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Abstract: Correlation of freedom and necessity in Fichte’s “science of knowledge” and Romantic theory of “transcendental subject” is analyzed in the article. In our previous research we have shown that “transcendental subject” may not be reduced to mere gnoseological function but comprise much wider functional space. So in the present article we analyze Fichte’s position who rejected so called “common sense” and demanded those who wanted to perceive his theory first of all to give up the set of mind characteristic for commonplace common sense that is aimed on reduction of freedom, as well as I. Kant, J.W. Goethe and J.C.F. Hölderlin, Novalis.

Key words: “Science of knowledge” %“Transcendental subject” %“Common sense” %Freedom %Necessity %Phenomenal %Noumenal %“Individual being subject”

INTRODUCTION

There is a deep relationship between Fichte's “the science of knowledge” and Romantic theory of “transcendental subject” and it originates from the urge towards rising above common sense, showing not only limitations of everyday consciousness but its complete insolvency and inability to comprehend truth.

Fichte disputed the so-called “common sense” demanding those who wanted to perceive his theory first of all to give up the set of mind characteristic for commonplace common sense that is aimed on reduction of freedom. This sense is pervasive in our era. The meaning of people's activity is to give up the spirit of primitive deliberativeness. “But there are many people being not so much engaged by dominating era... who feel infinite futility and superficiality of this maxim” [1]. So people are committed in all their heart to overcome futility and timelessness, to overcome poor and superficial science. Fichte's romantic spirit was aimed also on overcoming mediocrity and spiritual weakness.

Fichte disputed also the spirit of boring clearness being just numerous repetitions of the same. Valuable contribution in overcoming bourgeois pragmatic spirit made I. Kant and J.W. Goethe. From the very beginning Goethe was interested in Kant's idea of correlation between phenomenal and noumenal “worlds”. While in Kant's theory the object of aesthetic reflection is idea that sensual idea wake up in individual conscious some conceptual-undefined idea (noumen) Goethe drew attention to the excellent (and sublime) itself illuminated by final moral aim. It is in principal sensually perceived and at the same time morally understood integral human world. That is the way the beauty originates that was understood by Goethe as a symbol of morality; nature itself seems to be speaking about what is seemed to have higher spiritual sense [2]. According to Goethe the art unites perception of nature with its “necessary laws”. Each individual according to his organization has his own truth that may be understood in its intimate details. Those who reach generally valued truth do not understand themselves [3].

Thus romantic interest of Goethe shifted towards perception of individuality and existence of a man himself. It is difficult for a man to live in this world, everything is boring but transcendent is available that does not leave along even the most stable thoughts. As we can see Goethe considering Fichte's fight against the spirit of mediocrity is oriented on integral and at the same time individual subject that has the facet of aesthetic relation to the world and to himself.

In our previous research we have shown that “transcendental subject” may not be reduced to mere gnoseological function but comprise much wider...
functional space [4]. In this regard Goethe in some sense anticipated the problem that got philosophic status only in XX century, when integral “individual being subject” [5] with a facet of aesthetic, existential attitude of the world became a “new universal”.

“Individuality” itself became for Goethe the “key” to understand individual being forms and reproduction of unprecedented individual cultural forms. Capability to “capture” and express “general meaning” of art in some individual case makes artist an artist. Goethe as well as Kant considers art as a cultural sphere to be some symbolizing activity representing objective world even more adequately than science. So perception of scientific truth depends on the capability of a scientist to become like as artist, poet and use characteristic for art symbolization process in cognition process and thereby fronts objective. “Real symbolism is where individual represents general not as a dream of a shadow but as living instantaneous revelation of unexplored” [6].

Romantic authors (Hölderlin, Novalis, others) implied in their works just this “flash of being” in scientific, intellectual cognition. This “flash” is obviously some “proto-phenomenon”, a sort of “lightening” that flashed only for a moment. Art and science in this regard are two ways of symbolization of objective world. Art that has moral spirit together with science forms a sort of integral organism, humanistically understood world of cultural, spiritual being.

Fichte's idea of “infinite freedom” of a subject was taken up by Romantics authors bored by dullness of everyday life. Fichte's idea of “phenomenological reduction” gradually but logically transferred into F. Schlegel's idea according to which irony is the way to remove any limitations in endless “self-development” of creative potential of an artist and poet [7]. Innovative statement of a question about art specific made by Kant, limitation of science and moral claims on priority in culture convert in Romanticism into gradual absolutization of art itself. A “beautiful” itself became the synonym of “spiritual” and poetry became the supreme reality. According Novalis “the more poetry the closer to reality” [8].

“The poetry dissolve the other's being in its own”, Novalis wrote [9]. The process of disconnection of a thinker and a poet is just illusion that shifts us away from freedom. Both suffer from this disconnection. So we are speaking about spiritual disease that undermines our closeness to social reality.

Romantic authors who tried to interpret “transcendental I” as “I” of genius and really free as “free genius” developed the topic that art only correlate empirical and noumenal “worlds” in a man's consciousness and does not possess the reality status unlike others cultural spheres.

But a theory of a beautiful is apparently manifestation of the freedom itself in social phenomenon. At present the discussion about correlation between freedom and necessity is unsolvable neither with reason, nor with experience.

New social and spiritual shape of correlation of freedom and necessity itself can be relatively vividly seen via study of symbol, symbolic relationship of a man and reality.

Philosophic language slightly opens the idea of freedom. It is necessary to reveal to the world a work in which all the power of philosophic perception of the world would be understood. But is may be possible if freedom itself would be understood as a symbol of moral and philosophic work as a way to make unique being of a man available to other people via spiritual experience, suffering and the art of philosophy as free production of a sense of beauty.
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