

## Dialogue and culturological project of religious study in Ukraine: the philosophical aspect

Modern religious education in Ukraine is a dramatic unity of worldwide and specific-national bases. On the one hand, ethnic and cultural identification of the Ukrainian nation today takes place in the context of Ukraine's entry into a global "inter-discursive discourse" of information society with a tendency to the cultures' dialogue inherent to it, educational expression of which is the *Bolognese process* aimed at rapprochement of educational (and mental) traditions of different countries. On the other hand, challenges of intercultural education in Ukraine are felt especially sharply, taking into consideration polyconfessionality of the national religious life, historically formed as a result of boundary geopolitical position of our state between the East and the West. Contradictory combination of asceticism and mysticism, openness and closeness, cosmopolitanism and ethnographism, xenophobia and painful groveling before foreign – opposite frames of mind, which to the same extent originate from the lack of ability to carry on a real dialogue, are inherent to marginal cultures. Moreover: Ukrainian polyconfessionality, after all, comes to religious dualism – open or hidden opposition of Orthodox influence in the East and South and catholic influence in the West. Spatial model of this opposition gives it additional spiritual tension and promotes to forming of a kind of "mythological geography" of "own" and "alien", "space" and "chaos", "correct world" and "world inside out" (term of the Ukrainian culturologist Popovich), which remains a kind of "thing in itself", a source of taboo, fears and superstitions.

Specific character of religious life in Ukraine is influenced by a world outlook situation formed in postsoviet space. An ideological niche, that "has been exposed" as a result of rejection of soviet axiology, needs to be filled up, that provokes to intensive world outlook experiments. Their participants are, on the one hand, traditional churches (in light of the foregoing religious dualism), and on the other – numerous newest religious movements and organizations, including charismatic sects. Against this background educational activity of secular ethics paradigm's representatives, whose value positions are formed in a spirit of "academic religion science"<sup>1</sup> at a constant appeal to the constitutional principle of the liberty of conscience, pursuant to which a school in Ukraine is separated from the church (article 35 of the Constitution of Ukraine), also becomes more intense. Consequently, a conflict of "academic science" and theology as two approaches of teaching of religious knowledge is laid upon a conflict of eastern and western religious intensions, which according to the history inertia inherited from the soviet past, are perceived as alternative ones.

In our opinion, both represented oppositions are conditional and artificial. They should be surmounted to prevent numerous religious-political and world outlook conflicts. A question is that, what are *concrete mechanisms, programs of religious education*, which would help to "cure" or, at least, "suppress" its most painful areas? Such, in our opinion, is dialogue and culturological project of religious study. How you see, an adjective "dialogue and culturological" consists of two components: "dialogue and culturological". It points out the appeal of offered conceptual approach simultaneously to two problem spheres: to philosophy of a dialogue as to the paradigm of humanitarian knowledge and to culturology as to integrative humanitarian science. Concerning culturology, philosophy of a dialogue executes a function of the one of its principal methodological directions, which provides for interpretation of culture as existence of the Other, space of cultures interaction. Consequently, we deal with philosophy of a dialogue as culturological problem, refracted through an educational "prism".

In this work, on the basis of religious and culturological researches and pedagogical practice, we will make an attempt to *define theoretical and methodological principles and semantic constituents of dialogue and culturological project of religious study within the limits of modern higher and secondary education in Ukraine*. To realize the stated purpose, we will examine the following *questions*:

1. Analysis of the basic problems and principal progress trends of religious education in modern Ukraine by the example of selection of dominant world outlook and methodological approaches to

---

<sup>1</sup> The term "academic religion science" within the limits of this paradigm underlines its society, separation from theology. Actually that's why not a term "religious", but "religion science" education, which underlines its difference from "spiritual" (clerical) education, is used concerning religious education in social secondary and higher educational institutions in Ukraine.

teaching and study of religious knowledge (these approaches are classified by us as “modern” and “postmodern”).

2. Opening conception of dialogue and culturological project as a compromise way in opposition of present educational approaches (by way of introduction of the categories of “active tolerance” and philosophy of a dialogue as philosophy of the “Third”);

3. Outlining prospects of introduction of dialogue and culturological project of religious study into modern system of the national education (by way of outlining an ideal model of well-educated man within the limits of the offered project; selection of principal positions of methodological and methodical novelty of the project and giving practical recommendations by the example of teaching of author’s academic courses).

