

VOLODYMYR ROMENETS AS ARCHITECTOR OF METHODOLOGY OF HUMANITARIAN COGNITION*

Anatoliy V. FURMAN

Copyright © 2016

УДК 167/168 : 159.9.019

Анатолій В. Фурман
**ВОЛОДИМИР РОМЕНЕЦЬ ЯК АРХІТЕКТОР МЕТОДОЛОГІЇ
ГУМАНІТАРНОГО ПІЗНАННЯ**

V. A. Romenets “was not just scientist but also really wise and kind person to whom laws of human being were opened. He lived trying to do by the laws of truth, beauty, goodness and love to people. And that’s why for all who knew and for all who will join to creativity of Volodymyr Andriyovych, his life will always be sanctified as a deed and real event of being”
(V. O. Tatenko, T. M. Tytarenko [18, p. 11]).

“...V. A. Romenets considering the grandiosity of created by him theoretical system, – it’s Hegel in psychology”
(Author [20, p. 9]).

V. A. ROMENETS – BUILDER OF UKRAINIAN PHILOSOPHICAL- PSYCHOLOGICAL SCHOOL

Flow of everyday life is inexorable. Ninety years passed from the moment when in the Kyiv family of officer Andriy and Iryna Romenets was born Volodya, to whom destined to become the builder of Ukrainian philosophical-psychological school of exceptionally productive and perspective culture-forming format and flashed almost eighteen years when his earthly life ended and according to ancient thinkers, he joined the majority. A lot of light, argumented, meaningful was told by Ukrainian and Russian well-known scientists about academician V. A. Romenets as a talented philosopher and psychologist, historian and logician, culturologist and pedagogue. It’s gratifying to be stated that especially intensive mastering mental immense theoretical continent of this great nugget of nation was occurred in recent years: have seen the world as special edition of the journal “Psychology and society” (2011. – №2 [11]) as two fundamental collections of works – “Psychology of the deed

by ways of creativity of V. A. Romenets” (2012 [10]) and “Academician V. A. Romenets: creativity and works” (2016 [1]) that studying, detailing and enrich its creative heritage and dedicated to this giant of Ukrainian spirit – two-volume textbook of P. A. Myasoid (2011, 2013 [6]) and monograph of A. V. Furman and S. K. Shandruk “The essence of the game as committing” (2014 [30]) and P. A. Myasoid “Psychological cognition: history, logic, psychology” (2016 [9]).

And still, participation in interdisciplinary roundtable at the Faculty of Psychology of the Kyiv National University named after Taras Shevchenko with this solemn occasion (20. 05. 2016 [2]) and active interpersonal communication with students and successors of V. A. Romenets clearly indicates that creative mastering and intellectual humanizing his yet little apprehensible by ideas, concepts, episteme and generalizations of theoretical mainland only beginning. It is obvious that today it is needed not only to quote, retell and propagandize to world, without doubt, genius scientific achievements of this famous Ukrainian but also take

* Український текст статті див. на сторінці журналу в Інтернеті: psm2000.ucoz.ua

into consideration original forms, methods, ways and means of its *psycho-sophian methodologization*, with help of which there is a possibility to solve the most complex problems of human being – consciousness and unconsciousness, life and death, freedom and responsibility, committing and life way, cognition and self-creation etc. In other words, at the foreground of creative reflection of modern worthy people of intellectual discourse in the bosom of interdisciplinary theories appears ***Volodymyr Romenets as methodologist*** who creates and samisno practicing proposed by him *system of methodology of humanitarian cognition*. Especially since well-known: transmitted not only knowledge, research experience but also ways-methods of their extraction, construction, design, so valuable not opening themselves as a result of intellectual efforts but those *methods* with help of which they are carried.

In this analytical context, in 2011, we conducted a pilot research which indicated that the historical figure of Volodymyr Romenets affects not only the titanic work, colossal erudition and significant creative achievements but also a perfection of *dialectical committing thinking* that in the complementarity enabled to create a “universal theoretical world” exceptional completeness and multi-system perfection. There was substantiated a thesis that “*V. A. Romenets – it’s Hegel in psychology*” in connection with what presented logical content and purely procedural parallels between their encyclopedic teachings. In particular underlined that both thinkers are united by not only methodological instruction and premise of think-activity but also dialectical method, which is carried in the creativity of Ukrainian worthy man by *committing principle*. In the end, proved that it is thanks to *the method of committing dialectic*, academician Romenets managed to identify committing archetype, to create psycho-sophia of the deed and new synthetic direction of development socio-humanitarian knowledge – *canonical psychology* (see. [10, p. 108–116], [20]).

Recently, we have made the study of creativity of V. A. Romenets not so much as powerful, disjoint theoretic-humanist but – and that’s we note, the most important – as a bright, consistent and productive methodologist “who with his own self-cognition mastered a new way of development the science about human – committing canonical scheme of organization the humanitarian cognition as reflexive think-activity of special – psycho-sophian – type” [1, p. 204].

Actually proposed research, based on just received scientific material, from now on the level of over-task, detailing and enriches the system of methodological knowledge about the fundamental principles and basic forms of philosophical methodologization of academician Volodymyr Romenets that thesis delineated by A. A. Furman (see [19]).

RISING OF THE IDEA OF METHODOLOGICAL REVOLUTION IN THE SPHERE OF SCIENCE

For most of deeply-thinking researchers who professionally work on the field of humanitarian cognition, in the last decades of the twentieth century was clearly understood that the definition of primary sources of separate science (above all psychology, sociology, culturology, history or pedagogy) scilicet the substantiation of its object, subject, fundamental problems, leading method and basic categories, is non theoretical task but purely methodological. Thus, Imre Lakatos back in 1972 emphasized that namely taking this or another version of methodology of science, we will get essentially different rationally interpreted its histories (see. [33]). He pointed on four versions (inductivism, conventionalism, falsificationism, methodology of research programs) which are motion-step of science accordingly measure out either by opening unrebutted facts and their inductive generalizations or by inventing the detail of simpler classification of system or by nomination of theories and their rebuttal in the decisive experiments or by competition and ousting of scientific programs.

Obviously, to this it is rightly to add at least two well-known conceptual views of historic dissemination of science: it is develops by opening that confirms reflexive analysis of its step by scientists themselves from the internal positions of this intellectual sphere or thanks to scientific revolutions, the result of which is a change of paradigms (Thomas Kuhn, see. [32]). Nevertheless, named variants of understanding of how can be measured shifts in science methodologically doesn’t clarify the situation because in the first case it doesn’t make any difference about which actually discoveries it is talking about – about new facts, concepts, theories or classification systems (such as table of I. Mendeleev) and in the second – not clarified are staying internal mechanisms of development the science and thus – that important aspect that highlights the real reasons of change of

one paradigm to another because here “crisis” points only on impossibility of scholars community to work as before.

Regarding methodological concept of T. Kuhn paradigms’ change, let’s note that it having both advantages and limitations in the field of socio-psychological cognition (see. [27]) “can’t be directly applied in the field of humanitarian sciences because it is a theoretical model of reconstruction the historical movement-step of natural and technical directions of scientific cognition, acts like framework condition of organization life activity of scientific community and that’s why needs essential logical-content enrichment in projection on the specific of acquiring psychosocial knowledge – its problem-thematic filtering, paradigmatic selection, conceptual compaction and multi-theoretical reformatting” [24, p. 84]. That’s why we not only examined the possibility of conducting interdisciplinary paradigm researches but also we argued their multilevel, analytically characterized genesis of multi-paradigm of psychological knowledge in the context of episteme prospects of philosophizing (positivism, criticism, constructivism, methodologism) substantiated variability of paradigmatic-research cards with help of which scientific community (school, organization) moves in solving secrets-of regularities of social everyday reality and social being of the human in general, finally proposed criterion weighted typology of paradigmatic-research methodologies (see. [23], [24]).

