

Pedagogical Idea as Cognitive Imperative of Education

Marina L. Lezgina
 Herzen University
 Saint-Petersburg, Russia
 lezgina@mail.ru

Abstract—This article is devoted to such specific scientific phenomenon as a pedagogical idea, which serves as a cognitive imperative of pedagogical knowledge. The pedagogical idea is based on three maxims: the child becomes a person gradually; the process of becoming a person is accessible to management from outside, from educators; such management is not only possible, but also necessary. The pedagogical idea has two forms of its embodiment (theoretical, reflecting thought of society, and practical – live contact of mentors and children), which are interpenetrating and complementary to each other, act as a meaning-defining core of pedagogical search. In the course of its historical development, the pedagogical idea is realized as the logo of this process, performing explanatory, predictive and heuristic functions. Since society is fundamentally changeable, periodically there are needs to revise the old methods of education and the creation of new ones. Therefore, it requires a special selection principle for any specific techniques that would justify their application in the changed social conditions-cognitive imperative, which (for all transformations) in a generalized form expresses the criterion of ideal knowledge. This imperative for education is a pedagogical idea that is constantly deployed in antinomic phenomenon requirements for upbringing, which give rise to an endless series of an all-new antinomic phenomenon of pronounced problems of education.

Key words—*pedagogical idea, categorical imperative, education, upbringing, antinomy, evolution.*

I. INTRODUCTION

In response to the challenges of the XX century (universal suffrage, universal conscription, total industrialization of production et cetera) in the 20s of the last century, the idea of creating a philosophy of pedagogy (philosophy of education) was put forward [1, 2]. This idea soon gained international recognition. At the same time, from the very beginning, the philosophy of pedagogy was conceived as a special philosophical discipline, which is a general theory of education – unlike pedagogical conclusions and consequences from various philosophical schools and systems, conclusions that have a side and sometimes very amateurish character for them.

Speaking about the philosophy of pedagogy, one should thus distinguish such concepts as "philosophical questions of pedagogy", "philosophical foundations of pedagogy" and actually "philosophy of pedagogy". Understanding under pedagogy the science of education, upbringing and training of

young generations in accordance with the goals and objectives put forward by the specific historical conditions of life as its first basis, you can take philosophical and ideological ideas about Humanities, about society, about the meaning of life, about the purpose of man, about the features of concrete-historical time. The first foundations of pedagogy can also include ideas about the cognitive abilities of man, about the forms, ways and boundaries of knowledge. Such ideas are formed in philosophy, and pedagogy has always relied on the provisions of a philosophical school, justified accepted methods of teaching and education from the standpoint of appropriate ethics and theory of knowledge.

But pedagogy is not based only on philosophy. At least it develops under the influence of psychology, physiology, Humanities and historical sciences, and is based on the living experience of training and education. The pedagogical idea is considered as a rather selective approach to the provision of a wide variety of sources, borrowing only some of them, and in specific to its subject refraction. Ultimately, the principle which determines the choice and degree of influence of those or other provisions, acts as a conceptual core of the pedagogy, pedagogical idea. It is it, its content appears to be the subject of philosophy of pedagogy.

II. PROBLEM STATEMENT

The essence of the pedagogical idea follows from the fact that education, according to Hegel's apt definition, is "the second, spiritual birth of children, making them independent persons. Thanks to this self-dependence, children come out of the specific vitality of the family to which they originally belong, they begin to exist for themselves" [3] as a person of this society.

Pedagogical idea, expressing this essence of education, consists, at first, in recognition of the fact that the child becomes a person not at once, but gradually; secondly, it argues that the process of development of personality is available to management from outside, by educators; and thirdly: such management is not only possible, but also is necessary, while providing its spontaneous growth is undesirable. This last point is of particular importance for the pedagogical idea as a whole. It combines two positions. On the one hand, children have a need to become big. Such need is a component of the "immanent moment of any upbringing" [3]. But, on the other hand, this desire to become like the

adults must be awakened and cultivated in them, forcing them to “overcome the stages of trickery and teenage infantilism” [4]. To become a person means to rise above one's own individuality, to overcome the narrow horizons of one's own egocentric sensuality with one's mind, “the Spirit must be led to renunciation of one's quirks, to knowledge and desire of the universal, to assimilation of the universal education. Only this transformation of the soul is called upbringing... And talent, and genius, as they are only the inclinations, must be improved according to conventional wisdom ways, if only not want their demise, moral corruption or degeneration in set a bad originality. Only by improving in this way, the mentioned inclinations confirm the fact of their existence, their strength and their volume” [3].

