

## **Philosophical Precursors of Psychological Hermeneutics**

**Zinoviia Karpenko**

Doctor of Psychological Sciences, Professor, Lviv Polytechnic National University,  
12, S. Bandera str., 79013 Lviv, Ukraine, Zinoviia.S.Karpenko@lpnu.ua, ORCID: 0000-0002-0747-2591

<http://doi.org/10.23939/veritas2025.02.066>

**Abstract.** In a period of rapid development in natural sciences, the widespread digitalization of all spheres of public life, and the practically limitless possibilities of artificial intelligence, there has been a resurgence of interest in psychological hermeneutics. This field emphasizes the profound meanings of human existence and the values of collective being. The purpose of this article is to clarify the contribution of philosophical research in the humanities to the development of psychological hermeneutics as a descriptive (phenomenological) methodology in psychology. We utilize a cultural-historical analysis of key ideas in philosophical hermeneutics, viewing it as the broad epistemological landscape upon which the subject of psychological hermeneutics itself emerged. The article substantiates a key thesis: psychology, which considers the human being as a total unity of body, soul, and spirit, cannot reduce the subject of its research to finding answers to the question “Why?” (causal determinism). Instead, it must uncover the meanings of human existence by answering the question “What for?” (teleological determinism). The history of psychology’s development as an independent science confirms that only a mutual complementation of both epistemological traditions will help obtain knowledge congenial to human nature. The achievements of philosophical thought from the previous two centuries and the beginning of the 21st century have laid the foundation for the development of psychological hermeneutics itself – the science of finding meanings in diverse text-representations of human being-existence. The cognitive mechanisms for comprehending personal meanings and societal values in various cultural artifacts are intuitive understanding (empathy) and evaluative interpretation (reflection) of the direct experience of the dynamic structure of life realization.

**Keywords:** philosophy, psychological hermeneutics, meaning of existence, values of being, teleological determinism, understanding, interpretation, culture.

### **Introduction**

At the current stage of its development, psychological science is characterized by vast epistemological baggage accumulated over the long history of studies in humanities. Each such episteme presents stable facts, events occurring in typical circumstances. They explain certain human mental phenomena and behavioural reactions within the cause-and-effect logic.

However, a human being, as the crown of phylogeny, is an exceptional evolutionary creation, a multidimensional being and a body-mental-spiritual system capable for self-development and is not just an object of blind natural forces. A human being is a supreme subject, a manager of own life, an author of own destiny, having intentions to self-surpassing and transcendence through various trajectories of his/her development in activities and commu-

---

### **Suggested Citation:**

Karpenko, Z. (2025). Philosophical Precursors of Psychological Hermeneutics. *Veritas: Legal and Psychological-Pedagogical Research*. 1(2), 66–74. DOI: [doi.org/10.23939/veritas2025.02.066](http://doi.org/10.23939/veritas2025.02.066)

**Journal homepage:** <https://science.lpnu.ua/veritas>

**Article history:** Received: 17.06.2025. Revised: 25.08.2025. Accepted: 4.11.2025.

Copyright © The Author(s). This is an open access Article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)1

---

nication with others. A person as a “multi-locus” integral subject combines miraculously different, often conflicting, identities, polar value-motivational tendencies, seemingly incompatible character traits, strange comorbid hybrids of traits and symptoms and still remains a mystery, and often a threat to oneself and his/her surroundings. In addition, despite the unstoppable expansion of horizons for self-actualization, achieved high living standards, impressive scientific and technical progress, the problems of socio-economic inequality, various discriminations remain insurmountable; and the means for killing and mass destruction of one’s own kind and all living things on Earth are becoming more and more refined and deadly.

