considerable results have been reached on positions of the Philosophical-historical approach, combined efforts of Phenomenology of culture and Existentialism, and also the Struktural-semiotical approach.

The Philosophical-historical approach concentrates on evolutionary aspect of dynamics

of culture. This approach applies laws of dialectic philosophy on a reality of cultural-historical process. On the basis of the analysis of concrete historical types of culture, he allows to present a transition state as independent type of culture. As criteria of allocation of actually transitive epoch are offered qualitative transformation semantic kernel of culture (its outlook, language, a myth), loss by culture of self-identity and coexistence forms, styles (that is most brightly traced in aesthetic aspect at studying of specificity of art and art creativity in the conditions of this type of culture), cultural practices, before were on culture periphery.

Phenomenological tradition and cultural philosophy of Existentialism, attaching the greatest significance to anthropological and gnoseological aspects of research of transitivity, have allowed to reveal interface in it of two levels of life: onto- and phylogenetic, personal and cultural. This correlation is seen in awakening in transitivity of own nature of thinking. As the person is considered as the subject of cultural creativity, in refusal of automatism of thinking, orientations on itself and in aspiration to understanding of unfamiliar maintenances, to sense finding the transition state essence comes to light. «Transitive» from the point of view of this approach it is realised as «boundary», than intensity of experience of transitivity and its «humanity» as the image of «threshold» is always interfaced to idea of «prestanding» is underlined: in this sense occurs some kind of absolutization of the moments of transition as moments of «original life», thereby, in understanding of transitivity it is brought valuable categories thinking and an action.

The Struktural-semiotical approach, investigating mainly sign-language (semiotics) aspect of transitivity (and incorporating thus achievements hermeneutics and information theories), comprehends a transitivity situation as

actualisation in culture hermeneutical situations of plurality of senses and sense interpretation, co-existing among themselves both in dialogue, and in opposition. This approach owing to most intermediary the sign nature expands concept of transitivity to almost any forms of intermediary.

Mechanisms of transition are comprehended as inversion and mediation, thus inversion changes can be carried to intersystem changes, mediative changes and are, as a matter of fact, metasystem transition interesting us first of all – a birth of wider and general system level uniting some of similar systems – in semiotics treatment – a meta-language. Besides, the reference within the limits of this approach directly to structure of human consciousness allows to consider the binarity characteristic as necessary and for the process of thinking as a whole, and for understanding of specificity of thinking in a transition situation.

Research of a phenomenon of transitivity from the point of view of various approaches allows not only to prove it as significant and multilevel object of research, but also to reveal necessity of interface of various levels and aspects of understanding of transitivity more convincing. That more clearly designates prospect of necessity of synthesis of versatile knowledge in complete understanding of a phenomenon of transitivity in a context of complete vision of the culture.

«Time» and «place» existential characteristics in a cultural reflexion of a phenomenon of transitivity

At attempts to synthesize different levels and aspects of knowledge of a phenomenon of transitivity there is a question: what can be a basis for creation within the limits of cultural science complete concept of transitivity? If we allocate a transition state as objectively existing phenomenon of a cultural reality, as independent structure of cultural-historical process, independent type of culture such phenomenon by definition should

possess own existential localisation and own representation about a finding in space and time, own reflexion of «place» and «time». These positions unite in concept of the existential unity («time-and-place» unity), allowing to see any condition of culture as whole.

Thus, it is necessary to approach to complete studying and interpretation of a phenomenon of transitivity from a position of a recognition of presence at a transition state of own time and space, and, thereby, own semantic maintenance.

The reference to phenomenology of modern culture and to modern cultural and to philosophical consciousness allows to trace specificity of a reflexion of time-space of transitivity, and to see in it actualisation of the metaphors directly connected with existential characteristics of transitivity and its semantic filling: such metaphors are: «threshold» (M. Heidegger, V. Bibler), «a crossroads of cultures» (V. Bibler, G. Knabe), «fold» (G. Deleuze), «labyrinth» (U. Eko), «emptiness» or «anything» (M. Heidegger, G.-P. Sartre), «primary chaos» (M. Eliade), «ways» and «crossroads» (F. Girenok), «intermirror-space» (V. Kruglikov), etc.

In modern culture and in a modern theoretical reflexion is reproduced the archetypical circuitry of rite of passage (initiation). It allows to tell about present existence of concept of transitivity mainly as mytho-cultural-logical metaphor. The sense of this metaphor, as well as sense of transition, is realized as a meeting (interface) of various cultural forms, traditions, an expert by means of various forms of their interaction (and not just the dialogical form) in transitivity time-space. In this sense turning of culture back, in the past, can be understood as memory actualization, revival of former experience by means of which projective forms of culture arising are deduced from a latent condition.

Thus, transitivity realizes the major function of initiation toward culture and the person.

However experience of transition marginalizes a current state of culture, reproduces characteristics absence of distinctions (G. Baudrillard), of syncretic unity and immerses a human consciousness in atmosphere of a myth of «ends» and «beginnings».

