



ISSN 2450-6486

<http://ehs.eeipsy.org><https://doi.org/10.38014/ehs-ss.2021.4.01>**Irina MANOKHA**

Ontology of Time: explanation of the “Present” (in the context of the works and views of G.I. Chelpanov)

IRINA MANOKHA. Ontology of time: explanation of the “Present” (in the context of the works and views of G.I. Chelpanov). *The article-essay will analyze several key concepts-phenomena of personal being - Individual, Social, Time. In different paradigms, they could be called modes of being, existentials, ontological constructs, etc. - mandatory and necessary dimensions, levels, the sphere of development of life - and individual potential - of a particular person. Here they will be considered both in the context of the historical past and the historical present: how they manifest themselves in the life of a particular person (or a particular generation as a whole) and how they can be used to analyze what is happening and model the future - historical and one's own. Georgy Chelpanov's teachings about the Social, the Individual and - about Time were presented as a model example of interpretive models. The methods of theorizing and modeling in this study were the principles of classical ontology, hermeneutics, historical-critical analysis, comparative analysis, meaningful reconstruction and ontologically oriented interpretation. The*

purpose of the study is to show the ontological relationship of these levels of development of human being, the impossibility of extracting / rejecting any of them - for a holistic attitude to one's life and living one's life as an integral entity. The second layer of the research objectives is a historical and critical analysis of the teachings of the social, individual and time - one of the founders of Russian psychological thought, the organizer of science and philosophical and psychological education - Georgy Chelpanov.

Keywords: G.I. Chelpanov; social; individual; time; being; space; mode of being; Existence; analysis and modeling; temporality; individual potential.

1. Introduction

The present today is un-believable, un-imaginary and un-expected. Nowadays the past seems to be far, swiftly leaving us even further behind every moment and un-replicable in that former, habitual form... The future is not understandable, not touchable in full scope, and thus, full of anxiety...

Before now the past was a solid part of the present. As if the past did not exist, because everything that had happened, was a number of elements, firmly entwined in the picture of the present, which continues, is actual and is taking place... But now it has appeared- the past, which means something that is irreversible. It is behind a high mountain and vast ocean of time, experience and emotions, that had been felt and lived through.

The time of a catastrophe or philosophical lounge?

Time to rewrite everything or to write everything in a new way?

Time to review, retry and retest all the instruments of "to be", which have got accumulated in the suitcase of being- those which got stuck under the lining, or the dusty ones, or those gleaming and polished due to frequent use?

Attachment? Passion? Duty? Love?

The present is asking itself in a loud voice-Where you Were? How did you Exist?" Here and Now" or "There and Then"? In your *social*? In someone else's *individual*? Or maybe in *your own* individual and *someone else's* social?

Our *social time* today is many-sided and unexpectedly *different*... How will it look tomorrow? How does *individual time* grow through it or gets entwined with it? Is time *age*? Is time *planning*? Is time *achievements*? Those we met or those who departed? Those we found or those we left behind? Those we keep or those we let go?

2. Social...

During pandemic, lockdowns and totally imposed online communication “social” is the first to fall prey in comparison to habitual, pre-pandemic mode of social existence. Due to “diversification of modes of existence” which took place during pandemic, our “social” started to sound and vibrate, it “was amazed by the changes that took place”, as everything became not the way it was before. What was to expect- the “final monopolization” of online socialization and communication? Or the opposite - “sobering” from online enslavement and especial actualization of “off-line value”?

According to G.I Chelpanov, “...human nature can be fully explored only in *social life*”, since the essence of a human being lies in his life in society (Chelpanov G.I., 1926.) As a follower of L. Feuerbach, Chelpanov states, that only in life with the others and for the others, an individual reaches his purpose. On the other side, *individual psychology* only in conjunction with *collective psychology* gains completeness, this thesis belongs to W. Wundt, and Chelpanov agrees with him, thus acclaiming that spiritual life of an individual can be fully understood only in case his social life is explored. While talking about methodology of this exploration, “we ought not to oppose subjective to objective, but introspective to reflexive”, since “social relations of a human being raise complicated psychic processes, which cannot be expressed through reflexes” (Chelpanov G.I., 1926.)

Achitectonics of elements which constitute “sociality of an individual” may look and be interpreted in many ways, as there is a huge number of methods and approaches in psychology, sociology, as well as in other close fields of science in order to define and explain it (sociality). We can also mention that even up to date thesaurus of social-psychological studies has not been completely “standardized” while it remains rather metaphoric and explanatory rather than affirming.

In the beginning of the XX century, when psychology as science was shaping itself and forming its’ thesaurus, arguments about notions took place, definitions and thesaurus in principle were discussed on pages of journals, as well as in scientific circles. For example, in discussions with reflexologists, the notion of “social irritation”, introduced by M.A. Reisner, was opposed to the physiological notion of “irritant”, but at the same time it was associated with the notional picture of psychological states and qualities of an individual, such as “irritation as state”, as well as “irritability as personal quality”, etc. According to Chelpanov, “irritation” as notion can be applied only to simple feelings. In social relations consciousness

is being affected not by irritation, but by things and complicated events, which cannot be called "irritation." (Chelpanov G.I. 1926).

