

Sergii Rudenko¹
Centre for Chinese-European Studies
Guangdong University of Petrochemical Technology

Iryna Liashenko²
Faculty of Philosophy
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv

Chinese Studies in Ukrainian Philosophy of the Soviet Period

Słowa kluczowe: starożytna chińska filozofia; filozofia ukraińska; epoka sowiecka; historia marksizmu; historia filozofii; recepcja; komparatystyka filozoficzna.

Keywords: Ancient Chinese philosophy; Ukrainian philosophy; Soviet period; history of Marxism; history of philosophy; reception; comparative history of philosophy.

Introduction

The study of receptions is one of the productive areas of the modern history of philosophy. Comparative studies of the history of philosophy have scientific value in two dimensions. They allow us to obtain knowledge about the philosophical culture that is being studied, as well as about the philosophical tradition and culture of the recipient. In other words, the study of the way of perception of Ancient Chinese philosophy in the Ukrainian philosophy of the Soviet period of the second half of the 20th century allows us to gain new knowledge about the philosophical culture of Ancient China as well as the Ukrainian philosophy of the Soviet period of the second half of the 20th century. This study aims to investigate both aspects. However, the achievement of the second aspect, namely, the study of Ukrainian philosophy of the Soviet period in the second half of the 20th

¹ Sergii Rudenko, Centre for Chinese-European Studies, Guangdong University of Petrochemical Technology, 139 Guandu 2nd Rd, Maonan, Maoming, Guangdong, China, rudenosrg@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9069-0989>.

² Iryna Liashenko, Faculty of Philosophy, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Volodymyrska str. 60, 01033 Kyiv, Ukraine, liashenkoiv@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3912-2075>.

century, is a higher priority for the authors at this stage of the research project in Chinese-European studies in philosophy.

The general purpose of the current study is to research the way of perception of Ancient Chinese philosophy in Ukrainian studies of the History of Soviet philosophy of the second half of the 20th century to gain in-depth knowledge of Ukrainian Soviet philosophy and the history of Marxism in Ukraine.

The main objectives of the study are the reconstruction of the way of describing Ancient Chinese philosophy, the theoretical model of the main stages of its development, as well as historical links between different stages of Ancient Chinese philosophy in Ukrainian studies of Soviet philosophy of the second half of the 20th century; an explication of the key problems to which the attention of the philosophers of Ancient China was directed, from the standpoint of the Ukrainian historians of philosophy of the Soviet period; a description of the main personalities of the philosophers of Ancient China, from the perspective of the Ukrainian historians of philosophy of the Soviet period. Another important task of our study is to describe and analyse the methodology of research and understanding of the philosophy of Ancient China, which was developed and used by Ukrainian historians of philosophy of the Soviet era in the second half of the 20th century.

It is important to note that works on the history of philosophy of Ancient China are a rather rare phenomenon in the philosophical literature of Ukraine of the Soviet period of the second half of the 20th century which is written in the Ukrainian language. Moreover, even in the modern philosophical literature of Ukraine, the study of the history of Ancient Chinese philosophy is quite rare. This fact, according to the authors' opinion, is an argument for the value of the current research for modern studies of the history of philosophy.

The Sources

The systematic study of Ukrainian philosophy of the Soviet period in the second half of the 20th century has only recently begun. Therefore, at present, most printed works in the field of philosophy by Ukrainian authors of the Soviet period of the second half of the 20th century remain unexplored and, accordingly, little known.

In order to select the sources for this study, the authors researched the archives of the two biggest libraries in Ukraine, namely the Scientific Library of Ukraine named after Mykhailo Maksymovych and the National

Library of Ukraine named after Volodymyr Vernadsky. These libraries functioned in Soviet Ukraine in the second half of the 20th century and had a legal status that required at least one copy of all literature published by Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic publishers to be sent to these libraries. This fact allows us to assert the completeness of the authors' research of sources relating to the study of the philosophy of Ancient China by Ukrainian philosophers of the Soviet era in the second half of the 20th century. The authors searched according to the following criteria: (1) scholarly works in the genre of monographs written by Ukrainian philosophers of the Soviet era of the second half of the 20th century, devoted to the philosophy of Ancient China; (2) these works are written in the Ukrainian language.