When we ask ourselves: “Why does this happen?”, when we encounter ambiguous results of human activities here and there, we can find many explanations, each of which reproduces a linear relationship of a certain cause and its effect, isolated from other factors. Therefore, such explanations cannot be considered a satisfactory answer. At the same time, if we try to look behind the strict causal-deterministic scene with the aim to find answers to the actual and, ultimately, eternal problems of human existence in the world, if we try to use other theoretical and methodological approaches, not the standards of natural sciences, we inevitably come to undeservedly rejected hermeneutics. The latter, from the time of its self-awareness as the most relevant method of understanding the human uniqueness, does not try to explain “Why”, but tries to interpret “For the sake of what”.

How to assess cultural heritage, what is the meaning of human existence, the value ambivalence of human motivations, communicative barriers and distorted social perception, all these problems are once again appears in the viewfinder of psychological hermeneutics. Psychological hermeneutics draws its inspiration and ideas from the philosophical thoughts of the past and the present, it requires from researchers a flexible, synthetic and primarily metaphorical way of thinking that helps them find similarities between essential features of phenomena belonging to different levels of the world. This approach makes it easier to get into a cognitive meta-position, to manoeuvre between different contexts of a person’s life and to obtain the most plausible, authentic and useful knowledge as a result.

The new era of Metamodern, better known as post-postmodernism, does not reject previous epistemological traditions, but pays tribute to by acknowledging their inherent advantages and disadvantages, areas of application, set research goals. Similar to the pendulum “left-right” movement, we alternate the use in psychology of objective and subjective, quantitative and qualitative methods, induction and deduction, that is, we use a mixed methodology. In this case, one cannot work without methodological triangulation, especially when examining effectiveness of psychotherapy or various social practices, influence of art on a formed picture of the world and a person’s psychological well-being, etc. The identified methodological trends of Metamodern actualize scientific interest in psychological hermeneutics, taking into account new requests and challenges [8; 25].

### **Literature review**

At the historical path of its development, psychological science has encountered many epistemological problems, which in general terms can be narrowed to the opposition of two research traditions. One tradition is oriented to the prescriptions and norms used by natural sciences (and a human being is really a biological being). The other recognizes a metaphysical dimension of human existence, so that justifies a broader and more flexible humanitarian approach to the study of an individual as a personality. Therefore, the natural-scientific paradigm in psychology is based on the vision of a person as a being determined by external (situational) or internal (organismic) factors, subjected to objective research and experimental manipulation in order to determine general patterns of functioning and development [7]. The humanitarian paradigm, as a counterweight to the natural-scientific one, regard a person as a unique spiritual being, capable of self-development and self-transcendence, choosing value guidelines for behaviour.

The following is closely related to the above contrast. The so-called objective method – an indirect study of the psyche through observing a person’s behaviour, an organized experiment, testing, etc. is in opposition to the subjective method – a direct study of the psyche through self-observation of a person’s internal states, identification and empathy with another person, etc.

In turn, the objective method represents the nomothetic approach – a set of methods applied with the aim to identify general patterns and universal mechanisms of personality development and formation, while the idiographic approach involves a set of methods aimed at describing a personality as a special, unique value.

The specified methodological orientations determine the qualitatively different functions of psychology. Some scientists believe that psychology should be explanatory, that is, a science that applies the natural-science methods to study the psyche for analytically decomposing it into “primary elements” and revealing functional, cause-and-effect relationships between selected units of analysis. Other scientists believe that psychology should remain a descriptive or cognitive, that is, an “idiographic” science, which subject is understanding of a person’s mental life in its integrity, uniqueness and value-meaningful filling.

Additional methodological polarization emerges from the above opposition. The so-called R-methodology, which uses mathematical and statistical methods of empirical research (dispersion, correlation, factor, cluster, discriminant, regression analyses), is opposed to Q-methodology using descriptive, hermeneutic methods of empirical research [3].

The hypothetical-deductive research strategy, which represents the deductive course of thought from the general to the specific, is usually inherent in the natural-scientific paradigm, whereas the empirical-inductive strategy uses most often an inductive way and represents the course of thought from the specific to the general.

An accepted methodological orientation determines methods of reality cognition, a corresponding course of research and result generalization.

