

здорового суспільства стала наука “Євгеніка”. Справедливо буде зазначити, що він більше притримувався позиції позитивної євгеніки, однак деякі негативні її складові все таки прослідковувалися в окремих його публічних виступах та публікаціях, за що він не раз був підданий критиці з боку його колег, які не поділи ці погляди. Кращими практиками філософії здоров’я лікаря Келлога визнано його рекомендації в області харчування, фізичних вправ, негативний вплив на здоров’я людини не дотримання моральних принципів, користь сонячного світла, негативні наслідки потурання апетиту тощо.

Список використаних джерел:

1. Kellogg, JH 1903. The Living Temple, Battle Creek, *Good Health Publishing Company*.
2. Wilson, B 2014. Dr. John Harvey Kellogg and the religion of biologic living, *Indiana University Press*, Bloomington & Indianapolis.
3. Ковба, ДМ 2020. ‘Євгеніка как направление научной мысли и практика селекции человека в конце XIX – начале XXI вв.’, *Социум и власть*, Вып. 4, с. 7–19.

References

1. Kellogg, JH 1903. The Living Temple, Battle Creek, *Good Health Publishing Company*.
2. Wilson, B 2014, Dr. John Harvey Kellogg and the religion of biologic living, *Indiana University Press*, Bloomington & Indianapolis.
3. Kovba, DM 2020. ‘Evgenika kak napravlenie nauchnoj mysli i praktika selekcii cheloveka v konce XIX – nachale XXI vv. (Eugenics as a direction of scientific thought and practice of human selection in the late 19th – early 21st centuries)’, *Socium i vlast'*, Вып. 4, с. 7–19.

DOI 10.33930/ed.2019.5007.34(6)-8

УДК 2-4/5: 036.22

СХІДНОПАТРИСТИЧНА ІНТЕРПРЕТАЦІЯ “ΝΟΥΣ-ΛΟΓΟΣ”: САНОГЕННО-ТЕРАПЕВТИЧНІ ЗАСОБИ КОМУНІКАТИВНОСТІ (Частина I. Базові ідеї структурно-функціонального устрою)

*EASTERN PATRISTIC INTERPRETATION “ΝΟΥΣ-ΛΟΓΟΣ”:
SANOGENICAL-THERAPEUTIC MEANS OF COMMUNICATIVENESS
(Part I. Basic ideas of structural and functional system)*

O. T. Marchuk

Актуальність теми дослідження. Новий варіант прочитання базових філософсько-антропологічних ідей мислителів східної патристики в межах сотерично-санологічної інтерпретації є важливим не лише для якісно нового осмислення деяких ціннісно значущих проблем античної та середньовічної філософії, понять і категорій вищих проявів людської душі (її мислительної складової), а й для сучасного неопатристичного дискурсу, зокрема, аналізу деяких тематично

Urgency of the research. A new version of reading basic philosophical and anthropological ideas of thinkers of eastern patristics within the limits of soterical and sanological interpretation of important not only for the antique and medieval philosophy of concepts and categories of higher demonstrations of human soul (its cogitative component) and for the modern neopatristical discourse particularly the analysis of some thematically point structural and functional aspects of disclosure of

точкових структурно-функціональних аспектів розкриття онтологічно-органічного підходу в сотеріології.

Постановка проблеми. Для представників східної патристики розумна сила душі (з позицій з'ясування її значення, ролі, призначення та функціональних можливостей) постає як певна самостійна функціональна система, яка розкривається у двох основних здібностях: практичній і споглядальній. Що є особливо цінною концептуальною основою для розкриття проблематики саногенно-терапевтичних засобів комунікативності, з'ясування перспектив її практичної реалізації.

Аналіз останніх досліджень і публікацій. У вітчизняній історіографії відсутні комплексні наукові розвідки, які б присвячувались аналізу розумної сили душі з позицій саногенезу в антропології східної патристики. Єдиною працею, в якій коротко аналізуються важливі сотеріологічні теми з позицій обраного нами методологічного ракурсу є стаття архім. Тихона Софійчука. Серед відомих українських і зарубіжних учених, які в межах своїх основних наукових розвідок ґрунтовно займаються проблемно дотичною патристичною проблематикою є: Ю. Чорноморець, Ж.-К. Ларше, Г. Христокін, еп. Василій Осборн, митроп. Ієрофей Влакос, митроп. Іларіон Алфеєв, прот. В. Леонов й ін.

Постановка завдання. Саме тому, висвітлення особливостей, базових принципів і закономірностей структурно-функціонального устрою, накреслення можливих перспектив розкриття саногенно-терапевтичних засобів комунікативності, механізмів досягнення духовного здоров'я й досконалості розумної сили душі в ідейній системі антропології східної патристики наймісткіше актуалізує дослідницьке зосередження цієї статті, розкриває її основну мету та завдання.