Today "sociality" of a person is more frequently being described through his:

- «social role»;
- «social status»;
- personal«*social characteristics*» (though of psycho-physiological nature)- being an introvert or an extravert
- etc.

From the point of view of current social psychology and sociology, specifics of "social", which characterize social and society phenomena, can be defined through:

- *relations* «individual – group», as well as between groups, attitude towards one's own social status, as well as to events and processes of the life of the society;
- certain *states* of an individual, caused by *social relations*;
- *common social qualities*, which characterize various individuals and groups of individuals, as a result of their integration in social relations;
- etc.

In classical paradigm *social* is a condition and consequence of *team work* of various individuals through their communication and interactions, and can be expressed through appreciation, orientation, behavior as a whole, mode of life, etc. *Social* reflects in this case the content and character of interactions between individuals (separate people, groups and communities), and is a "field" and result of *social roles* played by an individual while being a member of a certain social community or a group.

In contemporary ontologically and existentially oriented tradition, while applying it to understanding of a human being, an individual, "social" is one of the modes of exploration of individual essence of a person, and it can be defined as "Me for the Others": that is what I manifest about myself to the other, how I show myself to the other, how I build relationships with the other and how I form the picture of my social being in principle. "Social" of a person emerges as combination of ontologically oriented- existential and phenomenological constructs:

- Social: Me for myself and the others? For me or for the other?
- Social: Hidden or Shown?
- Social: Born from Inside or Acquired from Outside?
- Social: it- Evident and Possible or Incomprehensible in its' Evident

Inevidence?

We can go on enumerating the given constructs, reformulating them, restructuring and using notions from various philosophical and psychological paradigms, but is it important to define and state the very fact of existence of definite mode of human existence, which indicates and reflects certain and specific combination of characteristics and qualities of a person, some “sociality” as opposite to reflexology paradigm- as indicated in his work “Social Psychology and Conditioned Reflexes” (Chelpanov G.I., 1926.), which is interesting today not only from historical, but from scientific-practical point of view.

We still need to systematically study how the “social” of our contemporary is changing (or has changed?) under the influence and in aftermath of the pandemic of COVID-19.

3. Individual...

When one starts talking about something “*individual*”, personal, unique and close, one wants to stop generalizing and theorizing, choosing instead to be very precise, emotional and at the same time to be carefully reflecting, as if exploring its’ image in one’s personal mirror, while intensely looking into it, watching and grasping its’ meaning as if from outside, in one or another reflection and embodiment...

In this article we will start to unveil the meaning of “*individual*” of a person as a combination of ontologically oriented constructs- both existential and phenomenological, as well as their contents and practical interpretation:

- Time: Do we have much or Little?
- Time is it inside or outside of me?
- Time: is it Flowing, Running or is it just Being?
- Time: is it Evident and Possible or Incomprehensible in its’ Evident Inevidence?

In traditional psychology “*individual*” is often understood as analogous to the notion of “*individuality*” deriving from Latin *individualitas*, which means indivisibility, or *individuum*, meaning something which cannot be divided. In this case individuality would mean “combination of features and personal qualities of a human being, which manifest themselves through character, interests, qualities, etc., that make one person different from another”. Also, we can often encounter with a definition of an individuality as a characteristic (or a quality) of a person, which defines and features the person as “an author of his own life”, as a “creator of

unique life path and special world view.

Ontologically oriented philosophy and psychology address the meaning of "individual" towards a person as "specific individual being", which is capable in his existence to implement and realize all aspects, elements and characteristics of being in principle, but in his personal unique way. This very human ability of a person as "concrete individual being" defines (shapes and grasps) his *individuality*.

According to S. Frank (1990), *individuality is constantly present in reality*, both in complete and undivided way, but its' study should assume its' unique nature, both concrete and singular in this entity of true reality.

Human ability to *develop the individual world of "me"* is being explained by the ability of conscious to reflect "its' very self"; "a person in his natural self-consciousness is separate from any philosophical reflection, but is able to feel and experience whatever he is going through, is capable of "internal: being as of something, belonging to some field, which is different from the reality of objects. At the same time, the fact of human ability to form the world of "me" does not restrict him from the ability to *develop his outer interactions*, moreover, it causes and provides this development with *new ways and means*, which this very person creates according to his unique individual nature and his essence.

The process of building a human individual "world" is long and reflects maturity of his ability to master the time of his life and to construct its' own space. Nevertheless, we should consider the fact of self-realization of a human as the one who has "internal being" to be a starting point of birth of the world of "me": "one needs special spiritual tension, special attention in order to see in this dream-like, slipping away, foggy and shapeless way of being, that anyway, in reality there is some existence, some sort of natural, closing and therefore unavailable to doubt and negation reality" (Frank S.L., 1990, p.322).

For each person as a unit of singular existence, *potentiality* is defined as *essential quality of individual personal existence*, which manifests itself in consecutive realization of *intentions and potentials* of "singular existence". *Intention* can be explained as essential quality proper to singular "self-existence" as mode of human existence in principle, potential is regarded from the point of view of human ability to implement intentions of human way of living and realization of individually unique characteristics of personal being. Generalized ability of a person to unfold his individual existence in his individually inherent way may be called *potential of individual existence of a person*. The ability to implement an individual's

purpose and *goal* in specific “life cause” or “occupation”, which can be produced in forecast of social and individual success of a person in this process, describes specific practical form of unfolding human individual potential in time and space of his life.