Based on the search in the archives of these libraries, the authors established the following facts. (1) The history of Ancient Chinese philosophy has been considered by Ukrainian scholars of the Soviet period in the second half of the 20th century, mainly in educational literature. (2) The research on Ancient Chinese philosophy is presented mainly in small-volume scholarly works which are written in the genre of research articles and conference reports. (3) The corpus of Ukrainian philosophical literature of the Soviet period of the second half of the 20th century contains only one work in the genre of a research monograph, which presents the results of the study of Ancient Chinese philosophy. It is a book by Volodymyr Dmytrychenko and Volodymyr Shynkaruk titled *The Development of Philosophical Thought in Ancient China* (Dmytrychenko V. & Shynkaruk V., 1958).

The authors believe that this book is representative of the Ukrainian philosophy of the Soviet period of the second half of the 20th century because its authors had a high reputation (Tabachkovskii V., 2002) and were considered to be the leaders among Ukrainian philosophers of the Soviet period of the second half of the 20th century. (Andros Y., 2017). Nowadays, they are recognised as the founders of the scientific school of philosophy in Ukraine, which was named "Kyiv Philosophical School" (Rudenko S. & Turenko V., 2019).

Based on the facts mentioned above and other considerations, we chose the monograph of V. Dmytrychenko and V. Shynkaruk *The Development of Philosophical Thought in Ancient China* as the primary source of our investigation. It consists of an introduction in which the authors present a methodology for studying the history of Ancient Chinese philosophy, seven main chapters, a short afterword and references. The first chapter of the book is devoted to an analysis of the general features of the origin and emergence of philosophy in ancient countries in general. The authors sub-

stantiate the theoretical principles and methodology of the study. In the second chapter, the authors reconstruct a picture of the formation of philosophical thought in Ancient China and set out their specific vision of the historical and cultural context in which philosophy emerges in Ancient China. The third section is devoted to the description and analysis of philosophical ideas contained in the works *I Ching* and *Yinfu Jing*. In the fourth chapter, the authors describe and analyse the teachings of Lao-tzu, and in the fifth chapter, they describe and analyse the philosophical and ethical ideas of Confucius. The sixth chapter of the book is devoted to the struggle of materialism against idealism in Chinese philosophy in the 4th – 3rd centuries B.C.E. The last seventh chapter of the book is devoted to the figure of Wang Chong.

Methodology

The authors' methodology is based on the reception studies approach developed by Tomasz Mróz in *Selected Issues in the History of Polish Philosophy*: “[...] In the studies on the history of any “local” philosophy, attention should also be drawn to the history of international reception of the various philosophical currents. The specific and unique character of philosophy in Poland, France, or Germany, is also reflected in the character of the reception of new philosophical ideas. The reception may be selective or incomplete, and sometimes even grotesque, but still, reception often reflects the true colours of the recipient” (Mróz T., 2016, p. 17–18).

One of the authors of this paper, in cooperation with other scholars, described the advantages and disadvantages of the aforementioned methodological approach in the history of philosophy (Rudenko S., & Yosypenko S., 2018), and also participated in a discussion published in the journal *Sententiae* in 2018 (Mróz T., 2018).

Also, we would like to note that the reception studies in the history of philosophy, which, in our opinion, are part of comparative studies, are the most effective method of studying the perception of the philosophy of Ancient China in Ukrainian Soviet philosophy of the second half of the 20th century. This method allows us to gain multifaceted reliable new knowledge about the philosophy of Ancient China, on the one hand, and about the Ukrainian philosophy of the Soviet period of the second half of the 20th century, on the other hand. Moreover, the authors of this paper believe that the above-mentioned approach is the most effective for the study of Ukrainian philosophy of the Soviet period and has significant advantages over existing methods in modern studies of the history of Ukrainian

philosophy, which focus on studying philosophy in Ukraine in the context of Ukrainian culture only.

The authors also used the methodological ideas of Wilhelm Dilthey, which were described and analysed in other publications by one of the authors of this paper (Liashenko I., 2018), to study the perception of the philosophy of Ancient China in the Ukrainian philosophy of the Soviet second half of the 20th century. Additionally, the authors used as methods the ideas obtained by R. Lakh as a result of studying the perception of Chinese culture in the works of Ukrainian scientist Ivan Svit (Lakh R., 2016), as well as the results of comparative studies on the history of philosophy Oleg Bazaluk (Bazaluk O., 2017) and Yaroslav Sobolievskiy (Sobolievskiy Y., 2018).

It is important to highlight that in the philosophical literature of the Soviet period (including, of course, the Ukrainian one) there were stylistic clichés that were associated with public and state life of the time. This fact was also taken into account by the authors of this paper when interpreting the content of the works of Ukrainian philosophers of the Soviet period of the second half of the 20th century.

Results

The results of studying the way of perception of the philosophy of Ancient China in the Ukrainian philosophy of the Soviet period of the second half of the 20th century can be presented using the following headings: research methodology and theoretical model; main philosophical problems; key personalities.