With certain warning we can speak about the *crisis (or close to such) state of study and teaching of knowledge about religion in Ukraine*. The main reason of the crisis is a problem of *methodological inconsistency of religious education*, – inconsistency, which further becomes deeper due to the absence of corresponding spirit epochs (and at the same time non-opportunistic) of conceptual religious material interpretation bases (or even absence of awareness of the necessity of making such and introduction them into educational and pedagogical process) in theoretical and mental fields of religious education.

In a scientific context modern methodological bases of teaching religion science arise as displays of corresponding theoretical positions (Marxism, existentialism, psycho-analysis, phenomenology of religion, hermeneutics and etc.). If to look at these methodologies from the world point of view, it is possible to reduce their diversity to semantic opposition of two most influential for today value and semantic options. It is a question of setting *modern and postmodern*, which fix two opposite, model of philosophism and, broader, cultural existence of a man: in scientific literature their dichotomy can be also met in the form of oppositions “*universalism (modern) – particularism (postmodern)*”, “*fundamentalism – relativism*”, “*essentialism – existentialism*” etc [1, p. 311]. Principal difference of modern from postmodern in the wide cultural seeing lies in an attempt (for modern) or keeping (for postmodern) from solving of fundamental problems of essence bases of phenomena (“*essentia*” – lat. “*essence*”), for example a question about existence of the Absolute, sense of existence, unity of humanity, presence or absence of culture’s universalities as common general sources of cultural and historical process and etc. If modern gravitates towards setting and positive solution of transcendental problems, thus exposing a tendency to “penetration into the essence”, exposure of reasons, total generalization, construction of “*metanarratives*”, then postmodern, with its ironical aspiration to “*sliding on a surface*”, will be absolutely free from any metaphysical references, directed at immanent categories of game, case, situativity, plurality, “*track*”.

A “*portrait*” of philosophical discussion given by us forms a world outlook background of modern religious education development in Ukraine. Among this progress trends we can distinguish “*modern*” (*universalistic*) and *postmodern (particularistic)*, which form corresponding conceptual approaches to the religious study. Modern approaches gravitate toward *a priori metaphysical evaluation options at determination of religion*. With regard to the last we can observe two camps, two large courses, from appearance of which, actually, all subsequent religion science “*streams*” are formed. Both camps begin definition of religion from a question about the verity or delusiveness of its object – the Absolute, eldritch (God, gods, spirits and etc). Thus “*verity*” and “*delusiveness*” are examined here not as particularly gnoseological, but as ontological categories.

Representatives of *the first camp* – secular scientists and teachers-materialists of “*pro-soviet*” orientation, apologists of all atheistic varieties of free-thinking (*Marxism, Freudism, atheistic existentialism*) – arise from a priori setting about absence of the Absolute. Mainly, these are representatives of the older generation, consisting of professors and teachers. Accordingly, they determine religion as “*disfigured form of public consciousness*”, a result of gaps in perception or even a product of ignorance and deception. Representatives of *the second camp* (it is a question of theologians of all confessions) a priori confirm existence of the Absolute and that’s why they interpret religion (in overwhelming majority of cases – dogma of exactly “*own*” confession) as His manifestation, form of Revelation, higher display of Truth. As a result we deal with “*two extremes of one essence*” – opposite in views, but internally related tendencies of world picture construction of modern religion science, which in an identical degree move us away from the research object and give to religion science paradigm hypertrophied evaluative (didactic, ideological, modern) pathos: either excessive *clericalization* or excessive “*atheization*”.

At the level of secondary school education, theological and secular opposition (let’s name it “*scientist and technocratic*”) approaches takes the form of a discussion about introduction into a school, either a course of religious ethics or a course of social (academic) ethics accordingly. The first variant is

complicated by the variety of confessions in our state (what ethics – orthodox, uniate, catholic should be actually introduced?), as well as by nominal legal requirement of the “liberty of conscience” in the sense of school separation from the church. The second variant threatens to transformation of neutral acquaintance and “educational” study of religion in frank atheistic propaganda in the spirit of soviet stereotypes.

Postmodern or close to it method of overcoming a deadlocked situation is offered by *phenomenological school* in religion science, which, based upon the traditional technique “epoche” of E. Husserl in the person of leading representatives (M. Eliade, R. Otto) suggests to “refuse” from any evaluative opinions, to “stop”, to keep, like Buddha in the state of “gold silence”, from setting and, moreover, solution of metaphysical problems, being limited to the sphere of impartial consideration of intentional orientation of consciousness for the sacral object (that is pictures of humanity of sacred and its feeling). Thus, antinomic Kant’s question “Does God exist?” is replaced by phenomenological one “How do we perceive Him”. On phenomenological positions in Ukraine there are often representatives of junior generation of religious and educational figures. Abstracting one’s mind from posing of “unusual for competence of the science” tasks, being limited to the description of concrete diversity religious experience, phenomenologists change a direction of the scientific thought from inductive (to general) for deductive (to partial). Without regard to the enormous role of phenomenology in development of modern (“neutral”) religion science, which can prevent numerous religious conflicts, representatives of this direction quite often are submitted to accusations from the part of their opponents (of both aforementioned camps) in deprivation of religion science of “world outlook depth”, reducing it to factual, illustrative and constatative approach, that, thus, not only does not promote to the dialogue of religions and cultures but also makes it impossible, as deprives religion science intercourse of deep, painful and existentially meaningful senses, interpenetration of which is the real essence of a dialogue.