The natural-scientific orientation is related to the postulates of epistemological realism and is based on the following assumptions:

1. There is a distance between a subject of cognition and the cognizable reality.
2. The requirement of objectivity in cognition is considered as fully fulfilled.
3. By studying the reality, its subjective assessment by the researcher should be avoided and the influence of various subjective moments should be eliminated.

4. Explanations of studied phenomena can be generalized and extended to events that took place at different times.

5. Human behaviour is a result of certain influencing regularities, is consistent with certain fixed norms and rules, so it can be understood in the same way as the reality examined in the natural sciences.

6. The research purpose is to describe and explain studied phenomena; therefore, the research is quantitative, contributes to standardization of the applied methods and tools, as well as the operationalization of problematic concepts and determined variables змінних [14, p. 25].

Thus, a naturalist scientist (follower of the natural-scientific orientation) tries to observe, count, measure and organize phenomena in accordance with the accepted theoretical model, while a humanitarian researcher tries to listen, have a dialogue, sympathize with the mental states of examined people, seeks to understand them, without being guided by the previously accepted theoretical model.

Hermeneutics examines how people interpret “texts” describing their life experience in order to understand fully the intentions and meanings hidden behind appearances [15].

Hermeneutics (from Greek *hermeneia* – interpretation) is an approach in philosophy and humanitarian sciences, where understanding is considered as a condition of making sense for social existence. Historical varieties of hermeneutics: translation (of existing meaning in a respondent’s own language), reconstruction (reproduction of an authentic meaning or a situation where meaning originated) and dialogue (formation of a new meaning within an interpersonal meaning context) [16, p. 4].

Hermeneutics, as a science of interpretation, plays an important role in many disciplines which subject requires interpretive approaches because it concerns the meanings of human intentions, beliefs or actions, or the meanings of human experience as they are represented in art and literature, various historical monuments and other artefacts. Traditionally, disciplines that rely on hermeneutics are theology, particularly biblical studies, law and medicine, as well as the human sciences of the social-behavioural and humanities spectrum. In this context, hermeneutics is sometimes described as an “official” study of cultural products, a researching methodology for certain area of human creativity [11, p. 1].

Hermeneutics usually means, first, a research branch and, second, the historical movement where this branch has been developed. In the first sense, hermeneutics could be called a “philosophy of interpretations”. Thus, hermeneutics sees interpretation as its subject, not as an aid to studying something else. It examines interpretation in the context of fundamental philosophical questions about existence and its cognition, language, culture and history, art and aesthetic experience, and human activity.

### **Purpose**

Purpose of this article is to clarify the contribution of philosophical studies of the humanities to the development of psychological hermeneutics as a descriptive (phenomenological) methodology of psychology.

### **Methodology**

Consists of a cultural-historical analysis of the development of key ideas of philosophical hermeneutics as a broad epistemological landscape, in which the subject of psychological hermeneutics itself has emerged.

### **Results and Discussion**

Wilhelm Dilthey, one of the hermeneutics founders, stated for the first time the need to distinguish between “sciences in the spirit” (philosophy, ethics, aesthetics, linguistics, law, etc.) and “sciences in the external world” (physics, chemistry, geology, biology) and defined the concept of fundamental science from which all “spiritual sciences” originate. The method of understanding is fundamental for all “spiritual sciences” and it is used for interpretation of the data about human experience.

W. Dilthey distinguished two forms of experience: internal life experience (primary, mental) and external sensory experience. Life experience is primary; it is unexplained knowledge that precedes discursive thinking. It is the foundation of research in the humanities or “spiritual sciences”.

At the same time, W. Dilthey believed that human sciences and natural sciences are empirical ones, but the nature of empirical knowledge in these sciences is different. The description of experience in the natural sciences is devoid of anthropomorphic qualities (values, goals, meanings) from the very beginning, and therefore this knowledge lays beyond the limits of life experience (exoteric know-

ledge). Humanitarian knowledge is close to life experience, its content is esoteric, and most of it is already known (there is no actual novelty in the sense of natural science) [4; 5].