Experience of personal activities presents itself as *potential* of given personality in the field of exploration and transformation of the world. As a rule, these potentials have different modalities and applicable directions. Nevertheless, their unique combination in relation to singular “individual existence”, manifests *individual potential of personal activities in the world*, as well as reveals ratio between ‘possible’ and “real” in the experience of the given personality.

Subjective “world” of “me” is unique, not tangible to full extent, but is always real and singular. This construct also represents one of analogous notions known as “individual” or “individuality”. Another analog of the notion of “individual” is the notion of “being humane”: “staying to be humanly concrete, the entity of being humane evidently conveys in itself, according to its nature, definitely everything in the world”. (N. Kuzansky, 1979, p.258). Humanity in itself “suggests” ability to comprehend the essential as it is, to grasp the meaning of everything. “Humanity is entity in definitely human way, as well as infinity, and if entity has the quality to unfold everything that exists out of itself, since entity is existence, folding in its’ simplicity everything that exists, a human being has the capability to unfold out of himself everything that belongs to the field of his sphere, i.e. to produce out of the potency of his center...As human force in human way approaches all this, everything in the world approaches him, and aspiration to grasp all the world on behalf of this wonderful force is nothing else but in human way unfolding of the universal whole in it” (Kuzanskyi N., 1979, p.260-261).

“Humanity as it is “ is being realized through realization of truly human *ways of activity*. Among them are self-realization, similarity, creativity, morality (or moral activity) and spirituality (spiritual activity) [1, 4, 14, 15, 16, 19, 20].

Self-realization is ontological condition of unfolding of the essence of human existence, which is the one to define the direction influencing human activities: exploring and transforming phenomena of the outer world, an individual realizes his being and manifests his essence. “Life is existence in self-realization. That is why a plant reaches its purpose by being and acting the way it is supposed to, that is being a plant; a feeling being reaches its’ purpose by acting as a feeling being; a conscious being-

by acting as a conscious being. (Feuerbach L., 1995, p.337).

Self-realization manifests itself in relation to similarity of all those who exist, which is reflected (presented) in existence of specific "me". *Relation of similarity* is "transrational entity" (S.L.Frank), which conditions "openness" to the other existing being and to his own self, which makes it possible to exist for those who are similar to the others and to himself. The very mode of human existence is laced with the *relations of similarities*, since the direct exploring and transforming influence (as the main forms of being) can be implemented by a human being only towards those similar to himself. A person, while realizing relation of exploration to someone existing, defines it as "*similar to me and to my essence*". While learning how to transform this existence, a person acquires "similarity" of a higher level, thus enlarging its' scope, space and time of existence. Therefore, a person discovers similarity of phenomena, to which he did not have access before; as "the accessible space of similar existing beings" grows, while the meaningful space of *individually unique essence* of the person widens as well.

Self-realization, meaning human mode of action, is artful and creative. The real nature of an individual lies in *the centre of creative energy*. There is no individual without creativity (N.A. Berdiaiev). Creativity, the ability to create, is ontologically inherent to human existence as to natural being of self. In reality of human singular existence it can be suppressed and hidden, or just vice versa- revealed and individually developed, but in any case it keeps its' ontic content. We can even talk about "creative instinct", which is initially inherent to a human being, and in certain living conditions it requires confirmation of authentic humanity, and brings satisfaction.

"Creativity means spiritual doing, during which a person forgets about himself, gets distracted from his being in the act of creation, he is immersed in the subject of his activity. In this process a person finds himself in a state of unusual uplifting of all his being. Creativity is always a shock, a means to overcome egotism of human life. A person is ready to pay with his soul for the sake of creative act." (Berdiaiev N.A., 1991, p.30). In this "creative self-denial" an individual finds himself, he manifests unbelievable creative force of humanity, as he is discovering existence as a whole of being.

Self-realization of a person, as the main mode of activity, is always *moral* in content and is means of implementation, since human existence is social in character. *Morality is a "special purpose" of humanity*. (I. Feuerbach).

Morality, as special human attitude, is possible only in relation to similar existing being. A person realizes moral attitude towards existing beings as a whole, towards concrete forms of existing beings, as well as towards human existence as it is. Moral relationships are more dense in human society, where similarity of the existing beings "belongs to the highest category". A Man realizes his morality by acting responsibly and showing initiative in his behavior, in relation to his obligation and love for the similar existing beings. While morality is of social nature, it is always individual, "morality is a creative task of an individual" (Berdiaiev N.A.). Being humane is related to spirituality (N.A. Berdiayiev). Spirituality manifests itself when a man fills every moment of his existence with valuable content. The main purpose of life lies in conquering spirituality, obtaining it and grasping of its' meaning. By realizing his spirituality, a person "objectifies his spirit", he implements it in concrete subject-existent". In principle, spirituality is always subjective, it reveals authentic, unique "self" of a concrete person. The very "in-depth" "self" of a person is connected to spirituality.

Humanity means to realize its' entity in human way, which folds in itself everything existing, and in realization of itself unfolds it. *Humanity is an intention of singular existence of a human individual*, which in time and space of human life strives to its' implementation, it realizes the very potential of *individual human existence*. *Intentionality and potentiality* are in fact ontological qualities of being existent, which lace through existence as a whole, as well as through each separate form. Intentionality and potentiality can be defined as inner in-depth conditions of unfolding of everything existing in reality and the universe. That is why all outer and inner relationships of existence are being filled with intentional and potential content.