Mystification of a transitive reality it is inevitably reflected in theoretical thought that forces to ask a question on possibility and conditions of actually scientific, rational understanding of transitivity. The cultural science positions itself as essentially new science, called to synthesize knowledge of culture, to realize culture as whole. Thus, the problem of scientific understanding of transitivity puts before it. For revealing of possibilities of such synthesis it is necessary to address to the nature and specificity of culturological knowledge.

Consciousness of culture in a transition state: Cultural science between a «myth» and «logos»

Cultural science formation as essentially new level of humanitarian knowledge is directly connected with a transition state of a modern society and culture. Transitivity is given modern consciousness in a first-hand experience. The transition state as a reality phenomenon is perceived and endured by the person. It requires the description and an explanation. If we perceive it as a phenomenon of a cultural reality, the problem of its complete, system research is put before cultural science.

The cultural science is not simply a science about culture, and it is represented as the form of a self-reflexion of culture (along with mythology, art, religion, philosophy) and as a meta- language of humanitarian knowledge. Its formation in itself is metasystem transition from languages the special humanitarian disciplines (which are studying specific spheres of culture) to formation of the uniform language. Its necessity is proved

by requirement of understanding of logic of culture as whole.

The culturological thought is capable to come nearer to understanding of a transition state of culture. The cultural science becomes the intermediary-translator, dialogue means in culture and person dialogue. It is not only language by means of which the person speaks «apropos» cultures, but it is language by means of which the person can become copresent to culture that is overcome «estrangement» from culture.

At the same time, completeness and integrity (organic interrelation of elements, their strict structural sequence and accurate distribution of functions) culturological knowledge remains more likely wished today, rather than its cash condition. It is expressed in remaining uncertainty of base concepts, in neosyncretic merge of art, scientifically-philosophical, mystical, daily ways of perception of a cultural reality, and in methodological eclecticism. The cultural science as the form of consciousness of culture, certainly, possesses some integrity, but this special type of integrity.

The cultural science in this sense represents more likely «mytho→logical» knowledge can be defined as «mytho→logy» of culture (the implication sign is used by us not casually). Such strange definition demands the explanatory. The term «mythology» can be used in two senses: as a science about myths and as a system of myths. To cultural science both definitions are applicable.

First, positioning itself as a science about senses, the cultural science inevitably comes to the limiting basis of any sense – to a myth. Secondly, the culture becomes the main object of mystification. The culture is represented as a certain «metasubject». The culture assimilates to

the person: it has a body, the soul; it lives certain age, stages of formation of the person, aspires to self-sufficiency and self-determination and possesses ability of a self-reflexion.

Probably we observe a birth of a new myth. This is the Myth about culture. It helps to find integrity to culture and cultural science. This myth initiates aspiration to understanding of logic of culture.

In a sense, science synthesis about culture is «primitive» and «monstrous» today. The culturological understanding of transitivity is substantially metaphoric that, however, is a necessary gnoseological stage on a way of rational understanding of a transition state.

Besides, «the transitive», «intermediary» nature of the cultural science allows to assert that the culturological knowledge is not «ready» or «complete» knowledge. But it is allows the modern person most to make transition from separated, fragmentary «initial intuitions» about the world (about actually human world, that is, about culture) to forming of own outlook, pledge of unity and which integrity is integrity of the culture.

Conclusion

In general it is possible to tell that the global purpose of our epoch consists in not simply to overcome a transition state, but to live it, to comprehend it, to receive transitivity experience. Thus, the cultural science executes the same function, as transitivity. It is a function of an initiation. Direct experience-myth about culture provokes interest to it, and its variability clears up requirement for a rational reflexion with a view of adequate interaction with a cultural reality, with a reality of cultural transition.

References

V. Bibler, *From the doctrine of science to a logic of culture: two philosophical introductions in the XX-th century* (Moscow, 1990)

D. Carr, *Place and time: on the interplay of historical points of view* // Agency after postmodernism, (Middletown, Conn., 2001), pp. 153-167.

Changing times: Reflections on the development of self and culture: Special issue // Culture & psychology, Vol. 6, № 2. (London, 2000), pp. 99-272.

Crisis of a modern civilisation. A choice of way. The collection of reviews, edited by F. Girenok (Moscow, 1991)

Culturological researches"03: the Collection of proceedings, edited by G. Schedrina, (St.-Petersburg, 2003)

M. Kagan, *To a problem of transitive type of culture//the System approach and humanitarian knowledge*: Selected articles (Leningrad, 1991)

A. Pelipenko, I. Yakovenko, *The system of culture: Structural morphology of culture* (Moscow, 1998).

J. Stern, *Knowledge by metaphor* // Midwest studies in philosophy, 24: Figurative language (Oxford, 2001), pp. 187-226.

V. Turchin, *The phenomenon of science: the cybernetic approach to evolution* (Moscow, 2000)