In this problem situation the substantiation of essential shifts in the development of science and even greater extent socio-humanitarian (mainly considering the exceptional complexity and recursivity of its disciplinary subject) there is a change of the methodological approach, namely from self-sufficient analysis episteme units (facts, hypotheses, problems, theories, decisive experiments, research programs, scientific lines or schools, etc.) to the conditions and schemes of organization scientific sphere and basic forms of scientists’ cognition inside its intellectual and personal organized life. In other words, it is necessary heuristically change the focus of methodologization from singling out a number of knowledge elements to those organization structures (co-vital, cultural, mental, activity) which ensure “life” and dynamics of becoming of these elements, scilicet opening new differently-decorated knowledge as the main product of scientific creativity. The scheme and what’s more form, organization of cognition

contently covers both institutional and jointly-rational reality scientific masses. And this means that under conditions of its separate realization is achieved specific correspondence between means and methods, organization forms of thinking and empirical searching, criteria of selection tasks and problems, understanding of what is knowledge and how it should be used, at last between organization of works (researches, communications, cooperation and etc.) and activity and functions of appropriate institutional formations.

So, it is talking not so much about scientific revolutions which are characterized by great uncertainty of what really changes in the sphere of science (let’s say – standards of evidence, priority for scientists problems, the way of intellectual community life-activity, dominant type of ontological pictures, criteria of evaluating the successfulness of research programs or all these integral parameters or its certain set) and about methodological revolutions which decisively ensure evolution of science (G. G. Kopylov [4]). And it is caused by that fact that ontological pictures and idea, traditionally named by scientific discoveries, primarily caused by accepted and processed at a particular historical period scheme of organization cognition and realization scientific knowledge and that’s why represent a secondary product concerning approaches and methods of acquisition of such knowledge and regarding found exemplar or the order of their use. Today, as in the past, science and its segmental directions – natural, technical, socio-humanitarian – are developing from basic forms (schemes) of organization cognition to creation new forms or schemes. Therefore, “all “scientific revolutions”, all acts of development the sphere of science are happening from *methodological positions*” [ibid, p. 118]. That’s why it is naturally that those worthy men of humanity who proposed new schemes of organization thinking and activity, built the original conceptual framework or languages of science, enriched the world culture with not only authentic knowledge but also with original methodological concepts and samples of researches of new type, are *methodologists of the first magnitude*.

**VOLODYMYR ROMENETS –
METHODOLOGIST OF PSYCO-SOPHIAN
SPIRIT**

Methodologist of the highest cultural class in the sphere of humanitarian cognition is

outstanding Ukrainian psychologist-philosopher of the second half of the twentieth century **Volodymyr Andriyovych Romenets** (1926–1998). Internally opposing to ruling ideology of that time and massive conventional everyday, by own titanic work he created historical-psychological science, theories of creativity and act, canonical psychology and unique methodological optics of committing-dialectical view on Human and World in their unstable attitude and dialectical unity, multiplicity of canonical decorations and phenomenal presence and after all, realized as founder of a new philosophical-psychological system of general-human cultural significance. Figure of scientist impresses not only by excessive hardworking and concentration of passionate to the verity and the truth thought-consciousness, enormous erudition and significant creative achievements but also perfection of dialectical committing thinking that in complementarity enabled to bring up “universal theoretical world” (P. A. Myasoyid) exceptional completeness and multi-system perfection. As a philosopher-humanist he managed to embrace with his fiery mind the immense array of historical-psychological material, accumulated by titans of humanity and filter it by incredible power of reflective consciousness with help of built by himself during decades the method of committing dialectics (see. [20]). This method has become the “magical crystal” through which was interpreted the history of psychology and on the basis of which was proposed original model of psychological knowledge integration (M. S. Gusevtseva [3, p. 92]) that covers whole spiritual history of mankind and has no analogs in world practice of humanitarian cognition. In addition “thinking of V. A. Romenets, according to P. A. Myasoyid, – postnonclassical it’s a thinking of alive, spiritual human, canon of tireless, inspiring and majestic searches which are opened to those who are involved to them, new vision of man and the science that studies it “[9, p. 470]. As a process that self-organizing by committing law, this thinking creates and continues itself: “one idea becomes a push to another, one spiral of thinking goes into the next” [ibid, p. 463]. In such way in the face of the creator-author, continuously lasted dialectical existence of its own think-committing with the task of creating a theoretical world about extremely complex relationship in the triad of “Man – act – World”, hence about direct presence of psychic in the world, about conscious-

ness as a way of human existence in the universe, about dialectic of the life and death (worldly and otherworldly), about searches and goal-oriented changes of life sense.

Several years ago, we outlined milestones of creative way of academician Volodymyr Romenets as methodologist who not only created multi-theory of act as system of systems but also discovered and in everyday practice of his own think-activity realized, mainly thanks to newly mastering type of thinking, the method with which he moved from theory of creativity and history of world psychology to psycho-sophia of committing and theory of canonical psychology (see. [20]). In addition, idealized statics of indicated multi-theory is easily changing by dynamics of discursive actualizations, positioning and thinking provided reflexively habilis usage of its ideas, principles, approaches, methods and means to setting and solving of new class of scientific and social problems. By think-activity potential to this method there is no equal on socio-humanitarian spaces of modern human thought and its author along with Aristotle, Bacon, Galileo, Newton, Descartes, Kant, Lakatos, Shchedrovitsky and other, becomes also methodologist of genius greatness considering grandiosity of that House – Temple of sophianity – which he has built.

At the same time not less important that fact that in the first approaching also at that time we have substantiated but yet didn’t supported by any successor or supporter of the creativity of Ukrainian thinker-worthy man, metaphorical thesis: “V. A. Romenets – it’s a Hegel in psychology”. For its confirmation are presenting logic-content and purely procedural parallels between encyclopedic teachings of both thinkers, noted that they are united by not only methodological instruction and premises of think-activity but also dialectical method, implemented in the works of Ukrainian nugget by committing principle. Unequivocally proved that namely method of committing dialectics gave to V. A. Romenets an ability to detect a committing archetype, to create psycho-sophia of the deed and new synthetic direction of socio-humanitarian knowledge – canonical psychology. And all this become possible thanks to gradual deployment of the deed (in its situational, motivational, active and after active definitions) in the bosom of motion-step of self-creative thought as unity of principles, forms, methods and means of committing methodologization. In

such way realizing committing canon and the method of committing dialectic multiplies the potential of the human spirit and enriches culture.

**V. A. ROMENETS
AS THINKER-EVOLUTIONER AND
AS METHODOLOGIST-REVOLUTIONER**

The purpose of this research is an argued illumination of methodological optics of creative way of academician Volodymyr Romenets as decisive in the construction of historical-psychological science and multi-theory of the deed in cultural-humanist position and its main task is to substantiate innovation and exceptional heuristic of basic forms of methodological organization the research activity of this giant of Ukrainian national spirit, namely distinctive principles, approaches, methods and techniques as important instruments of its everyday philosophical-psychological methodologization. Their logical fundamentals are based on the fact that working out and demonstrating samples of researches of new type, confirming committing form-scheme of organization humanitarian cognition, scientist step by step creates distinctive methodological concept which in multi-theoretical runway of reflective considerations covers full range of forms, methods, techniques and means of think-activity, its system products from the beginning are psychology of creativity and history of world psychology (HWP) and on the top of creative ascent of thinker – philosophy of transient, psycho-sophia of deed and canonical psychology.

For example, it is gratifying to note that the center of proposed by V. A. Romenets psycho-sophia of the deed is really methodological, whereas episteme content is its worldview background or sophian context that spreading as actual infinity which generates a finite – all-general wisely-giving cleverness of the human – and returns it mainly in human deeds and creations into its bosom, characterizing the integrity and exact unity of meaning rhythms of social being, its experiences as indivisibility of instantaneity and eternity. Moreover in ratio of purely theoretical and methodological components in illumination psycho-sophian horizon of committing to which constructed steps of ecstatic (scilicet the highest by the level of personal admiration and inspiration) being, obviously dominates the second. Thus in two sections of “History of Psychology of the twentieth century”

[15, p. 710–721, 771–783] directly devoted to the indicated problematic, existing only four thematic lines of theorizing. Proof of this is that psycho-sophia, the wisdom of the deed is interpreting as:

a) “holistic system of ideas about regularities of becoming and detection in committing action the essence of individual human being”;

b) “exact psychology and philosophy of being wisdom” in its inspiration as readiness and ability of human to feel, to experience the state of comprehension the quintessence of life;

c) logical-psychological essence of the deed in which “is observing certain dialectic of the cognition subject: if on the stage of general theorizing, the deed appears as complex multi-content phenomenon, synthesized for its nature which has to be considered with certain degree of abstraction from reality of individual life of personality, then on the stage of applied theorizing, specific being features of committing activity of individual appears as primary, output and namely they determine that content cut in which are studying, investigating, analyzing external and internal content layers of action human in the world”;

d) sophianity, wisdom as exact harmonized unity of semantic fullness of human being in the format of spiritual merging with absolute essence, as “dramatic disclosure of characters, situations, self-disclosure of the world in which people see each other and find between each other mutual understanding”.