Potentiality of human existence as of natural self-existence stretches in time: it is always in the past as something finished, fulfilled: it is always in the present as something which is being fulfilled, done, it is always in the future as something which is yet to be fulfilled. But, as potentiality "colors up" the essence of individual existence, which stays unchanged in the process of unfolding, development and becoming, and which combines in its' present both the past and the future, thanks to this fact prognostic exploration of the given existence it is possible, as well as it is possible to forecast its' *potential movement*".

While defining ontological quality of individual human existence to unfold unique singular-concrete essence in its' becoming and

development, it is possible and necessary to talk about *potential of human existence*. *Intentionality* of individual existence lies in unfolding of existential characteristics of human mode of existence as it is unfolding in reality of human personal life.

Потенциальность индивидуального бытия определяется его неповторимой, индивидуальной сущностью самостоятельного сущего. Поскольку о-существленное сущее, как онтологический "результат" бытия человека, всегда в будущем, всегда проецирует момент настоящего в предстоящее, сущее индивидуального человеческого бытия всегда – положительная возможность жизни конкретного человека, стремящаяся к своему во-площению в действительности, к своему завершению в неповторимом "мире" самобытия человека, к своему признанию как ценности, постигающей в себе "всеединство бытия как сущего". *Потенциальность* поэтому – "существенный определяющий признак непосредственного самобытия", его *онтологическое свойство*.

Potentiality of individual existence is defined by its' unique individual essence of independent existing being. Since the implemented existent being, as ontological "result" of human existence is always in the future, always projects the moment of the present into the upcoming, individual human existence is always a positive possibility in the life of a concrete person, which strives to its' implementation in reality, to its' fulfillment in the unique "world" of human self-existence, to his acknowledgment of his own value, which explores in itself "the overall unity of being in existence". Therefore *potentiality* is an "essential defining sign of direct self-being", its' *ontological quality*.

The rate of "individual" and "social" in individual and social history is being expressed not only in meaningful issues of scientific knowledge, addressing an individual and existential being of his "me", but also in acknowledgement of individual influences of "singular existence" on cultural-historic process as a whole. Through these influences the real individuality and singular uniqueness of a human being unfolds and gets implemented.

So how can we explore the very nature of "individual", as well as the process of his becoming and development? According to G.I. Chelpanov, these tasks are being solved by the so called individual psychology, which became a special separate stage of development of psychology and became a separate science, which has in its' arsenal its' own methods of studies and exploration. (G.I. Chelpanov, 1910).

According to G.I.Chelpanov, “the outstanding interest to individual psychology, which, to significant extent coincides with the development of experimental pedagogy, can be explained by the extremely important goals it sets. The final goal of individual psychology lies in exploration of spiritual qualities of one or another individual, i.e. to find out not only how he is thinking, feeling and what he is doing, but also how he will be thinking, feeling and what he will be doing in this or that situation. If we can find out how an individual will react in one or another situation, we will have a possibility to *psychologically diagnose* him” (G.I. Chelpanov, 1910).

So how can we diagnose tectonic changes in our “individual”, caused by Today, Current and Present?

4. Time...

Time is one of the main modes of human existence. “Being and time” is the basic existential duo, which characterizes human being and existence, it is acknowledged by various philosophical and psychological paradigms and is interpreted within them in many different, and sometimes drastically opposite ways.

Time in a myth is *two-dimensional*. Mythological time appears in two dimensions – *sacral* and *profane*. It is possible to grasp only profane, as we exist only within its’ frame, we are *present* in it, we *are* in it and we can testify the existence of anything in it. Sacral time is incomprehensible by default, it is some “*once upon a time*”, where everything appeared and took place. But our profane is definitely someone’s sacral, which will appear and gain this status, possibly later, but it definitely will.

Time in classic philosophy is, as a rule, *three-dimensional*, it contains the past, the present and the future. Though some authors find in these three dimensions some *under-* and *over-*levels (or axis).

For example D.U. Dunn in his “Essay with time” (D.U.Dunn, 1927) suggested that a man exists in two measurements or on two levels at the same time: *1-in subjective flow of time* and *2-outside of time axis*, which allows him to simultaneously feel the past, the present and the future. This, for example, Dunn describes the phenomena of *deja vu*, assuming that a person is capable of “perceiving events which take place outside mind flow of a common observer”. Dunn suggested the existence and analyzed “subjective flow of time”, he assumed the possibility of existence of endless hierarchy of time dimensions, according to levels of consciousness.

Analytical philosophy (G. Frege, J. Moore, B. Russell, L. Wittgenstein, etc.) brought up and developed theory of multi-measured time. For example, J. Benard suggested existence of 3 actual time dimensions: 1) "time" - habitual for a human being linear course of events;

2) "infinity" - some kind of "hyper-time" which is "cosmological time" and "time outside of time"; 3) "hyparxis" (from old Greek ὑπαρξις - existence) the state of being, a kind of meta-time, thanks to which, according to the author, travel in time, travel between parallel universes and travel faster than the speed of light are possible, and which are not considered nowadays to be exclusively a prerogative of fantastic views (3, 12, 17, 19, 20, 24).