One of the most essential aspects of opposition of modern and postmodern types of religious study is a famous discussion about universalities, which still have medieval sources. Are there notions, values which can be described as common to all mankind? Or, possibly, each of religious traditions has its own set of universalities? In the context of this dilemma modern, being oriented at “Plato’s and Kant’s canon”, gives a positive answer to this question: yes, there are, and on this basis it is possible to carry out the world cultures “synthesis”. Extreme displays of universalism result in the danger of total standardization, unification or centering, concentration round a single “dominating” culture (Europocentrism, sociocentrism, “logocentrism”, “phalologocentrism”), with respect to which other cultural traditions are subject to hierarchical ranging into “modernized” and “outdated”, forming a “progressive” linear matrix.

Postmodern, in contract to modern, adheres to particularism and declares setting to single and special in each of multiple religions and cultures. Thus, anti-Kantian of R. Rorty, “poet and prophet of a new pragmatism”, asserted that “there is nothing in the depth of each of us, no nature common to all mankind, no solidarity inherent to humanity, and which could be used for moral reference” [1, p. 311]. Accordingly, universalistic idea of the “synthesis” is considered as hidden realization of Europocentrist (Christian) impulse through the artificial search of “pro-western” elements in different cultures of the world. “Fundamentalist” burst in the East proved impossibility of such synthesis, and scientific community directed a thought towards deconstructivist intensification of differences, expressed in the famous aphorism of R. Kipling: East and West, they will never meet [2].

Consequences of such an attitude are no less (if no more) painful, than total universalization. Excess relativism results in “dissolution in the Other”, loss of own selfhood, leveling of principles and persuasions. Tolerance within the limits of relativism always has a character of “negative”, indifferent tolerance (according to Rorty, “justice as a large loyalty”), that causes the crisis of ethnic and cultural (in particular religious) identity.

As a result “We are all that we have”: higher education hesitates between attraction to theology or to “academic religion science” (Marxist or phenomenological); educational policy of government, based on the principle of the liberty of conscience, simultaneously supports initiative of the Church at school; social scientists quite often refuse to visit theology conferences and etc. We Young people, representatives of which were educated in families with different world outlook orientations, appearing within one educational collective together, suffer from these disputes (often – nominal) most of all. The author of this article quite often feels complication at reading lectures in religion science, being afraid, on the one hand by his/her “sociality” to offend persuasion of religious students, and on the other hand, by his/her “religiousness” – antichurch superstitions of atheists. At the same time in the real living practice of educational process young people quite often appear to be wiser than their tutors. Through

straightforward sympathies and favour, through improvisation of sincere intercourse, those ways forecasting a new type of religious education and study, are intuitively paved.

The conflict of mentioned approaches intuitively brings us to the thought about the certain “third alternative” which would offer compromise solving of a problem. How we can save a sense of community of mankind, which promotes to the international peace, and at the same time not to standardize our existence? How we can perceive the idea of cultural multiplicity and at the same time not to dissolve in it, not to lose personal identity and faith? How we can “avoid” most painful and most intimate question of belief in God and at the same time not to deprive the religious study of depth existentially, not to convert it into dry illustrative and constative description of facts – and no more? Against one’s will association of the “golden mean” arises, but in modern, but not in ancient understanding, when a “middle” at the same time is not a “middle”, as a consensus does not bring to averaging of alternative bases of discussion.

Such modern “golden mean”, in our opinion, is *dialogue and culturological project of religious study*. The main conceptual basis of this project is an idea of active tolerance. In order to explain its essence better, we will appeal to methodological developments, executed within the project of European Council “New challenges of intercultural education: religious multiplicity and a dialogue in Europe” (2002–2005). Authors of this project choose *tolerance «in more narrow meaning»* (isolated reconciliation, passive indifference, that not necessarily means respect to the Other) and *tolerance «in more wide meaning»* (respectful attitude to the Other, recognition of his merits and accuracy of his opinions in the context of his necessities and interests) [3, p. 21].

