

© Veronika N. DIMITRIEVA

*dimver2006@yandex.ru*

UDC 37.01

### **FORMATION OF THE SPIRITUAL AND MORAL CULTURE OF A PERSON AS A PARADIGMATIC TERM**

*SUMMARY. The author addresses the interpretation of the categories which are included in the term "formation of spiritual and moral culture of the individual" in the framework of secular non-religious and religious/Church paradigms.*

*KEY WORDS. Personality, culture, spirituality, morality, training.*

The problem of formation of spiritual and moral culture of the individual has been actualized in Russia with the transition to the new version of state education focused on the preparation of competent experts, possessing high personal and professional culture, the core of which is the spiritual and moral culture of the individual.

The term "paradigmatic concept" is used in science to describe concepts whose interpretation is ambiguous in various scientific schools. According to T. Kuhn, the paradigm answers the following questions: What are the fundamental entities of the universe? How do they interact with each other? [1] The representation of the concept of paradigm is implemented in scientific practice through the description of the relationship of the components and the disclosure of this relationship with the close categories of public life. The main idea of the paradigm of thinking is a historical approach to the concept. So, the concept "spiritual and moral formation of cultural identity" as a paradigm requires a historical approach to such categories as "person", "culture", "personality", "morality", "upbringing", "education", "development", "formation", and others with the same categories in scientific and religious paradigms.

The starting point of the analysis of the paradigmatic concept of "spiritual and moral formation of cultural identity" is the definition of the category of "personality". The interpretation of the person as a standard or, in other words, as the model of the "new man" with the desired traits of character was distinctive of Soviet pedagogy. The understanding of personality as an integrated mental system with certain functions was first seen in the research of L. Vygotsky and developed in post-classical psychology, particularly in the studies of the Siberian psychological school (V.E. Klochko, E.V. Galazhinsky, A.B. Klochko and others). In the first paradigm, the personality is analyzed as the aim of the educational process, in the second it is recognized as a psychological instrument of self-development and self-realization of the person.

Due to these interpretations there are some divergences in approaches to personality, which have several aspects. Firstly, in classical psychology the terms 'personality' and 'human being' are considered to be identical. In post-classical science they are different: the 'personality' is recognized as a specific psychological instrument, which helps to change the individual (a separate representative of the human race) with certain psycho-physiological abilities into a 'human being'. In psychology, this idea goes back to the works of A. Leontiev. Secondly, classical understanding of 'personality' as a model of human being with given characteristics is influenced by the category of "consciousness" ("consciousness" is studied in stasis through a set of defined characteristics); whereas in post-classical psychology, "consciousness" is seen as a dynamic multifunctional structure and "personality" is interpreted as new objects. These new personal objects occur in the case of the person's active work: when the person is not the object influenced by various factors but the subject of independent activities. The understanding of the category "personality" was given by the researchers of the theory of personal activity—S.L. Rubinstein, A. Leontiev, K.A. Abulkhanova-Slavskaya, A.V. Brushlinsky, A.K. Osnitsky. This theory examines the problem of the relationship between social and individual characteristics of personality. On the one hand, the social qualities of personality are formed during interaction with society. On the other hand, this interaction helps to develop unique qualities of the person which characterize personality. The science of our country has extensive scientific data that show the unity of personal and social aspects in the integral structure of personality (K.A. Abulkhanova Slavskaya, B.G. Ananiev, A.G. Asmolov, T.A. Blumin, Vygotsky, B.F. Lomov, A.K. Markov, R.S. Nemov, Alexander Petrovsky, V.A. Slastenin, V.A. Sonin, M.G. Yaroshevsky).

In the religious (Christian) paradigm, the understanding of 'personality' is also dual. Personality is perceived through the prism of the Church's doctrine of man as the image and likeness of God. The image of God in a human being is "a material" or "a tool" that provides the full existence and development of the personality. Likeness to God is the purpose of personal formation, a possible result of the implementation of the image of God in a human being, in accordance with the transcendental conception of self-improvement of the personality.

The Christian concept of personality is currently being integrated by domestic secular psychology and pedagogy. So, the statements of secular scientists and representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church can be presented together: "It is necessary to become a person [...] Personality is equal to a human being, and the human being to God" [2, 27], "Personality [...] is not self-sufficient, having the sense of self-existence" [3, 58]. The concept 'personality' brings us to the end of the idea of the Absolute Personality, the idea of God (the beginning of personality is revealed through the Holy Trinity) " [4, 67, 68], "Man, created in God's image, is designed to liken himself to God. Since the beginning of time, God ordained the purpose of human existence: it is personal self-development" [5, 38].

