

**UDC 130.2:101**S. S. VOZNYAK<sup>1\*</sup>, V. V. LIMONCHENKO<sup>2\*</sup><sup>1\*</sup>Lesya Ukrainka Volyn National University (Lutsk, Ukraine), e-mail sergiyvoz@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0002-6904-009X<sup>2\*</sup>Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University (Drohobych, Ukraine), e-mail volim\_s@ukr.net, ORCID 0000-0002-4770-7199**The Co-Existential Educational Community and Culture**

**Purpose.** The article aims to comprehend the concept that has a serious anthropological meaning, – a "co-existential educational community" – which points at the real subject and object in the development of the educational reality, as well as to explicate its importance towards understanding the real way of addressing actually to the culture and its acquisition in the pedagogical process. **Theoretical basis.** To achieve this purpose, the method of categorical-reflexive analysis of texts and problems of real educational realities is used; this allows to involve of such philosophical concepts as "sobornost", "all-unity", "culture" and distinguish their anthropological meaning. Under this approach, philosophical categories are able to appear as internal dimensions of the essence in the educational process, rather than a certain matrix, for which one or another theoretical or practical construction is adjusted. **Originality.** The originality of the article lies in the actualization of philosophical content in "sobornost" and "all-unity" concepts for philosophical-educational discourse and in solving the question on the real way of entering culture (precisely in its potential that generates its own human in man) in the context of pedagogical communication. **Conclusions.** Addressing the idea of a co-existential educational community is able to oppose the widespread superficial notions of the so-called "educational environment" in the pedagogical and psychological literature and orient pedagogical theory and pedagogical practices on the real way of entering the individual into truly human forms of life. It is argued that the co-existential educational community can and should unfold not only "horizontally" (in space), but also "vertically" (in historical time), consciously integrating the high culture in itself as a culture of high. The authors emphasized the role of imagination in this process. Education can and should build co-existence with the culture of participants in pedagogical communication. It is with this approach that the education sector can emerge from the systemic crisis and actively oppose those trends in modern social life that increase alienation and depopulation.

**Keywords:** human nature; human essence; education; co-existential community; sobornost; all-unity; culture; imagination

**Introduction**

The crisis situation of modern education in Ukraine (the ultimate educational disempowerment, a critically low level of motivation to study, as well as the general culture of young people) objectively requires the intensification of philosophical-educational discourse to help pedagogical theory and practitioners adequately understand educational realities and seek proper ways to solve the pressing issues. Usually, many people want to find them in the "advanced educational technologies", the most of them are thoughtlessly borrowed abroad or "designed" hastily on native vastnesses. But no "technological innovations" will not save the situation without meaningful comprehension of anthropological issues. Searches inside pedagogical (and psychological-pedagogical) theories should be based on a profound anthropological concept that reveals the essential dimensions of human being and determines the true form of its implementation.

The idea of V. Slobodchikov (1999, 2004, 2010; Slobodchikov & Isaev, 1998) has significant anthropological content concerning the co-existential educational community as a subject and object of development, in essence, sources of human development. This is even evidenced by the title of one of the works – "An Anthropological Principle in Psychology of Development". The author opposes unstructured existential community against social structuring. Community, sociability arise as an essential attributes of man (Slobodchikov, 2010, p. 4). Exactly in the context

## SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

of the co-existential community the human nature is forming and developing – this dimension is indicated by the German term "Ausbildung", that is, the image of a person appears to be a new formation that arises in the educational process.

In the national research literature, one can mention only a few works (Kobylchenko, 2014; Revasevych, 2003; Yushchenko, 2018), these authors appeal to the concept of "co-existential educational community". However, its content by no means is explicated, at the same time, on a positive note such expressions as "co-existential environment", "educationally pedagogic environment" are used, which shows a misunderstanding of the very meaning in V. Slobodchikov's idea. After all, from the viewpoint in recognition of the co-existential educational community as the source of child development, anything about any "environment" is out of the question. It seems that quite often the authors do not understand the specifics of the co-existential educational community, its radical difference from simply "medium".

The role of communication in the educational process is quite often discussed. An interesting development of a topic is made in the article of J. Vlieghe and P. Zamojski (2019), who speak about "educational love" as a necessary component of education. In contrast to the usual sense of love as a sense directed toward a person, a very specific meaning is emphasized when love has an educational rather than pedagogic significance:

Our approach is different from the recent recovery of love in the educational literature, in that we take Arendt's cue very seriously, and define love first and foremost in terms of love for the world. The object-side of educational love is not the student (or the teacher seen from the perspective of the student), but the thing that is studied in the classroom. Educational love is love for a thing, not a person. Although we do grant the importance of love for children and students, we think that this love is secondary. (Vlieghe & Zamojski, 2019, p. 520)

It should be emphasized that love by the way means the need for amorousness in the learning process precisely into the subject that appears as a part of the world. It is worth the effort to study with new generations. We believe, if the culture as such is the subject in the educational process, it opens only in a state of love, but the introduction into such a state is possible only in the context of the co-existential community.