Instead of methodological lines of reflective analysis in mentioned sections at least twice more that brightly visualized themes concerning logic-content filling of psycho-sophian sphere of committing presence of human in the world and event driven presence of the world in the human life. It is saying, in fact, about comprehensive definition of psycho-sophia of the deed as:

– means of cognition and worldview landmark in choosing by human an affairs, life’s way;

– cognitive means and cognitive system of scientifically substantiated and professionally oriented action, based on logic-historical regularities of existence investigated phenomena in the centre of phenomenal diversity of which is staying uniquely individual human being;

– “peculiar functional model of individual existence which raises as system of specific knowledge” moreover both about its essence and about methods and means of their usage for

achieving certain level of mastering the person, real technologies of self-ensuring of the efficiency of deployment own life action;

- holistic model of any completed form of creative activity of human (artistic, scientific, spiritual, etc.) that presents not only a prototype of psycho-sophia of the deed but also “means of establishing, balancing, approval of parity-essential relationship” between the world and man, its unique nature and existential abyss of being;

- actually psycho-sophia – “a way to wisdom, a way of how to be inspired, directed to the world as active, effective partner” able to master the system of means of committing self-practicing, peculiar “technology of being”;

- vector of cognition the essence of the deed in acts of applied theorizing that foresees mandatory involvement of appropriate means, conducting multilevel analysis of the essential features of committing activity of the subject, ensuring methodical integrity of research committing forms of life-activity by the way of usage adequate means (receptions, methods, techniques) theoretical and empirical comprehension of the object of study or constructing.

At the same time psycho-sophia – it’s steps of cognition as wonderful guide in comprehension the world (both external, material and internal, individual light of Self) through the deed that proposing for researcher to pass the sequence of certain analytical and interpretative actions in determining the essence of the object of the study and “rises as stages of existence and deployment of being”.

And finally, psycho-sophia – it’s completed system of activity concerning the appointment of the person as the creative disjoint personality who is able to catharsistic ups, to the balance between the phenomenon (real horizon of everyday) and noumenon (ideal plan of being) with saving the essential contradictions of them as impelling mechanism of “peculiar circulation of energy – creative, spiritual, humane, life-giving”.

Given argumented strengthening – only the local segment of confirmation the wide consumption by Volodymyr Andriyovych in self-sufficient philosophical-psychological discourse such defining for him methodologically loaded conceptual markers as “path”, “means”, “method”, “vector”, “steps-actions”, “technology”, “mechanism”. To this, of course, we must to add newly created by him scheme of organization his own thinking creativity that centered around logical-canonical structure of the deed in a cyclical

succession of situational, motivational, active and post-active components in intellectual projections on history of world psychology and multifaceted phenomenology of human being. This scheme from the beginning, realized by Ukrainian wise man as the idea of deed-center of psychological system, further on its ground acquires importance committing principle of analysis of the history of psychology and modern for it subject field of theoretical, scilicet canonical, psychology (“The deed is a canon of psychological knowledge because there is canon in the deed itself, in the deed center” [15, p. 827]). Further is developing cultural-humanistic approach as a strategic determination of interrelated cognition and self-cognition, theorizing and methodologization, reflection and creation now philosophical-psychological system; and finally constructed and mastered committing way of human being as a pragmatic means of highlighting the nature and the essence of psychic which serves as peculiar existential tool of self-reflection of the world. As a result, there is not only a canon psychological knowledge (historical-theoretical line of thinker creativity) but also organization scheme of philosophical and applied methodologization, form of that unique psycho-spiritual practice in which a person “being a theorist and practitioner in one person” (P. A. Myasoyid [8] and also [25]), creates the world, itself in the world and the way and character of their coexistence. In fact, this points on clear singling out and predominance in cognitive creativity of V. A. Romenets, especially in its last period, methodological line that required from him as a great intellectual-volitional efforts and also caused in the result creative scientific achievements.

P. A. Myasoid as a tireless encourager and active popularize of creativity of his teacher, not unreasonably calls V. A. Romenets a revolutionist in psychology (see. [7], [9, p. 389-453]). However, this requires clarification. Thus, Volodymyr Andriyovych indeed proposed and mainly – implemented in multi-content format of his own creative life new – think-committing – scheme of organization the historic-humanitarian cognition and appropriate to it original form of reflexive methodologization as practice of exceptional intellectual type, centered on the orbit of his consciousness and self-consciousness around logic-canonical structure of the deed as idealized etalon philosophical-psychological research. Separately let’s note: novelty and ori-

ginality impresses not itself the array of collected by the talented scientist cultural-historic material (from the symbols of primitive consciousness, folklore finds, religious beliefs, painting, music, sculpture and artistic writings to the philosophical, scientific, ideological, social achievements) and even not created by him “new theory of historic-psychological process” and “consistent presentation of scientific searches”, implemented in relevant theories, systems, directions, schools in connection with the history of human culture” [17, p. 7] as stated in the author-report of the doctoral dissertation of the scientist (1990) because it is just only objective by language means, results of long intense cognitive creativity, so to speak “curtailed into the product” being existence of its dialectical committing thinking. Primarily the main and intransitively unique in life-giving individual image of V. A. Romenets – it’s committing-canonical organization of his think-activity, scilicet that scheme of organization the humanitarian cognition which unite surprisingly differently-faced material of spiritual culture of mankind mentally and org-action, logically and historically, theoretically and methodologically, additionally in new philosophical-psychological system of unreachable panoramic completeness which unites different types of knowledge from before differentiated sources and cultural niches, building a grandiose episteme reality with its “gold core” – conceptual-categorical manner of modern psychology. Confirmation of what was said is obvious: Romenets scheme of cognition, integrating in itself rational moments-components, representing “embryo” of new order or way of developmental functioning humanitarian sciences, is that “magical crystal” which sets the “look” of psychology in different historical periods of its development, creating closed in itself, majestic and self-sufficient, theoretical world.

So as a thinker, V. A. Romenets, certainly – evolutioner who rethinking creative heritage of other famous philosophers and scientists, and what more, evolutioner who is captious to details, excessively responsible for each proclaimed word, standardly humane in everyday relationships and actions. But as methodologist of cultural-historical direction, psycho-sophian spirit and creative way of life, he certainly is revolutioner – brave and at the same time tolerant on well-trodden by themselves ways to the truth in the realm of jewelry methodically checked theorizing, personal think-committing and self

creation. In this essential dimension of creative way, obviously overcrowded by transcendental actualizations of sphere matrix of own consciousness-self-consciousness, he truly revolutioner, innovator, pioneer.

PRINCIPLE, APPROACH, METHOD AND WAY AS THE BASIC FORMS OF METHODOLOGIZATION IN CREATIVITY OF V. A. ROMENETS

Among methodologists of system-think-action camp (see [31]) there is a conviction that “Dialogues” of Galileo, “A treatise on light” Descartes, “Principles” Newton, work in special and general theories of relativity of Einstein – it’s methodological but not scientific works, since the most important in them is not “scientific result, not new knowledge but a formation and demonstration of new methods, new forms and schemes of organization cognition”; that’s why they “were used by contemporaries-colleagues not as textbooks but as samplers of researches every time of new type, scilicet in org-action function and only later in structures of training, brought to serial state of ontological statements” [4, p. 118].