The Research Methodology of Ancient China Philosophy

In Ukrainian Soviet philosophy of the second half of the 20th century, the investigation of Ancient Chinese philosophy forms a methodological approach in the history of philosophy studies which is critical of “Eurocentrism” and “West-centrism” as strategies for understanding the history of philosophy. The emergence and application of such an approach is a significant precedent for Ukrainian studies of the history of Soviet philosophy of the second half of the 20th century, as it indicates a critical rethinking of the dominance at that time of Hegel’s theory and methodology of the History of Philosophy.

The study of the philosophy of Ancient China also allows us to conclude how Ukrainian philosophers of the Soviet period understand philosophy itself and its history. For example, V. Dmytrychenko and V. Shynkaruk

question the “European” origin of philosophy, arguing their point of view with the example of the philosophy of Ancient China: “[...] The philosophy of Ancient China has its own vivid history of origin and development. This history is so rich and multifaceted that there is no philosophical problem that the sages of Ancient China have not posed or outlined. Therefore, concerning Ancient Chinese philosophy, one can fully and completely apply the words F. Engels said about the philosophy of Ancient Greece: “[...] in its various forms Greek philosophy is in its infancy, with the emergence of almost all the latest types of worldview”. This is the great scientific and historical cognitive value of the history of philosophy of Ancient China” (Dmytrychenko V. & Shynkaruk V., 1958, p. 61).

In other words, the authors question the unique status of Ancient Greece as the culture from which philosophy first emerged and spread. Ancient Chinese philosophy, according to the authors of the book, did not originate under the influence of the philosophy of Ancient Greece, so it is equivalent in content to the latter. Furthermore, if Ancient Greece is not the only culture in which philosophy originated, then Europe does not have exclusive rights to philosophy. Thus, the way philosophy develops in Europe cannot be considered a universal criterion for understanding and evaluating philosophy and its history. It is important to emphasise that V. Dmytrychenko and V. Shynkaruk in their book, using the material of the philosophy of Ancient China, critically rethink the statements of Friedrich Engels about the unique role of the philosophy of Ancient Greece in the development of philosophy in other countries. Moreover, the authors propose to reconsider the theoretical model of the historical development of philosophy as a product of the culture of Ancient Greece, which is generally accepted in Ukrainian studies of the history of Soviet philosophy.

This standpoint is developed by V. Dmytrychenko and V. Shynkaruk from the first pages of their book, in the form of a critique of the «Eurocentric» methodology in the history of philosophy. The authors use the existence of the philosophy of Ancient China as their main argument: “The history of the spiritual culture of the Chinese people, in particular, the history of Chinese philosophy, is clear, indisputable evidence of the absolute groundlessness of the ideas of ‘Eurocentrism’ or ‘West-centrism’ in the development of science and philosophy. Reactionary bourgeois historians have made considerable efforts to prove that all the development of science and philosophy was concentrated in the West only, that the peoples of the East did not create any original philosophical teachings, that the philosophical thought of the East trailed behind Western philosophy, or regurgitated old religions [...] The peoples of the East, including the Chinese people, have made a massive contribution to the development of the mate-

rial and spiritual culture of humankind [...] modern science and philosophy are the product of the creativity of particular people and not “chosen peoples”, but all the peoples of the West and East” (Dmytrychenko V. & Shynkaruk V., 1958, p. 4).

This methodological idea of V. Dmytrychenko and V. Shynkaruk, in our opinion, was of great scientific importance and significantly influenced the development of research methodology not only on the history of Ancient Chinese philosophy but also on the studies of the History of Philosophy in Ukraine in Soviet and post-Soviet times. As the facts show, the critique of “Eurocentrism” in Ukrainian studies of philosophy and history of Soviet philosophy of the second half of the 20th century arises precisely as a result of research and perception of the philosophy of Ancient China.

The theoretical model of Ancient Chinese philosophy

In contrast to the methodology mentioned earlier, the theoretical model of the origin and development of philosophy in Ancient China is formulated by V. Dmytrychenko and V. Shynkaruk based on the precepts of dialectical and historical materialism. The authors interpret the emergence of philosophy in Ancient China as a result of the transition from primitive society to the slave-owning socio-economic formation: “In the conditions of the radical breaking of the old tribal social order and the formation of a new slave-owning society, a materialistic philosophy is emerging in China. It has absorbed all the scientific achievements and embryos of the materialist worldview of the previous era – the era of tribal and communal order” (Dmytrychenko V. & Shynkaruk V., 1958, p. 14).

