



NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY
HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

Elena B. Starovoytenko

A MODEL OF “ACHIEVING ONESELF” IN RELATIONSHIP TO THE OTHER

BASIC RESEARCH PROGRAM

WORKING PAPERS

SERIES: PSYCHOLOGY
WP BRP 15/PSY/2013

*Elena B. Starovoytenko*¹

A MODEL OF “ACHIEVING ONESELF” IN RELATIONSHIP TO THE OTHER²

“Achieving oneself” is not a subject of a systematic scientific research in Russian personality psychology. The goal of the current study is to justify the significance of such research in current socio-cultural and scientific context. “Achieving oneself” is understood in this paper as an integral reflectively mediated fulfillment of the I’s potential in leading vital relationships of a person. The field of study is “the new personology”, the method is hermeneutics. This study offers a reflective model of the I’s potential towards the Other and presents an application of this model to the analysis of the process of achieving oneself in a loving relationship.

JEL Classification: Z

Key words: significance, the I, relationship, reflection, potential, the Other, achieving oneself.

¹ Dr Elena B. Starovoytenko, Professor, Head of Department of Personality Psychology, National Research University Higher School of Economics (Moscow, Russia) E-mail: hstarovoytenko@hse.ru

² This study was carried out within “The National Research University Higher School of Economics Academic Foundation Program in 2013-2014, research grant No.12-01-0073”.

Introduction

To live is to make the I possible

The value of life reveals itself not only through the amount of benefits, given by the world, or through the social scale and novelty of the activity, but also through development of the Self, I. This article focuses on the specific process of personal development and reveals the ways to elaborate reflexivity of one's potentials in relationship to the Other. Different terms to describe that process have been suggested in psychology and philosophy: forming identity, authenticity, the cultivation of self (Foucault), the care of the self (Foucault) (5,6). In this paper, we would like to stress the development of I's potentials which leads to "achieving oneself". "Achieving oneself" is not a subject of a systematic scientific research in Russian personality psychology. Our goal is to justify the significance of such research in the current socio-cultural and scientific context. To do so, we will firstly reveal the method of our research, then describe the reflexive developmental model of the I's potential towards the Other, and finally illustrate it with loving relationship to the Other.

Hermeneutic Method in Personology

"Achieving oneself" is understood in this paper as an integral reflectively mediated fulfillment of the I's potential in leading vital relationships of a person. The field of study is "the new personology" (11, 16, 17), which differs from the traditional personality psychology in its focus on theoretical synthesis, innovation, reference to many sciences, and a diversified practical activity. The essence of the personological approach to particular research is the acquisition of psychological knowledge of personality through the unity of cultural experience, fundamental knowledge, practice, ways of individual self-knowledge, and a life change (16). The acquired knowledge is evaluated through a scientific, instrumental, and existential importance for the understanding, explanation, and self-investigation of a person.

In the forefront of our research stands the cultural-personological approach, and in particular, the use of the hermeneutic method. This method is widely used in psychology and social science (2, 4, 9, 14). In this paper it serves the task of explication, generalization, and modeling of the theoretical knowledge about the potential of the I in the new understanding of certain

philosophical and psychological works, which refer to literature and art. Some examples, which explain the specifics of applying hermeneutics in the field of ‘new personology’, are provided below.

The documents, valuable for hermeneutic research in the field of “new personology”, can be called “personality texts”. A good text contains such a connection of meanings, which opens a possibility of a different and better life for a person. These texts are constructed not only of words, but of symbols, images, colours, and tones of sound, which in a cultural language can “say” or “let the personality say” what is necessary for its fulfilment and unity with other people. “A personality text” contains something that clarifies vital puzzles and questions for a person: a story, a picture, a novel, a philosophical treatise, a psychological work, a confession, an autobiography, etc. By reading these documents a person gains new interpretations of his/her life events, him or herself and the Other, and this process facilitates his/her general understanding of text pertaining to the humanities that originate from many different cultures.

The generation of such texts can coincide for a person with the dynamics of his/her life, which involves a continuous creation of inner text, which interacts with texts of other people. The texts created by personality in its different vital states (yearnings and intuition, memories and thoughts, imagination and attribution) become instruments that the personality uses to “read” and interpret its life, creates its own chronotope, which can become a part of culture (15).