Later, W. Dilthey distinguished different types of understanding depending on its subject:

1) understanding as a theoretical method, its criteria: truth-delusion;

2) understanding of actions, which requires reconstruction of the goals they are aimed at, its criteria: success – failure;

3) understanding of “live experience”: from creative products to acts of life behaviour (gestures, intonation, etc.), its criterion: authenticity [6].

Friedrich Daniel Ernst Schleiermacher, a creator of universal hermeneutics, differentiated its grammatical and psychological aspects, behind of which there is the unity of ontology (an individual’s life in specific cultural and historical conditions) and epistemology (mental processes that provide understanding of intentions, meanings, motives of human life). Text is a carrier and embodiment of this unity. Text given by some author presents not only the author’s unique system of used language signs, but also the integrity of his/her life and individual human destiny. Life becomes a source for understanding and the hermeneutic principle that guides the process of understanding, since it is a starting point of both text and language. An author’s individual life is expressed via speech or text as a true manifestation of his/her life and evidence of his/her activities. Psychological interpretation involves entering an author’s position, identifying with him/her through projection. Such interpretation involves direct intuitive guessing the meaning of used words based on one’s own feelings. Thus, thanks to projection, we discover for ourselves the intentional orientation of examined text as an individual’s life story in its specific language presentation or manner.

On the one hand, it is necessary to understand text as a whole in order to understand correctly any part of it; on the other hand, it is necessary to understand text in each of its parts in order to understand it as a whole [23].

The existential philosophy of Martin Heidegger has become a powerful impetus for development of modern hermeneutics. M. Heidegger focused on finding the meaning of existence. In his fundamental

work "Being and Time", the author viewed the task of hermeneutics in studies on meanings of being as a condition of human existence, on self-interpretation that led to understanding [12]. M. Heidegger proceeded from the thesis that a person is "thrown into the world", therefore he believed that ontological structures making up human existence lay not in consciousness, but in our very being in the world. Heidegger's existential phenomenology explicates the structures of being in the world (self-projection), which, at least initially, we experience vaguely, mostly silently, in everyday activities and communications. The structure of the world is mediated by everyday existence and represented by our values and goals, referential relations, etc.

M. Heidegger claimed that self-interpretation of one's own existence is also complicated by the fact that being in the world always also involves being with others, so that the threat of deindividuation exists as well as biased perception because of used social stereotypes. That is, an authentic perception is preceded in some way by pre-understanding that is determined by influencing traditions and ethno-cultural context, which a person is necessarily involved in, being "thrown into the world". Hence, there is Heidegger's call for the destruction of interpretations handed over by historical tradition and not related to a real position in the world of a particular person [13].

By analysing the epistemological foundations of existentialism, Anna Mróz has concluded that the hermeneutic interpretation introduces into psychology the possibility of considering a person in his/her noetic (transcendent, spiritual) dimension, taking into account the needs and axiological motivation characteristic for this dimension [19, p. 115].

The philosophical hermeneutics of Hans-Georg Gadamer was based on his belief that the hermeneutic experience of truth is not only valid itself, but also different from the meaning of truth, as it is referred to knowledge obtained through compliance with the norms and methods of modern science. Moreover, the philosopher believed that success of the scientific method has distanced us from validity of such truth that is referred to interpretive experience. In his opinion, aesthetic perception of arts can serve as an example of the hermeneutic experience of truth. Perception of a work of art is an interpretive event. If it is suc-

cessful, a spectator cognizes something that claims to be true. A person's general cultural competence is the key to "penetration into the truth" of an artist's creative idea, the sphere of intentions and meanings embodied in the work.