Throughout the book, V. Dmytrychenko and V. Shynkaruk interpret the development of philosophy in Ancient China as a struggle between materialism and idealism, assigning philosophers, various philosophical works, schools, and ideas to “materialistic” or “idealistic” camps. The authors of the book interpret the difference between materialism and idealism based on a particular philosopher’s solution to the “basic question of philosophy” about what is primary: matter or consciousness. The assertion of the primacy of matter to consciousness is a criterion for the interpretation of a philosophical doctrine as “materialistic”, and vice versa, the assertion of the primacy of consciousness in relation to matter is, according to the authors, the basis for calling a philosophical doctrine “idealistic”. Moreover, the authors emphasise that materialism and idealism are confrontational, contradictory philosophical views. The contradiction between materialism and idealism lies not only in the theoretical differences between philosophers but in the differences between practical and religious

ideas about nature and society. That is why “materialism” is interpreted as a philosophy formed on the basis of the social experience of production, whereas “idealism” arises based on religious experience. The authors of the book declare the first as true and the second as false. The authors also contrast science and religion in this way.

However, V. Dmytrychenko and V. Shynkaruk propose not to divide philosophical ideas in Ancient China into materialist and idealistic periods from the earliest times up to the 4th–3rd centuries BCE. They believe that in primitive society “neither religion nor science as independent forms of social consciousness did not yet exist. There was also no materialism or idealism as philosophical worldviews. At that time, only social and theoretical preconditions for their emergence were maturing” (Dmytrychenko V. & Shynkaruk V., 1958, p. 6). As a result, there was no fundamental question of philosophy in the above-mentioned form. According to the authors of the book, the first philosophical question at this historical stage was the question of “the origin and unity of things, the question of the unity of the world” (Dmytrychenko V. & Shynkaruk V., 1958, p. 6).

That is why the authors of the book characterise the philosophical ideas in the book *Guo Yu*, the works *I Ching* and *Yinfu Ching* and even the ideas of Lao-tzu and Confucius as “elements of materialism” and “elements of idealism”.

Nevertheless, V. Dmytrychenko and V. Shynkaruk devote a separate section of their book to the struggle between materialism and idealism, and classify the philosophical schools of Ancient China of the 4th – 3rd centuries BCE as materialistic and idealistic. V. Dmytrychenko and V. Shynkaruk consider the philosophical teachings of Lao-tzu to be the source of the development of materialism, whereas the teachings of Confucius are a precondition for idealism.

The authors of the book include the school of philosophers Yang Zhu, Mo-tzu and Mohism among the main materialist philosophical schools of Ancient China. The authors of the book include the Mencius School, legalism, the School of Ming-tzu, Zhuang Zhou, and Hui Shi.

According to V. Dmytrychenko and V. Shynkaruk, the “struggle” of these schools consisted of fundamentally different interpretations of ethical issues (for example, Yang Zhu’s “ethics of rational egoism” vs Mencius’s teaching on the innateness of moral norms), logic, and the theory of knowledge (Xun-tzu’s “materialistic sensualism”; Mohism vs Zhuang Zhou’s “relativism”), public administration (“theory of the contractual origin of the state”, Mo-tzu’s “the principle of universal love” vs. legalism).

It should be noted that the affiliation of a philosopher or school to the line of materialism or the line of idealism is presented by the authors of

the book confusingly and inaccurately, because “materialism” or “idealism” in this context is not absolute. They depend on the particular field of philosophy (Ethics, logic and theory of knowledge, public administration). For instance, according to the text of the book, the “legalism” in matters of public administration is depicted as “idealistic” (Dmytrychenko V. & Shynkaruk V., 1958, p. 50) whereas in matters of religion as “materialistic” (Dmytrychenko V. & Shynkaruk V., 1958, p. 50).

However, in our opinion, V. Dmytrychenko and V. Shynkaruk associate the “line of materialism” in the philosophy of Ancient China with the names Lao-tzu, Yang Zhou, Mo-tzu, Xun-tzu and, finally, the philosopher Wang Chong, and the “line of idealism” is connected with the teachings of Confucius, Mencius, Ming Jia, Zhuang Zhou and Hui Shi. However, we tend to take our point of view more as open to debate rather than final.

The main problems of Ancient Chinese philosophy

According to V. Dmytrychenko and V. Shynkaruk, the key problems of Ancient Chinese philosophy are the problem of world unity, the problem of knowledge, the problem of wise public administration, which is closely related to the problem of the relationship between “old” and “new”, and the ethical problem of happiness. According to V. Dmytrychenko and V. Shynkaruk, the comprehension and solution of these problems were carried out in the forms of naïve dialectics, ethics and political studies.