For us it is clear that philosophical, historical-psychological works of V. A. Romenets, firstly “Life and death in the scientific and religious interpretation” [34], sections of the textbook “Bases of psychology” [16], “History of the psychology of XX century” [15] and of course the author-report of the doctoral dissertation “Subject and principles of historical-psychological research” [17]), also is mainly methodological than actually scientific. The explanation to this focuses around methodological core of his creative way in the science and philosophy: objectively substantiated principles of formation historical-psychological knowledge for building the history of world psychology are organizing in paradigmatic format of cultural-humanistic approach, implementing method of committing dialectics as a standard of rational cognition in humanities for students and successors offering at the same time as research canons methods of setting and solving the most complex problems: creativity, deed as logical core of historical-psychological research, life and death in being personal existence, the canonical psychology as a way to wisdom by steps of ecstatic being and other (see. [22]). In the last case we get four fundamental form of methodological organi-

zation the research activity of Ukrainian worthy man – a principle, an approach, a method, a way with which permeated through entire fabric of theoretical constructs and empirical appearances and factual argumentations. It is noteworthy that the scientist uses these forms of clearness the historical-psychological process of humanity not only and not so much by their highest philosophical appointment but also in meaning-semantic similarity on the one hand and in structural-functional and form-creative difference – on the other, additionally on maximum widely reflexive horizon of own problem-dialogic consciousness. In general for our convictions there are reasons to state the uniqueness of perfect sphere of semantic flow of Romenets consciousness which embracing existential all-inclusive and poli-dialogically tense field of canonical think-action presence of the scientist-thinker in the world and this world in his everyday psycho-spiritual existence, at the same time provides not only a detailed reflection of historical-psychological process of human development but also the generation of meanings, values, actualization and activation cognitive, sensory, intentional, intuitive and other psychiforms (let's say personal experiences, opinions or knowledge) finally enabling scatter of critical and creative reflection in acts of self-awareness Self-conceptualization, self-knowledge and self-creation (see. [28]).

Mentioned eloquently confirms the structure and content, themes and methodologems, concepts and episteme of doctoral report of V. A. Romenets. And the substantiation of the subject and principles of inter-scientific research of cultural-humanistic direction from the very beginning creates great by its complexity methodological problem in finding ways and forms of setting, solving and interpretation of which he doesn't go by well-trodden way. Ukrainian thinker only repelled from famous works of M. M. Bakhtin, S. L. Rubinstein, M. G. Yaroshevsky and other philosophers and scientists and creates those organizational-thinking schemes and models (first of all “the deed as logical core of IVP” stages and peculiarities of transformation of its subject, scilicet definition of essential shifts in “clarifying the nature of mental and its place in the world” and on this base “establishing the culturalogical periodization” of this integral scientific discipline, etc.) which are modern “skeleton” of historical-psychological science, more precisely – peculiar worldview map

that defines culturally the most important and the most humane research directions for present and future generations of scientists. So actually it is talking about IVP as about new world-creating scheme which embracing in its numerous branching differently-fundamental (including personalized, intuitive) knowledge from all spheres and segments of human activity, a number of theoretical concepts (art, history of psychology, life course of the human, sources of human being) and principles of systematization rich historical-psychological material is still built by talented scientists on first-premises and exceptionally within frames of newly created by him form of organization the humanitarian cognition.

Methodological organization of reflexive think-activity of V. A. Romenets in determining the object of historical-psychological research is not just logically substantiated by idealization of historically lengthy reality mankind in positions of deductive method of cognition. It is a separate exemplary way of structural-functional unification of various knowledge with all-possible means of ratio-humanitarian searching (from thinking operations and empirical activities to schematisms and conceptual-categorical apparatus of modern science). Volodymyr Andriyovych himself very modestly defines this as the main task – “the development of the complex of methodological techniques of studying the sources of historical-psychological knowledge for periodization and creation IPP” [17, p. 8]. In fact, we have discovery of one of the most fundamental, compared with existing, methodological schemes of research that rises from subject core of philosophical-psychological considerations of thinker and complement:

a) evolution, development, formation of psychological knowledge and their form of expression in folklore, art, religion (theology), law, medicine, philosophy, science;

b) forms and types of creativity as an important channel of disclosure psychological nature of human, his cultural step, beginnings and transformation of psychological ideas in human history;

c) step interpretation of psychic nature and its place in the world that enables the separation of the leading trends in definition the subject of psychology;

d) methodologem of logical transition of objective and subjective as the process wave of becoming, determination and formation of

psychic due to committing core which is subject to historical-psychological shifts in different regions of the world;

e) approval of unity of the subject and the principles of historical-psychological research that in the end enabled at the first time determine culturological periodization of HWP (history of world psychology) as a basis for building the perfect model of historical-psychological process.

For V. A. Romenets the principle is a leading position that has self-sufficient value in the ideal area, alternately pulsing in his consciousness theorizing (clarification the essence and peculiarities of “behavior” of the subject cognition) and methodologization (selection and application on this way to the hidden secrets of object forms, methods, techniques, means and tools of thinking and activity). Thus, fundamental in the construction of HWP undoubtedly is committing principle that allows “to see the logical structure of psychology, to build its system, points towards the establishment of psychology as an independent science with its psychological regularities. To understand historically conscious forms of the deed means to understand qualitatively different stages of the becoming psychology itself, to understand its history “[17, p. 10]. Except this first-fundamental principle, the researcher reflexes at least two quaternary centers of principles that reflect the basic characteristics of the object cognition and orient it in actualized historical-psychological material, forming a kind of a launch pad of analyzing, explanation, interpretation, guidance to committing think-activity and self-determination in the ocean of views, opinions, facts of differently-perfect knowledge. First center is principles of general periodization of HWP that conceptualizes full range of Romenets research (always available correlation with the essence which saves the existence of psychic; phenomenological change of forms of psychic moves to revealing its real essence; psychic unfolds itself in the mastering of the world and at the same time knower itself in this mastering and creates instructed to self-creation). Second center covers the principles of committing periodization of HWP – situational, motivational, committing-active, post-active – as those logical and structural substantiated moments-components of the deed that denote the basic content of the main stages of development the psychology; what’s more each of its historical level “has its

emphasis in this structure of the deed and their shift determine in the most essential features the content, meaning of psychology history, first of all the transition to the new position of vision the subject from which the field of discipline opens its rising wealth” [17, p. 11]. In particular, the situational side of the deed represented in mythological psychology, psychology of the Ancient World and the Middle Ages (see. [12]), motivational determines the major milestone of becoming the psychology from the Renaissance to the Enlightenment inclusively (see. [13]), effective and post-effective become the most important focus in the studying of psychology of XIX-XX centuries (see. [14], [15]).

So, the deed and its org-functional structure quite rightly used by V. A. Romenets as logical core of methodologization just because as event driven being, scilicet as real subjective presence of the human in the world and implemented availability of the world in psycho-sphere of the human and at the same time as psychospiritual phenomenon of called mutual presence it is the core or a clot of course-transformation of psychic in cultural-historical dynamics of human development. Processed by Volodymyr Andriyovych hierarchically self-sufficient system of principles of historical-psychological research, setting basic provisions for aimed step forward in organization humanitarian cognition, elaborates its thought-semantic horizon of consciousness as a methodologist by basic ideality which later in meta-system of ideas, principles and standards of reflexive searching, create cultural-historical approach and method of committing dialectics.