The hermeneutic experience in personology is “reading of the text with texts”. It is considered a scientific investigation dedicated to finding a solution to a new problem (for example, in this paper the problem is creating a model of “achieving oneself”) in correspondence with the wide text of conceptual understanding of “personality”, which was formed by the investigator-interpreter. The texts that serve as a basis for investigation are those towards which the investigator has a special disposition due to a rational and internal movement he or she has already felt while trying to reach a solution of the stated problem. “Our understanding and our thinking is organized thus that from the text, even from the Gospels, nothing can reach us. It will come if we have inside the nonverbal root of the experienced misfortune” (8, p.88).

Hermeneutics can be exercised in different forms that include intuitive construction, logical interpretation, reconstituting reconstruction, creative modeling, and elaboration of a new practice. In a single hermeneutic process these forms can interact and interchange depending on the tasks set by the investigator. The desired knowledge about personality can be contained in the explicit semantics of the text, or can be hidden by the author in the subtext. It may be pushed

aside by the already performed interpretations of the work, or stay unclear to the author himself. According to Paul Ricoeur, hermeneutics consists of the extraction of the “meaning potential, left unexploited, even repressed by the very process of systematization and of school formation to which we owe the great doctrinal corpora. If one cannot reawaken and liberate these resources that the systems of the past tend to stifle and to conceal, no innovation is possible, and present thought would only have a choice between repetition and aimless wandering” (12. P.350). Hermeneutics of “the known” and “the unknown” knowledge when turning to the consciousness and the unconsciousness, intuition and logic, feeling and cognition of the author is an innovative action, which unleashes the previously concealed resources of the text for the solution of some current scientific problem in the field of personality study.

Hermeneutics of a text is an act of creative perception, which is aimed towards solving the mystery, deciphering the symbols, breaking through the unbreakable, resolving contradictions, shedding light on the dark contents, transforming the meaning, and inspiring the progress to the truth. This is an introduction of the work in the cognitive, emotional and practical life of the interpreter, and its change. It is a “breakthrough to the area of the unknown”, “opening of the limits of the known”, existential experience of “extracting the value out of the concealed” (10). The texts are read by the interpreter substituting the meanings with his own, changing the meanings, transforming the intonations of the author. The meanings proposed by the author and the meanings revealed by the interpreter often don’t concur, but, as Merab Mamardashvili mentioned, with the great books these “errors” are good.

A text is a complicated speech, thought, symbolic, and emotional structure, created by various states of the author, which have the same high value for the hermeneutic process. Penetration into the style, genre, manner, unique expressions of the author, revelation of his thought process, compassion with his feelings and impressions, readiness to share his life experience makes up the holistic relationship between the work and the person who actively understands it (interpreter). “My task is not the description of the beauty of the text literate beauty, but the revelation of the way of thinking of the person, who had the experience which is no different in its matter from the one we can have. It’s just that we can experience and not understand it, and another person understood and wrote it down, so it’s interesting to look at it” (8. P.34).

The practice of personological hermeneutics is effective when the interpreter assumes the part of a “practicing phenomenologist” together with the author. This means to be able to use thought, feeling, imagination, and text to influence the intellectual, aesthetic, and practical life of

many people. Particularly, our research interpretation aims to reveal I's potential which leads to the ethic relationship to the Other. The texts of author and interpreter, the culture that stands behind them "make sense when they are directly individually interwoven, when they constitute this life" (2. P.52). Both texts can touch and define the history of the I of many people, including the creators. "The affection of the self by the other that self finds in fiction, a privileged milieu for thought experiments that cannot be eclipsed by the "real" relations of interlocution and interaction" (12. P.384). Hermeneutics is a complex personological phenomenon co-existence of the author, the interpreter, the reader, "personality", and a theme or the character of the texts.

Hermeneutics allow us to see the flow of author's thought and word in a general continuum of thinking and writing, directed at "the mystery of personality". The hermeneutic experience reveals that the author in his ideas continues the long cultural process of cognition and description of personality, marked by the "flashes of genius" of prominent thinkers. Presence of the author along the way of revelation of "personality", gives the interpreter the possibility to open the continuity, correspondence, synchronicity of the author's search with the search of his predecessors, contemporaries and successors. The interpreter finds himself in an eternal "laboratory", where a community of intellectual experimenters creates and modifies the knowledge of personality. "There is a continuum of thought and a continuum of state. As soon as we started thinking, we moved towards what already exists, what stays still, and shows itself in us, when we take the path of correspondence. We start to coincide with Mandelstam, Proust, Dante etc" (8, p. 111).