The authors of the book believe that historically the first in the philosophy of Ancient China was the problem of the unity of the universe: “There are reasons to believe that the question of the unity of all things began to concern the Chinese people somewhere in the middle of the 2nd millennium BCE. Even then, the Chinese sages saw this unity of all things in five elements: water, fire, wood, metal and earth. It is reflected in the ancient book of the Chinese sage Guo Yu (Ancient Word). It is written here that the fundamental basis of 10,000 things is the five elements: water, fire, wood, metal, earth” (Dmytrychenko V. & Shynkaruk V., 1958, p. 14).

According to V. Dmytrychenko and V. Shynkaruk, solving the problem of the unity of all things is the philosophical content of the ancient Chinese works *I Ching* and *Yinfu Ching*. According to the authors of the work *I Ching* (*Book of Changes*), the unity of all things is described by the categories “Qi” and “Tai Qi”. The authors interpret “Qi” as the only basis of all elements, which is of exceptional importance: “In its content, it [category “Qi” – Authors] resembles concepts such as air, ether, elementary particles of things” (Dmytrychenko V. & Shynkaruk V., 1958, p. 15). The category of “Tai Qi” is interpreted by Ukrainian philosophers as the source of “Qi”, as

a “great beginning”, from which “under the influence of opposing forces – ‘yin’ and ‘yang’ – all things arise”. Using the categories of “Qi” and “Tai Qi”, they compare the philosophy of Ancient China with the philosophy of Ancient Greece: “Hence, if the Ancient Greeks said that ‘all things come into the World out of Chaos’, the Chinese sages said that all things come from Tai Qi”. (Dmytrychenko V. & Shynkaruk V., 1958, p. 15).

V. Dmytrychenko and V. Shynkaruk evaluate the book *I Ching* as “a step forward in the development of materialist philosophy, because philosophical thought from the search for the unity of the world in something special (water, metal, wood, etc.) went on to finding this unity in the universal, which cannot be identified with any of the five elements” (Dmytrychenko V. & Shynkaruk V., 1958, pp. 15–16).

V. Dmytrychenko and V. Shynkaruk evaluate the book *Yinfu Ching* as a deepening of the achievements of the Ancient Chinese philosophy. They connect the philosophical content of the book *Yinfu Ching* with the category of “Tao”. Ukrainian philosophers note that the category of “Tao” is challenging to translate into any other language, including the Ukrainian language. They suggest literally translating “Tao” into the Ukrainian words “way”, “path”, “line”, whereas the philosophical translation of “Tao” is the category of “regularity” (Dmytrychenko V. & Shynkaruk V., 1958, p. 16). Ukrainian philosophers assess the emergence of the category of “Tao” as an “extremely important step” in the development of Ancient Chinese philosophy, as its content indicates a break with religious ideas about changes in nature as a result of supernatural forces: all phenomena arise and disappear not as a result of supernatural creatures, but as a result of their inherent regularity” (Dmytrychenko V. & Shynkaruk V., 1958, p. 16). Ukrainian philosophers conclude that by the beginning of the first millennium in Ancient China such philosophical problems as (1) the problem of unity and diversity of things; (2) the problem of opposing forces in a single material substance; (3) the problem of natural regularity; (4) the problem of the naturalness of the human soul and consciousness had been put forward (Dmytrychenko V. & Shynkaruk V., 1958, p. 17).

The authors pay special attention to the problems of the development of dialectics, logic and theory of knowledge in the philosophy of Ancient China. However, it should be noted that Ukrainian philosophers understand dialectics as a method of philosophy, so they call the dialectics in the philosophy of Ancient China “naïve”. The authors of the book call Lao-tzu “an outstanding dialectician” not only of Ancient China but also of world philosophy. They interpret the relationship between the categories of “Tao” and “Te” in Lao-tzu’s “Tao-Te-Ching” as understanding and solving the problems of “unity of essence and quality and their differences”, “the rela-

tionship between general essence and specific essence”. Ukrainian philosophers also believe that Lao-tzu was the first who posed and attempted to solve the problem of the dialectic of general and particular, abstract and concrete (Dmytrychenko V. & Shynkaruk V., 1958, pp. 23–24): “[...] Through a specific essence, we know the universal essence, and through the universal, the specific. There is a deep dialectical relationship here, and Lao-tzu understands this when he argues that ‘where’ is impossible to know without knowing ‘Tao,’ and ‘Tao’ is impossible to know without knowing ‘where’”.