At the same time, H.-G. Gadamer claimed that the hermeneutic experience of truth is determined by tradition and language that we inherit from past generations, but this heritage does not completely determine our own interpretations of existence. Rather, experience from the older generation is transferred to the younger one with certain changes in its content. In this regard, H.-G. Gadamer criticized the standards of "true" science initiated by the Age of Enlightenment, considering the authority of this scientific tradition to be questionable. Yet tradition is a legitimate source of interpretation in the sense that it makes possible and conditions any understanding. This means that our attempts to understand are always guided by tradition and, therefore, by prejudice more than we may realize. Therefore, knowledge in general and about oneself in particular can never be complete [10].

We should recognize that scientific knowledge is always governed by a certain degree of bias, which cannot be fully controlled by any scientific method at one or another stage of research. We can only talk about expanding the horizon of knowledge by changing the "optics" of perception and understanding ("fusion of horizons"), which can be done only hermeneutically. Then we advance to a higher level of universality, which overcomes limitations and surpasses not only our own, but other people's capabilities.

The hermeneutic experience of truth is determined not only by tradition, but also by language. H.-G. Gadamer introduced the concept of hermeneutic conversation, interpreted as such communicative interaction where different interpretive experiences meet and, as a result, the horizons of understanding of the interlocutors can be merged. Moreover, interpretation of works of art and any texts in general is seen as a conversation between an interpreter and a work about the work subject, that is, language here acts as a mediator and a tool of hermeneutic conversation that concerns the actual aspects of interlocutors' existence. Since human existence has a temporal dimension, so a hermeneutic conversation continues throughout life, and the experience about lived events is always open to understanding and assimilating new meanings [9].

Paul Ricoeur developed Heidegger's approach to hermeneutics, focusing mainly on such linguistic concepts as symbolism, metaphors and narratives. He substantiated a hermeneutic phenomenology that embraces the "long way" of self-interpretation by going through hermeneutical considerations on multiple conflicting interpretations. The fact is that each topic discussed by interlocutors contains different meanings that often contradict each other. According to P. Ricoeur, the purpose of interpretation is evidencing about many meanings existing in a communication or text. P. Ricoeur explained that the long hermeneutical path to self-understanding lies through the analysis of a wide range of symbolic forms, such as the "cosmic" symbolism revealed by the phenomenology of religion, the symbolic character of "desire" revealed by psychoanalysis and the symbolic forms discovered in studies in literature and art [20].

A linguistic tool that enables interpretation is a metaphor. In turn, the mechanism of metaphor formation, according to P. Ricoeur, is predicative assimilation: assimilation consists directly in making similar, i. e., semantically close, terms that a metaphorical statement brings together" [21, p. 421]. P. Ricoeur believed that this assimilation of the properties of one object to the properties of another, a kind of recoding of the semantic reality, which is the basis of mutual understanding, occurs thanks to the intuitive combinatorial and synthetic action of human imagination, which breaks established categorization phenomena and determines semantic identity of previously distant phenomena. At the same time, the so-called split reference is preserved: an explicit or implicit seeing through a newly formed meaning of its semantic predecessor. It is important that the split reference is inherent in a metaphor both from the side of imagination and from the side of perceptions, which send the meaning synthesized by imagination to sensory perceived objects [21, p. 423].

Additionally, P. Ricoeur considered the more complex forms of expression – narratives (stories) that have a common function, namely: they mark, organize and specify a temporal experience represented by a work composition, its plot. The narrative referential function is manifested in attribution of meanings to certain persons, situations, events, thanks to which narratives fulfil their value-orientation purpose – they relate to moral dilemmas, political life, etc. Narratives also perform a heuristic function, as it is a way of

scientific research conducted using discovery-oriented methods; it is a way of self-discovery in dialogue with others, aimed at finding the meaning underlying meaningful human experiences. The deepest meanings and knowledge are born in a person thanks to his/her impressions, observations, beliefs and judgments. In addition to narrative descriptions, a researcher should look for internal dialogues, stories, poems, diaries and other personal documents that represent life experiences. In this case, hermeneutic research is focused on individual narratives that explain the dynamics of an individual's meaning structures in specific life conditions and end up with a creative synthesis [21].