Interesting thoughts on mutual influences between anthropology and education are included in the article of the writing group (Bloome et al., 2018), which raises educational problems as anthropology issues – in the center, there are no questions to obtain professional skills, namely the fulfillment of human nature. In 2020, in the UK, the published issue "Journal of Philosophy of Education" was devoted to the understanding in the phenomenon of education, taken not in the dimension of professional-sectoral training of a specialist, but when it appears to be a human-creation process (Bakhurst, 2020; Kern, 2020; Rödl, 2020). The strategy, represented by the au-

## SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

thors of the journal, comes out of fundamental importance of education in human life. D. Bakhurst (2020), sharing the ideas E. V. Ilyenkov in relation to education and being a student of the Russian philosopher F.T. Mikhailova, points at a legacy of Cartesianism and British empiricism among the reasons for the scorn of the Anglo-American Mainstream to education, a sharp opposition of the conceptual to empirical (when education is seen as a "simply empirical" issue), the influence of scientism, which prefers naturally-scholarly knowledge. He fully true notes:

No credible natural-historic description of what a human being is could fail to give education a central place. Yet the concept of education has often been neglected by philosophers, especially those working in the Anglo-American mainstream. It seems, however, that the prejudices at the root of this neglect are on the wane, and more and more philosophers are beginning to recognise that education is of profound philosophical significance, entering into questions of the nature of knowledge, theoretical and practical reason, the formation of mind and its relation to the world, and the cultivation of moralvision. (Bakhurst, 2020, p. 255)

Referring to McDowell's idea, Kern (2020) claims that the learning process is described as the process of initiation into the social practice (p. 272), however, in our opinion, such a very abstract universality the V. Slobodchikov's idea upon the co-existential educational community overcomes substantially. We are impressed by Rödl's thoughts concerning human nature that a person is free precisely because he/she has no "own principle by nature", a person has own nature, but "not naturally", as well as that "*Education is the relation of individual to individual in which the individual gives herself to the individual*" (Rödl, 2020, p. 303). However, the author does not reach the particular content that is inherent in the concept of the "co-existential educational community".

The concept "co-existential educational community" by V. Slobodchikov in its content is significantly has something in common with the concept of "appeals" by the famous philosopher F. Mikhaylov, who claims that the appeal from the depths of the subjectivity of one individual to the subjectivity of others (and thus – to oneself) in search of "co-feeling, co-action, co-thinking" is such an attitude that generates both human community, and all human abilities (Mikhaylov, 2001b, p. 266), so such a way of attitude should be the basis of the educational process.

In the theoretical plan, we rely on philosophical-educational researches of such scientists as G. Lobastov (2014), F. Mikhaylov (2001a), V. Voznyak (2008). The ideas expressed in the articles of V. Voznyak and N. Lipin (2020), are consonant with our reasoning. In relation to the concept of "all-unity", except for the works of V. Soloviev (1990a, 1990b), we rely on the publication of V. Limonchenko (2014).

Thus, it can be noted that the concept of "co-existential educational community" is not comprehended in philosophical and educational discourse, and in pedagogy and pedagogical psychology. Its content has not yet "upended", not "plowed across" pedagogy, although it contains such potential in itself. Philosophical categories, such as "sobornost" and "all-unity", which are correlated with this concept, are not reflected in the philosophical-educational dimension when education arises as the space of human's institutionalization. The possibility of the expansion of the co-existent educational community seems essential not only in space but also in time due to the integration of culture in the context of educational communication. How do we attract students to the works of high art? Modern pedagogy gives only superficial answers to such a question. Appeal to the concept of the co-existing educational community, in our belief, is capable of providing a meaningful and practically significant solution to this problem.

### **Purpose**

The purpose of the article is to activate the concept of a "co-existential educational community" in all its anthropological content for philosophical-educational discourse. Identifying the anthropological meaning of categories "sobornost" and "all-unity" and the expansion of this concept toward the discovery of real forms of integrating high culture into the context of pedagogical communication are research tasks.

### **Statement of basic materials**

We must find an answer to the question: *what kind of form* should we enter a person to introduce him/her into the *truly human forms of being*? It is our conviction that such a *form* should be sought in the *character of the structuring of relationships* between the participants of the pedagogical process. We will proceed from a fairly accurately formulated opinion: "The organization of school life itself turns out to be a meaningful life material that brings up and models a student" (Lobastov, 2014, p. 72). A special role belongs to *jointly-divided activity* in the learning process by the child of specifically human forms of life:

The universal form in the union of the individual with the subject, as it has already been shown by a long-term national theoretical and experimental-pedagogical psychology, is a *jointly-divided substantive work*. Such a form of activity begins by a teacher together with a pupil, and in the course of learning the logic of the subject by the pupil, the teacher reduces the proactive attitude – a teacher through the form of joint activity with the subject seeming to transfer the ability, in this form presented to another who assimilates and assigns this ability. The activity, activity

with the subject, substantive work is being formed in the pupil.

(Lobastov, 2014, pp. 118-119)

However, here the community between the adult and the student is taken from the side of the *activity*. Let us try to approach this process precisely from the side of *communication*, a form of community and address the fundamentally important idea of a modern psychologist V. Slobodchikov in relation to the *co-existential community*, which, according to the author, is the *educational community*, the source of development and the subject of education. This fact closely connects the person's existence in the world with education, and this indicates that the person has the ability of free self-determination, this what Rödl (2020) is talking about, distinguishing the forms of life by the principle of self-knowledge, and then knowledge is not just an integral part of human life, but "human life is knowledge of themselves" (p. 296), that is, education makes human beings human, building a person (Russian *Education*, German *Bildung*).

V. Slobodchikov opposes the existential community to the social organism, a certain structure that is determined by a clear distribution of social roles, functions and statuses. Here, groups of people with those or other needs interact with each other and unite. Such ways of the organization are most effective for solving the tasks of *social adaptation* of the individual to existing systems of activity, they literally "make fit" the individual's ability to a specific type of social production (it is here, according to the author, the mystery of the fashionable today and the widely winned over by propaganda popular "competency-based approach" in education lies. The opposite of such a structure is "an unstructured *existential community*, which adds up on a general *value-semantic* basis of its participants" (Slobodchikov, 2010, p. 4). It is with this understanding, the human being is taken in such a way that indicates the event of communication.