In ontologically oriented philosophy and psychology time is being interpreted and qualified as multidimensional and multilevel phenomena. Time, as a form of human existence, unfolds in a few meaningful directions: as *time of biological environment of a human being*, as *time of*

"community" and "sociality" of a human being, as well as time of *"subjectivity" and "individuality of singular human being"*.

In human life, as well as in definite part of real life, characteristics of time of a developing organism get intertwined, those of becoming an individuality, which form the subjective "me" of a person. And if the development of an organism and individual (as a social quality of a human being) takes place according to objective laws of sequence of realizations with "non-existent" influence of peculiarities of "individual performance", the objective laws in forming of "me" of a person is caused only by sufficient number of conditions (availability of causal relationships in the structure of existence), realization of which was given to a person as positive intention. Implementation of the essence of singular existence is possible if a person himself is engaged in specific activity, which unfolds as the positive intention meaning "to be".

Hence is the origin of unique qualitative characteristics, which time of human existence obtains. Time is subjectively lived by a person, and this subjectively lived time is "not exactly seeming, as if through emotion inadequately reflected time of moving matter, but relative time of life (behavior) of a given system - a person, which objectively enough reflects the life plane of the given person." (S.L. Rubinshtein 1976, p.302). Human life is characterized by certain "time perspective" (K. Levin, V.A. Romenets, 1998, 2003, 2016) - peculiar rate of the past and the future in the present of a human being and their influence (which is indirect and determines) his behavior in the current moment.

Time of human life is *cyclic*, which is determined by the corresponding sequence of development of biological, social and individual characteristics of human existence. "In connection to the character of these cycles, relative reversibility can be discovered, meaning aspect of reversibility of time" (Rubinshtein S.L., 1976, p.303). Time of human lifespan has *rhythm*, which changes according to the development of human existence and depends on regularities of biological, social and individual becoming of this existence. "Fulfillment and intensity of events in time, as well as speed of their duration, change rhythm of time of human life" (Rubinshtein S.L., 1976, p. 303). Each period of human lifespan corresponds to certain *time tempo*, which is explained and determines itself the content of a given period.

We can conclude that the time of human life, as well as human existence, is *historical*. The fact that human mode of existence is historical can be explained by sequence and mutual determination of all the levels of human existence. The *ability to master time of one's own lifespan* is also a quality of human life, as well as the ability to change the level of meaningfulness of a man's life in principle.

G.I. Chelpanov is regarded to be the author of the original theory of time (2, 12, 13, 18). By analyzing the history of approaches in understanding of the nature of time, Chelpanov joins the number of ancient philosophers, asking : "what is time? Does it exist? And if yes, where and how?" (Chelpanov G.I., 1893).

In his analysis of the phenomena of time Chelpanov brings up the importance of acclaiming general characteristic of psychic as a whole- it is not seen, not evident not accessible through direct observation and study. Psychic as a whole and in each separate manifestation can be studied only indirectly. As for the phenomena of time- it can neither be substantiated or studied indirectly, it can be studied and described only indirectly. If "actual existence of time is not that evident, as existence of other things in the universe" where can we set our eyes in order to see time. I can make sure that material things exist by touching them. How can I touch the time in order to believe in its' existence and not doubt anymore?" (Chelpanov G.I., 1893, p.1-10).

Time is a "flood, carrying away on its' waves the events of the present into the chaos of nothingness. But where is the beginning of this flood, where is its' end, and what kind of waters are filling its' channel?" Chelpanov classifies such definition of time as "image-like", the one that poetically expresses *understanding of time*. The other definition he classified

as *mathematical understanding of time*, “definition of mathematicians”: “time does not exist by itself- it is infinite, inseparable, fixed, does not consist of parts, flows evenly and continuously.

Possibly, similarly to epiphenomenality, ie.. “inability to see” psychic, Chelpanov characterizes phenomena of time and distinguishes three types of definition and understanding of time: 1-*poetic* time, 2- *mathematical* time, 3- *psychological* time, though he does not deny its’ classical three-dimensional structure: “in reality we distinguish the past, the present and the future; but as there is no past *already*, and there is no future *yet*, the present is only the border between the past and the future! So where is time? Time is behind us, time is before us, but we don’t see any of it (Chelpanov G.I., 1893, p.14). Also Chelpanov is putting accent on the fact that psychological time is rather given *original* reality or ability, while mathematical time is secondary and *acquired* one.

According to Chelpanov, one can refer to an image as a unit of psychological time: image as a feeling, image as action, image as a thought, etc. ...The more there are, the more full is the individual (subjective) time. The less there are, the more “dispersed” is the time, it gets filled with “images of boredom” and “images of inaction”. For example, “a day spent while travelling, filled with various impressions, can seem to be a week; the same very day spent in suspense waiting, may seem to be equal to a decade, while the same day spent in the usual monotonous course of mundane impressions may seem to last one hour”. (Chelpanov G.I, 1893, p.15-17).