III. REASONING

Pedagogical idea constituting the essence of any educational theory, has its origins, stretching back to the mists of time, in the processes of anthroposocietal when a person begins to mediate the relationship with nature and their own culture. “Culture in the most general sense should be understood as the biological aspects of human species behavior, including speech, making tools, increased plasticity of behavior, the ability to symbolic thinking and self-expression with the help of symbols” [5], which are transmitted not through a system of genetic mechanisms, but through learning and assimilation. We must conclude that the pedagogical idea grew out of need, first. To consolidate the achieved level of culture in the younger generations, turning the child into a bearer of this culture, and secondly, through the development of symbolic thinking in it, at least potentially, the ability to develop the culture further. The growth of culture complicates both tasks.

On pedagogical practice grows the theoretical superstructure. But thus the pedagogical idea acquires two forms of its embodiment-theoretical, abstract-conceptual, and practical, functioning in the living experience of training and education [6]. Both forms of development of the idea are interrelated and at the same time separate: the art of the teacher individually, specifically, relative to the nature of his personality, temperament, skill, the conditions of his work [7]; the theory, summarizing teaching experience, takes away from him what little predisposed to absorb and enrich an existing or evolving concept. Theoretical pedagogical thought should at every moment have its own criteria for the selection of the chain in the experience, but it aims practitioners to solve its problems, and not “on the reproduction of problems, ultimately undermining this theory” [8]. Thus, pedagogical practice can be innovative only if it has its own incentives, independent of pedagogical theory. Such incentives are in the field of interests related to the need of society in the reproduction of the Amateur population. Changing the way of life of people and their occupations leads to the transformation of the requirements in training and education, as periodically there are significant differences between the due and achieved results, thereby stimulating pedagogical search. Thus, the pedagogical idea is embodied in the living experience of

education, as if dissolving in it, but the corresponding conceptual form of expression is found only in theory, and its development in theory and practice does not always and does not fully coincide.

In this sense, both forms of realization of the idea, complementing each other, being taken separately, cease to be adequate to the development of the idea embodied by them. This idea exists and develops as if outside them, in Popper's “third world” – in the “world of objective content of thinking” [9]. This is the kind of reliability, when “thoughts in excess of their subjective existence as data mental States exist at the same time and in the formal-objective meaning of the general provisions, so that their mental cash is a transition beyond this cash” [10].

The pedagogical idea functions as a hidden knowledge. It is that hidden component of any pedagogical knowledge on which it rests as on the base directing on achievement of the main goal. Methodologically, it plays the role of one of the “cognitive standards that guide the intellectual activity of the scientist” [11]. These standards are not explicable by purely logical means and have an “implicit tacit nature, supported by the processes of social control in professional groups” [12]. They are “as common as they are a product of all, extending more or less far beyond personal experience” [13]. As this kind of super – conscious beginning – “collective representation”-pedagogical idea belongs to the level of metatheory, which, in fact, is the subject of philosophy in relation to all other forms of knowledge. Pedagogical theory, participating in the development of pedagogical ideas, turns out to be more an object than a subject of such development, identifying in historically limited forms the stages of its evolution.

Having its roots in the early primitive and numbering more than one Millennium of its existence, education as a branch of spiritual production is going through a number of stages.

At the first stage, at its origin and initial development, the process unfolds through the diversity of its forms at the level of the phenomenon, at the level of direct practical activities of people aimed at the education and training of the younger generation, but the essence of this process is not yet clearly understood and expressed “in its pure form”.