The Postmodern era gave a new impetus to hermeneutics. In particular, Jean-Francois Lyotard expressed a "distrust to metanarratives". According to him, metanarratives are the foundational stories of modern Western philosophy, functioning as dominant legitimate discourses in science, for example, about science objectivity and its ability to ensure the steady humanitarian and technological progress of humankind. Faith in a metanarrative increases the danger that our evaluations of knowledge will be reduced to a totalitarian standard, namely to an "information commodity" that is produced and exchanged for wealth accumulation and power concentration [18]. Postmodern hermeneutics defends the freedom of meaning-making in narratives of arbitrary content and rejects the "coercion" of a dominant (meta)narrative.

Perhaps the most influential concept of postmodern hermeneutics is the concept of "weak thought" proposed by Gianni Vattimo. Speaking about "weak thought", Vattimo referred to interpretive practices that gradually diminished the efficacy of narratives about the supposed "being" of things, originated from the tradition of Western metaphysics. He believed that interpretive practices are needed that loosen the dogmatic grip of these narratives and thereby clarify that what they say about "being" of things are not eternal truths, but merely models subject to interpretive revision. Only by acting in this way, understanding can be freed from the power of outdated, limiting narratives, and a researcher can "recover" and be ready to discover new meanings and construct alternative narratives. This is "complete nihilism", breaking with the tradition that binds scientific research [24].

Richard Rorty in his “Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature” comprehensively criticized modern philosophy that developed the foundations of classical epistemology, especially the idea that knowledge is a representation or a mental “mirror” of the reality independent of the mind. He suggested a return to a hermeneutic conversation that does not seek to find truth conceived of as a correspondence between the mind and the mind-independent reality, but instead called for education that affects personality formation through acquisition of cultural achievements [22]. Comprehensive expansion of horizons leads to even greater hermeneutic skill in our attempts to cognise the world and ourselves in it.

Among the representatives of modern hermeneutics, we should note Anton Friedrich Koch, standing on a position of hermeneutic realism, asserting the need to understand a person comprehensively, in his spatio-temporal, bodily and living subjectivity, who makes things interpretable [17].

The current stage of development in psychological hermeneutics occurs predominantly under the influence of constructionism, which has changed the understanding of reality by denying the objectivity of truth [2]. It is considered that reality is not something given and objective, but is actively constructed by individuals and social groups through language, interaction, and cultural practices. Consequently, understanding is always an interpretation that depends on the context, goals, and prior experience of the interpreter. This legitimizes the existence of multiple, but equally valid, interpretations of psychological phenomena and texts. The active role of the subject (interpreter) is noted, who is not a passive recipient of information but actively constructs meanings from the “material” of their own cognitions, existing knowledge, and cultural contexts. From a constructionist perspective, even the “Self” is not a fixed entity but is constantly constructed in the process of social interactions and the production of various narratives (Bruner, 2002). Constructionism shifts the focus from the internal to the external. It is under its influence that psychological hermeneutics pays more attention to how linguistic practices and social discourses affect the interpretation of psychological phenomena. Understanding is viewed not as an internal mental process but as an action that takes place in a specific social and cultural context. Overall, constructionism has proven to be a source of new hermeneutic methods used in psychology – discursive, narrative analyses, etc. – and also became a precursor to the so-called performative turn in psychotherapy.

## Conclusions

Researchers who follow the humanitarian orientation recognize that:

1. The worlds of spirit and culture differ from the world of nature.
2. A subject and an object of cognition are mutually determined.
3. Values determine the direction and subject of cognition.
4. The research purpose is understanding and interpretation.
5. Each study shall have a holistic character.
6. It is extremely important to take into account the context.
7. Explanations relate only to a certain place and time, which are indicated in the study.
8. Flexible methods of data collection can be used.
9. Structured research methods and tools, as a rule, are not used.