The methodological approach in philosophy or science – it’s a certain strategy of cognition as more or less balanced set of principles and standards of reflexively implemented theorization that determines the orientation of individual and collective think-activity, caused by problematic field of consciousness of researcher (difficulties on the way of satisfaction cognitive need by impossibility to achieve the goal of the search in a known way, etc.). This approach testifying personal certainty of researcher in selecting directivity of theoretical or practical work, present in his thinking in reflexive form (mainly on the stage of becoming during processing appropriate means and methods) and in not reflexive (in the period of steady, episteme unchanged functioning) and finally settles in multiple-segment rational knowledge of history

and theory of thinking. In this analytical cut of cultural-historical approach of V. A. Roments, to opinion of M. S. Guseltseva (see. [3]) and P. A. Myasoyid (see. [6], [9]) are post-nonclassical, concerning the three- aspect methodological optics, substantiated in the philosophical conception of theoretical knowledge of V. S. Stiopin (classical, nonclassical and postnonclassical types of rationality, see. [35]). The main features of this approach are: “communicativity of the concept, categorical network, culturalological and anthropological methodological formats, mutual complementarity micro- and macro-analysis, the dialectic of the universal and unique” overcoming dilemmas of monism and pluralism as interdependent functioning of two research strategies and finally “the opportunity to engage a living canvas of knowledge the work of thinkers as different cultures and historical epochs and establish a rehash of ideas between them and contemporaries ... “[3, p. 102–103].

Obviously, there are reasons to state a high complexity of implemented by scientist, as he called it by himself, cultural-historical or cultural-humanistic approach to HWP which except outlined principles and methodological standards (with the help of category of the deed, taken as a cognitive tool) allows to conduct the research in such way that it branches from the trunk to crown by parameters of the situation, motivation, committing actions, reflection and let new shoots of analysis: unique reveals itself through universal and semantic diversity of boundless horizons of psycho-spiritual phenomenology of human existence detected structured by single logic of conceptual-categorical organization covered by psychological material. However, based on substantiated by us earlier (see. [10, p. 108–116], [11, p. 7–14]), “by exceptional importance are characterized not only works of V. A. Romenets the significant historical-psychological themes in the context of the entire human culture and created by him meta-theory of the deed and no just paramount way-method which he moved from theory of creativity and history of world psychology to psycho-sophia of the deed and theory of canonical psychology...” [20, p. 8].

Speaking about the rising of the method of committing dialectics as a form of methodologization (see. [21]) compared with form-content of committing principle then its formation “can’t coincide either with available at our dis-

posal amount of knowledge about the subject or with any separately taken principle or even not with a set of principles. Because a set of principles – is, figuratively speaking, only the artist’s palette. Its paints should be carried over canvas so that is the recognizable nature’s outline (subject) ... “[5, p. 209]. At the same time self-sufficient research use any approach, in addition cultural-historical as one of the most complex and the most heuristic, does not guarantee a success. Moreover, the main thing for V. A. Romenets was to achieve the goal – to get the right product, namely a new scheme of organizing implementation of humanitarian cognition and on its basis create a theory of historical-psychological process. And here really decisive role starts to play knowledge of psychological content, adequate to the subject of think-activity. So, that’s why in works of Volodymyr Romenets, author’s method presents by itself the system of knowledge about the principles and approaches to the implementation both – cognition and any of intellectual practice. Although it is clear that such knowledge can’t be complete, and the more scientists deepened within implementation by him approach into the essence and forms of display of the research subject, the bigger and more interesting became a problematic field of episteme confrontation between knowledge and ignorance, understanding and ignorance, considerations and misrecognition, reflection and intuition in network of idealization and semantic forms of its polintentional problem-dialogic consciousness.

So, the main in the methodic of committing dialectics – is that it theoretically determines general direction of historical-psychological research, fundamental milestone in forming the idea about the object and its multi-aspect filling by subject content, limits and character of interpretation obtained outcome of creative work. Exceptional significance of this method is not only that it is essentially by the method of theorizing is philosophical, but also because of its historically variable, invariant content turns out psychological, cultural-humanistic. Without no doubt that method of such level of sophianity foresees thorough knowledge of the essence and peculiarities of the subject and philosophy, and psychology, and history, and culturology, the ability to intelligently draw logically non-contradiction sketch of mutual enrichment configuration, single out from a number of other fillings of subject content and detail their se-

parate parts and the main – to determine opportunities and limitation of this sketchy decorated episteme psycho-cultural picture in certain set of premises, principles, basic provisions. With this task as follows from the creative heritage of V. A. Romenets, scientist fully coped, leaving to the next generation of scientists committing scheme of organization humanitarian cognition as a canon of methodological thinking and an example of perfect research activity.

At the same time another important form of methodologization of this hard-working boundless spiritual culture of the Ukrainian nation and humanity is the way which elaborates and even pragmatic variant of norm-content of committing principle, cultural-historical approach and method of committing dialectics, represents such committing think-actions and accordingly the system of cognitive techniques that enable implementation of historical-psychological research of grandiose culture-knowing magnitude and completeness of psychological material. This method, firstly using for its direct methodological appointment – organizing research, teaching and psycho-sophian practice of everyday life that leads to the real achievement of the goal – to building fundamental meta-theoretical system, segment formations of which is the theory of creativity, deed, historical-psychological process, psycho-sophia as a model of human being; secondly it serves as a reflective tool, a means and in separate logical-cognitive procedures even as a tool of committing organized and dialectically implemented thinking, thus – philosophical and applied methodologization. As a result a set of ways – from “psychic as a peculiar way of self-reflection of the world” to “committing way of human being” and mastering by the person world and herself and finally to “practice as committing way of existing human in the world and the world in the human” – in the creativity of Volodymyr Romenets quite naturally becomes practically accented, reconstructed form of approval the method of committing dialectics.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Methodology of humanitarian cognition today – unexplored mysterious world, which in complementarity and integrity covers at least four side: a) teaching about logical organization and structural-semantic dynamics, principles and

standards, methods and means of action; b) a system of rational knowledge about the forms, methods, ways of reflexive thinking and committing action in the unity of totality of norms and tools of different level methodologization; c) the sphere of think-action centered cognition, criticism, creation and reflection which integrate all types and styles of thinking in the form of such neoplasm as methodological thinking, through the optics of which setting whole world; d) personified lifestyle, the type of problem-reflective existence in which self-produced methodological thoughts and attitude that circulating situationally each time anew from problematisation to designing and back as difficult practical art of thoughts realization (detail see. [29]).

2. One of the first discoverers of new continent of methodology of humanitarian cognition as little-known multi-problem world is outstanding Ukrainian philosopher and psychologist Volodymyr Andriyovych Romenets, whose creative way marked as extraordinary but little-mastered and what more little-worked out culturally significant achievements and discoveries. He – is not only self-sufficient, strong, disjoint theorist-humanist and what is the most important bright, consistent and productive methodologies who with his self-knowledge mastered a new way of development of sciences about human – committing-canonical scheme of organizing the humanitarian cognition as reflective think-activity – psycho-sophian – type. That’s why real mastering of this Romenets continent is still ahead.

3. V. A. Romenets is an architector of the methodology of humanitarian cognition in the sense that he is as a gifted thinker and a talented scientist creates a new – original, logically slender, heuristic – scheme of implementation of intellectual creativity hitherto unprecedented completeness and perfection. Psycho-sophian core of this scheme, scilicet unique way of cognition-creation is committing-canonical organization of his think-activity which connecting extremely different faced material of spiritual culture of humanity mentally and org-action, logically and historically, theoretically and methodologically, understandable and practically represents by itself “embryo” of new order or way of developmental functioning of socio-humanitarian sciences and what is first of psychology with its main filling of subject content – “life taken in the development process” – and

the “golden fund” – conceptual-categorical apparatus. In this reflexive cut, definition of academician Volodymyr Romenets, certainly – evolutioner who rethinking creative heritage of other famous philosophers and scientists but also with no doubt he is a revolutioner, too responsible, captious to details of well thought out and proclaimed and at the same time invariably tolerant on well-trodden by himself ways to the truth in the field of methodology of cultural-historical direction, psyho-socium spirit and creative lifestyle.