At the second stage, due to the increasing complexity of the process, people begin to think and talk about its essence, because blind adherence to tradition ceases to satisfy them in some certain respects. The essence is already being realized, and people are trying to give it a definition. At this stage, the idea, in our case the pedagogical idea, has an ideal content, which is nothing more than a concept expressed through a sequence of definitions, and the real content, that is the very existence of the process of training and education, a lot of problems that are found in it, and the self-development of this process in the search for solutions to these problems.

For this stage, it is characteristic that the idea does not just exist in a series of successive and struggling definitions, but it still splits into two levels. On the one hand, the idea is realized at the level of practice (“practical idea”) in the form of

definitions of current and long – term tasks and solutions, on the other – it acts at the level of theoretical understanding and definition of problems of education ("theoretical idea"). Having the same subject (the essence of the process of education), each of them expresses it unilaterally, and they coincide only in the limit, in the future. But the development of the process displayed by them, giving rise to new problems and challenges, constantly distances this limit.

Only the third, the highest, stage leads to the synthesis of practical and theoretical ideas and thus assumes awareness of the essence of the developing process in its entirety, integrity and perspective. The idea is first understood as a logo of this process, its basic law, the principle of performing the explanatory, predictive, and heuristic function [14]. It is this work designed to fulfill the philosophy of pedagogy. Its basic problem is the pedagogical idea taken in the specified three functions.

IV. METHODOLOGY

But it should be taken into account that the process of self-deployment of pedagogical ideas has its own methodological side. Its essence is as follows. The pedagogical idea is the semantic core of creative pedagogical thought and as such lies at the heart of pedagogical theory, and as any theoretical core, it needs a so-called protective belt formed by a set of conclusions, extrapolations and guesses. Through them, the idea is developed, accompanied by the elimination of inadequate derivatives.

V. RESULTS

Here we come to the very essence of the development of pedagogical ideas in its problematic perspective. Education is the process of forming socially accepted attitudes and behavior in children. But the living conditions of people in society change-sometimes quickly, abruptly, obviously, in other times, such changes occur gradually, imperceptibly accumulating, then to manifest themselves with catastrophic force. This creates a need for periodic reassessment of old methods of education and the development of new ones. But "appropriate methods of nutrition can not be developed in detail as long as it is not known what should be changed social conditions and changed people" [15]. They are only to a limited extent available to the Outlook of pedagogical thought, guided primarily by its own history and concepts. "The highest unconditional morality obliges the present generation to pass on to the new two-fold heritage: first, all the positive things that have been produced by the past of mankind, all the results of historical savings, and secondly, the ability and willingness to use this basic capital for the common good, for a new approach to the highest goal. This is the essential purpose of true upbringing, which should be at once and inseparably traditional and progressive" [16].

Pedagogical idea, thus, for all its simplicity, detects the internal complexity. The source of this incompleteness differ from natural sciences. If natural science deals with the inexhaustibility of nature, then in society constant changes in the way of life of people periodically destabilize the education

system, not allowing pedagogical thought to stop in its development. The continuity of any branch of knowledge is methodologically provided by a special standard in the field of hidden knowledge – cognitive imperative. In the course of the development of this branch of knowledge, its cognitive imperative evolves, however, with all its transformations, expressing in a generalized form the criterion of ideal knowledge, orienting knowledge. The pedagogical idea also acts in relation to pedagogical knowledge as such imperative.

In contrast to the principles laid in the Foundation of the logical structure of the theory, implicitly encompassing its content, the available deduction to eliminate, the categorical imperative as a kind of hidden knowledge is not the basis of deductions, its function is different: it expresses a kind of super-goal, in the light of which selection heuristic is valuable for the knowledge of the conjectures and findings. Thus, the pedagogical idea first of all presupposes the answer to the question: what should education ultimately strive for? So, according to Plato, a similar overarching goal is "education, which makes the soul of the child love to, and he raised, should be the expert and to attain perfection." Education means development "that from childhood leads to virtue, causing the person to crave and strive to become a perfect citizen who knows how to rightly submit to or dominate. Only this, I think, can be called education... Education, having its object and purpose money, power or any other art, devoid of reason and justice, is low and ignominious, and indeed unworthy to bear this name" [17]. Here Plato gave his understanding of the cognitive imperative of pedagogy in an expanded form. The certain super-purpose of education is approved and at the same time in the generalized form the strategy how to influence brought up in the interests of achievement of the necessary end result is formulated. The cognitive imperative is revealed as a certain selection principle in relation to any specific methods, justifying their application or refusal in the name of the highest and main goal.