The own sustainability of an individual is grown exactly in the existential community. Here he/she finds protection psychological well-being against external troubles. The highest form in the development of the existential community is characterized by specific features – the defining peculiarity is accepting other people's differences. The initial norm of the community is a steady *spiritual bond* between its participants, which provides an *understanding* of one individuality with another. This opportunity is realized only in terms of continuous communication, dialogue, mutual trust, and *empathy*. "In the community people meet, it is created by the joint efforts of its participants; norms, goals, values, the meaning of communication and interaction in the community are brought by themselves, making it the truly *co-existential community*" (Slobodchikov, 2010, p. 4). It is this form of the community that is the fundamental *ontological basis* of the very possibility in the emergence of human in man, the basis of their normal development and full life. In essence, such a community should be in principle *co-existential* due to the fact that its participant are

..."*incompatible-inseparable*": incompatible – in their ultimate individuality of each, inseparable – in their ultimate spiritual integrity. In a co-existential meeting, people provide, and, in fact, guarantee the *presumption of humanity* to each other; the right and opportunity to stand on the

human way of development, as we grow we become a true decider and the author of our own development. (Slobodchikov, 2010, p. 6)

The main function of the co-existential community in the existence of man is *development*. *Co-existence is both the object of development, and its subject* – that is, what develops and is being developed; this or another form, this or another level of individual and collective subjectivity appears to be the result of development. Interestingly, in this context, exactly the "*form*" and "*content*" categories are used regarding the definition of the role of the co-existential educational community:

Dialectics of correlation between two fundamental categories – in this case: *education* – as a form and *development* – as the content continues to be far from clarified fact. In general, the form and determines (imposes limits) of the content; In turn, the content literally gropes, finds its adequate form. (Slobodchikov, 2010, p. 6)

A. Kern's (2020) thoughts are consistent with such an approach, who, when considering human nature, appeals to the Aristotelian principle, according to which the difference between human species and inhuman animal life forms is exactly in the form and explicates this idea further, justifying the difference that human form of life is realized through learning, which is described at the most general level as an inclusion into the social practice, which by nature is a phenomenon communicational.

Consequently, development appears to be the *content* of the existence of the co-existential educational community, education – as a *form* of its implementation. Indeed, the *content of education* is the development of human subjectivity due to the desobjectivation of the *forms* of human life into the *content* of human abilities, or – developing *forms* of these abilities through the desobjectivation of the *essentiality in the content* of the human way in living together. *The form* of the educational process is a way of building relationships of participants in the educational process. The most adequate form of education is the movement of it through the *co-existential community* and it is not coincidentally that a well-known Christian formula "inseparably and incompatibility" is applied to determine the essence of the co-existential community:

I introduced the concept of "co-existential community" in psychology. The principle of incompatibility and inseparability is the basis of it. This is the principle of the Trinity but it impenetrates not only the Church but all human life. It lives in the family (not accidentally family is called a small church), in friendly associations (but not in backyard companies,

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

---

arranged quite differently, by forcible and hierarchical principle). The essence of this principle is that we are together and at the same time every person is unique, independent. But by itself, such co-existence does not add up. In order to unite upon such a principle, people have to make efforts. Otherwise, they fall either within the symbiotic community or a formal structure. In the first case, the distinctness, the individuality of a person is destroyed, in the second one – a person is atomized, there is the depersonalization of people. The experience of the co-existential community was set 2000 years ago when Christ has gathered the apostles. Then the principle of sobornost was introduced in theology, the essence of which is just at in incompatibility and inseparability. And when I became a psychologist, I found that there is no such concept in psychology. (Slobodchikov, 2004)

Taking into account the above, it should address the concept of "sobornost" and, if possible, identify its philosophical-educational meaning. S. Frank claims that the sobornost arises as the internal, organic unity which lies at the root of any human communication, any public association of people. Sobornost is organically inseparable unity "I" and "You", which grows from the primary unity "we". In this event, not only individual members of the sobornical unity are not separated from each other, but the unity of "We" itself and the dissipated multiplicity of individuals including in it are in the same inseparable bond and internal interpenetration. Unity "We" does not oppose here as an external beginning of multiplicity, but it is imminently present in it and unites it inside. S. Frank writes:

And this means: not only an individual member of the unity, being inseparable from the other, thereby inseparable from the whole, not only "I" is unthinkable outside the unity "we" that holds it, but also on the contrary: the unity "we" are internally present in each "I", is the internal basis of his/her own life. The whole not only inextricably combines parts but is

## SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

available in each of its parts. Therefore, these two instances, the unity of the whole and independence of each part, do not compete here between each other, do not restrict one another. Unlike the external social unity, where the authorities of the whole normalize and abridge freedom of individual members and where the unity is carried out in the form of external order, the distribution of competencies, rights, and obligations of individual parts, the unity of sobornost is a free life, it is as a spiritual capital that supplies and enriches their members' lives. (Frank, 1992, p. 61)

Thus, according to S. Frank (1992), sobornical unity forms the *life content* of the personality him/herself. Let us pay attention, preeminently the *content*, not some *external background*, "environment". Sobornost for the personality is not something external, not subject of interaction. It is spiritual nourishment, the richness of the individual, his/her achievement. "Other people and society, as a whole, here are not external means of life, namely its internal content, on the wealth of which prosperity and abundant life of the individual depends on" (Frank, 1992, p. 61).

Consequently, the unity – both *content*, and *form*, their mutual transition, mutual modulations, in one word – a specific oneness. How can we not recall the Hegel's opinion that the content is the transition of the content into the form, and the form is the transition of the form into the content?

The concept "*sobornost*" really reveals the essence of the co-existential community. Then sobornost appears to be the *content* and the co-existential community as the form of its implementation in real relations of people. The philosophical-anthropological meaning of the "sobornost" category, in our opinion, is that the true *meaning* of the actually *personal existence*, its deep basis, the method of the *internal person's belonging* to a person, a way of a peculiar presence of some people in the subjectivity of others, a way of a *presence* of all people in the human soul. Human individuals are connected with invisible, but undoubtedly essential ties differing from external social interaction. This means that the educational process has no right to neglect the *sobornical nature* of the human personality, that educational activity should *build* such relations *between the participants* in pedagogical communication, to look for such *forms of community* that would express not external social expediency but the very *basis of human existence* – sobornost.