Self-realization of personality on the way to becoming the "ideal" is better conveyed by "culture". The term "culture" was originally used as the definition of

humans' influence on nature: the meaning of this word was the cultivation of the soil. However, in ancient society, culture was seen as an indicator of humans' creativity and abilities development (according to Protagoras, a human being is able to create a second nature closely connected with art); it was identified with the concept 'paideia'—'education' (according to Plato, 'paideia' means the guide to the changes of the human being). For the Roman orator and philosopher Marcus Tullius Cicero, the word "culture" is metaphorically connected with upbringing and education: Cicero speaks not about the cultivation of the soil, but the human's soul and spirit ("culture animae"). During the Renaissance, the word 'culture' was connected with 'education' (J. Herder and Kant) and the concept of 'culture' was identified with humanity; the history of culture was taken as the history of the human being's evolution as the individual. Later, thanks to the research of H. Rickert, E. Cassirer and V. Dilthey, the humanitarian approach to culture was saved and was accentuated with the categories of "freedom", "kindness", "beauty", "spiritual commencement", "values", "the meaning of life", "emotional comfort", "experience", "empathy". In Russian philosophy, beginning with A.S. Homjakov, the phenomenon "culture" was understood as a spiritual substance based on a hierarchy of spiritual values (G.P. Fedotov, B.P. Vysheslavtsev, P.B. Struva, S.S. Frank).

The paradigm of 'culture' understanding, which was developed by the philosophers of the Middle Ages, the Renaissance and the researchers of the 19<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, is being developed by modern scientists. So, P. S. Gurevich gives some interpretations of the concept "culture". Two of them distinctly show the connection between universal culture and the culture of the personality. Culture is a concrete and systematic way of reproduction (cultivation) of certain human qualities, characteristics and ranges (professional, emotional, intellectual, physical, ecological, etc.); culture is the measure of mankind's assimilation of personal achievements and a means of their application in creativity and communication.

In a religious paradigm the term "culture" is connected with the concept "cult". Originally, culture was understood as a cult of two inseparable meanings: "cultivation" and "admiration". They correlated with the culture of the soul, the culture of the mind, the cult of gods, and the cult of ancestors. During the Middle Ages, the word "cult" was used more often than the concept "culture", expressing the ability of the human being to open personal creative potential through love for God. The tradition of the correlation of the concepts "culture" and "cult" became strongly established in science. According to P. S. Gurevich, culture was born from cult, and it is of the same origin as spirituality and religion.

The approaches to the definition of the concepts "spirituality", "spiritual", "spirit" have been being transformed in social and philosophical research for the last three decades. In the 1980s, in Russian sociology and philosophy attention was focused on the active, social and practical nature of the spirituality of the person (S.F. Anisimov, A.K. Uledov, V.A. Bachinin, G.N. Musin). The interpretation of the concepts "spirituality", "spiritual", "spirit", presented in the research of the scientists above is united by the approach of anthropocentrism. The root of the concept "spirit" is

---

connected with a person, his consciousness, thinking, will, values and ideals, feelings and imagination. At the end of the 1980s and the beginning of the 1990s, during the process of humanization and democratization in all spheres of life in Russia, the tendency to consider a phenomenon of spirituality was outlined with the warm-heartedness of the person in Russian social and philosophical research. In this connection, callousness and undeveloped spiritual and sensual experiences are required as the basis of heartlessness (V.G. Fedotov, R.L. Livshits, P.V. Simonov, P.M. Ershov, Yu.P. Vyazemsky and others). The anthropocentric paradigm of the concept spirituality's study is preserved in the social and philosophical research of the 1990s. The works of R.G. Apresyan, O.B. Badmayeva, E.P. Belozertsev, L.P. Buyeva, I.A. Gundarova, A.A. Guseynova, E.L. Komarov, V.I. Murashova, I.V. Siluyanova, V.Yu. Troitskogo, S.V. Homuttsova, A.G. Yakovleva follow this paradigm.

The paradigm of the objective existence of spirituality and the inner world, transcendental to the person, and unconscious appeared in Russian social and philosophical sciences in the 1980s-1990s. The demand of the ideas of Christian theologians and scientists focused on Christianity testifies the formation of this paradigm, which is shown, particularly, in editions of their books: "Spirit, Soul, Body" by V.F. Voyno-Yasenetskogo, "The Problems of Education in Light of Christian Anthropology" by V. Zenkovsky, and other editions. As a result, the secular interpretation of human spirituality is enriched with theocentric ideas, according to which it is possible to speak about spiritual culture of the personality only in the transcendental prospect, the center of which is God as a spirit.