“Has time quantity or is time quantity?” – Chelpanov is starting the discourse regarding possibilities and characteristics of time. “The same quantity of time we can perceive as extremely long or extremely short” –what does this testify? That perception of time is subjective or that time can be drastically differently filled either with small or big? How is time measured in our consciousness? Is it filled with images, as psychologists think, or with something else? What is necessary for understanding of time – separate images, their definite quantity or relations between these images? Chelpanov comes to the conclusion that in order *to realize what time is*, one needs certain successions of images while at the same time “*can periodic changes be regarded to be an objective measure of time while images of our consciousness can still be regarded to be a subjective measure*” (Chelpanov G.I., 1893, p.17).

One way or another, “the idea of duration may be received only by combining in the same act thoughts of past and present psychological

states", which form and characterize the unfolding of individual life of a person, i.e. concrete individual existence. *Psychological time* is "time in our consciousness" (Chelpanov G.I., 1893, p.14), according to which we may suggest that we can live through very different circumstances and states, no matter at what age, whether physical or biological. According to Chelpanov, in frame of individual time *we may discuss eternity, infinity and objectiveness in time*, we live them through in psychological time, while one of the key factors of such living and experience is physical and constitutional organization of a person. Chelpanov G.I., 1893, p.14-18).

Summing up the preliminary results of the mentioned above theses, we state that "time" of an individual appears to be combination of ontologically oriented existential and phenomenological constructs, while their content and practical interpretation are still to be defined :

Time: do we have Little or a Lot?

Time is it In me or Outside of me?

Time: is it Flowing, or Flying, or just Is?

Time: is it Evident or Possible, or Incomprehensible in its' Evident Inevidence?

5. Conclusions and reflections

We can also say that we will need to study and describe the impact of today on history of mankind with its' pandemic collisions, i.e. how it is able to change (or has already changed) our perception and understanding of time of one human life, of a generation or mankind in general.

The goal of the given essay is to reveal ontological connection between "social", "individual" and "time" as levels of unfolding of human existence, as well as impossibility to deny any of them for the sake of attitude towards one's own life and living one's life as a whole granted existential. The second layer of the goals of the given research relates to social critical analysis of studies about social, individual and time, written by Georgiy Ivanovich Chelpanov, one of the founders of our native psychological thought, organizer of science and philosophical psychological education,

This is only a beginning of historical critical research, presented by G.I. Chelpanov in his works, of issues of interconnection and interdependence of "individual" and "social" in a person, as well as *the time of his life*, during which they interact and unfold. Chelpanov's works cover key aspects of psychological science and practice in the beginning of XXth century and have not lost their relevance up to date.

Prospects of the upcoming stages of research lie in defining theory of the given characteristics and elements of human life, as well as development of psychological methods of qualification and interpretation in relation to a concrete person, unfolding of his “individual” and “social” in real facts of his specific life in its’ unique space and in time.

References:

1. Бердяев Н.А. (2000). Смысл творчества: Опыт оправдания человека. Париж: YMCA-PRESS, 1991, 452 с.
2. Г.И. Челпанов: период профессорства в Университете Св. Владимира (г. Киев, 1891—1907 гг.) [Текст] / В. А. Роменец, И. П. Маноха, А. А. Бреусенко. (2000). К. : Гнозис, 2000. 270 с.
3. Длугач, Т.Б. (2018). Флоренский и Кант: человек в пространстве и времени // Историко-философский ежегодник. 2018. Т. 33. С. 242-266.
4. Кузанский И. (1979). Сочинения: в 2 т. М.: Мысль, 1979. Т.1. С. 258-261.
5. Лазурский А. (1897). Современное состояние индивидуальной психологии, в кн.: Обзорение психиатрии, неврологии и рефлексологии, СПб, 1897.
6. Маноха И.П. (2015). Г.И. Челпанов и система «новой науки психологии»: анти-интроекты XXI века. Міжнародні Челпанівські психолого-педагогічні читання. Том 13. С. 33-40.
7. Маноха И.П. (2014). Становление онтологически ориентированной философии и психологии XX века: логика и а-логичность пробуждения (Л. Шестов, Н. Бердяев, Г. Челпанов, С. Франк). Міжнародні Челпанівські психолого-педагогічні читання. К.: Гнозис. Том 9. С. 47-62.
8. Маноха И.П. (2013). К онтологическим основаниям бытия человека: Франк, Челпанов, Рубинштейн. Міжнародні Челпанівські психолого-педагогічні читання. К.: Гнозис. Том 6. С. 46-61.
9. Маноха И.П. (2012) Кризис психологической науки и пути его преодоления: современность и своевременность воззрений Г.И. Челпанова. Г.І. "Челпанов і його роль у розвитку психологічної освіти і науки слов'янських держав". Мариуполь: ПДТУ, 2012.
10. Маноха И.П. (2001). Психологія потаємного «Я»: монографія. К., 2001.
11. Маноха И.П. (1995). Человек и потенциал его бытия: монография. К., 1995 (1-е изд.). 2016 (2-е изд.).
12. Михальский А.В. (2016). Психология времени (хронопсихология). М.: МПГУ, 2016.
13. Роменец В.А., Маноха И.П. (1998, 2003, 2016). Історія психології XX століття. – Київ, 1998 (1-е вид.), 2003 (2-е вид.), 2016 (3-є вид.).
14. Рубинштейн М.М. (1927). О смысле жизни. Ч.І. Ч.ІІ. Историко-критические очерки. Изд. автора, 1927.