Sobornost appears in fact as a human form of manifestation and implementation of the existing *unitotality*. Volodymyr Soloviev (1990b) names true, positive unitotality such, in which the unity exists without the sacrifice of everybody or detriment for them but in favor of all. "The false, negative unity suppresses or absorbs the elements that are part of it, and itself turns out to be *emptiness*; the true unity retains and enhances its elements, carrying out in them as the *completeness of being*" (Soloviev, 1990b, p. 552).



## SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

He notes: "Pure existence is perfect or worthy, only so far it does not deny the universal, but gives it a place in itself, and in the same way, the general ideal or worthy to the extent that it gives a place to itself for the partial" (Soloviev, 1990a, p. 361). Let us pay attention: the salient principle is that to give a "*place in itself*", hold it, and not just slightly "move". "Worthy, perfect existence is the complete freedom of components in the perfect unity of the whole" (Soloviev, 1990a, p. 361). Once again, we emphasize: not limiting partial existence, not submission of it to the universal, and namely, giving it a true space. Sobornost, unity and humanity are not just interconnected, they thoroughly interpenetrate into each other, determine one another. We remember that the co-existential community V. Slobodchikov names the "presumption of humanity".

That is why for pedagogy, oriented anthropologically, which is capable of truly humanizing individuals, the co-existential educational community is of great importance, which is implemented as positive unity and sobornost. The chatter of the so-called "educational environment" is not able to clarify the core of a subject and contribute to the finding such a real form, which introduces individuals into the image of a person actually. Because the "educational environment" may also be a symbiotic community, and a formal structure. It is necessary to radically distinguish these types of community, do not jumble them together. This distinction is practically not found in pedagogical literature.

V. Slobodchikov in an interview notes that thoughts concerning the place of man among people and the search for the true forms of their community led him to the idea of "co-existential community" as a basis, sources of development of merely human in a person. And he adds: "By the way, much in this regard, communication with Batyshev gave me, which came in parallel to similar ideas" (Slobodchikov, 2004).

What ideas of philosopher G. Batishchev are consonant with the thoughts of psychologist V. Slobodchikov? First of all, it is a distinction between two dimensions of communication: external ("linguistic-psycho-communication", as the author names it) and the internal – "ontocommunication", actually "deep communication", purely existent communication (Batishchev, 2015) and universals of such "deep communication" named by him. Without a doubt, G. Batishchev's universals of "deep communication" in philosophy conceptually express religious (Christian) experience, but they significantly deepen the concept of V. Slobodchikov's "co-existential community". The above universals include the indisputable *philosophical and educational* meaning, since each of them, as they all together, *frankly oppose* real educational practice in schools of all levels, oppose many ideas and principles that are professed by the modern pedagogical ideology (especially – focus on "self-affirmation of the individual", "self-realization of personality").

The compatibility in ideas V. Slobodchikov and G. Batishchev also concerns the concept of the latter regarding the typology of social ties. The philosopher distinguishes three types of such ties: social-organic, social-atomistic and harmonic (Batishchev, 1997). The first type is characterized by a non-free co-belonging of an individual together with likeminded to a certain Whole, in relation to which he/she is only a component bereft of significant independence. In the social-atomistic relationships, the individual acts as a certain atom, for which independence is possible on condition of self-isolation and value loneliness; the individual here is an ontological unit for him/herself, and relations between people are links of *indifference*. True is, G. Batishchev talks about the variants of closed and unlinked ties both in the first type, and in the second one. The unlinked ties mitigate the negative effects of each of them. Harmonic ties reproduce universal activity and universal communication

## SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

where the creative attitude towards the world prevails. There is no pluralism, but the *logic of polyphony*, the logic of co-creativity. Such harmonious ties are not utopia, they have always existed, although they did not have an appropriate development, they exist out of time, are always present and among people, and in a personal man's world, combining with other types of ties. It is clear that "harmonious ties" in its basis coincide with the meaning of the "co-existential community" concept.

I. Butsyak (2011) reviewed the types of social ties in culture, singled out by G. Batyshev, as certain ways of building a pedagogical space and concluded that in modern education, in ways to build a conventional pedagogical space, we observe the chimeric mixing of *closed* social-organic and social-atomistic ties, which almost completely filled the pedagogical space, and – paradoxically, but in reality they get along well with each other, complementing each other – but rather cacophonically then harmoniously; if harmonic links exist or arise – most often spontaneously – in this area, they remain on the periphery. To bring educational space to more or less human (that is, reasonable) form – means to ensure *unconditional supremacy*, priority, primacy of precisely the harmonious type of links. The real pedagogical space capable of providing a *holistic self-development of the individual* should be built according to the type of *harmonious* ties.

Thus, a way, a *form* of constructing relationships, a *form* of communication, a *form* of community of participants in the educational process has a direct relation to the *actual quality* of education, to the formation of a free harmonious personality. After all, the personality is formed by relationships just within the personal being: this is the place of education. Pedagogy should contribute to the transformation of the potency of personal existence into the personality.

Therefore, the most important task is the formation of such an educational "space", filling it with such *content* that would force all participants in the educational process to act in accordance with the logic of its internal *content*. The corresponding educational space as a form of communication, as the co-existential community, must be filled with adequate content – actually a culture as such. And it is *the co-existence of communication* that is capable of making everyone to move by the logic of the *evolution of the content*. The relations of external expediency, too, in their own way force to move students and teachers – just to take the necessary information, gain useful in the life "competencies", learn to adapt to the conditions and structures of the existing society. Here, we are not talking about own *personal development*, it happens – if it happens – beyond the bounds of institutionalized education.

The school itself should be life, but it must be stronger than life, for its spontaneous and existing, highly distorted, disfigured forms to introduce students into truly human dimensions. The forms of life, in which the school introduces students by its own structure, should *exceed forms of existing being* by their deep human meaning.