There are several criteria that determine formal principles and cognitive rigor applied to hermeneutic studies: (1) the subjective is opposed to the objective; a subject is not excluded from the cognizing process, but his/her position significantly affects the subject’s objective knowledge; (2) understanding is developed via a hermeneutic spiral: from subjective to objective and vice versa; (3) hermeneutic understanding spiral (hermeneutic circle) means understanding something as something and searching for the meaning in a specific hermeneutic situation; (4) a part is possible to be understood only in the context of the whole, and the whole as a separate independent quality can be grasped thanks to the knowledge of interconnected parts that form it and thereby enable the meaning of one’s own existence within the whole [1, p. 294–295].

Understanding is usually preceded by pre-understanding that is based on an individual’s cognitive schemes and certain life situations experienced in his/her past. Each subsequent “meeting” with a new hermeneutic object adjust a researcher’s previous ideas and perceptual attitudes due to entering the hermeneutic circle and with taking into account a different and often broader context of an examined person’s life or artefacts of his/her activities.

Hermeneutics is interested in ways of knowledge acquiring and determining the reliability of our interpretive experience. Moreover, the “success” of interpretation is manifested via completeness and

depth of our understanding: repeated attempts to interpret from different points of view lead to better understanding of a theme of our interest.

On the other hand, an adequate, authentic and successful understanding is ensured by an interpreter's educational and cultural level: coverage of studied phenomenon, the flexible change of options for its consideration, as well as degree of penetration into the constitutive principles of its functioning and development depend on the interpreter's outlook, life experience and cognitive abilities.

The knowledge discovered through hermeneutic studies is radically different from that gained in the natural sciences. First, it is a priori incomplete, open to other interpretations, reinterpretations and, at least, additions; knowledge of the natural sciences tends towards finitude and exhaustiveness with a claim to the ultimate truth. Secondly, in contrast to studies oriented to the standards of natural sciences, characterized by vertical architectonics of logically ordered postulates, hermeneutic knowledge develops horizontally, absorbing adjacent contexts and enriched by them according to the logic of a hermeneutic circle.

This means a cyclical return to the same topics, events, phenomena, etc., in order to revise, validate and refine their meanings.

**Acknowledgements.** None.

**Funding.** The author declares no financial support for the research, authorship, or publication of this article.

**Author contributions.** The author confirms sole responsibility for this work. The author approves this work and takes responsibility for its integrity.

**Conflict of interest.** The author declares no conflict of interest.

**Institutional review board statement.** Not applicable

## REFERENCES

1. Ablewicz, K. (2003). Badania hermeneutyczne w pedagogice. In: T. Pilch (Ed.), *Encyklopedia pedagogiczna XXI wieku* (Vol. 1, pp. 294–295). Warszawa: Wyd-wo Akademickie “Żak”.
2. Berger, P. L., Luckmann, T. (2011). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. London: Penguin Books.
3. Campbell, D. T., Fiske, D. W. (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. *Psychological Bulletin*, 56(2), 81–105.
4. Dilthey, W. (1990). Die Entstehung der Hermeneutik. *Gesammelte Schriften*, 1, 317–338. [In German].
5. Dilthey, W. (1996). The emergence of hermeneutics. *Current Foreign Philosophy*, 31–60. Kyiv: Vakler.
6. Dilthey, W. (1976). *Selected writings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
7. Domany, E., van Hemmen, J. L., Schulten, K. (2012). *Models of neural networks I*. Berlin: Springer Science & Business Media.
8. Eshelman, R. (2000–2001). Performatism, or the end of postmodernism. *Anthropoetics: The Electronic Journal of Generative Anthropology*, 6(2), 1–17.
9. Gadamer, H.-G. (1994). *Literature and philosophy in dialogue: Essays in German literary theory*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
10. Gadamer, H.-G. (2006). *Truth and method*. London–New York: Continuum.
11. Grondin, J. (1994). *Introduction to philosophical hermeneutics*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
12. Heidegger, M. (2010). *Being and time*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
13. Heidegger, M. (1999). *Ontology – the hermeneutics of facticity*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
14. Juszczak, S. (2013). *Badania jakościowe w naukach społecznych. Szkice metodologiczne*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
15. Karpenko, Z. S. (2009). *Axiological psychology of personality: Monograph*. Ivano-Frankivsk: Lilia-NV.
16. Karpenko, Z. S. (2001). *Hermeneutics of psychological practice*. Kyiv: Ruta.
17. Koch, A.-F. (2016). *Hermeneutischer Realismus*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. [In German].
18. Lyotard, J.-F. (1979). *La condition postmoderne: Rapport sur le savoir*. Paris: Minuit. [In French].