Виклад основного матеріалу. Відповідно, було висвітлено специфіку інтерпретації, співвідношення (особливостей взаємозв'язку),

ontological and organic approach in soteriology.

Target setting. For the representatives of eastern patristics, a mental soul power (from the standpoint of perception of its importance, role, purpose and functional possibilities) is presented as a certain separate functional system that is opened up in its two main abilities: practical and supervisory. This is a particularly valuable conceptual basis for revealing the problems of sanogenic-therapeutic means of communication, clarifying the prospects for its practical implementation.

Actual scientific researches and issues analysis. In domestic historiography there are no integrated scientific investigations that would be devoted to the analysis of the rational soul power from the standpoint of sanogenesis in the anthropology of Eastern patristic. The only work in which important soteriological topics are briefly analyzed from the standpoint of our chosen methodological perspective is the article Archim. Tikhon Sofiychuk. Among the well-known Ukrainian and foreign scientists who, within the framework of their main scientific investigations, thoroughly deal with the problematic patristic issues are: Y. Chornomorets, Zh.-K. Larshe, H. Khrystokin, Bp. Vasylii Osborne, Metr. Hierofei Vlakhos, Metr. Ilarion Alfeiev, Archpriest V. Leonov and others.

The research objective. Therefore, outlining features, basic principles and patterns of structural and functional structure, defining perspectives outlining possible prospects for the disclosure of sanogenic-therapeutic means of communication, possible mechanisms to achieve spiritual health and perfection of soul's smart power in the ideological system of anthropology of Eastern patristics predetermines the actuality of this article, reveals its basic aim and objectives.

The statement of basic materials. Accordingly, the peculiarity of interpretation, the correlation (the peculiarities of interrelation), structural

структурно-функціонального влаштування, можливості концептуальної співмірності та відмінності складових мислительної сили душі: розсудку, розуму, ума (яким надані відповідні змістовно-конотаційні характеристики). Зокрема, нечіткість понятійного розрізнення долається у досить простий спосіб з'ясування смислових особливостей їх забарвлення з позицій розкриття сутнісно-енергійного принципу влаштування розумної сили душі та способів реалізації її здібностей (хворобливого чи позитивно-здорового).

Висновки. Розкрито базовий ідейний інструментарій та принципи можливої духовної саногенези та досягнення досконалості людини. А зважаючи на те, що мислительна сила душі – це вмістилище особистісності, основа свідомості та самовладності, фундамент споглядальних та інтелектуально-розсудкових функцій, вона розкривається і як визначальна функціональна складова формування вектору оздоровлюючої комунікативності (у внутрішньо- та міжособистісній перспективі: людина – Бог – людина).

Ключові слова: “Бог”, “духовне здоров'я”, “душа”, “мислительна сила душі”, “духовна досконалість”, “саногенно-терапевтичні засоби комунікативності”

and functional arrangement, opportunities of conceptual adequacy and distinctions of components of cogitative soul power: intellect, mind, wit (that got the appropriate composite and connotative characteristics) were highlighted. Particularly, an ambiguity of conceptual differentiation can be overcome in such a simple way of determining the meaningful peculiarities of their slant from the standpoint of disclosure of essential and dynamic principle of arrangement the mental soul power and realization ways of its abilities (sickly or positive and healthy).

Conclusions. Consequently, the basic ideological instrument, principles of possible sanogenesis and achievement of human perfection were revealed. Taking into account that mind and intellect are the container of individuality, basis of consciousness and composure, the foundation of observant and intellectual-rational functions that's why it is a defining functional component of creating the vector of health-improving communicativeness (in the internal- and interpersonal perspective: human – God-human).

Key words: “God”, “spiritual health”, “soul”, “cogitative soul power”, “spiritual perfection”, “Sanogenic-therapeutic means of communicativeness”.

Urgency of the research. The phenomenon of health in the structure of humanity's system of values is unanimously treated as a norm, fundamental condition of existence, high level of life-fulfillment, positive development and realization of all potentially incorporated abilities: in physical, social, psychological, and spiritual scopes. Meantime, generally accepted falsity of rather limited perception and understanding of health only from the perspective of disease or lack of physical manifestations in modern science, stipulates expansion of research horizons in comprehension of the whole complex of its vital practical and semantic interpretations. Regularity and demand of such interpretations of alternative approaches of scientific research in the given methodological sphere, from the perspective of contemporary synergetic approach in science, is regulated by a key definition of health in the preamble of the Constitution of the World Health Organization (WHO), which states: “Health is a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity”. Among all the constituents, spiritual element of health plays an important role of a summit, which determines and influences all its constituents and stipulates the genesis of human's nature. It's obvious that a complex of different ethical,