And what about a thesis that received the status of the truism: "*School must prepare students for life*"? It's quite simple. We must give ourselves a clear and reflexive report – exactly what kind of "life": to be a small screw (preferably – successful) in existing social structures or to be a man among people? If we prepare creative temporizers, creative and very competent careerists – it is enough to have available forms. If otherwise – to learn to be a man, means to be the individuality, then much more needs to rethink. And, above all, to seek *true forms* of human existence, communication.

Some may argue: so formed, so developed person would not find them in "modern life", they will fall out from reality and, in the end, become unhappy. Together with G. Lobastov (2014, p. 118) one can answer this – working knowledge of true forms of being and thinking has never

## SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

hurt anyone, since true forms are able to relate to any material, to hold any content in itself, not coinciding, however, directly and proximately with it.

In order to provide clear *meaningfulness* of the educational process, the content form adequate to this is necessary, the form of its own *meaningfulness*. The *co-existential educational community* appears to be such a form. Beyond it, the development of an individual will be left to chance, and not always be happy.

When we complain about the extremely low motivation for the training of modern students, the fall of morality, the growth of hard-heartedness and soullessness among young people, I would like to ask: were you (we) able to build a relationship with them so that the *co-existential community* would be formed? When we reproach that our children are somehow different, they do not respect parents, they are disobedient and strive to do God knows what, and not what it is necessary – again we would like to ask: were you (we) able to build a relationship in your own family so that they formed the *co-existential community*? Someplace where there is a *co-existence* prevails, a child is happy to go home. Where there is not just a night shelter, staying, and joint being, meeting with which is an event.

The form of the co-existent community should not be taken purely *spatially* (family, school, friends, creative team), it unfolds *over time*. After all, it is safe to assume the possibility of forming the co-existential community in the chronotope of culture, to feel own co-existence with those who have long ago passed into oblivion, but we can not imagine our life without their works, beyond communicating with their creativity, beyond immersion in their art.

Something usual will be said: it is clear, conversance with the cultural property plays a significant role in the education of young people since it acquires a certain necessary experience in the process of socialization ... We are not satisfied with such easy variants. Philosophical-educational discourse is exactly *philosophical*, which should call into question the usual interpretation of those or other concepts, brought to simple words-terms; it has to work with *categories*, bringing them to the *concept*, to understanding.

The essence of education, as we have already defined, is the process of forming human subjectivity, respectively, the content of education is *cultivating* human in man, growing a person from his birth. After all, education begins, as it is known, still in the mother's womb. Therefore, it is first necessary to identify the essence of the culture itself.

Culture is not simply "everything that is produced by mankind". It is known that in domestic and foreign literature, there are several hundred different definitions of what is "culture". We consider the following definition as the truest and meaningful for the *anthropological* understanding of the *educational* process:

*The culture* is nothing else than the process of constant creation of the external appeal of the restless human soul to the subjectivity of other people who in the same manner persistently seek sympathy in the meaningful development of their tragically lonely and always public (only in communication, through appeal to other possible) being. (Mikhaylov, 2003, p. 266)

## SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

That is, the author implies that culture appears as a prerequisite, the process and the result of the creation by people vitally important addresses toward one another and themselves. Culture is what *generates* and *saves* a person. The attitude to the subjectivity of other people in search of *co-compassion, co-thinking (consciousness) and agreement in cooperation* with them was, remains, and will be such the attitude that generates and saves a person. It is precisely this forming the motivation of their behavior and can provide expanded reproduction of *living allowance* and the main condition in human life: *forms of the community* of people (Mikhaylov, 2001b, p. 260).

Acquisition, *development of cultural and historical forms* is the basis for the formation of an individual, his/her soul and spirit. Determination of cultural-historical, social reality that is experienced and thought by individuals, in fact, are the definitions of *spiritual* ones. They are presented in the movement of an individual body as his/her soul. The body in its self-position is forced to hold *asserted* definitions of cultural-historical reality as a scale, as a *measure of own attitude* toward any *content* in the space of its existence. On the one hand, inside the child's energies, the form of action develops, absorbing, engaging the earlier unobtainable bonds (hence, methods of synthesis) of reality. On the other hand, it rotates interactions within reality, the interaction between things, against the things themselves, rotating the forms of appeals to it of adults outside – not only on adults, but on toys, objects of nature. In this – it is the *beginning of the subjectivity*, the return to the world what the child receives from the world. The child finds active reasons in it and, with the help of these reasons makes, constructs, creates their own reality freely.

Consequently, education by its nature is an *entry into the culture*. Moreover: it appears to be the *experience of entering* a culture. Education is the experience, the *experience of engaging to the experience others* (history), but at the same time, it appears as *the experience of the experience*, the experience of appropriation of cultural and historical *content* in all diverse and differentiated forms within themselves. The form of mastering, achieving such an experience (that is, the *form of acquiring such content*) is the educational *co-existential community*, which means *coworking* of a child with an adult, a student with a teacher, and in an "internal" form itself – *coworking* of an individual with history, with human origin.

Education is not just a "transfer", "broadcast" of cultural experience, it itself is an activity and communication faces the experience of entering the culture. Otherwise, at schools teachers will only "talk about culture", "to give examples", "make explicit", to organize voluntary-compulsory excursions to the museums and art galleries, "culture visit to the theater", and not to *introduce* pupils to their own *cultural content*, not to *enter together* with their pupils into the culture as *content*.