Ukrainian philosophers also interpret Lao-tzu’s philosophy as “the desire to find the transition from one opposite to another”, which is carried out by understanding the category of “measure” and the problem of the relationship between “old” and “new” (Dmytrychenko, V. & Shynkaruk, V., 1958, p. 25). They call Lao-tzu’s dialectic “naïve”, explaining this because in his dialectic Lao-tzu prefers “unity”, not the “struggle” of opposites. In this respect, the authors of the book consider Lao-tzu and Heraclitus to be similar.

V. Dmytrychenko and V. Shynkaruk believe that the problems of logic and the theory of knowledge are essential in the philosophy of Ancient China. For instance, the followers of Mo-tzu (Mohists) made a significant contribution to the development of logic and theory of knowledge. Their main achievements in the theory of knowledge, from the Ukrainian philosophers’ standpoint, are: (1) substantiation of the idea that the object of cognition is independent of human consciousness; (2) an explanation of the three ways of cognition, which are “knowledge perceived by other people”, “knowledge arising from the activity of our thinking”, “knowledge arising from personal observation”; (3) developing the categories of “tautology”, “difference” and “causality”. In the field of logic, according to Ukrainian philosophers, “Mohists have established seven types of logical cognition”, which we now call “deduction”, “hypothesis”, “induction”, “analogy” (Dmytrychenko V. & Shynkaruk V., 1958, p. 49).

Among the key problems of the philosophy of Ancient China, Ukrainian philosophers also point out ethical studies, which are closely related to political studies. V. Dmytrychenko and V. Shynkaruk pay special attention to the ethical and political views of Lao-tzu and Confucius. Moreover, they portray the ethical ideas and related political ideas of Lao-tzu and Confucius as the opposite. Ukrainian philosophers evaluate the ethics and political ideas of Lao-tzu as “materialistic”, “progressive”, “promising”, while they evaluate the ethical teachings and political ideas of Confucius as “idealistic” and “contradictory”, as well as “justifying domination and subjugation of the poor to the rich” (Dmytrychenko V. & Shynkaruk V.,

1958, p. 43). Ukrainian philosophers consider other ethical and political ideas in the philosophy of Ancient China as developing the philosophy of Lao-tzu, or the philosophy of Confucius. In addition to Lao-tzu and Confucius, the book of Ukrainian philosophers examines the ethical and political ideas of such philosophers of Ancient China as Yang Zhu, Mencius, Mo-tzu, Xun-tzu, Ming Jia, Zhuang Zhou and others. However, V. Dmytrychenko and V. Shynkaruk describe them as subordinate to either the philosophy of Lao-tzu or the philosophy of Confucius.

The Key philosophers of Ancient China

As it has been already mentioned, V. Dmytrychenko and V. Shynkaruk describe and analyse the ideas of a large number of philosophers of Ancient China. However, in this book, we can see that the authors paid particular attention to three philosophers of Ancient China, namely Lao-tzu, Confucius and Wang Chong. This is evidenced by the fact that V. Dmytrychenko and V. Shynkaruk dedicated separate chapters of their book to the aforementioned three Chinese philosophers. The peculiarity of the perception of the figures of these philosophers of Ancient China in the Ukrainian philosophy of the Soviet period of the second half of the 20th century is that Lao-tzu's philosophy is perceived as containing elements of "materialism" and "idealism", Confucius' philosophy is interpreted as "idealism" and Wang Chong's philosophy as "materialism".

Discussion and conclusions

The results of the study of the perception of Ancient Chinese philosophy in the Ukrainian philosophy of the Soviet period form, in our opinion, a productive field for discussion. Its results may well be valuable for the development of studies in the history of philosophy in general, as well as for the studies in Ukrainian philosophy of the Soviet period and Ancient Chinese philosophy.

The first debatable question can be formulated as follows: "Is it possible today to go beyond the West-centric guidelines in the study of the history of philosophy?". This question inspires many accompanying debatable questions such as "Is it possible to abandon Hegel's theory in the modern history of philosophy studies?" (This question was formulated by the Ukrainian philosopher Yurii Kushakov in face-to-face conversations with the authors of this article); "Is it possible to understand philosophy in a different way than that which originated in the culture of Ancient Greece and, subsequently, in other European cultures?"; "Is Ukrainian

philosophy part of the European philosophical tradition?” and other similar questions. The authors of this paper tend to give an affirmative answer to these questions, but on the condition of unequivocally acknowledging that overcoming Western-centric guidelines in studies of the history of philosophy cannot be direct and complete. The experience of investigating the perception of Chinese philosophy in Ukraine convinces the authors that, on the one hand, philosophy existed and continues to exist in alternative Western culture; however, its knowledge is always more complete if it is carried out in terms of another tradition and culture. In other words, comparative studies in the history of philosophy allow us to expand our knowledge about what is being compared as well as who is comparing it.