4. The most well-known and widely cited philosophical and historical-psychological works of V. A. Romenets are methodological, but not actually a scientific that confirm well-known fact of their usage by students, successors and supporters as schemes or means of professional methodologization. And it is naturally, considering that they contain development and demonstration of new forms and methods of humanitarian cognition and that’s why were using and are using today as exemplar of the research of new type, scilicet in purely org-think-action function. This convincingly confirms on the one hand principle, approach, method, way as basic form of methodological organization of research activity of the scientist, with which permeated through the entire fabric of his theoretical constructions and empirical outcomes and argumentations, on the other – structure and content, themes and methodologems, concepts and episteme of his doctoral report (1990). In other words, academician Romenets creates such methodological schemes and models which in complementary creates foundation of modern historical-psychological science and at the same time logically organized as a peculiar worldview map that determines culturally important and the most humane research directions for current and future generations of scientists. Namely the deed in his org-functional structural-canonical construction and categorical certainty is a logical core of problem-dialogue methodologization which centered on the course-transition of psychic in cultural-historical dynamics of human development. Limitless thought-semantic horizon of consciousness of this scientist-intellectualist as disjoint methodologist overflowing with basic idealities and thought-schemes which later in meta-system of ideas, principles and standards of reflexive searching, create both cultural-historical approach and method of committing dialectics.

Perspective directions of application the committing-canonical scheme of organization the cognitive creativity of philosophers and scientists in the problem field of modern humanities are: a) further development of cyclically-committing approach (see. [26], [27], [30]) that revealed its heuristic in reconstruction of complete paradigmatic cycles of collective cognitive creativity in the sphere of science, game as committing, creative way of Imre Lakatos as well-known methodologist of science, etc.; b) substantiation of four-zone scheme of thought-committing as form of methodological thinking and toll of methodologization and also its versatile approbation in “live” socio-humanitarian discourse; c) creation a series of new methodological including paradigmatic plan-cards of the research as one of the most advanced tools of theoretical and applied methodologization (see detail work of O. Y. Furman in which at the first time studied the innovation-psychological climate of educational organization and its parameters [36]); d) rising of the psycho-sophia of consciousness as the highest form of and at the same time frames of human existence, co-vitally organized as an act of mutual presence of human and the world by canons of wisdom commitment and etc.

1. Academician V. A. Romenets: creativity and work: coll. art. /f. P. A. Myasoid; e. r. L. O. Shatytko. – K.: Lybid, 2016. – 272 p.

2. Committing psychology: history and modernity: materials of interdisciplinary roundtable on the occasion of the 90th anniversary of birthday prof. V. A. Romenets, May 20, 2016 /by ed. I. V. Danylyk. – K.: Logos, 2016. – 105 p.

3. Gusel'tseva, M. Cultural-historical approach of V. A. Romenets: the idea of culture and ideas in culture [Text] / M. Gusel'tseva // Psychology and Society. – 2011. – № 2. – P. 92-104.

4. Kopylov, G. On the nature of "scientific revolutions" [Text] / G. Kopylov // Psychology and Society. – 2010. – № 2. – P. 113-127.

5. Laponov, M. Philosophy as a science. Fundamentals of philosophical methodology [Text] / M. Laponov, V. Komissarov // System of modern methodologies: [reader in 4 volumes] / f., e. r., transl. A. V. Furman. – Ternopil: TNEU, 2015. – T. 1. – P. 220-222.

6. Myasoid, P. A. Course of general psychology [Text]: textbook: in 2 v. / P. A. Myasoid. – K.: Alerta, 2011. – Vol.1. – 496 p.; 2013 – Vol.2. – 758 p.

7. Myasoid, P. Meta-theoretical analysis in psychology [Text] / P. Myasoid // Psychology and Society. – 2009. – № 4. – P. 54-82.

8. Myasoid, P. Science and practice in the psychologist work [Text] / P. Myasoid // Psychology and Society. – 2004. – №3. – P. 5-74.

9. Myasoid, P. A. Psychological cognition: history, logic, psychology [Text] / P. A. Myasoid. – K.: Lybid, 2016. – 560 p.

10. Psychology of the deed: By ways of creativity of V. A. Romenets: coll. art. / f. P. A. Myasoid; e. r. A. V. Furman. – K.: Lybid, 2012. – 296 p.
11. Psychology and Society: Special edition devoted to the 85th anniversary of the birth of Volodymyr Andriyovych Romenets. – 2011. – №2. – 190 p.
12. Romenets, V. A. History of psychology: Ancient world. Middle Ages. Renaissance [Text] teach. Textbook. – K.: Lybid, 2005. – 916 p.
13. Romenets, V. A. History of psychology: XVII century. The Age of Enlightenment [Text]: [teach. textbook] / V. A. Romenets. – K.: Lybid, 2006. – 1000 p.
14. Romenets, V. A. History of psychology: XIX – early XX century [Text]: teach. textbook / V. A. Romenets. – K.: Lybid, 2006. – 832 p.
15. Romenets, V. A. History of psychology XX century [Text]: teach. textbook / V. A. Romenets, I. P. Manoha. – K.: Lybid, 1998. – 992 p.
16. Romenets, V. A. Rise of canonical psychology [Text] / V. A. Romenets // Bases of psychology: textbook. / by gen. ed. of O. V. Kyrychuk, V. A. Romenets. – 6th ed., stereot. – K.: Lybid, 2006. – P. 605-621 (1st ed. – 1995).
17. Romenets, V. A. Subject and principles of historic-psychological research [Text] / V. A. Romenets // Psychology and Society. – 2013. – № 2. – P. 6-27.
18. Tatenko, V. O. Volodymyr Andriyovych Romenets (1926-1998): Life as the deed and event [Text] / V. O. Tatenko, T. M. Tytarenko // Romenets V. A., Manoha I. P. History of psychology of XX century: teach. textbook. – K.: Lybid, 1998. – P. 7-37.
19. Furman, A. A. Fundamental forms of methodologization in the creativity of V. A. Romenets [Text] / A. A. Furman // Committing psychology: history and modernity: materials of interdisciplinary roundtable on the occasion of the 90th anniversary of birthday prof. V. A. Romenets, May 20, 2016 / by ed. I. V. Danylyk. – K.: Logos, 2016. – P. 35-38.
20. Furman, A. V. Volodymyr Romenets as methodologist of psycho-sophian spirit [Text] / A. V. Furman // Psychology and Society. – 2011. – № 2. – P. 7-14.
21. Furman, A. V. The idea and content of professional methodologization [Text]: monograph. / A. V. Furman. – Ternopil: TNEU, 2015. – 362 p.
22. Furman, A. V. Methodologist – profession of the future [Text] / A. V. Furman // Psychology and Society. – 2016. – № 1. – P. 16-43.
23. Furman, A. V. Methodological substantiation of multi-level of paradigmatic researches in social psychology [Text] / Anatoliy V. Furman // Psychology and Society. – 2012. – №4. – P. 78-125.
24. Furman A. V. Methodology of paradigmatic researches in social psychology [Text]: [monograph.] / Anatoliy Vasyliovych Furman. – K.: Institute of polit. and social psychology; Ternopil: Economic thought, 2013. – 100 p.
25. Furman, A. V. Science and practice in the work of psychologist, sociologist: between truth and duplicity [Text] / A. V. Furman // Psychology and Society. – 2004. – P. 7-12.
26. Furman, A. V. Organization-action games at high school [Text]: [monograph.] / Anatoliy V. Furman, Sergiy Shandruk. – Ternopil: TNEU, 2014. – 272 p.
27. Furman, A. V. Paradigm as a subject of methodological reflection [Text] / A. V. Furman // Psychology and Society. – 2013. – №3. – P. 72-85.
28. Furman, A. V. Consciousness as the framework conditions in methodologization in social-humanities [Text] / A. V. Furman // Psychological principles of development psychological diagnostics and correction the personality in the system of continuing education / by scientific edition of Tomchuk M. I. // coll. mat. Podilskf n.-pr. conf. – Vinnytsya: KVNZ “Vinnytsya academy of continuing education”, 2016. – P. 147-156.
29. Furman, A. V. World of methodology [Text] / A. V. Furman // Psychology and Society. – 2015. – № 2. – P. 47-60.
30. Furman, A. V. The essence of the game as commitment [Text]: [monograph.] / Anatoliy V. Furman, Sergiy Shandruk. – Ternopil: TNEU, 2014. – 120 p.
31. Georgiy Petrovych Shchedrovyt'skiy / [under. ed. of P. G. Shchedrovyt'skiy, V. L. Danilovoy]. – M.: Russ. pol. enc. (ROSSPEN), 2010. – 600 p.
32. Kuhn, T. Structure of scientific revolutions [Text] / Thomas Kuhn; transl. from engl. / f. V. Y. Kuznetsov. – M.: “Publishing House AST”, 2002. – 608 p.
33. Lakatos, I. The history and its rational reconstructions [Text] / I. Lakatos // Structure and development of science. From Boston researches on the philosophy of the science. – M.: Progress, 1978. – P. 203-235.
34. Romenets, V. A. Life and death in the scientific and religious interpretation. Ed. 2nd [Text] / V. A. Romenets. – K.: Lybid, 2003. – 232 p.
35. Stepin, V. S. Theoretical knowledge: structure, historical evolution [Text]: [monograph.] / V. S. Stepin. – M.: Progress-Tradition, 2000. – 744 p.
36. Furman O. Ye. The innovative psychological climate: its scope, structure and parameters / Oksana Ye. Furman // Problems of Psychology in the 21 st. Century. – 2015. – Vol. 9, No.1. – P. 14-19.