aesthetic, philosophical, and religious value paradigms, in its unity form, accordingly, different spiritual systems of humanity, which, in their turn, can influence the establishment of the spiritual element of health. However, truth as a verified token of conceptually positive content of knowledge states the authenticity of such status of truth in this process of the spiritual system, which cultivates real spirituality. The representative of such spirituality is alive, experienced communication with God, way of confession, which veracity is proved not by human's "prudence" and defined "concepts" of God but by ontological reality of Theophany in the Incarnation through personification of human's nature, combining two natures in one Divine Hypostasis of Word – God and Human – Jesus Christ. Since the bequeathed Testament by Jesus Christ, practically confirmed by a feat salvific incarnation, life, death and resurrection, overcomes the limits of any earthly system of values, human's dimensions of philosophy, ethics or aesthetics, and therefore opens prospects of divinely synergies of spirit - the spirituality formed on the basis of patristic theoaesthetics, praxis ethics and contemplative love of wisdom.

Target setting. Based on the positively verified experience of selfless practice of the evangelical lifestyle and contemplatively verified truths of divine knowledge principles of Orthodox Christian spiritual life were plainly formulated and clearly recorded by Eastern patristic thinkers that in its entirety reveals to men really effective prospects of its comprehensive development, limitless excellence and health. Such spiritual life is functionally possible through spirit praxis, natural desire and constant unity with God. The actual unity of a man spirit with God Spirit is the key to the transformation of a man, all the constituents of his nature, even more, the ability to acquire divine features without changing human nature - theosis. The human spirit is a reasonable source, which is why called "mind" by Eastern patristic thinkers. In turn, mind – key element of soul's smart power (cognitive, mental), which in the tradition of its triple division in patristic anthropology is delineated along with sensual and emotive powers. Mind, according to St. Fathers is the key principle of soul, a tsar and ruler of human nature aimed to dominate the rest of the soul and all being, while obeying God as King of all created beings. Therefore, excellence and health of mental strength causes the acquisition of spiritual health and other subordinate components, that is a guarantee of full recovery of human nature in the Logos-Christ, age-divine Wisdom, Truth and Good.

The purpose of the article. The research objective. Therefore, outlining features, basic principles and patterns of structural and functional structure, defining perspectives and possible mechanisms to achieve spiritual health and perfection of soul's smart power in the ideological system of anthropology of Eastern patristics predetermines the actuality of this article, reveals its basic aim and objectives.

Actual scientific researches and issues analysis. The conceptual prerogative of the given research is the application of authentic theological and philosophical sources of the most outstanding representatives of eastern patristics. Among them: works of saints: Vasyliy Velyky, Hryhoriy Bohoslov, Hryhoriy Nisky, Hryhoriy Palama; reverends: Maximus the Confessor, Ioan Damaskin, Kallist Katafihiot, Nicodemus Ahioryta, martyr Irenaeus of Lyon, church writers: Clement of Alexandria and Nemeziya Emeskoho. Thus, to solve the most complicated aspects of research issues works of reverends Maximus the Confessor and Ioan Damaskin were analyzed.