In psychological research, non-religious (anthropocentric) and religious-oriented (theocentric) paradigms of the phenomena "spirituality", "spiritual", "spirit" are also realized. Within the anthropocentric paradigm, the spiritual is understood by psychologists as the activity of the consciousness which is realized in culture (V.E. Klochko and others). V.V. Znakov and E.I. Garber assume the possibility of both scientific and religious interpretation of the category "spirituality". Besides, Christian psychology is revived in Russian psychology nowadays (B.S. Bratus, M.Ya. Dvoretzkaya, V.V. Abramenkova, M.I. Volovikova) as a special direction which is guided by the doctrine of the Orthodox Church and the ideas of the Russian religious philosophers and psychologists of the 19<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup> centuries: V.N. Lossky, I.A. Ilyin, V.V. Zenkovsky, V. Nevyarovich, B.V. Nichiporov.

In the domestic pedagogical literature of the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, polysemantics of interpretation of the terms "spirituality", "spiritual", "spirit" finds its reflection in socio-philosophical and psychological works. From the point of view of the secular, non-religious approach, the definition of the term "spirituality" is given in "The Pedagogical Encyclopedic Dictionary" in the works of A.I. Subetto, N. M. Borytko, L.A. Stepashko, B.M. Bim-Bud, V.P. Zinchenko, I.A. Kolesnikova. However, in recent years more and more representatives of domestic pedagogy declare the relevance of the religious paradigm of the concept "spirituality" in the modern world, and see their research task in judgment on and generalization of the educational ideas of Russian religious philosophy and orthodox pedagogy

(E.I. Artamonov, S. S. Brikunova, V.S. Vidov, Z.V. Vidyakova, T.I. Vlasova, E.V. Glukhikh, A.A. Ignatov, V.A. Kalachev, E.A. Karunin, S.I. Maksimenko, N.V. Maslov, T.I. Petrakova, A.V. Rogova, T.V. Sklyarov, H.P. Strelkov, V.A. Tukish, S.V. Shevchyuk and others). A considerable number of works is devoted today to the introduction of orthodox pedagogy's ideas in the practice of spiritual and moral education of the younger generation. These are proved in the research of V.A. Belyaeva, E.V. Bondarevskoy, L.P. Gladkikh, S.Yu. Divnogortseva, S.A. Efimenkova, D.N. Kravchenko, N.N. Nikitina, T.I. Petrakova, T.V. Sklyarova, L.V. Surovoy, E.V. Shestun (abbot George).

The research experience of S.I. Doroshenko, I.A. Kolesnikova, I.A. Solovtsova is considered to be fruitful due to the necessity of combining the two diverse paradigms of spirituality (secular and the Church). They laid the bases for the integration of Church and scientific experience of the phenomenon "spirituality". There are some characteristics of spirituality that are admitted by both secular and church traditions:

- inborn spirituality in the person and its future development;
- the connection of individual spirituality with the world;
- the connection of rationality and irrationality in spirituality;
- the dual, antinomian nature of spirituality which assumes the manifestation of both positive (directed towards good) and negative (directed towards evil) spirituality in a person.

The tendency towards a steady combination of the concepts "spiritual" and "moral" in modern pedagogy can be explained, first of all, as the striving to emphasize that spirituality as a mental characteristic is expressed in morals.

The majority of researchers (L.I. Bozhovich, B.S. Bratus, Volovikov, O.G. Drobnitsky, T.A. Florenskaya, V.E. Chudnovsky and others) consider morals as a set of human relations, norms and principles of behavior in society among other people, and point to the values of moral manifestations in which human care for a person is realized through the person's activity, his recognition, love and respect of him and the awe of human life (A.G. Zdravomyslov, N. S. Rozov, L.N. Stolovich and others).

The problem of correlation of the concepts "morals" and "ethics" is resolved in science unambiguously. On the one hand, they have a very similar approach: it is admitted that morals operate with the categories of ethics, its norms and role in society. On the other hand, as V.V. Abramenkova claims, morals are opposed to ethics: ethics is limited to the frames of time period, social community and group, and morals is the concept which exists outside of time, outside of the narrow frames of society, it is impartial and has a divine origin.

The transcendental and extrahistorical approach to morals, realized as a religious approach, becomes more and more appropriate in modern pedagogical research. That is shown, firstly, in the striving of scientists to comprehend the theoretical concepts and practical experience of moral upbringing presented in works of domestic philosophers and scientists (N.O. Lossky, K.D. Ushinskogo, P.F. Lesgafta,

V.V. Zenkovsky and others). Secondly, that approach is shown in attempts to apply confessional, orthodox experience of moral upbringing to modern educational process.

Paying attention to the fact that the personality is not initially a ready “product” (it is a developing phenomenon), the logic of research demands substantial analysis of the categories “**formation**” and “**development**”.