But it is this "how to educate" and can not remain unchanged because of the dynamism, variability, mobility of the living conditions of society. As a result, the categorical imperative, simple in its basis, is really stratified into levels, each of which allows for antinomic forms of its expression.

So, on the one hand we are faced with recommendations, according to which "a child from an early age should exercise, then having fun, then seriously... it is necessary with the help of games to direct the tastes and inclinations of children" [17], on the other – no less categorical prescriptions "fear to save, punishing and teaching, and condemning, beat... Raise the child in restraints... do not smile at him, playing, do not give him the will in his youth, but crush his ribs while growing, and then, having matured, he will not blame himself before you" [18].

Another level of pedagogical paradigms determines the direction of education in its pragmatic component. Should education be aimed at the child, who grew up, "rest you in old age" and "will not be at home at a loss, from the judges and the authorities – to Pena and shame" [18], or he should be brought up "for the common good, for... to be a virtuous

husband and a virtuous citizen is not in all respects the same" [19]. The assessment of the priority of the development of civil or family virtues makes its own adjustments in the understanding of pedagogical paradigms. So, according to some, "deprived of the roots going into labor, family, communitive morality, human "I" is blurred ... the lack of a moral core, a hierarchical structure of values and destroys the system of motivation... In the foreground memorilla motivation: utilitarian, conformistic and often primitive hedonistic at the level of physiological needs" [20]. According to others, adherence to class, family, local customs and traditions means orientation to the old as a pattern " in which they look for ideals and answers to all questions with a negative attitude to innovations, to any changes that are expected only to worsen the situation. As a result, initiative, independent individuals in such an environment are not held in high esteem" [21].

There is another level of cognitive pedagogical imperative applications related to the determination of the measure of the necessary knowledge and skills of the student: is there some optimal sustainable amount of them, or "avalanche-like growth of scientific, technical and socio-political information excludes education forever, once a lifetime, and requires the creation of a unified system of continuous learning" [22]. But even in this case you need to accurately determine the extent of the knowledge obtained in the school. "Classical", "musical", "real", "labor" and other types of schools meant primarily various measures of knowledge and skills acquired in them.

The pedagogical idea as a cognitive imperative is not simply and not only deployed through a number of antinomies, but also, for all its categoricity, constantly experiencing age-old and local fluctuations between extreme, polar definitions. In this teaching idea, striving to overcome the antinomy, deploys all new antinomy: joint or separate education, the priority of cultural or practical knowledge in teaching, the development of the mind or taste, orientation, memory or imagination, on the development of algorithms or the development of creative abilities, loyalty to tradition or a desire for innovation and so the History of public education, and pedagogy appears more a living process in which Matures and develops in a similar way, the pedagogical idea. Therefore, the history of pedagogical thought, as well as live teaching practice of today, acts as the em-pricheski base of philosophical and pedagogical research.

As we have already noted, the initial foundations of education and upbringing were formed in the era of primacy under the rule of traditionalism. At this level, the learning process is carried out through the direct involvement of the child in the family and the working group and is separate for boys and girls. Training is thus indirect. Initiations are preceded by a short-year – and-a-half-period of direct training and training. The main methods of training – showing and imitation. The process is regulated and directed with the help of incentives, sanctions, and inspections (tests). The initial stage - up to 5-6 years of age-the development of the "taboo" (prohibitions).