We consider it is necessary to specify and develop contents of these categories and consequences of their use. For this purpose we will use the concept “*passive tolerance*” to define “narrow” tolerance, and “*active tolerance*” to define “wide” tolerance. The idea of *activity* – my respect to the Other, expressed in ability to make a sacrifice to Him (but only “tolerate” his presence) – is on the basis of this division. Within the limits of active (effective) and passive (inactive) tolerance a questions on *persuasion, adherence to principles as a basis of authenticity* is being solved. The fact is that the real, active, sacrificial tolerance not only conflicts with adherence to principles, but these tolerance opposites and *assists in its development*. The real tolerance must not *mix up exactly persuasions with aggression of persuasion*: it can protest against orthodoxy, but not be in connection with *adherence to principles*. To be tolerant on such conditions means *to hear confession of own persuasions, but at the same time not to impose them to the Other*.

To hold out on this unsteady border is extremely difficult. *Active tolerance is constantly threatened by a danger of degeneration into passive tolerance*. Knowing of plurality and relativity of thoughts can result in degradation of a sincere sacrificial respect into thoughtless and contemptuous “loyalty”, superficiality, spacing indifference in relation to the Other (in the spirit of the folk Ukrainian proverb: “My house (izba) is on the brink”) and, after all, the “*absence of principles*”. The danger of such degradation is in formal-logical approach to the problem solving: recognition, that the Other can freely express own persuasions, and it means either indulgent and disrespectful recognition of his right to make an error (starting from a priori pre-condition, that my persuasions are “true”, and persuasion of the Other – are “wrong”) or recognition of his right on Truth. Both the first and the second, after all, *devalue persuasions*. If we recognize that the Other wishes to make mistakes, we can make this error with regard to ourselves. If we recognize that the Other is right, such recognition will mean (starting from European Aristotelian logic) that I am wrong. Annexation of the east relative logic here (in the spirit of Jainism logic “A is B” – “A – is not B”, “A is B and is not B”) makes an impression, that all persons are right, and that there are a lot “truths”, and that they are relative and contextual (dependent upon the concrete conditions of “use”, and consequently – they are one-sided and, if to take each of them separately, – they are imperfect or even wrong). In this respect we will remember the fine reasoning of P. Riker concerning “corrosion” of tolerance, metamorphose of its humanism meaning into egoistic purposes, in accordance with which “all has a price and nothing can obligate us” [4, p. 325].

Multiplicity of cultures of the modern model of identity, famous Slavonic figure of “bee” from “Slovo” of the Old Russian thinker Daniil Zatochenik, which collects nectar of book wisdom from numerous other cultural “flowers”, such as books [5], but, in contract to this personage, a postmodern “bee” is not always able to process this nectar into “honey”. Thus, *plurality* (chaotic multiplicity) generates pluralism (legalization of multiplicity into normative principle of the liberty of conscience), which, in its turn, results in cultural *relativism* (knowing of relativity of multiplicity) and *nihilism* (objection of multiplicity and relativity). There is a whole series of relative stations in society philosophy: “*alienation*” (E. Fromm), “*loneliness*” (G. Arendt), “*absurdity*” (A. Kamue), “*depression*”, “*crisis of metaphysical identity*”

(B. Huebner). Archetypical image of Truth is not clear as Whole and Single. As for religious tradition, here relativism is represented especially destructive, because it takes out from church dogmatic its stumbling-block – a principle of monopolistic possession of certain confession, sacral truth. On this basis – loss of religious validity by numerous confession associations, and general confusion as a result of strengthening of orthodox intolerance.

How can we overcome existing crisis situation? It is necessary to definitely joint perceptions and emotional experiences of a *variety of* cultural positions with feeling of their some internal *unity*, knowing of presence of many points of view – and simultaneous desire for the truth of Whole. For this purpose it is necessary to represent these points of view as concrete demonstrations of single Truth (which are identically accomplished as well as identically limited) in different variations and versions, which represent its different borders and at the same time only through interaction can give the complete and integral picture of reality.

Consequently, it is necessary to find combined inflexible basis of cultural confrontations, which converts them into alternative, but however partial interpretations of general and joint conceptions. Actually, this basis is represented by *philosophy of a dialogue*. *The key category of dialogic philosophy is not only well-known the Other, but also so called the “Third”* (this term, in particular, was used by a famous Russian philosopher-dialogist M. Bakhtin [6, p. 293], and which was used by us “on default” without quotation marks).