As for the last studies and publications of this topic, the Ukrainian historiography has no any, unfortunately, complex scientific developments that would be dedicated to the analysis of mental soul power from the standpoint of spiritual health in the anthropological system of eastern patristics. The only famous for us a specific and systematic work where the patristical conception of internal consistency and knowledge of God as the key to a unification with God that is an achievement of spiritual health (salvation) is analysed shortly and gradually (according to the state of human being: before and after the fall) is the article of Archim. Tykhon (Sofiichuk) [16]. Accordingly, a definite cognitive perspective requires a profound perception of the whole eastern patristic heritage with a special concentration on the anthropological range of problems whereas it is lined up in concept exceptionally within its limits. Among the Ukrainian scientists are Y. Chornomorets (Byzantine Neoplatonism, anthropology of Greek Patristics), H. Khrystokin (theognosia within the limits of neopatristic interpretations of eastern patristic traditions) who directly or indirectly (within the limits of their main scientific exploring) discovered a patristic approach as for the interpretations of some aspects of structural and functional demonstrations of mental soul power, content and chance of the knowledge of god. Furthermore, it is worth to recall the authors who analysed in their articles the problems of the knowledge of god, correlation of faith and mind in the theology of different representatives of eastern patristics: deacon A. Hluschenko (within the limits of general anthropological range of problems of theological system of Rev. Maksym Spovidnyk), V. Zhukovskiy (the problems of correlation between transcendental and immanent aspects of God in the theology of Kirylo Oleksandriiskiy and Ioan Zolotoustiy, ascertaining the soteriological chance of the knowledge of god and deification), S. Kachmar (the problems of correlation the faith and mind, knowledge, knowledge of god in the theological synthesis of Martyrdom Yustyn Filosof, Klyment Oleksandriiskiy and St. Hryhorii Bohoslov, M. Krokosh (knowledge of god and philosophy in eastern theology with special concentration on the god thinking of St. Hryhorii Palama). The mentioned scientists often not the first time in the native science tried to solve the definite research tasks and fill the appropriate gaps of modern Ukrainian historiography by their scientific developments. Among the foreign researchers, it is worth to recall those who specifically or superficially (in the context of own main research concentration) analysed the problems of structure particularity of mental soul power, its functional demonstration and chances of the knowledge of god from the standpoint of patristic tradition: Bp. Vasylii (Osborn), Archpriest O. Heronimus, Metr. Hierofei (Vlakhos), Metr. Ilarion (Alfeiev), Archpriest. V. Leonov, S. Lohinovskiy, Archim. Plakyda (Dezei), S. Khoruzhyi, P. Khrystu, O. Chystiakova, J. Alert, H. Bardi, K. Bilei, S. Lill, L. Barnard, E. Hudinaf, Zh.-K. Larshe, K. Mondesert, Y. Pelikan, Zh. Planzhe, J. Pirvs, Sh. Freppel, V. Kheleman and others. It is necessary to pay attention on the profound enough scientific development of specialists in the field of morally-oriented Christian, patristic psychology: M. Dvoretzka, Y. Zenko, L. Shekhovtseva, O. Khodyriev, K. Yatskevych and others. However, despite of a various historiographic base, complex native researches in the field of definite scientific problems from the position of the proposed cognitive perspective of perception unfortunately haven't been conducted yet. That's why, there is a pressing need to perform such volume of a research work and this scientific work is called up to become a minor part of it.

The statement of the main material of the study. Basic and distinguishing among other beings, the part of a human soul, which in its narrow meaning is the Image of God, actual ontological and potentially soteriological repository of a human personality, having the ability to control its unreasonable part (vital power of soul: sensual and affective), is represented, actually, by its smart power. Reverend Ioan Damaskin claims that soul is reasonable and spiritual: “God... created man in His own image and likeness. God gave reasonable and prudent soul by His inhalation. This we call the image of God, as the word combination “in His own image” points at the ability of thinking and having freedom; in turn the word combination “in His likeness” stands for assimilation to God in His virtue (charity)...” [7, p. 115]. Stating creative God-likeness of man, Clement of Alexandria specifies: “the image of God is the divine and regal Logos, [First] man who is not apt to desires. Human’s mind is the image of this image [9]. In general, in works of many reverends and teachers of the Church of Christ, mind appears as the image of God, the image of the Divine Logos-Christ, which is the very esse of a human soul, preconditions all his/her life forms, is expressed by the divine power through which, rising above everything sensual through “liberation from earthly images”, the human is able to aim and achieve the purity of contemplation of the First Image, which is longed and desired, becoming an oblationary of the divine life and overcoming sensory and spatial extent of their praxis in the field of cognition. Mind plays the role of a manager and helmsman of soul that defines the structure and form of a human life, commanding over passions and as “Head of virtues”, capable of directing will at good. Reverend Ioan Damaskin states: “Soul... possesses intellect and reason (noeran kai logiken)... Intellect belongs to soul as its own pure part. As the eye belongs to the body, so is intellect in soul. Soul is a free being, that possesses the ability to long and act; it’s apt to changes, changes conditioned by soul, as it is a characteristic feature of the being” [7, p. 116]. Martyr Irenaeus of Lyon writes: “Man was given intellect and in this he/she is like God, created to be free in choice and autocratic” [8]. Saint Hryhoriy Nisky claims that intellect and will comprise real esse of a human spiritual nature, which existence is predetermined by intellect, unifying in itself the willing and mental activities. “Lingual and intellectual esse, if it stopped to act freely, also lost the gift of reasoning”, - these words of St. Hryhoriy represent a deep connection of will and intellect [4, p.604]. In turn, St. Vasyliy Velyky notes: “As body eyesight – in the eye, so the eye of soul in the inborn intellect; but not as one in another, but the same – soul and intellect... <...> ... though soul is the same, its power has double nature: vital power of the body, and another, the power to contemplate, which we also call intellect. <...> And the power to contemplate is activated via will” [1, p. 362-363]. St. Vasyliy points to the connection of will and intellect, even more, he calls intellect an “autocratical” power [2, p. 379]. In general, most reverends of Christian East patristics outline two fundamental abilities of a human soul – intellect and free will take their owner to the level of royal dignity as a lord and helmsman of nature. “For eastern church writers human – first of all – mind, which is considered to be “imperious” and God-like part of soul which brings man to God; from here the moral ideal of life - “the contemplation of God in the mediocrity of mind” ...and selfless task of a fallen man - clearing the mind of sinful thoughts and his contemplative aspirations to God” [2, p. 381].