In modern philosophy, psychology, pedagogy, the questions of personal formation are considered in the research of T.V. Bezrodnykh, L.A. Zelenova, N.N. Zinchenko and E.B. Morgunova, R.A. Zobova and A.V. Lissovsky, V.V. Ignatova, O.E. Kitarioglo’s T.K. Klimenko, Yu.N. Klochko, T.V. Luchkina, T.I. Petrakova, Popov, A.V. Rogovoy, A.M. Stolyarenko, A.A. Chuprina, E.V. Shestun and others. Generalizing the conclusions drawn by them, we may consider the most important points:

*Development* means changes in general; unity is understood as the emergence, the formation of certain qualities in the process of *development* (speaking about personality, this is the formation of the person and his personal qualities, and also the formation of his status roles and anthropological essence, for example—“to become a parent”, “to become a teacher”, “to become a person” and so on); the *formation* assumes the object’s acquisition of some external form and the internal structural organization in the process of development.

This formation is possible only in the process of life and the implementation of different types of activity, accompanied by the introduction of the person into relations with the world around them, with people and the accumulation of socio-active, personal and existential experience.

In that case, it is necessary to consider personal formation, using the concepts “self-knowledge”, “self-judgment”, “self-determination”, “self-creation”, “self-development”, “self-education”, “self-strengthening”, “self-updating”, “self-improvement”.

The particular interest in the problem of formation of the personality in domestic pedagogical science was noted in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> / early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. For this reason, modern personally-focused pedagogy actively addresses the heritage of K.N. Venttsel, Vakhterov, S.I. Gessena, P.F. Kapterev and others. The ideas of self-creation, self-ascension and self-eminence of the personality were formulated in the works of Russian philosophers and psychologists of the end of the 19<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup> centuries (N.A. Berdyayev, V.V. Rozanova, V.S. Solovyev, S.L. Rubenstein, G.S. Batishchev, E.V. Ilyenkova, M.M. Bakhtin, V.S. Bibler, M.S. Kagan, V.V. Davidov, E.N. Knyazeva).

The point of view on spiritual and moral formation of the personality found in modern pedagogical research is based on consecutive implementation of the Church tradition in understanding this process (T.I. Petrakova, E.V. Shestun and others).

A number of the ideas stated by T.I. Petrakova and E.V. Shestun, the representatives of orthodox pedagogy, are productive for the understanding of the essence of the personality’s formation through spiritual and moral culture, which can be implemented in secular education. The ideas are:

— the “eminence” of the process of spiritual and moral formation of the personality, which has a valuable character, over the process of spiritual and moral development, adaptive by nature;

— synergies of the imperfect spiritual forces of the person and the perfect spiritual forces of the transcendental source for the person;

— the implementation of spiritual dialogue in the person’s activity (emotional, intellectual, cultural).

It is important that in domestic pedagogy today there is research (E.I. Artamonov, V.A. Belyaev, A.G. Bermus, E.V. Bondarevskaya, S.S. Brikunova, E.V. Glukhikh, S.Yu. Divnogortsev, Ya.A. Zolotavin, O.E. Kitarioglo, D.G. Levchuk, S.I. Mansimenko, I.I. Pankova, O.M. Potapovsky, A.V. Rogova, I.A. Solovtsova), which organically join extrareligious and religious traditions of problem solution of the spiritual and moral formation of the personality into one paradigm.

This paradigm is successfully realized in the secular system of education because the Church tradition itself is not a methodological basis. A methodological basis is formed by the world outlook of Orthodox culture, corresponding to Church tradition, present in national history, written and artistic culture, moral Orthodox doctrine about the person and the purpose of his life, in the national Orthodox traditions of the Russian people.

Thus, the concept “formation of spiritual and moral culture of the personality” can be interpreted in the frames of two opposite paradigms, found in modern philosophical and psycho-pedagogical sources: anthropocentric (secular extrareligious) and theocentric (religious).

Besides, recently a third paradigm was outlined in scientific sources.

Its theoretical and methodological base are the points of Christian anthropology, Orthodox psychology and pedagogy; cultural and historical approaches are fundamental to rely on.

The research of this paradigm has the aim to identify the “common points” in secular and Church paradigms, which allow to find the connection between the most productive ideas and join them into a complete system idea of spiritual and moral culture formation of the personality which would adequately reflect the essence of this process and could be implemented in secular education.

#### REFERENCES

1. Kun T. *Logics and Science Methodology. The Structure of Scientific Revolutions.* Moscow: AST: Yermak, 2003. 365 p.
2. Bratus B.S. *Psychology and Ethics: the Experience of Discussion Making.* Samara: Bahrah, 1999. 128 p.
3. Bratus B.S. *The Abnormalities of Personality.* Moscow: Misl, 1988, 301 p.
4. Dvoretzkaya M.Ya. *Patristic Psychology.* St. Petersburg: Kupina, 2000. 112 p.
5. Kiril, Smolensk and Kaliningrad Metropolitan. *The Word of Clergyman. The Talks about Orthodox Faith.* Moscow: Publishing Council of Russian Orthodox Church, 2004. 424 p.