Culture by nature is *subjective* since only it is itself capable of *generating human in a person*. The man achieves self-determination in culture, achieves *self-determination by culture*. Culture is the material for "buildings" of all human abilities without exception, subjective qualities, and properties, but human in man is not created by the *externally-objective way*. And therefore, according to V. Voznyak (2014), who advanced the idea of culture as a "third subject" of the educational process, really brings up exactly the *"third subject"*. And therefore "the task of the reasonable teacher – is to build the learning process in such a way as to give the word, space and time exactly for this – rather strange – the subject, so the "will would not be mine", teacher's, but "your will", of the *"third subject"* as a deep-laid content of culture"(Voznyak, 2014, p. 112).

This "third subject" (culture) has a rather strange feature: it does not *transform anyone into an "object"*, does not deprive any of its own sovereign subjectivity and subjectiveness. On the contrary: it is it who retains, protects, revives and develops the subjectivity of all participants in ped-

agogical communication. In this situation, I cease to be a "teacher", "former" and give this difficult mission to the subject *in eidos of culture*, and it (culture) is really *smarter than me*, a teacher.

So, as we see, there is a real possibility of building and implementing a form of the *co-existential educational community* precisely in the context of culture, involving culture to *co-existence* with us, or otherwise: co-existing with culture. After all, culture retains its essence precisely as a culture, and not as a set of some artifacts, information about the events of the past, etc., – when it remains *subjective, alive, permanently relevant*. When it is addressed to us, personally – to me. And everything in culture is a *continuous appeal* of past generations to the present generation in search of *co-existence with us, with me*. To extremely activate these *appeals* for students – is the very first task for the teacher. By the way, *talented* teachers always did so, and therefore their students differed significantly from others.

An important role in the process of attracting to culture belongs to a *productive imagination*, which arises as the basis of all creative forces of the human soul. It is in the context of the co-existential educational community, the imagination as the ability to look at the world and oneself by eyes of other people is formed, in the end – the ability to see the world with the eyes of the human race (Ilyenkov, 2006). In acts of imagination, a person does not just reduce one or another subject to an image but also resolves oneself into the image of man. In the situation of imagination, a person is holistic with all of his/her being is present in the image. The imagination faces a way of organizing human sensuality, and *beauty* is a form of organization of developed imagination. The mania of modern young people with a variety of counterfeits for culture ("Mass culture") really spoils the imagination, deforming the entire sphere of sensuality.

Sometimes you can hear such a point of view: what works, let us say, of Gogol or Chekhov can give to modern young people? There – it is about a completely different life, but it is necessary – about the modern, which real people live. However, if seriously, the works of classical, high art can create a new organ of perception and understanding in our subject, without which we radically lose the opportunity to focus adequately (ie – with understanding) in the world of human, in including – and in the present.

Only the co-existential educational community (itself – as culture) enables the involvement into its orbit the works of high culture as a culture of high since certain *co-existence and community* are established, thereby they become full-fledged participants in communication, compassion, experience. The phenomena of high culture, which are "grown" in the context of the existential educational community, are perceived by participants not as something external, alien, but as own, such, without which one cannot breathe.

### Originality

The originality of the article is in better understanding of the "co-existential educational community" concept due to the activation of anthropological content of the "sobornost" and "all-unity" categories and its rotation into philosophical and educational discourse, as well as in the finding real ways to attract high culture into pedagogical communication (living together in culture and with culture).

### Conclusions

Based on this, it becomes clear why the experience of entering the culture (as experience in attracting to the subjectivity of others in the context of the co-existential educational communi-

## SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

ty) is an indispensable and main task of education. Exactly the *forms* of such experience that include methods of entering the culture as a content within subjectivity, or, which are the same, include ways of entering subjectivity into the *content and form of* culture, and should become the subject of unceasing and intelligent *solicitudes of the teacher*. And theoretical pedagogy should not perform a "social order", but *analyze such forms in all their content*, without violating the logic of understanding forms of joint-divided activity and, first of all, focusing on creating the co-existing community or for a moment not forgetting that *forms* of such experience are directly related to the intellectual culture (the culture of thinking), moral culture and artistic-aesthetic culture. Otherwise, with the *culture of thought, will, and feelings*. It is worth taking care of their development.