REFERENCES

1. Akademik V.A. Romenets: tvorchist i pratsi: zb. st. / uporiad. P.A. Miasoid; vidp. red. L.O. Shatyрко. – K.: Lybid, 2016. – 272 s.
2. Vchynkova psykholohiia: istoriia i suchasnist: materialy mizhdysts. kruhloho stolu z nahody 90-richchia vid dnia nar. prof. V.A. Romenetsia, 20 travnia 2016 roku / za red. I.V. Danyliuka. – K.: Lohos, 2016. – 105 s.
3. Huseltseva, M. Kulturno-istorychnyi pidkhid V.A. Romenetsia: ideia kultury ta idei v kulturi [Tekst] / M. Huseltseva // Psykholohiia i suspilstvo. – 2011. – № 2. – S. 92-104.
4. Kopylov, H. Pro pryrodu “naukovykh revoliutsii” [Tekst] / H. Kopylov // Psykholohiia i suspilstvo. – 2010. – № 2. – S. 113-127.
5. Laponov, M. Filosofiia yak nauka. Osnovy filosofskoi metodolohii [Tekst] / M. Laponov, V. Komissarov // Systema suchasnykh metodolohii: [khrestomatiiia u 4-kh tomakh] / uporiad., vidp. red., perekł. A.V. Furman. – Ternopil: TNEU, 2015. – T. 1. – S. 220-222.
6. Myasoyid, P.A. Kurs zahalnoi psykholohii [Tekst]: pidruchn.: u 2 t. / P.A. Myasoyid. – K.: Alerta, 2011. – T.1. – 496 s.; 2013. – T.2. – 758 s.
7. Myasoyid, P. Metateoretychnyi analiz u psykholohii [Tekst] / P. Myasoyid // Psykholohiia i suspilstvo. – 2009. – № 4. – S. 54-82.
8. Myasoyid, P. Nauka i praktyka u roboti psykholoha [Tekst] / P. Myasoyid // Psykholohiia i suspilstvo. – 2004. – №3. – S. 5-74.
9. Myasoyid, P.A. Psykholohichne piznannia: istoriia, lohika, psykholohiia [Tekst] / P.A. Miasoid. – K.: Lybid, 2016. – 560 s.
10. Psykholohiia vchynku: Shliakhamy tvorchosti V.A. Romenetsia: zb. st. / uporiad. P.A. Myasoyid; vidp. red. A.V. Furman. – K.: Lybid, 2012. – 296 s.
11. Psykholohiia i suspilstvo: Spetsvypusk, prysviachenyi 85-y richnyi z dnia narodzhennia Volodymyra Andriiovycha Romenetsia. – 2011. – №2. – 190 s.

12. Romenets, V.A. Istoriia psikhologii: Starodavniy svit. Seredniy viky. Vidrozhennia [Tekst]: navch. posibnyk. – K.: Lybid, 2005. – 916 s.

13. Romenets, V.A. Istoriia psikhologii: XVII stolittia. Epokha Prosvitnytstva [Tekst]: [navch. posibnyk] / V.A. Romenets. – K.: Lybid, 2006. – 1000 s.

14. Romenets, V.A. Istoriia psikhologii: XIX – pochatok XX stolittia [Tekst]: navch. posibnyk / V.A. Romenets. – K.: Lybid, 2006. – 832 s.

15. Romenets, V.A. Istoriia psikhologii XX stolittia [Tekst]: navch. posibnyk / V.A. Romenets, I.P. Manokha. – K.: Lybid, 1998. – 992 s.

16. Romenets, V.A. Postannia kanonichnoi psikhologii [Tekst] / V.A. Romenets // Osnovy psikhologii: pidruch. / za zah. red. O.V. Kyrychuka, V.A. Romentsia. – 6-e vyd., ster. – K.: Lybid, 2006. – S. 605–621 (1-vyd. – 1995 r.).

17. Romenets, V.A. Predmet i pryntsyipy istoryko-psikhologichnoho doslidzhennia [Tekst] / V.A. Romenets // Psikhologhiia i suspilstvo. – 2013. – № 2. – S. 6–27.

18. Tatenko, V.O. Volodymyr Andriiovych Romenets (1926–1998): zhyttia yak vchynok i podiia [Tekst] / V.O. Tatenko, T.M. Tytarenko // Romenets V.A., Manokha I.P. Istoriia psikhologii XX stolittia: navch. posib. – K.: Lybid, 1998. – S. 7–37.

19. Furman, A.A. Zasadnychi formy metodolohuvannia u tvorchosti V.A. Romentsia [Tekst] / A.A. Furman // Vchynkova psikhologhiia: istoryia ta suchasnist: materialy nizhdysts. kruhloho stolu z nahody 90-richchia vid dnia nar. prof. V.A. Romentsia, 20 travnia 2016 roku / za red. I.V. Danyliuka. – K.: Lohos, 2016. – S. 35–38.

20. Furman, A.V. Volodymyr Romenets yak metodoloh psikhosofiinoho dukhu [Tekst] / A.V. Furman // Psikhologhiia i suspilstvo. – 2011. – № 2. – S. 7–14.

21. Furman, A.V. Ideia i zmist profesiinoho metodolohuvannia [Tekst]: monohr. / A.V. Furman. – Ternopil: TNEU, 2015. – 362 s.

22. Furman, A.V. Metodoloh – profesiia maibutnoho [Tekst] / A.V. Furman // Psikhologhiia i suspilstvo. – 2016. – № 1. – S. 16–43.

23. Furman, A.V. Metodolohichne obgruntuvannia bahatorivnevosti paradyhmalnykh doslidzhen u sotsialnii psikhologii [Tekst] / Anatolii V. Furman // Psikhologhiia i suspilstvo. – 2012. – №4. – S. 78–125.

24. Furman A.V. Metodolohiia paradyhmalnykh doslidzhen u sotsialnii psikhologii [Tekst]: [monohr.] / Anatolii Vasylovych Furman. – K.: Instytut polit. i sots. psikhologii; Ternopil: Ekonomichna dumka, 2013. – 100 s.

25. Furman, A.V. Nauka i praktyka u roboti psikhologa, sotsioloha: mizh pravdoiu i lukavstvom [Tekst] / A.V. Furman // Psikhologhiia i suspilstvo. – 2004. – S. 7–12.

26. Furman, A.V. Ohanizatsiino-diialnisi ihry u vyshchii shkoli [Tekst]: [monohr.] / Anatolii V. Furman, Serhii Shandruk. – Ternopil: TNEU, 2014. – 272 s.

27. Furman, A.V. Paradyhma yak predmet metodolohichnoi refleksii [Tekst] / A.V. Furman // Psikhologhiia i suspilstvo. – 2013. – №3. – S. 72–85.

28. Furman, A.V. Svidomist yak ramkova umova metodolohuvannia u sotsiohumanitarystytsi [Tekst] / A.V. Furman // Psikhologhiia i suspilstvo. – 2015. – № 2. – S. 47–60.

29. Furman, A.V. Svit metodolohii [Tekst] / A.V. Furman // Psikhologhiia i suspilstvo. – 2015. – № 2. – S. 47–60.

30. Furman, A.V. Sutnist hry yak uchynnennia [Tekst]: [monohr.] / Anatolii V. Furman, Serhii Shandruk. – Ternopil: TNEU, 2014. – 120 s.