Remarks of Ioan Damaskin on intellect as a part of soul and St. Vasyliy Velyky on soul and intellect as one entity cause the necessity in a detailed analysis

of the issue of their connection and definition of semantic components in their patristic interpretation: soul – mind, mind – intellect – reason - heart. In patristic texts mind sometimes correlates with the notion of soul, and sometimes is treated as its independent power, “the eye of soul”. Since man is created in the image of God, and God is esse and energy, accordingly, esse and energy are characteristic features of soul. Taking into consideration patristic matching of mind and soul, the only valid definition of the principle of their contextual differentiation or, even, matching presupposes the statement of the fact that mind also has esse and energy. St. Hryhoriy Nisky wrote: “...thinking (dianoia) is energy, a wave of mind”. In the theology of St. Hryhoriy Palama, a thorough interpretation of such notional idea is provided: “Mind is an act (energeia), which lies in thoughts and ideas; mind is the power that causes it, which is called in the Bible as heart” [5]. It means that esse of soul is heart, and its energy is “thoughts and ideas”. As we can see, solving ambiguous terminological issues with the help of differentiation and revealing contextual meanings of the concept “mind”, which in some notional aspects is used by St. Fathers in the meaning of esse, and in others – energy. Opponents of St. Hryhoriy Palama didn’t understand his ascetic appeals to match notions of mind and heart. St. Hryhoriy Palama, full of true spiritual wisdom and prudence, responded clearly: “They don’t know, as it seems, that one is the esse of mind, and another – energy...” [6, p. 128]. Thus, mind has its own energetic expression and esse, which is actually the esse of soul, which is called heart in Biblical and Patristic texts. Maximus the Confessor mentions those people who try “to clear of hatred and intemperance their minds that God calls heart” [12, p. 214]. Mind and heart in such interpretations are correlating terms. Heart is susceptible to divine revelation (since God is energetically revealed in it, as Christ will live in mind) on condition of purification, and thus opening his spiritual eyes. Besides, mind is called His energy, which is revealed in thoughts and ideas. In such interpretations mind is treated as thought, mental act (logike). Reverend Maximus the Confessor writes: “Mind (nous) is an organ of prudence, and intellect (logos) – an organ of knowledge. Mind, moving, searches the cause of beings, and logos, differently equipped, studies only qualities. Search is the initial movement of mind to the cause, and research is the differentiation of the cause via the notion by logos. Mind is characterized by movement, and logos – by differentiation via notions” [10]. Reverend Maximus along with eastern Christian thinkers states the fact of defining and revealing peculiarities of double functional load of soul’s smart power. In works of Ioan Damaskin we find: “Intelligent beings possess two abilities – contemplative (theoretikon) and practical (praktikon). Contemplative ability comprehends the nature of things; practical is thinking about active actions and defines them as valid. Contemplative ability is called mind (noan), practical – intellect (logon); contemplative ability is called prudence, practical – sagacity (wisdom) (thronesin)” [7, p. 109]. Reverend Kallist Katafihiot also notes: “One thing is to contemplate, another – to think. Firstly mind contemplates, and then thinks differently... Mind shall be taught to keep silent. Then it finds the sense of secret, extremely smart and divine” [15]. Summarizing suggested patristic considerations we should point out their clear distinction between over discursive-contemplative and intellectual abilities of soul’s smart power. The term “mind” (nous) or “spirit” defines intuitive and contemplative abilities. The functional ability of reason manifests itself through intellectual, mental activities. The word “reason” in the patristic tradition perpetuates a spiritual value system of thought, intelligence, intellectual, logical and mental activities. As to “intellect”, it has