For thousands of years there has been a reduplication of such a system of education. Significant changes in it arise only with the period of urban development and the formation of statehood. There is a school education (training of state scribes, jewelers, military engineers, lawyers, priests of various profiles). Shkolyar now completely breaks out of the family circle and closes on the development of knowledge, far from the ordinary. The general nature of such training is clearly seen in the so-called "school teachings" of papyri of Sallya, Anastasi, Bologna. "When a man comes out of the womb of his mother, he is already subordinate to his boss... as a Boy he is in servants, as a young man – in recruits, and then he is determined to a particular craft, based on his social origin". But the schoolboy from the very beginning is entirely devoted to his future occupation. "Write with your hand and read with your mouth, and ask the advice of one who knows more than you... Do not spend your days idly, or they will beat you, for the boy's ear is on his back, and he listens when he is beaten... And at night you teach, and day are raised... Do not spend the day idly, for Woe to your body otherwise" [23].

This severity of school education becomes a tradition and is noted as its specific feature a century later. "The teacher's authority was based generally on the use of the lash or the rod" [24] – writes K. Komanecky about the schools of Ancient Rome. Erasmus of Rotterdam discovers the same in his modern schools: teachers "frighten the timid flock of children with their menacing look and voice; they strip the poor things with rods, lashes and rage, in their good faith, in every way" [25]. The very process of education in this era of school development was often put by contemporaries on a par with the taming of animals, with the difference from the latter, that the methods of taming are complemented by teachings about the need for obedience.

Depravity of this tradition was in full accordance with the general stagnation of pedagogical thought: over the centuries, the same method of teaching was preserved without "special changes – at first, the alphabet was learned by ear, then the writing of letters was mastered, and only after that they moved on to writing words. As a result, elementary training in reading and writing lasted for years. By the beginnings of more serious knowledge of the student came only at the time of adulthood. One reason for this stagnation was issued to IV-V century BC. the branch of school craft teacher from a master. On the one hand, the teacher could now focus only on training, but on the other – in those social conditions, this led to a decrease in the social status of the teacher. So, if in Ancient Egypt the scribe teaching students – "is the one in charge of it all: exempted working on the letter, he had no taxes" [23], then in Rome, "the teacher for his work were few and were forced to earn money on the side; the social status of teachers, rekrutirovaya most of the freedmen, was very low. School was rather primitive: large groups in small and tight spaces" [24]. According to Erasmus, and at the dawn of Modern times, teachers - "a breed of people, unhappy, ill-fated and hated by the gods which was not in the world. Not five curses, they are doomed, but a thousand, for always hungry, dirty, and spend their entire lives in schools...

or rather, in the dungeons of torture; surrounded by crowds of boys, they prematurely age from overwork, fade away from the hubbub, you wither away the dirt and stench" [25].

This state of the school was accompanied by another change in its status. Elementary school is separated from the system of higher and secondary special education. Associated in its origins with the professional preparation of specialists of high qualification – the scribe, the priest, the sailor, the architect, engineer, etc., an elementary school now limits its functions by teaching writing, reading and numeracy. The purpose of training becomes more abstract, universal, but at the same time far from the realities of everyday life of society. School, breaking away from life, and responds poorly to changes in it.

In the conditions of such conservatism of the school pedagogical thought develops therefore not through school practice, but outside it – among philosophers, within the framework of the pedagogical function of philosophy. This is not pedagogy or philosophy of pedagogy. It is rather a reaction of former schoolboys to the training they have undergone themselves. At the same time, it is a fitting of one's own philosophical concepts to a special, along with others, circle of human activity. In such a construction expressed their own idea of man, his purpose and ideals, given in opposition to the available teaching practice. Therefore, the pedagogical imperative, the emerging philosophical reasoning about education, antinomic phenomenon real teaching practice. So, the already mentioned requirement of Plato to teach "then amused, then seriously" opposes the dogma that "the boy's ear is on his back", the requirement to educate a conscious citizen is a protest against the concept of "taming", emphasizing the importance of the development of self-consciousness of the schoolboy disputes the school requirements of absolute and unconditional non-reasoning obedience. In contrast to the current school, practice put forward the principles of interested, conscious learning, systematic training and education, a closer connection with the life of the school.