15. Рубинштейн С.Л. (1989). Принцип творческой самодеятельности. К философским основам соврем. педагогики // *Вопр. филос.* 1989, № 4. С. 89-95.
16. Рубинштейн С.Л. (1976). Проблемы общей психологии. М.: Педагогика, 1976. 416 с.
17. Руднев В.П. (2000). Джон Уильям Данн в культуре XX века : [вступ. ст.] // *Эксперимент со временем / Дж. У. Данн ; пер. с англ. Т. В. Ивлевой. М. : Аграф, 2000. С. 5-14. 223 с. ISBN 5-7784-0130-2.*
18. Савинцев В.И. (2020). Концепция психологического времени Г.И. Челпанова в контексте междисциплинарных исследований // *Научный результат. Социальные и гуманитарные исследования.* 2020. Т.6. № 4. С. 41-48.
19. Фейербах Л. (1955). Вопрос о бессмертии с точки зрения антропологии // *Избранные философские произведения.* М., 1955. С. 337-46.
20. Франк С.Л. (1990). Непостижимое. Онтологическое введение в философию религии // *Сочинения.* М. : Правда, 1990. С. 183-559.
21. Челпанов, Г.И. (2893). О природе времени // *Вопросы философии и психологии.* М., 1893, Год IV, Кн. 19 (4). С. 36-54.
22. Челпанов, Г.И. (1910). Современная индивидуальная психология и ее практическое значение // *Вопросы философии и психологии.* М., 1910, Кн. III (103). С. 306-330.
23. Челпанов, Г.И. (1926). Социальная психология или «условные рефлексы». М.-Л.: Изд. Автора, 1926.
24. Dunne J.W. (1927). *An Experiment with Time.* L.: A & C Black, Ltd, 1927. 208 p. (en)

Transliteration of References:

1. Berdyaev N.A.(1991). *Smysl tvorchestva: Opyt opravdaniya cheloveka.* Parizh: YMCA-PRESS, 1991, 452 s.
2. G.I. Chelpanov: period professorstva v Universitete Sv. Vladimira (g. Kiev, 1891 – 1907 gg.) [Tekst] / V. A. Romenec, I. P. Manokha, A. A. Breusenko. (2000). K. : Gnozis, 2000. 270 s.
3. Dlugach, T.B. (2018). Florenskij i Kant: chelovek v prostranstve i vremeni // *Istoriko-filosofskij ezhegodnik.* 2018. T. 33. S. 242-266.
4. Kuzanskij I. (1979). *Sochineniya: v 2 t. M.: Mysl', 1979. T.I. S. 258-261.*
5. A. (1897). *Sovremennoe sostoyanie individual'noj psihologii, v kn.: Obozrenie psihiatrii, nevrologii i refleksologii,* SPB, 1897.
6. Manokha I.P. (2015). G.I. Chelpanov i sistema «novoј nauki psihologii»: anti-introekty XX veka. *Mizhnarodni Chelpanivs'ki psihologo-pedagogichni chytannya.* Tom 13. S. 33-40.
7. Manokha I.P. (2014). Stanovlenie ontologicheski orientirovannoj filosofii i psihologii XX veka: logika i a-logichnost' probuzhdeniya (L. Shestov, N. Berdyaev, G. Chelpanov, S. Frank). *Mizhnarodni Chelpanivs'ki psihologo-pedagogichni*

- chytannya. K.: Gnozis. Tom 9. S. 47-62.
8. Manokha I.P. (2013). K ontologicheskim osnovaniyam bytiya cheloveka: Frank, Chelpanov, Rubinshtejn. Mizhnarodni Chelpanivs'ki psihologo-pedagogichni chytannya. K.: Gnozis. Tom 6. S. 46-61.
 9. Manokha I.P. (2012) Krizis psihologicheskoy nauki i puti ego preodoleniya: sovremennost' i svoevremennost' vozzrenij G.I. Chelpanova. G.I. "Chelpanov i jogo rol' u rozvitku psihologichnoï osvity i nauky slov'yans'kih derzhav". Mariupol': PDTU, 2012.
 10. Manokha I.P. (2001). Psihologiya potayemnogo «Ya»: monografiya. K., 2001.
 11. Manokha I.P. (1995). Chelovek i potencial ego bytiya: monografiya. K., 1995 (1-e izd.). 2016 (2-e izd.).
 12. Mihal'skij A.V. (2016). Psihologiya vremeni (Hronopsihologiya). M.: MPGU, 2016.
 13. Romenec' V.A., Manokha I.P. (1998, 2003, 2016). Istoriya psihologii XXI stolittya. – Kiiŭ, 1998 (1-e vid.), 2003 (2-e vid.), 2016 (3-e vid.).
 14. Rubinshtejn M.M. (1927). O smysle zhizni. CH.I. CH.II. Istoriko-kriticheskie ocherki. Izd. avtora, 1927.
 15. Rubinshtejn S.L. (1989). Princip tvorcheskoy samodeyatel'nosti. K filosofskim osnovam sovrem. pedagogiki // Vopr. filos. 1989, № 4. S. 89-95.
 16. Rubinshtejn S.L. (1976). Problemy obshchej psihologii. M.: Pedagogika, 1976. 416 s.
 17. Rudnev V.P. (2000). Dzhon Uil'yam Dann v kul'ture XX veka : [vstup. st.] // Eksperiment so vremenem / Dzh. U. Dann ; per. s angl. T. V. Ivlevoj. M. : Agraf, 2000. S. 5-14. 223 s. ISBN 5-7784-0130-2.
 18. Savincev V.I. (2020). Konceptiya psihologicheskogo vremeni G.I. Chelpanova v kontekste mezhdisciplinarnyh issledovanij // Nauchnyj rezul'tat. Social'nye i gumanitarnye issledovaniya. 2020. T.6. № 4. S. 41-48.
 19. Fejrbah L. (1955). Vopros o bessmertii s točki zreniya antropologii // Izbrannye filosofskie proizvedeniya. M., 1955. S. 337—346.
 20. Frank S. L. (1990). Nepostizhimoe. Ontologicheskoe vvedenie v filosofiyu religii // Sochineniya. M.: Pravda, 1990. S. 183-559.
 21. Chelpanov, G.I. (1893). O prirode vremeni // Voprosy filosofii i psihologii. M., 1893, God IV, Kn. 19 (4). S. 36-54.
 22. Chelpanov, G.I. (1910). Sovremennaya individual'naya psihologiya i ee prakticheskoe znachenie // Voprosy filosofii i psihologii. M., 1910, Kn. III (103). S. 306-330.
 23. Chelpanov, G.I. (1926). Social'na psihologiya ili «uslovnye refleksy». M.-L.: Izd. Avtora, 1926.
 24. Dunne J.W. (1927). An Experiment with Time. L.: A & C Black, Ltd, 1927. 208 p. (En)