ambiguous semantics (mind – intellect = mind, mind – intellect = intellect (reason)). Firstly, convergence of concepts and even their identification is possible on condition of returning to integrity, vigorous appeal to its essence; that is to mind as intellectual and mental abilities in its subordination and unity with its spiritual and sensual nature of a contemplating mind. Then we can talk about mind as the mind that faces the contemplation of a spiritual world and God, and through His Logos (ideas, thoughts, will, energy) and all created things. According to such ontological and conceptual patterns and conditions intellect always will be defined via “mind” (nous), because in this state its activity corresponds entirely to the Creator’s plan, a person is susceptible to divine revelation and certain specified mortal logoses of the world that, in fact, opens prospects for true wisdom. Secondly, the distinction between the concepts of “mind” – “intellect” is possible under conditions of lower cognitive abilities disclosure of the mental strength of a human soul. Then mind in its vigorous manifestation of intellectual and mental ability is revealed as intellect, directed not to its esse (heart), intelligible reality and God, but to the sensual “fruit” of material reality of a mortal plain. If mind refers only to activities of reasoning, building concepts, judgments, prudence, intelligence, then it can be called reason and the result of such activities is knowledge of the visible world. It means that intellect - mind that thinks. “If you use a trichotomous diagram describing human nature, reason - a mental category, while mind relates to the higher spiritual part of man, and intellect - mind that is turned away from contemplation, interacting with reason, which is based on its mental strength and experience. Therefore, it is possible in a context to match words “reason” and “intellect” [10] and, consequently, the distinction between the concepts of “mind” and “intellect”. So, blurred distinction between meaningful concepts is overcome in a relatively easy way by clarifying their specific semantic coloring from the point of view of analysis of an esse-energetic principle of the structure of soul’s smart power and ways to implement its abilities (positive, healthy and painful) [13, p. 79].

Analyzing separately the mental power as an independent functional system and summarizing all previously mentioned it is necessary to point out its main capabilities: contemplative (theoretikon) and practical (praktikon), which would otherwise be called mind (nous) and intellect (logos). Structurally describing the power of reason of soul’s smart power St. Gregory the Theologian says that the power of reason is characterized by the ability of mind (nous), intellect (logos), will (thelema) [3, p. 535]. Its two main components – Intellect (logos) and, at the highest level, spirit (pneuma) or mind (nous), which in a psychological and moral sense is the basis of consciousness and the human ability of self-control (auteksousion). Thus, it confirms that it is the basis of the highest manifestation of human liberty and freedom. So, mind (nous) equally is the basis of all functions of reasoning: first, it's intuitive mind (nous, as such), the ability to contemplate (pheoria) and the source of any knowledge; Secondly, intellect (logos) and everything that comes from the mental abilities: thought (ennoia, dianoia), meditation (dianoia), judgments (krisis), prudence (diakrisis), the internal word (endiaphetos logos), where language and memory originate from [14, p. 49].

Conclusions. Soul’s smart power, as the image of God, the image of the Logos-Christ, ontologically set and soteriological realized receptacle of the man’s personality, for eastern patristic thinkers is imperious, autocratic and purest part of soul that comprise its true esse. Unifying a strong-willed and mental activities, soul’s smart power is capable of directing will actions to good (induce to virtue),

commanding passions, which reveals in a man feature “after the image of God” – royal dignity to control, define and influence not only the formation of soul life forms, lifestyles, but all created beings in general. The esse dimension of the ontology eastern patristic within the categorical pair “esse – energy” is a ideological key source of solving anthropological problems of interpretation and clear definition of substantial components of soul’s smart power, their relationship, structural and functional features (conceptual-categorical aspect), principles of healing genesis and achieving excellence through a complete energetic unity with Creator (soterically-sanological aspect). First, solving any inconsistencies in terminological distinctions is achieved through meaningful and deep understanding the concept of “mind”. Mind as soul has esse and energy. The esse of soul is mind, which in terms of semantics can be called heart, and its energetic manifestation is thought, opinion and ideas. That is, mind can be used by eastern patristic thinkers in two aspects of meaning: in the meaning of esse or energy. Regarding energetic manifestations of soul’s smart power, its functional disclosure is possible in dual abilities, contemplative and practical. Contemplative ability is realized through mind (that is why it is often accordingly defined) and practical - in mind (this includes all the things that belong to the mental ability: thought, reflection, judgment, prudence, inner word, the source of language and memory). Besides, thinkers of Eastern patristic make distinction between above discursive, contemplative and intellectual abilities-higher and lower cognitive abilities of soul’s smart power. In the functional aspect mind or spirit are focused on vigorous comprehension of the nature of things – embodied creative ideas in it and finding out its causes, and mind, via mental activity explores their external properties. The term “intellect” in the tradition of patristic interpretation can be used ambiguously. Firstly, in the meaning of “mind”, with the appropriate semantic load, namely in the ideological plane of reintegration into pristine spiritual integrity and health, vigorous appeal to its esse, that is, subordination and unity of the intellectual abilities with its reasonable esse (heart), fixed on the contemplation of divine thoughts and ideas (uncreated energies, logos, ideas) in respect of all created things and Triune God. Secondly, the meaning of “intellect” – in its energetic display of intellectual and mental abilities, aimed not at cognitive reality of all created things and God, but at the grossly sensual material reality of the world. Thus, a clear distinction of the meaningful concepts of “mind - intellect” is possible on condition that the energetic principle of structuring soul’s smart power, ways to implement its abilities (positive, healthy or morbid) will be defined. The process of recovery of soul’s mental power would expand the spiritual horizons of knowledge, the transition from lower (sensual, intellectual, reasonable) to higher (transcendental, intuitive, and above discursive) cognitive level: in terms of purity of heart and spiritual focusing of mind, contemplation of the apparent “beauty” of the natural world, imperishable beauty of true strength and Wisdom of God in His uncreated, creative, ideological energies - ideas, methods, reasons and expediency of all being created with the prospect of knowledge by grace, not by esse and God himself.