Such gap between the recommendations of the "high science" and the realities of the school is so great that the progressive ideas of philosophers have no influence on the school for the time being. Rather, there is another: there is a tightening of previous methods of education, their spread to the sphere of home education (as evidenced by at least the same "Domostroy"). The degree of this gap can be judged by comparing the above assessment of the state of the school Erasmus and pedagogical ideas close to him at the time of Montaigne.

Pedagogical idea, matured in the form of philosophical arguments about school practice, then refers to this practice, goes into it. Pedagogical practice is enriched with new principles and is subject to rationalization according to the laws of the theory of knowledge and scientific pedagogy. As a result, the school as a social institution comes out of the centuries-old stagnation. This process is associated with the name of Y. Komensky. The peak of cooperation between pedagogy and philosophy is the XVIII century, developing the

pedagogical ideas of Kant, Rousseau, Vico, Helvetia, Pestalozzi.

However, this "Golden age" of pedagogy contained the seeds of its own denial. On the one hand, the process of formation and strengthening of strong centralized States with their need for appropriately trained, educated personnel, which the state needed, contributed to the successful implementation of school reform. It has taken primary care to change the school system. On the other hand, the course of scientific research in pedagogy increasingly goes into the task of rationalization, improvement of the educational process, in the development of more sophisticated techniques. The school remains a school of learning, "cramming", more and more acutely begins to feel its separation from life.

Humankind enters the XX century with new needs in education and requirements for school. Transition to general education of the population becomes necessary. Old programmes and methods are either designed for elite schools and are therefore unsuitable for mass schools or too primitive to provide the necessary level of education for the population.

A new round of pedagogical search begins. The search itself goes in two divergent directions. The first of them is the "school of social education", developed primarily by P. Natorp. Social education is regarded as something "conditioned by the life of the community and, in turn, determining its forms... Man is a microcosm, a world in miniature, as if concentrated in one point" [26]. "The main task of the school is to educate a person on the path of freedom through the stages of cultivation of desires, will and, finally, reason" [26].

Another direction of pedagogical search was "school of labor" (D. Dewey, G. Kershensteiner, V. A. Lai, etc.), which is characterized by the thesis "modern man should think technically, and all the work of the school is thought of as focused on productive work, a kind of center around which all the training sessions in the school are concentrated".

Really, however, according to P. N. Milyukov, "even in the West, new pedagogical ideas were used only in exceptionally favorable cases, usually on private initiative of some enthusiast-creator of some of the new systems, supported by a small circle of enlightened parents who agreed to entrust their children authoritative experimenter. Abroad, these new schools were in total. Dewey himself admitted that he can consider only 8 schools in the space of the SASS" [27]. In other schools, innovations were introduced to the extent that they were able to accept the mass of teachers and the public opinion of the mass of parents. In particular, in the USSR after the first search one "had to go back, in general terms, to the organization that... it has already been implemented by the legislation of the state Duma" [27].

VI. CONCLUSION

Without dwelling on the peculiarities of development of pedagogical ideas in this century and its condition in our days (which should be the subject of a separate analysis), we only note one fact: the development of pedagogical ideas is not a purely immanent process. The system of public education is

not a self-sufficient monad, but an organ of society, carrying out one of its most important functions and depending on the state of the social organism as a whole. The development of the pedagogical idea follows the development of society and inevitably adapts to it.

The correspondence of the pedagogical idea to the state of society is not a simple reaction of the school to the social conjuncture like the processes of marketing. Of course, the people's education of the last centuries is the object of constant attention of its society and the directives of its power structures. Pedagogical practice and pedagogical science cannot but react to them. But in most cases, such intervention produces only a superficial and fleeting result, the reaction of the school remains quite formal. This may mean one thing – the pedagogical idea is related to the social situation not directly, but indirectly through the whole system of culture, the state and needs of which it reflects in a specific form [28]. Society must first become aware of its cultural needs, and it is only through this generalized interpretation that they influence the development of the pedagogical idea. In other words, it is impossible to prescribe the direction of development of the pedagogical idea – as well as to investigate it by means of any private discipline, since it, being the subject of the philosophy of education, follows the history of pedagogical thought and the Logos of the deployment of the pedagogical idea as a cognitive imperative of education.