31. Georgiy Petrovich Shchedrovitsky / [pod. red. P.H. Shchedrovitskoho, V.L. Danylovoi]. – M.: Ross. polyt. ents-ya (ROSSPEN), 2010. – 600 s.

32. Kuhn, T. Struktura nauchnykh revolutsyi [Tekst] / Thomas Kuhn; per. s anhl. / sost. V.Iu. Kuznetsov. – M.: OOO “Izd-vo AST”, 2002. – 608 s.

33. Lakatos, Y. Istoriia nauky i yeyo ratsyonalnye rekonstruksyi [Tekst] / Y. Lakatos // Struktura i razvytye nauky. Iz Bostonskykh issledovaniy po fylosofii nauki. – M.: Prohress, 1978. – S. 203–235.

34. Romenets, V.A. Zhyzn y smert v nauchnom i relyhnoznom istolkovanii. Izd. 2-e [Tekst] / V.A. Romenets. – K.: Lybid, 2003. – 232 s.

35. Stiopyn, V.S. Teoreticheskoe znanie: struktura, istorycheskaia evolutsiia [Tekst]: [monohr.] / V.S. Stiopyn. – M.: Prohress-Tradytsiia, 2000. – 744 s.

36. Furman O. Ye. The innovative psychological climate: its scope, structure and parameters / Oksana Ye. Furman / Problems of Psychology in the 21 st. Century. – 2015. – Vol. 9, No.1. – P. 14–19.

АНОТАЦІЯ

Фурман Анатолій Васильович.

Володимир Роменець як Архітектор методології гуманітарного пізнання.

Міждисциплінарне дослідження висвітлює творчість видатного українського вченого другої половини ХХ століття В.А. Роменця (1926–1998) не стільки як талановитого теоретика філософсько-психологічного дискурсу, скільки як послідовного і продуктивного методолога, котрий творив і мислевчинково апробував самобутню систему методології гуманітарного пізнання. Осереддя цієї системи становить циклічно-вчинкова схема організації його винятково плідної рефлексивної мислєдіяльності, яка поєднує оригінальні форми, методи, способи і засоби психософію зорієнтованого методологування. Аргументуючи погляд, згідно з яким сфера науки розвивається не стільки науковими революціями, скільки кардинальними методологічними зсувами, що завдяки оновленню формосхем організації дослідницької діяльності вчених забезпечують її еволюцію, доведено, що як мислитель Володимир Роменець є еволюціонером, котрий ґрунтовно переосмислює творчу спадщину інших відомих людству філософів і науковців, тоді як методолог культурно-історичного спрямування, психософіюного духу і креативного способу життя він справді революціонер, новатор, першопроходець. Це підтверджують його віхові, головні твори, що демонструють нову, власне світоглядну, схему оргучинкового здійснення розумової праці на найскладніші предметні ділянки міждисциплінарного пошуку (творчості, життєвого шляху людини, джерел людського буття, періодизації історії всесвітньої психології, житті і смерті та ін.), а тому є визначально методологічними. Водночас базовими формами проблемно-діалогічного методологування для вченого є принцип, підхід, метод і спосіб, якими наскрізно пронизана вся тканина теоретичних побудов, логічних вислідів та емпіричних оприявнень.

Ключові слова: гуманітарне пізнання, теоретичний світ, методологія, методологування, вчинок, метод учинкової діалектики, парадигма, багаторівневість парадигмальних досліджень, методологічна революція, форма (схема) організації пізнання, психософія вчинку, канонічна психологія, культурно-гуманістичний підхід, учинковий канон, теорія історико-психологічного процесу, понятійно-категорійний лад, базові форми

методологування, мислєдїяльність, оргмисленнєва схема, вчинковий принцип, методологічне мислення, циклічно-вчинковий підхід.

АННОТАЦІЯ

Фурман Анатолій Васильєвич.

Владимир Роменец как Архитектор методологии гуманитарного познания.

Междисциплинарное исследование освещает творчество выдающегося украинского ученого второй половины XX века В.А. Роменца (1926–1998) не столько как талантливого теоретика философско-психологического дискурса, сколько как последовательного и продуктивного методолога, который творил и мыслепоступково апробировал самобытную систему методологии гуманитарного познания. Средоточие этой системы составляет циклически-поступковая схема организации его исключительно плодотворной рефлексивной мыследеятельности, которая соединяет оригинальные формы, методы, способы и средства психософийно сориентированного методологизирования. Аргументируя взгляд, согласно с которым сфера науки развивается не столько научными революциями, сколько кардинальными методологическими сдвигами, что благодаря обновлению формосхем организации исследовательской деятельности ученых обеспечивают ее эволюцию, доказано, что как мыслитель Владимир Роменец – эволюционер, который основательно переосмысливает творческое наследие других известных человечеству философов и ученых, тогда как методолог культурно-исторического направления, психософийного духа и креативного образа жизни он действительно революционер, новатор, первопроходец. Это подтверждают его этапные, главные произведения, которые демонстрируют новую, собственно мировоззренческую, схему оргпоступкового осуществления умственного труда на самые сложные предметные участки междисциплинарного поиска (творчества, жизненного пути человека, источников человеческого бытия, периодизации истории всемирной психологии, жизни и смерти и пр.), а поэтому изначально являются методологическими. В то же время базовыми формами проблемно-диалогического методологизирования для ученого являются принцип, подход, метод и способ, которыми насквозь пронизана вся ткань теоретических построений, логических выводов и эмпирических фактуализаций.

Ключевые слова: гуманитарное познание, теоретический мир, методология, методологизирование, поступок, метод поступковой диалектики, парадигма, многоуровневость парадигмальных исследований, методологическая революция, форма (схема) организации познания, психософия поступка, каноничная психология, культурно-гуманистический подход, поступковый канон, теория историко-психологического

процесса, понятийно-категориальный строй, базовые формы методологизирования, мыследеятельность, оргмыслительная схема, поступковый принцип, методологическое мышление, циклически-поступковый подход.

ANNOTATION

Furman Anatoliy Vasyliovych.

Volodymyr Romenets as Architect of methodology of humanitarian cognition.

Interdisciplinary research highlights the creativity of the outstanding Ukrainian scientist of the second half of the twentieth century V. A. Romenets (1926–1998) not so much as talented theorist of philosophical-psychological discourse but as consistent and productive methodologist who created and thought-committing approbated distinctive system of methodology of humanitarian cognition. The core of this system is cyclically-committing scheme of organization of its exceptionally productive reflective think-activity which unites original forms, methods, ways and means of psycho-sophian oriented methodologization. Arguing the opinion, according to which the area of science develops not so much by scientific revolutions but radical methodological shifts that thanks to updating of form-schemes of organization the research activity of scientists ensured its evolution, proved that as thinker Volodymyr Romenets is evolutioner who thoroughly rethinking the creative heritage of others well-known to mankind philosophers and scientists, while methodologist of cultural-historical direction, psycho-sophian spirit and creative lifestyle, he's really revolutioner, an innovator, a pioneer. This confirms his main works which demonstrate new, own worldview scheme of org-committing implementation of mental work on the most difficult subject areas of interdisciplinary search (creativity, human life way, sources of human existence, periodization of the history of world psychology, life and death, etc.) and that's why methodological from the very beginning. At the same time basic form of problem-dialogue methodologization for a scientist is the principle, approach, the method and the way with which is permeated through the entire fabric of theoretical constructs, logical and empirical appearances.

Keywords: humanitarian cognition, theoretical world, methodology, methodologization, the deed, method of committing dialectic, paradigm, multilevel of paradigmatic researches, methodological revolution, form (scheme) of organization the cognition, psycho-sophia of the deed, canonical psychology, cultural-humanistic approach, committing canon, theory of historical-psychological process, conceptual-categorical manner, the basic forms of methodologization, think-activity, org-thought scheme, committing principle, methodological thinking, cyclically-committing approach.

Надійшла до редакції 11.05.2016.