The second debatable issue is methodological. It can be formulated as follows: “Is reception studies an effective and reliable method of studying history of philosophy in general, and Ukrainian philosophy of the Soviet era and the philosophy of Ancient China in particular?”. Despite all our sympathy for reception studies as a methodological approach in the history of philosophy, we consider it necessary to recognise some of its weaknesses. For example, quite often, the recipient transforms the image of the perceived philosophy so that its carriers cannot identify it. Moreover, the experience of our research shows that the reception does not always depict the “true colours” of the recipient. Sometimes this idea proposed by T. Mróz is not confirmed.

The third question, which has substantial grounds for discussion, can be formulated as follows: “Can we trust the texts written by Ukrainian philosophers of the Soviet era about the philosophy of Ancient China?”. There are at least two grounds for doubt. First, Ukrainian Soviet philosophy of the second half of the 20th century used many clichés and stylistic rules that could significantly change the philosopher’s opinion in the process from its original form (for example, in a manuscript) to an already published text. Secondly, according to the bibliography of the book by V. Dmytrychenko and V. Shynkaruk, the authors did not use any source written in the Chinese language. The position of the authors of this article is the following. We tend to value the texts of Ukrainian philosophers of the Soviet period if they are written in Ukrainian in the form of a monographic study. Other texts need to be scrutinised. After all, a high degree of reliability in the study of the perception of the philosophy of Ancient China in Ukraine, in any case, will have knowledge about the recipient, that is, primarily about the Ukrainian philosophers of the Soviet period.

The results we obtained during the study are not exhaustive of the stated topic. The authors consider it vital to conduct a separate study of the perception of the main problems and key personalities of the philosophy of

Ancient China in the Ukrainian philosophy of the Soviet period. The authors also believe that it would be valuable, useful and necessary to research the perception of other historical periods of Chinese philosophy and its modern ideas in Ukrainian philosophy of the 20th and 21st centuries. We consider the comparative study of the philosophical terminology of the Ukrainian and Chinese languages to be essential and scientifically valuable.

As a result of the study, we came to the following conclusions. Ukrainian philosophers of the Soviet period of the second half of the 20th century studied the philosophy of Ancient China and formed a holistic, systematic theoretical model of its understanding and interpretation. The history of Chinese philosophy was taught both at the faculties of philosophy and as part of a general course in philosophy which was studied by all students of higher educational institutions. The study of the philosophy of Ancient China inspired the emergence and implementation in Ukrainian studies of the history of philosophy of a new methodological approach, the essence of which is a critical attitude to Hegel's theory and methodology of the history of philosophy in particular, and "Eurocentrism" and "West-centrism" as a way of understanding philosophy. Ukrainian philosophers of the Soviet period in the second half of the 20th century improved the existing terminology and developed a new terminology in the Ukrainian language which is used to describe the philosophy of Ancient China.

Acknowledgements

This research is done in the framework of the Project "Chinese-European studies in Philosophy" supported by the Guangdong University of Petrochemical Technology (Maoming, Guangdong Province, China). It is also supported by Guangdong Social Science Planning Project: GD15XWW11.

The authors would like to express their profound gratitude to the Scientific Library named after Mykhailo Maksymovych of the Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, especially to the Director of the Library Dr Oleg Serbin.

STUDIA CHIŃSKIE W ZAKRESIE FILOZOFII UKRAIŃSKIEJ OKRESU SOWIECKIEGO

(STRESZCZENIE)

W artykule przedstawiono wyniki badań nad obecnością starożytnej filozofii chińskiej w filozofii ukraińskiej epoki sowieckiej drugiej połowy XX w. Opracowanie oparte jest na unikalnym materiale źródłowym, monografii autorstwa dwóch wpływowych autorzytetów filozofii radzieckiej – Wołodymyra Dmytryczenki i Wołodymyra Szyńkaruka,