References

- [1]. J. Dewey. Introduction to the Philosophy of Education. Moscow, 1921.
- [2]. J. Dewey. School and Society. Moscow, 1925.
- [3]. G.W.F. Hegel. Encyclopedia of Philosophical Sciences. Vol.3. Moscow, 1977, p. 74-75, 85, 342.
- [4]. Y.V. Puyu, "Deviant Behavior in Teenagers" Tineydzheri in the Space of Humanitarian Technologies. SPb.: ed. Herzen University, 2015.
- [5]. R. Foley, "Another Unique Species: Patterns in Human Evolutionary Ecology". Leningrad, 1987.
- [6]. M.L. Lezgina, A.P. Fomin, "Pedagogical Idea: Theory and Practice". SPb.: ed. LEMA, 2017.
- [7]. O.D. Shipunova, "Prospects of Research of Subjectivity in Modern Philosophy", Scientific and technical sheets of St. Petersburg Polytechnic University. Humanities and social Sciences, No 1 (191), p. 254-260, 2014.
- [8]. V.I. Strelchenko, "On the Problem of Identification of True Meanings", Scientific opinion, No. 1-1, p. 13-30, 2015.
- [9]. K. Popper, "Logic and Growth of Scientific Knowledge". Moscow, 1983.
- [10]. V.I. Soloviev, "Crisis of Western Philosophy (against positivists)", Essays in 2 volumes, vol. 2. Moscow, 1990.
- [11]. O.D. Shipunova, I.P. Berezovskaya, "Features of Cognitive Interaction in the Practice of Scientific Communication" Discourse, No 3, p. 3-9, 2018.
- [12]. O.D. Shipunova, "Intellectual Filters as a Problem of Modern Education", Scientific and technical statements of St. Petersburg state Polytechnic University. Humanities and Social Sciences. No 1 (239), p. 166-176, 2016.
- [13]. E. Durkheim. Sociology and Theory of Knowledge. Moscow, 1981, p. 224-225.
- [14]. M.L. Lezgina, "The Idea as a form of Scientific Knowledge", Philosophy of law, No 5 (60), pp. 21-25, 2013.
- [15]. M. Bunge. Causality. Moscow, 1962.
- [16]. V.I. Soloviev, "Meaning of Love", vol.2. Moscow, p. 494-497, 1990.
- [17]. Plato. "Laws", vol.3. Moscow, Part 2, pp. 213, 107, 1971.
- [18]. Domostroy. Reader of Old Russian Literature. Moscow, 1991, p. 166-167.
- [19]. Aristotle. "Nicomachean Ethics", vol. 4. Moscow, pp. 150, 1983.
- [20]. E.N. Starikov, "People Marginals" In the human dimension. Moscow, 1989, p. 198.
- [21]. B.N. Mironov, "Family: Whether it is Necessary to Look Back in the Past", In the human dimension. Moscow, 1989.
- [22]. Y.V. Zaytsev, "Public Education and the Future of Society", Drama of Renewal, 1990.
- [23]. Reader on the History of the Ancient World, vol.1. Moscow, 1950, p. 112-114.
- [24]. K. Komanecky, "History of Culture of Ancient Greece and Rome". Moscow, 1990, p. 294-295.
- [25]. Erasmus of Rotterdam. The Praise of Folly. London: Hamilton; Adams & CO. 1887.
- [26]. P. Natorp, "Culture of the People and Culture of Personality". SPb., 1912, p. 51, 118-119.
- [27]. P.N. Milyukov, "Essays on the History of Russian Culture", vol. 2. Moscow, 1994, pp. 378, 387.
- [28]. A.P. Fomin, "The Actualization of Pedagogical Ideas in Modern Social Reality", Picture of Man: Philosophy, Cultural Studies, Communication: collective monograph. Saint Petersburg: Herzen University, pp. 97-101, 2016.