The Third is a general judge of dispute participants, who plays the part of a single point of support in pluralistic confrontation. Exactly *the Third* outlines *the limits of tolerance*, imposes a limit on relativism development inertia. The Third promotes to forming of active tolerance on the basis of passive tolerance or prevents its degradation, holding it in active state and not allowing sincere emotional experience of the world to grow into indifferent loyalty. The Third allows returning to the ideal of absolute values, grouping around their “axis” interaction of numerous “interpretations” and “ways”. Thereby the Third prevents the crisis of identity and crisis of religious dogmatic and plays the key part in forming of methodological basis of culturology and religious knowledge in general, as well as dialogue and culturological project of religious education in particular. In the end, all philosophy of a dialogue in modern discourse can be read not only (and not so much) as philosophy of I and the Other, but as philosophy of the Third.

At the same time there is an archetypical barrier in the intercourse, which prevents from appearance of the Third. An obvious necessity in the “Other” associated with no less obvious vital capacity of ethnic archetypes, the basis of which is originally mythological semantic division of the Universe into two unequal spheres in terms of value and quality: higher (accordingly, “moral”), which is associated with “*own*” persons as a carrier of cultural values, and lower (“unmoral”), where the “aliens” live as “savages” and “barbarians.” From here – complexes of xenophobia, often inherent to the ethnic consciousness based on ethnocentrism. The culture of ethnocentric type rests on the extended knowledge of own values, which is based on an emotional-perceptible sphere, and covers other cultures for it, forms their images in accordance with fears, superstitions and reduction stereotypes – reports on vulgarization of all internal multiplicity of every cultural tradition to certain extreme and visible, mainly to the profanation audience, of ethnocentric culture, orthodox forms, which are represented as a source of danger (for example, reduction of American culture to “American centrism” in Soviet culture, Arabian-Islamic culture – to Islamic fundamentalism in modern cultures of the West, German culture – to Nazism in many Slavonic cultures after the World War II, Ukrainian culture – to ethnographism in average cultural circles of Russia etc.).

Another feature of mental behavior of ethnocentric culture is its attempt to appropriate itself general cultural values (often obtained by it from the other culture, “culture-donor”). “Culture-recipient” in such a context, based upon differentiation of authority of donor with authority of texts translated by him, which are understood as “traveling truth”, considers that in that way it returns them to a single legal place (in culturology – this phenomenon is known as “revolt of periphery against the center of cultural area”, Yu. Lothman [7]). For example: Christian values in a dispute of Rome and Constantinople, Constantinople and Kyiv, Kyiv and Moscow; biblical inheritance in relations between “Abraham’s” religions, such as: Judaism, Christianity, Islam.

And here, just then, when interaction of cultures has the most hostile and painful character, a new “hero” of a dialogue appears “for the rescue” – the *Third*. His appearance is inevitable. It originates from recognition of the Alien by a man, but recognition of special, which is possible only due to *hermeneutic interpretation* of its inner life as a text, that should be decoded (M. Bakhtin “act as a text”). Conflict situation which arises up between participants of a dialogue only increases a depth of penetration into the Other. Because in conditions of a “Challenge” genes-archetypes of the culture go out to intercultural

continuum, which expect for its “Answer”. Famous paradoxical situation appears, in particular mentioned by A. Toynbee and Yu. Lothman: *a dialogue of cultures takes place more effectively in conditions of confrontation of consciousness of its carriers*. Consciousness-text is represented to its interpreter, who should, using resources of associative memory and artistic skills to penetrate through empathy into this text and to understand its secret meaning – inasmuch, as the Author of a text can allow (and if possible, even more). For this purpose it is necessary to be able to put itself at place of the Other, in other words – to enter in the process of *reflection into internal dialogue*. Such ability is especially important for people of artistic professions (artists, writers, and teachers), for whom a dialogue, conversation, communication, comparison of itself with the Other – a reader, a spectator, a listener, a student is a basis of professional activity. Yet O. Mandelstam said that a poet should reach “providential interlocutor”, who is an inalienable pre-condition of creative self-expression of the author: “There is no lyric poetry without a dialogue. – O. Mandelstam writes. – And a single power, what pushes us into embraces of interlocutor, – is a wish to be surprised by own words, to be captivated by its novelty and suddenness” [8, p. 174] (the Russian poetess Tsvetaeva: “**I was a traveler too! Stop, traveler**” [9, p. 9]).