19. Mróz, A. (2015). Analiza hermeneutyczna narracji autobiograficznych w badaniach nootycznego poziomu rozwoju człowieka. *Rocznik Lubuski*, 41(1), 107–116.
20. Ricoeur, P. (1978). Existence and hermeneutics. [PDF file]. Retrieved from: [https://wiki.gonzaga.edu/alfino/images/5/55/Ricoeur.Existence\\_and\\_Hermeneutics.pdf](https://wiki.gonzaga.edu/alfino/images/5/55/Ricoeur.Existence_and_Hermeneutics.pdf)
21. Ricoeur, P. (2007). *The conflict of interpretations: Essays in hermeneutics*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
22. Rorty, R. (1979). *Philosophy and the mirror of nature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
23. Schleiermacher, F. (1998). *Hermeneutics and criticism and other writings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
24. Vattimo, G. (1992). *The end of modernity: Nihilism and hermeneutics in post-modern culture*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
25. Vermeulen, T., van den Akker, R. (2010). Notes on metamodernism. *Journal of Aesthetics and Culture*, 2(1), 1–14. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3402/jac.v2i0.5677>

### Філософські предтечі психологічної герменевтики

Зіновія Карпенко

Доктор психологічних наук, професор, Національний університет “Львівська політехніка”, Львів, вул. С. Бандери, 12, 79013, Україна, Zinoviia.S.Karpenko@lpnu.ua, ORCID: 0000-0002-0747-2591

**Анотація.** У період бурхливого розвитку природничих наук, масової діджиталізації всіх сфер суспільного життя і практично безмежних можливостей штучного інтелекту спостерігається поживання інтересу до психологічної герменевтики, яке акцентує увагу на глибинних сенсах людського існування і цінностях колективного буття. Мета цієї статті полягає у з'ясуванні внеску філософських досліджень гуманітарних наук у розвиток психологічної герменевтики як описової (феноменологічної) методології психології. Використано культурно-історичний аналіз ключових ідей філософської герменевтики як широкого епістемологічного ландшафту, на якому виник сам предмет психологічної герменевтики. У статті обґрунтовується ключова теза: психологія, що розглядає людину як тотальну цілісність тіла, душі і духу, не може редукувати предмет своїх досліджень до знаходження відповідей на запитання “Чому?” (каузальний детермінізм), а повинна відкривати сенси людського існування, відповідаючи на запитання “Для чого?” (телеологічний детермінізм). Історія розвитку психології як самостійної науки переконує, що лише взаємне доповнення обох епістемологічних традицій допоможе отримати знання, конгеніальне людській природі. Досягнення філософської думки двох попередніх століть і початку XXI століття заклали фундамент розвитку власне психологічної герменевтики – науки про знаходження сенсів у розмаїтих текстах-репрезентаціях буття-існування людини. Когнітивними механізмами осягнення особистісних смислів і суспільних цінностей різноманітних культурних артефактів є інтуїтивне розуміння (вчування) та оцінна інтерпретація (рефлексія) безпосереднього переживання динамічної структури життєздійснення.

**Ключові слова:** філософія, психологічна герменевтика, сенс існування, цінності буття, телеологічний детермінізм, розуміння, інтерпретація, культура.