opublikowanej w języku ukraińskim w 1958 r. Autorzy artykułu podjęli się próby opisanego sposobu postrzegania starożytnej filozofii chińskiej, przedstawili zasady ideowe tej filozofii oraz jej zarysowali główne problemy podejmowane przez przedstawicieli filozofii ukraińskiej okresu sowieckiego. Ponadto zaprezentowali wiodące stanowiska teoretyczne i metodologię badań w zakresie historii filozofii w ukraińskiej kulturze filozoficznej okresu sowieckiego. Autorzy podkreślają – na podstawie pogłębionej analizy – że specyfika ukraińskich studiów nad historią filozofii w okresie sowieckim polega na odejściu od teorii historii właściwej dla filozofii Hegla, której głównym teoretycznym i metodologicznym mankamentem jest „eurocentryzm”. Oznacza to, że należałoby krytycznie przemyśleć rolę i znaczenie heglowskiego rozumienia historii filozofii w ukraińskiej kulturze filozoficznej okresu sowieckiego drugiej połowy XX w. Wykazali ponadto, że podejście porównawcze i studia recepcyjne są skutecznymi metodami badania historii filozofii ukraińskiej okresu sowieckiego.

CHINESE STUDIES IN UKRAINIAN PHILOSOPHY OF THE SOVIET PERIOD

(SUMMARY)

This paper presents the results of the authors' study of the perception of Ancient Chinese philosophy in the Ukrainian philosophy of the Soviet period in the second half of the 20th century. The study is based on a unique source: a monograph by two authoritative and influential Soviet philosophers, Volodymyr Dmytrychenko and Volodymyr Shynkaruk, which was published in Ukrainian in 1958. The authors described the way of perception of Ancient Chinese philosophy, its ideological principles, main problems and key personalities in the Ukrainian philosophy of the Soviet period, and systematically presented them. The paper presents the authors' conclusions about the leading theoretical positions and methodology of the history of philosophy in the Ukrainian philosophical culture of the Soviet period. The authors concluded that the peculiarity of the development of studies in the history of philosophy in Ukraine in the Soviet era is a departure from Hegel's theory of the history of philosophy, the main theoretical and methodological shortcoming of which is "Eurocentrism". This circumstance allows us to assert a critical rethinking of Hegel's theory of the history of philosophy in the Ukrainian philosophical culture of the Soviet period of the second half of the 20th century. Also, in this paper, the authors prove the point of view that a comparative approach and reception studies are effective methods of studying the history of Ukrainian philosophy of the Soviet period.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Andros Yevhen, 2017, *Volodymyr Shynkaruk: Anthropologic Turning Point in Ukrainian Philosophy of the Second Half of the 20th Century*, *Filosofska Dumka*, Vol. 1, p. 66–73, URL: <https://dumka.philosophy.ua/index.php/fd/article/view/266>.
- Bazaluk Oleg, 2017, *The Strategies of Systematization of the Theories of Education. The Main Meaning and Features of the Theories of Education of Plato's and Isocrates' Lines*, *Future Human Image*, Vol. 7, p. 11–27.

- Lakh Roman, 2016, *Sinology in the Creative Legacy of John Svit (1897–1989)*. Chinese Studies, 2016, Vol. 1–2, p. 136–150, URL: <http://chinese-studies.com.ua/en/Archive/2016/1-2/17>.
- Liashenko Iryna, 2018, *Wilhelm Dilthey: Understanding the Human World*. Philosophy and Cosmology, Vol. 20, p.163–169. <https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/20/16>
- Mróz Tomasz, 2018, *Reply to the Paper “National Philosophy as a Subject of Comparative Research”*. Sententiae, Vol. 37, p. 130–135, doi: 10.22240/sent37.01.130.
- Mróz Toamsz, 2016, *Selected Issues in the History of Polish Philosophy*. Vilnius: Vilnius University.
- Dmytrychenko Volodymyr and Shynkaruk Volodymyr, 1958, *The Development of Philosophical Thought in Ancient China*. Kyiv, Publishing Centre of the Kyiv State University named after Taras Shevchenko.
- Rudenko Sergii and Turenko Vitaliy, 2019, *Formation and Development of the Philosophical Anthropology Studies in Soviet Ukraine*. Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research, Vol. 16, p. 143–156. doi: 10.15802/ampr.v0i16.188911.
- Rudenko Sergii and Yosypenko Serhii, 2018, *National Philosophy as a Subject of Comparative Research*, Sententiae, Vol. 37, Issue 1, p. 120–129, doi: 10.22240/sent37.01.120.
- Sobolievskiy Yaroslav, 2018, *Soviet and Ukrainian Studies of American Philosophy: Translation of Philosophical Texts*, Future Human Image, Vol. 9, p. 101–106. doi:10.29202/fhi/9/10.
- Tabachkovskii Vitaliy, 2002, *Vladimir Illarionovich Shynkaruk – In memoriam*. Voprosy Filosofii, Vol. 6, p. 189–190.