This “Stop!” is a magic glance at the Other, admiration by him, fascination with a certain part of fear and at the same time dreamy attraction, which fixes the moment of birth of common communicative (intercultural) field, space of semantic convergences, “a sphere between” (term of M. Buber), – that allows to overcome spatiotemporal borders between “I” and the Other (in appeal of M. Tsvetaeva to O. Mandelstam:

“**I kiss You – through the hundreds of disconnecting years**” [9, p.47]). In that way a common “child” was born in a dialogue “I” and the Other, who is – the Third, transforming Chaos of Foreigner into Space, Enemy – into Friend, who is inconceivable, but urgently necessary for “my” internal survival. The Third quasi “tames” the Alien person, gives him well-known cultural lines, and makes him closer, clearer, more pleasant in the process of communication, opens him as an underside of “I”. Due to the Third, the Alien turns into the Other, and the Other – into the Neighbor.

Functional authorities of the Third can be divided into two basic directions: *social and communicative* and *moral and ethical*. The first direction is related to pluralistic character of society, sociocultural situation, where a dialogue of cultures takes place. Image of the “Third” helps to find common semantic (and at the same time normative) point of support on conditions of presence of plural ways of development of separate cultures. The second direction focuses attention on *moral and ethical focus of a dialogue*, which combines into one its numerous knuckle lines. A question is about *value (and at the same time evaluative) center of dialogic process*. The Third plays a part of moral and ethical criterion, which promotes in differentiation of structural and destructive demonstrations of cultural activity, eliminating from field of a dialogue, so to say, its “nasty participants” – such as vulgar reductions of cultures. Therefore the process of sociocultural *integration* in a dialogue of cultures is combined with the process of moral *selection*: for example, a dialogue of the Jewish culture with German culture – is a dialogue of a poet P. Tselan with a poet J. W. Goethe, but not with a dictator Hitler. A dialogue of western civilization with Arabic-Islamic civilization – is an intercourse of intellect of Einstein with intellect of Avicenni, but not with international terrorism, formed on the basis of Islamic fundamentalism. A dialogue of Orthodoxy with Catholicism – is not a justification of inquisition and Crusades and etc.

*Concept of the Third is completely culturological*. Therefore the Third is, foremost, “*universalities of culture*”, general cultural senses, invariants, which are subject to a great number of historical and regional interpretations. Culturology is an integrative science about the senses of culture, expressed in corresponding texts. In this context a “*dialogue*” (from Ancient Greek “*dialogos*”: “*dia*” – through movement, penetration, “*logos*” – word, speech, sense) – “*interpenetration of senses*” – has a semantic character and is a subject of culturology. Universal senses of culture should be perceived as a certain a priori entity, as a presence or absence of them in the light of modern world-view discussions is not obvious and requires additional proofs. At present time we can speak about specific characteristic features of universalities. These senses are *existential*, as they reach deep spiritual bases of human existence in its intimate and metempirical measuring. They are *transpersonal* (inspired, but not personal), *intercultural* (the process of an intercourse between cultures is facilitated), *crosscultural* (cultural boundaries are “*crossed*”) and at the same time *transcultural* (*transcendent* as to cultural space – and at the same time immanently inherent to the internal world of every cultural subject as its natural ontological impulse: therefore, we can confirm its certain “*intra*” – *lat.* “*internally*” – “*level of culture*”). Most difficulties are in an attempt to specify scientifically contents of these existential transcultural senses, existence of which exceeds the bounds of rationalistic discourse. Chaos and space, life and death, masculine and female,

good and evil, love, beauty, truth, freedom, responsibility, alarm, loneliness, harmony, blessing – such is an incomplete list of “medications” of the Third.

In *ethics* a category “*values, common for all mankind*” partly correspond to the conception of culture’s universalities, – taking into account, that “senses” – are always wider than values, as all meaningful for humanity categories are included in them, but not only moral values. At the level of gnoseology the “Third” is a *Truth* at multiplicity of cognitive approaches to it, such as – scientific, philosophical, religious, artistic etc. At the level of theological approach the “Third” is a *God* (Jesus Christ from the parable of M. Buber about Jew and Christian) – at multiplicity of ways to him. In literature and artistic dialogues the Third is understood as a truth of the Whole, which, being finally “unsaid”, in the form of *nonverbal subtext* of expressions floats in pauses between replicas of the real dialogue as a certain sacred “quiet” (let’s remember that exactly a quiet, soundless, is a symbol of beginning of artistic creation in Indian classical yoga; German poet Hauptman says about a word which should “sound higher than words”; this idea is expressed in poetic works of Holderlin and in philosophical studios of poetics of M. Heidegger about a language as a “house of existence”, about “repercussion” of text in works of G. Gadamer, about “vivification” by the poet of transpersonal archetypes in K.G. Yung; the same principle as “the iceberg principle” – is the hidden contents of work – was defined in aesthetical postulates of writers-impressionists E. Hemmingway and A. P. Chekhov, methods of classic Japanese poetry *Khokku*).