So, the conducted anthropological synthesis of the ideas of representatives of eastern patristics on the subject of a perception of functional ability, importance and purpose of intellectual power of human soul reveals the extremely interesting theological aspects of achievement not only the interpersonal dialogicity but also outlines basic perspectives of disclosure the essential and energetic potential of therapeutic communication due to the two-pronged cooperation “human – God”

and “human – human”. Patristic approach concerning the interpretation and precise conceptual determination the components of cogitative power (reason, mind, intellect) in the range of essential survey of eastern patristic ontology offers the possibility to comprehend the fundamental ideas of interpretation the peculiarities of their interrelation, structural and functional system, principles of health-improving development and achievement of a perfection. Mentioned peculiarities of the arrangement of cogitative part of soul, its energetic demonstration in two cognitive abilities: activity (rational and intellectual) and observant (over discursive and intuitive) reveal and two basic levels of therapeutic communicativeness. Accordingly, the characteristic features of their soterical-harmonious interdependence due to the functional hierarchy that was arranged by God and is the energetic demonstration-index on the way to the achievement of perfection and spiritual health, reproduce the essential and energetic potential of therapeutic communicativeness at least in the integrity of three projections: internal personal, interpersonal and God-human.

Список використаних джерел:

1. Василий, Великий, святитель 2014. Творения, в 2-х т., Москва: *Сибирская благовонница*, Т. 2, 1136 с.
2. Владимирский, ФС 1912. Антропология и космология Немезия, епископа Емесского, в их отношении к древней философии и патристической литературе, Житомир: *Электро-типография Дененмана М.*, 451 с.
3. Григорий, Богослов, святитель 2011. Творения, в 2-х т., Москва: *Сибирская благовонница*, Т. 2, 944 с.
4. Григорій, Ниський, святитель 2011. Творіння, в 3-х т., за ред. Патріарха Філарета (Денисенка), Київ: *Видавничий відділ УПЦ КП*, Т. 1, 623 с.
5. Григорий Палама, святитель 2019. Три главы о молитве и чистоте сердца. Добротолюбие, в 5-ти т., Москва: *Сибирская благовонница*, Т. 5, с. 327.
6. Григорий, Палама, святитель 2015. Гомилии, Саратов: *Изд-во Саратовской митрополии*, 703 с.
7. Иван, Дамаскин, преподобный 2010. Точный виклад православної віри, за ред. Патріарха Філарета (Денисенка), Київ: *Видавничий відділ УПЦ КП*, с. 109-116.
8. Іринеї, Ліонський, сщмч. 2013. Творіння, за ред. Патріарха Філарета (Денисенка), Київ: *Видавничий відділ УПЦ КП*, 620 с.
9. Климент, Олександрійський 2012. Стромати, за ред. Патріарха Філарета (Денисенка), Київ: *Видавничий відділ УПЦ КП*, 847 с.
10. Леонов, В протоиерей 2011. ‘Понятия “Рассудок”, “Разум”, “Ум” в святоотеческой традиции’, *Психологическая наука и образование*, № 31, с. 1-9. Доступно: <<http://psyedu.ru/journal/2011/3/2403.phtml>>. [25 Червень 2021].
11. Максим, Исповедник 2018. Мистагогия, пер. с др.-греч. А. И. Сидорова, Москва: *Рипол классик*, 240 с.
12. Марчук, ОТ 2019. ‘Проблема здоров’я розумної сили душі в антропології східної патристики : комунікативний вимір’, *Гуманітарно-наукове знання: горизонти комунікативістики : матеріали X-ї ювілейної міжнар. наук. конф., присвяч. 25-літтю відродж. філософсько-теологічного факультету (Чернівці 4-5 жовтня 2019 р.)*, с. 78-80
13. Немесий, Эмесский, епископ 2011. О природе человека, пер. с греч. Ф. С. Владимирский, Москва: *Канон*, 464 с.
14. *Преподобнейшего отца нашего Каллиста Ангеликуда главы (фрагменты)* 2009. Антология восточно-христианской богословской мысли, в 2-х т., пер. Д.А. Поспелов, О.А. Родионова, Москва: *Никея*, Том II, 624 с.
15. Тихон, Софийчук, игумен 1999. ‘Внутренняя целостность и Богопознание’, *Труды Киевской духовной академии*, Київ: *Видавничий відділ УПЦ*, № 2, с. 59-134.