The Author

Iryna Manokha

Doctor of Science (Psychology), professor

Director of East European Institute of Psychology,

Kyiv, Ukraine

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0360-8823>

E-mail: manokha@ukr.net

Abstracts

ІРИНА МАНОХА. Онтологія часу: тлумачення «теперішнього» (у контексті праць і поглядів Г.І. Челпанова) У статті-есе буде проаналізовано декілька ключових понять-феноменів особистісного буття – Індивідуальне, Соціальне, Час. У різних парадигмах вони могли б бути названі модусами буття, екзистенціалами, онтологічними конструктами та ін. – обов'язковими та необхідними вимірами, рівнями, сферами розгортання життя – та індивідуального потенціалу – конкретної людини. Тут вони будуть розглянуті як у контексті історичного минулого, так і історичного сьогодення: як вони проявляються в житті конкретної людини (або конкретного покоління загалом) і як з їхньою допомогою можна аналізувати те, що відбувається, і моделювати майбутнє – історичне та власне. Як модельний приклад тлумачних моделей цих понять-них конструктів постали вчення Георгія Челпанова про Соціальне, про Індивідуальне і – про Час. Методами теоретизації та моделювання у цьому дослідженні стали принципи класичної онтології, герменевтики, історико-критичного аналізу, компаративістський аналіз, змістовної реконструкції та онтологічно орієнтованого тлумачення. Мета дослідження – показати онтологічний взаємозв'язок даних рівнів розгортання буття людини, неможливість вилучення/відмови від будь-якого з них – для цілісного ставлення до свого життя та проживання свого життя як цілісної даності. Другий пласт цілей дослідження – історико-критичний аналіз навчань про соціальний, індивідуальний та час – одного із засновників вітчизняної психологічної думки, організатора науки та філософсько-психологічної освіти – Георгія Челпанова.

Ключові слова: Г.І. Челпанов; соціальне; індивідуальне; час; буття; простір; модус буття; існування; аналіз та моделювання; темпо-

ральність; індивідуальний потенціал.

ИРИНА МАНОХА. Онтология времени: истолкование «настоящего» (в контексте работ и взглядов Г.И. Челпанова). В статье-эссе будут проанализированы несколько ключевых понятий-феноменов личностного бытия – Индивидуальное, Социальное, Время. В разных парадигмах они могли бы быть названы модусами бытия, экзистенциалами, онтологическими конструктами и пр. – обязательными и необходимыми измерениями, уровнями, сферами развертывания жизни – и индивидуального потенциала – конкретного человека. Здесь они будут рассмотрены как в контексте исторического прошлого, так и исторического настоящего: как они проявляются в жизни конкретного человека (или конкретного поколения в целом) и как с их помощью можно анализировать происходящее и моделировать будущее – историческое и собственное. В качестве модельного примера истолковательных моделей этих понятийных конструктов предстали учения Георгия Челпанова о Социальном, об Индивидуальном и – о Времени. Методами теоретизации и моделирования в данном исследовании стали принципы классической онтологии, герменевтики, историко-критического анализа, компаративистский анализ, содержательной реконструкции и онтологически ориентированного истолкования. Цель исследования – показать онтологическую взаимосвязь данных уровней развертывания бытия человека, невозможность извлечения/отказа от любого из них – для целостного отношения к своей жизни и проживания своей жизни как целостной данности. Второй пласт целей исследования – историко-критический анализ учений о социальной, индивидуальном и времени – одного из основателей отечественной психологической мысли, организатора науки и философско-психологического образования – Георгия Челпанова.

Ключевые слова: Г.И. Челпанов; социальное; индивидуальное; время; бытие; пространство; модус бытия; существование; анализ и моделирование; темпоральность; индивидуальный потенциал.