The Third, opened through the collision of own and alien, means: a Truth appears through a dialogue, or, using the evangelic term, *the God must be recognized through love*. Presence of the “Third” forms the most important result of a dialogue – a feeling of tolerance as *universal spiritual activity of a man*, which through emotional experience of its community with the Other is able to the active assistance to him as the Neighbor.

When we turn to the prospects of dialogue and culturological project of religious study, first of all, a question arises: what is its final product? What is the ideal of a well-educated man in the context of a dialogue of religions and cultures? It seems to be extremely important to understand its essence, since this new type of religious personality, as “Great the day before”, is an imaginary project to a certain extent, an algorithm, development of which will be cardinally reflected on the fate of cultures and religions. Will there be a man of future by a “strong beast”, a “superman” in a spirit of F. Nietzsche or a “humane man”, as humanists and educators wished, will it be a “modernist”, a “premodernist”, a “postmodernist” as to sensitivity and attitude to the world, will it be it such a “postpostmodernist” – carrier of new, unknown, alternative as to all previous concepts, mental setting?

Now we can judge only about separate “contours” of a world outlook of dialogue and culturological personality. Obviously, there should be a personality having an ability to search for the Third in inter-religious intercourse. “*Culture of a dialogue*” (or “*dialogic consciousness*”) should become the basis of its world outlook – openness to the world of various spiritual and emotional, mental, ethno-confessional traditions, which penetrate into the internal world of a “man of culture” and synchronously interact in it. Such a man should be ready to cognition of the Other, respect, care, responsibility and co-operation on the basis of sincere, altruistic interest in alien cultures, which become an organic constituent of its own loneliness, an inalienable pre-condition of its spiritual formation and development, which “live” in it as essentially necessary conditions of its existence.

Consequently, we can speak about three constituents of dialogic consciousness: *culturological education, loyalty (passive tolerance) and active tolerance* – as world outlook lines of a new model of a well-educated man. First line – *culturological education* – reflects *informative competence* of a man, his knowledge of the fact of cultural variety – existence of the Alien, looking not like me. Second line – *loyalty (passive tolerance)* – confirms *communicative competence*, ability to enter into interaction with the Alien as with the Other (strange, but not hostile). Third line – *active tolerance* – higher stage of evolution of dialogic consciousness – is related to moral and spiritual *competence of a man*, his ability to sacrificially treat to the Other as to the Neighbor – in a primary, biblical sense of this word (similar opinion is expressed by the Belgian specialist B. Roebben, classifying religious education into its “multi-, inter- and intra-religious” types [10; 11]).

Various educational technologies in Ukraine have a large experience of forming of such a man. Thus, for example, at the level of secondary school methods of “a school of cultures’ dialogue” is being introduced in separate educational institutions (experimental program of the Russian philosopher B. Bibler, which in Ukraine is used by G. Ball, A. Volynets, V. Lytovskyy et al.); “personally oriented (humanitarian-humanistic) study” (schools of “pedagogical technique” of I. Zyazyun) and etc. At the same time mentioned experimental areas are mainly related to general secondary education and provide for forming of communicative culture of a student in plural society. The emphasis is placed on inter-subjective (subjective) measuring of a dialogue of student with a student, a student with a teacher and a student with a world culture.

A dialogue with the Other, carried out by a pupil or a student, is ended by a dialogue of the adult man with the world. At the same time at using the verb “to end” as to a dialogue open *undialogic meaning is felt*: a real dialogue can never be ended – it can only be *interrupted*. To interrupt a dialogue upon completion of studies at school, and to begin again at a mature age, intruding into the depths of spectrums of values of the Alien, who has become the Friend. Actually, exactly such ability to interrupt and to begin a conversation, ability to “listen” in semantic sense of ability “to hear”, ability to understand and to adopt alien mentality “as it is”, not trying to change it and to adjust in accordance with “own” – determines the type of a man of the XXI century.

Dialogue and culturological project of religious study is a conversation in a “non-stop” style, which is similar to the Socrates dialogue, where love to wisdom (literally – the Greek “*philosophy*”) was presented as motion without a final purpose, eternal travel in pursuance of a dream, ardent apology of the process at ironical neglecting of its result. Perhaps, somebody will consider it to be utopia, but, we let’s remember “I believe, because it’s absurdly” of Quint Tertullian, – this genius formula of a deep “authenticity” of that in the context of vulgar-realistic understanding is represented as a fiction. At the same time a modern man is too pragmatic to ignore the result. And new and “old” discoveries are considered to be this result simultaneously. A man opens in individual experience, as in a “monad”, all macrocosmos of religious thoughts and feelings of a mankind, and at the same time a man does not lose his own identity, own microcosmos, because he feels own-alien integrity and own identity.