## REFERENCES

- Bakhurst, D. (2020). Teaching and Learning: Epistemic, Metaphysical and Ethical Dimensions—Introduction. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 54(2), 255-267. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9752.12418> (in English)
- Batishchev, G. S. (1997). *Vvedenie v dialektiku tvorchestva*. St. Petersburg: RGKhI. (in Russian)
- Batishchev, G. S. (2015). Osobennosti kultury glubinnogo obshcheniya. In *Izbrannye proizvedeniya* (pp. 505-538). Almaty: Institut filosofii, politologii i religievdeniya KN MON RK. (in Russian)
- Bloome, D., Beauchemin, F., Brady, J., Buescher, E., Kim, M., & Schey, R. (2018). Anthropology of Education, Anthropology in Education, and Anthropology for Education. *The International Encyclopedia of Anthropology*, 1-10. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118924396.wbiea2140> (in English)
- Butsyak, I. D. (2011). Tipologiya sotsialnykh svyazey v kulture G. S. Batishcheva i sposob postroeniya pedagogicheskogo prostranstva. *Nauka i obrazovanie v sovremennom mire: Vol. 3: Sbornik materialov Mezhdunarodnykh nauchno-prakticheskikh konferentsiy, April, 2010, April, 2011, Ust-Kamenogorsk*, 14-28. (in Russian)
- Frank, S. L. (1992). *Dukhovnye osnovy obshchestva: Vvedenie v sotsialnyu filosofiyu* (pp. 13-146). Moscow: Respublika. (in Russian)
- Ilyenkov, E. V. (2006). *Ob idolakh i idealakh* (2nd ed.). Kyiv: Chas-Krok. (in Russian)
- Kern, A. (2020). Human Life, Rationality and Education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 54(2), 268-289. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9752.12412> (in English)
- Kobylchenko, V. (2014). Psychological Health and Wellbeing of Children with Psychophysical Development Disabilities as Urgent Problem of Special Psychology. *Osvita osib z osoblyvymy potrebamy: shliakhy rozbudovy*, 5, 65-73. (in Ukrainian)
- Limonchenko, V. (2014). *Opyt filosofskoy analitiki antropologicheskogo diskursa v Pravoslavii: Monografiya*. Drohobych: Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University. (in Russian)
- Lobastov, G. V. (2014). *Filosofsko-psikhologicheskie problemy pedagogiki: Monografiya*. Mendeleevo: FGUP "VNIIFTRI". (in Russian)
- Mikhaylov, F. T. (2001a). Filosofiya obrazovaniya: ee vozmozhnosti i perspektivy. In *Izbrannoe* (pp. 452-512). Moscow: Indrik. (in Russian)
- Mikhaylov, F. T. (2001b). Kulturologiya kak osnovanie obshchego chelovekovedeniya. In *Izbrannoe* (pp. 257-390). Moscow: Indrik. (in Russian)
- Mikhaylov, F. T. (2003). *Samoopredelenie kultury. Filosofskiy poisk*. Moscow: Indrik. (in Russian)
- Revasevych, I. (2003). Obhruntuvannia psikhologichnoi kontseptsii osobystisnoi adaptovanosti za modulno-rozvyvalnoi orhsystemy. *Psychology & Society*, 4(14), 96-109. (in Ukrainian)
- Rödl, S. (2020). Teaching, Freedom and the Human Individual. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 54(2), 290-304. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9752.12415> (in English)
- Slobodchikov, V. I. (1999). *Paradigmy razvitiya sovremennoy psikhologii i obrazovaniya*. Retrieved from <http://charko.narod.ru/tekst/alm3/slob.html> (in Russian)
- Slobodchikov, V. I. (2004). *Bez dukhovnoy sostavlyayushchey ne ponyat cheloveka*. Retrieved from <http://www.pravoslavie.ru/4560.html> (in Russian)
- Slobodchikov, V. I. (2010). Co-being Educational Community – Source of Development and the Subject of Education. *Uchenye zapiski. Seriya Psikhologiya. Pedagogika*, 3(2), 3-8. (in Russian)

## SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

- Slobodchikov, V. I., & Isaev, Y. I. (1998). *Antropologicheskiy printsip v psikhologii razvitiya*. Retrieved from [http://library.by/portalus/modules/psychology/readme.php?subaction=showfull&id=1107593635&archive=1120045907&start\\_from=&ucat=27&](http://library.by/portalus/modules/psychology/readme.php?subaction=showfull&id=1107593635&archive=1120045907&start_from=&ucat=27&) (in Russian)
- Soloviev, V. S. (1990a). Krasota v prirode. In *Sochineniya* (Vol. 1, p. 351-389). Moscow: Mysl. (in Russian)
- Soloviev, V. S. (1990b). Pervyy shag k polozhitelnoy estetike. In *Sochineniya* (Vol. 2, pp. 548-555). Moscow: Mysl. (in Russian)
- Vlieghe, J., & Zamojski, P. (2019). Out of Love for Some-Thing: An Ontological Exploration of the Roots of Teaching with Arendt, Badiou and Scheler. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 53(3), 518-530. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9752.12375> (in English)
- Voznyak, V. (2008). *Spivvidnoshennia rozsudku i rozumu yak filofsfsko-pedahohichna problema: Monohrafiia*. Drohobych: Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University. (in Ukrainian)
- Voznyak, V. (2014). In search of "the third subject" of educational process. *The Kazakh-American Free University Academic Journal*, 6, 109-116. (in English)
- Voznyak, V. S., & Lipin, N. V. (2020). Education like breach between past and future. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, 17, 98-109. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i17.206722> (in English)
- Yushchenko, I. M. (2018). Psychological safety as a conditions of formation of subjectivity of the child. *Scientific Bulletin of Kherson State University. Series "Psychological Sciences"*, 3(1), 153-158. (in Ukrainian)

## LIST OF REFERENCE LINKS

- Bakhurst D. Teaching and Learning: Epistemic, Metaphysical and Ethical Dimensions – Introduction. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*. 2020. Vol. 54. Iss. 2. P. 255–267. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9752.12418>
- Батищев Г. С. *Введение в диалектику творчества*. Санкт-Петербург : ГХИ, 1997. 464 с.
- Батищев Г. С. Особенности культуры глубинного общения. *Избранные произведения*. Алматы : Институт философии, политологии и религиоведения КН МОН РК, 2015. С. 505–538.
- Bloome D., Beauchemin F., Brady J., Buescher E., Kim M., Schey R. Anthropology of Education, Anthropology in Education, and Anthropology for Education. *The International Encyclopedia of Anthropology*. 2018. P. 1–10.
- Буцяк И. Д. Типология социальных связей в культуре Г. С. Батищева и способ построения педагогического пространства. *Наука и образование в современном мире. Вып. 3. Сб. материалов Международных научно-практических конференций (Усть-Каменогорск, апрель 2010 г., апрель 2011 г.)*. 2011. С. 14–28.
- Франк С. Л. *Духовные основы общества: Введение в социальную философию*. Москва : Республика, 1992. С. 13–146.
- Ильенков Э. В. *Об идолах и идеалах*. 2-е изд. Киев : Час-Крок, 2006. 312 с.
- Kern A. Human Life, Rationality and Education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*. 2020. Vol. 54. Iss. 2. P. 268–289. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9752.12412>
- Кобильченко В. Психологічне здоров'я та благополуччя дітей з порушеннями психофізичного розвитку як актуальна проблема спеціальної психології. *Освіта осіб з особливими потребами: шляхи розбудови*. 2014. Вип. 5. С. 65–73.
- Лимонченко В. *Опыт философской аналитики антропологического дискурса в Православии* : монография. Дрогобич : Дрогобицкий державний педагогічний університет імені Івана Франка, 2014. 482 с.
- Лобастов Г. В. *Философско-психологические проблемы педагогики* : монография. Менделеево : ФГУП "ВНИИФТРИ", 2014. 318 с.
- Михайлов Ф. Т. Философия образования: ее возможности и перспективы. *Избранное*. Москва : Индрик, 2001. С. 452–512.
- Михайлов Ф. Т. Культурология как основание общего человековедения. *Избранное*. Москва : Индрик, 2001. С. 257–390.
- Михайлов Ф. Т. *Самоопределение культуры. Философский поиск*. Москва : Индрик, 2003. 272 с.
- Ревасевич І. Обґрунтування психологічної концепції особистісної адаптованості за модульно-розвивальної оргсистеми. *Психологія і суспільство*. 2003. № 4 (14). С. 96–109.
- Rödl S. Teaching, Freedom and the Human Individual. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*. 2020. Vol. 54. Iss. 2. P. 290–304. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9752.12415>

## SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

- Слободчиков В. И. *Парадигмы развития современной психологии и образования*. 1999. URL: <http://charko.narod.ru/tekst/alm3/slob.html>
- Слободчиков В. И. *Без духовной составляющей не понятие человека*. 2004. URL: <http://www.pravoslavie.ru/4560.html>
- Слободчиков В. И. Со-бытийная образовательная общность – источник развития и субъект образования. *Ученые записки. Сер. Психология. Педагогика*. 2010. Т. 3. № 2 (10). С. 3–8.
- Слободчиков В. И., Исаев Е. И. *Антропологический принцип в психологии развития*. 1998. URL: [http://library.by/portalus/modules/psychology/readme.php?subaction=showfull&id=1107593635&archive=1120045907&start\\_from=&ucat=27&](http://library.by/portalus/modules/psychology/readme.php?subaction=showfull&id=1107593635&archive=1120045907&start_from=&ucat=27&)
- Соловьев В. С. Красота в природе. *Сочинения* : в 2 т. Москва : Мысль, 1990. Т. 1. С. 351–389.
- Соловьев В. С. Первый шаг к положительной эстетике. *Сочинения* : в 2 т. Москва : Мысль, 1990. Т. 2. С. 548–555.
- Vlieghe J., Zamojski P. Out of Love for Some-Thing: An Ontological Exploration of the Roots of Teaching with Arendt, Badiou and Scheler. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*. 2019. Vol. 53. Iss. 3. P. 518–530. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9752.12375>
- Возняк В. С. *Співвідношення розсудку і розуму як філософсько-педагогічна проблема* : монографія. Дрогобич : Дрогобицький державний педагогічний університет імені Івана Франка, 2008. 357 с.
- Voznyak V. In search of "the third subject" of educational process. *The Kazakh-American Free University Academic Journal*. 2014. № 6. P. 109–116.
- Voznyak V. S., Lipin N. V. Education like breach between past and future. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*. 2020. No. 17. P. 98–109. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i17.206722>
- Ющенко І. М. Психологічна безпека як умова формування суб'єктності дитини. *Науковий вісник Херсонського державного університету. Серія "Психологічні науки"*. 2018. Вип. 3. Т. 1. С. 153–158.

С. С. ВОЗНЯК<sup>1\*</sup>, В. В. ЛІМОНЧЕНКО<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1\*</sup>Волинський національний університет імені Лесі Українки (Луцьк, Україна), ел. пошта [sergiyvoz@gmail.com](mailto:sergiyvoz@gmail.com), ORCID 0000-0002-6904-009X

<sup>2\*</sup>Дрогобицький державний педагогічний університет імені Івана Франка (Дрогобич, Україна), ел. пошта [volim\\_s@ukr.net](mailto:volim_s@ukr.net), ORCID 0000-0002-4770-7199

## Спів-буттєва освітня спільність і культура

**Мета.** У статті ставиться завдання осмислити концепт, що має серйозний антропологічний зміст, – "спів-буттєва освітня спільність", який вказує на справжній суб'єкт і об'єкт розвитку освітньої реальності, а також розгорнути його істотність у бік розуміння реального способу звернення до власної культури та її освоєння у педагогічному процесі. **Теоретичний базис.** Для реалізації поставленої мети застосований метод категоріально-рефлексивного аналізу текстів та проблем реальних освітніх ситуацій, що дозволяє залучити такі філософські поняття, як "соборність", "всеєдність", "культура" і виокремити їх антропологічний смисл. За такого підходу філософські категорії здатні поставати внутрішніми вимірами сутності освітнього процесу, а не певною матрицею, під яку підганяється та чи інша теоретична чи практична побудова. **Наукова новизна.** Новизна статті полягає в актуалізації антропологічного змісту понять "соборність", "всеєдність" для філософсько-освітнього дискурсу та у вирішенні питання про реальний спосіб входження культури у тому її потенціалі, що породжує власне людське в людині. **Висновки.** Звернення до ідеї спів-буттєвої освітньої спільності здатне протистояти широко розповсюдженому в педагогічній та психологічній літературі поверхневим уявленням про так зване "освітнє середовище" та орієнтувати педагогічну теорію та педагогічні практики на дійсний спосіб входження індивіда в істинно людські форми буття. Стверджується, що спів-буттєва освітня спільність може і повинна розгортатись не тільки по "горизонталі" (у просторі), але й по "вертикалі" (в історичному часі), свідомо інтегруючи в себе високу культуру як культуру високого. Підкреслено роль уяви у цьому процесі. Освіта може і повинна будувати спів-буття з культурою учасників педагогічного спілкування. Саме за такого підходу сфера освіти може вийти із системної кризи та активно протистояти тим тенденціям у сучасному соціальному житті, що посилюють відчуження та знелюднення.



SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

---

*Ключові слова:* людська природа; людська сутність; освіта; спів-буттєва спільність; соборність; вседність; культура; уява

Received: 30.06.2021

Accepted: 26.11.2021