References:

1. Vasilij, Velikij, svyatitel 2014. Tvoreniya (Writings), v 2-h t., Moskva: *Sibirskaya blagozvonnica*, T. 2, 1136 s.
2. Vladimirskij, FS 1912. Antropologiya i kosmologiya Nemeziya, episkopa Emesskogo, v ih otnoshenii k drevnej filosofii i patristicheskoj literature (Anthropology and cosmology of Nemesius, Bishop of Emesa, in their relation to ancient philosophy and patristic literature), Zhitomir: *Elektro-tipografiya Denenmana M.*, 451 s.
3. Grigorij, Bogoslov, svyatitel 2011. Tvoreniya (Writings), v 2-h t., Moskva: *Sibirskaya blagozvonnica*, T. 2, 944 s.
4. Grigorij, Niskij, svyatitel 2011. Tvorinnya (Writings), v 3-h t., za red. Patriarha Filareta (Denisenka), Kiyiv: *Vidavnicij viddil UPC KP*, T. 1, 623 s.
5. Grigorij, Palama, svyatitel 2019. Tri glavy o molitve i chistote serdca. Dobrotolyubie (Three chapters on prayer and purity of the heart. Philosophy), v 5-ti t., Moskva: *Sibirskaya blagozvonnica*, T. 5, s. 327
6. Grigorij, Palama, svyatitel 2015. Gomilii (Sermons), Saratov: *Izd-vo Saratovskoj mitropolii*, 703 s.
7. Ivan, Damaskin, prepodobnij 2010. Tochnij viklad pravoslavnoyi viri (Accurate statement of the Orthodox faith), za red. Patriarha Filareta (Denisenka), Kiyiv: *Vidavnicij viddil UPC KP*, s. 109-116.
8. Irinej, Lionskij, svshm. 2013. Tvorinnya (Writings), za red. Patriarha Filareta (Denisenka), Kiyiv: *Vidavnicij viddil UPC KP*, 620 s.
9. Kliment, Oleksandrijskij 2012. Stromati (Stromats), za red. Patriarha Filareta (Denisenka), Kiyiv: *Vidavnicij viddil UPC KP*, 847 s.
10. Leonov, V protoierej 2011. 'Ponyatiya "Rassudok", "Razum", "Um" v svyatootecheskoj tradicii (The concepts of "Reason", "Reason", "Mind" in the patristic tradition)', *Psihologicheskaya nauka i obrazovanie*, № 31, s. 1-9. Dostupno: <<http://psyedu.ru/journal/2011/3/2403.phtml>>. [25 Cherven 2021].
11. Maksim, Ispovednik 2018. Mistagogiya (Mystagogy), per. s dr.-grech. A. I. Sidorova, Moskva: *Ripol klasik*, 240 s.
12. Marchuk, OT 2019. 'Problema zdorov'ya rozumnoyi sili dushi v antropologiyi shidnoyi patristiki: komunikativnij vimir (The problem of the health of the rational force of the soul in the anthropology of Eastern patristic : the communicative dimension)', *Gumanitarno-naukove znannya: gorizonti komunikativistiki : materialy H-yi yuvilejnoyi mizhnar. nauk. konf., prisvyach. 25-littyu vidrozh. filosofsko-teologichnogo fakultetu (Chernivci 4-5 zhovtnya 2019 r.)*, s. 78-80
13. Nemesij, Emesskij, episkop 2011. O prirode cheloveka (About human nature), per. s grech. F. S. Vladimirskij, Moskva: *Kanon*, 464 s.
14. *Prepodobnejshego otca nashego Kallista Angelikuda glavy (fragments) (Reverend Father of our Callista Angelicuda chapter (fragments))* 2009. Antologiya vostochno-hristianskoj bogoslovskoj mysli, v 2-h t., per. D.A. Pospelov, O.A. Rodionova, Moskva: *Nikeya*, Tom II, 624 s.
15. Tihon, Sofijchuk, igumen 1999. 'Vnutrennyaya celostnost i Bogopoznanie (Inner integrity and knowledge of God)', *Trudy Kievskoj duhovnoj akademii*, Kiyiv: *Vidavnicij viddil UPC*, № 2, s. 59-134.