At realization of a mankind, such a man realizes himself, and alternatively: at realization of himself, he will realize a mankind. “Love Your Neighbor”, broken though Cant’s imperative and experienced in postmodern intellectual fights... In order to understand the Other, it is necessary to remain Oneself, – in order to understand Oneself, it is necessary in oneself to become the Other. It is possible to make an objection: they say, that idea of a dialogue is not new, but it is simply laid by a mankind as a dusty old book, but, as Z. Freud said, “forgotten matters return”. Perhaps, it comes back with a new terminology covering of “the Other”, “the Third”, “transcultural” and etc., but its meaning remains unchanged in sacral, archetypical sense of invariability of the Bible, – that confirms its significance once more.

#### *The bibliography*

1. Степанянец М. Т. Мир Востока: Философия: Прошлое, настоящее, будущее : монография / М. Т. Степанянец – М. : Восточ. лит., 2005. – 375 с.
2. Kipling R. The Ballad of East and West / R. Kipling Poems. Short Stories. – Moskow : Raduga Publishers, 1983.
3. Релігійна багатоманітність та міжкультурна освіта : посіб. для школи / за ред. Дж. Кіста. – Львів : ЗУКЦ, 2008. – 160 с.
4. Рікер П. Толерантність, нетолерантність, неприйнятне / П. Рікер // Рікер П. Навколо політики / пер. з фр. В. Андрушка, О. Мокровольського, А. Плеханової [та ін.] – К. : Дух і літера, 1995. – С. 313–332.
5. Слово Даниїла Заточника // О, Русская земля: памятники древнерусской письменности XI–XVII вв. / редкол. : Ю. В. Бондарев, Я. Н. Засурский, А. Н. Иезуитов и др. ; вступ. ст. В. А. Грихина. – М. : Совет. Россия, 1982. – С. 257–262.
6. Бахтин М. М. Проблемы поэтики Достоевского / М. М. Бахтин. – М. : Совет. Россия, 1979. – 318 с.
7. Лотман Ю. М. Проблема византийского влияния на русскую культуру в типологическом освещении / Ю. М. Лотман // Византия и Русь. – М. : [б.и.], 1989. – С. 227–235.
8. Мандельштам О. Шум времени: Воспоминания. Статьи. Очерки / О. Мандельштам. – СПб. : Азбука, 1999. – 382 с.
9. Цветаева М. Через сотни разъединяющих лет... / М. Цветаева – Свердловск : Изд-во Урал. ун-та, 1989. – 416 с.
10. Roebben B. Learning in difference. Inter-religious learning in the secondary school in Western-Europe [Elektronic resource] / B. Roebben. – Mode of access : / [www.iifpo.pp.net.ua/publ/11-1-0-119](http://www.iifpo.pp.net.ua/publ/11-1-0-119).
11. Більченко Є. В. Розмаїття релігій і культур світу: на допомогу вчителю / Є. В. Більченко ; Міністерство освіти і науки України; Управління освіти Волинської облдержадміністрації, Луцька гімназія № 18 Луцької міської ради Волинської області. – Луцьк, 2007. – 121 с.

**Більченко Євгенія. Діалого-культурологічний проект релігійної освіти в Україні: філософський аспект.** У статті здійснюється аналіз основних проблем та провідних тенденцій розвитку релігійної освіти в сучасній Україні на прикладі виокремлення основних світоглядно-методологічних підходів до викладання («модерні» та «постмодерні»). Розкривається концепція діалого-культурологічного проекту як філософського шляху погодження наявних освітніх підходів (через уведення категорій активної толерантності та філософії діалогу як філософії Третього).

**Ключові слова:** діалог, культурологія, релігійна освіта, активна толерантність, Третій.

**Більченко Євгенія. Диалого-культурологический проект религиозного образования в Украине: философский аспект.** В статье проводится анализ основных проблем и ведущих тенденций развития религиозного образования в современной Украине на примере выделения доминирующих мировоззренческо-методологических подходов к преподаванию («модерные» и «постмодерные»). Раскрывается концепция диалого-культурологического проекта как философского пути согласования имеющихся

образовательных подходов (посредством введения категорий активной толерантности и философии диалога как философии Третьего).

**Ключевые слова:** диалог, культурология, религиозное образование, активная толерантность, Третий.

Стаття надійшла до редколегії  
11.12.2015 р.