In this sense, any important author under the view of the interpreter becomes synchronous to many authors and intellectual movements, dispersed throughout the history of culture. In a hermeneutic process, Proust, as the creator of a great novel and the discoverer of new worlds of personality, coincides in cultural time with Pound, Eliot, Joyce, surrealism, Lacanian psychoanalysis, and existentialism (8). The text of the work, the texts of its theoretical co-authors, and the text of the interpretation meet in a wide, polyphonic, multidimensional space of senses and meanings, which reveal "personality".

Personological hermeneutics extends the life of the work and prolongs the existence of the author in a historico-cultural process. If the constructions and interpretations are marked by the investigator's talent and are based on subtle understanding and free improvisation, they strengthen the influence of this text in every area of personality cognition, from philosophy to

literature. Hermeneutics is a way of the text's existence; we are "in the conscious infinity, which is opened by this work" (8, p. 33).

In multiple interpretations, relationships, and impressions that emerge within this work centered on personality, the latter gradually stands out in the completeness of its "whole", and its essential, generally valid motive, idea, meaning, and symbol are being revealed. The making of the author's I during writing and the ascent of this making to the transindividual level opens up.

"The genius of Proust, even when reduced to the works produced, is no less equivalent to the infinity of possible points of view which one can take on that work and which we will call the "inexhaustibility" of Proust's work. But is not this inexhaustibility which implies a transcendence and a reference to the infinite-is this not an "hexis" at the exact moment - when one apprehends it on the object? The essence finally is radically severed from the individual appearance which manifests it, since on principle it is that which must be able to be manifested by an infinite series of individual manifestations" (13, p.22).

Interpretation reveals in the "personality texts" that which is related to the individual and ontological structure of our soul and life; it relates to the historical and the timeless aspects of being and cognition of personality.

Detection of valuable personological content in "personality texts" is determined by the quality of the hermeneutic model, which sets the interpretation procedure. In general, the procedure of hermeneutic analysis and synthesis in the personological context can be described as follows:

1. Setting a new "personality" problem, which could in future be successfully elaborated using hermeneutics.
2. Actualizing the current understanding of this problem by the investigator, and uncovering gaps in its preliminary conceptualization.
3. Identifying the relevant works that have undetected potential for building the concept of the solution for the problem.
4. Elaborating a system of categories and ideas (by the investigator), which generates a "code" for reading, an instrument for research, and a project for the reconstruction of the text.
5. Searching for the fragments where the authors reach the "clearest clarity of insight" (7), logical purity of thought expression, and outline the ideas that contribute to the solution.

6. Applying phenomenological understanding and intuition in order to reproduce, explicate, and extract knowledge that is concealed, developing understanding of the essence of that aspect of personality, which has been problematized by the investigator.
7. Collecting, systematizing, organizing into a whole (logos), development of knowledge about the aspect of personality that is being examined, retrieved from the texts.
8. Constructing a conceptual model, which contains a new solution for the set “personality” problem, based on the synthesis of the thought experience of the text authors and the investigator-interpreter.
9. Reflexive delimitation of the constructed model and the notions of personality, which belong to the authors of the researched texts.

Various “personality texts” are important for personology. It uses the philosophical reading of literary text”, which was practiced by M. Mamardashili towards Proust’s novel. It involves a psychological reading of philosophical texts and of literature, as well as a philosophical and psychological interpretation of the individual self-knowledge texts, and a historical cultural hermeneutics of confession texts and biographies. It may also involve a philosophical or psychological comprehension by the author of his own life and Self, which is exemplified by “Self-knowledge” of Nikolai Berdyaev.

Personological interpretation of cultural texts presupposes the implementation of general scientific and specifically personological hermeneutic guidelines (theoretical synthesis, innovation, reference to many sciences, and a diversified practical activity). In search for sources of hermeneutic analysis and synthesis we consulted a wide range of documents, which form the European humanities culture and share similar vision of the authors on personality existence. Among them we separated works based on ontological and existential approaches, where the philosophers could express their interest in the psychological knowledge of personality. Among those, we selected the works of Martin Heidegger, Jean-Paul Sartre, and Roland Barthes (7; 13; 1). In our opinion, these texts are connected by a mutually complementary understanding of the potential of the I, which are gained and multiplied in relationship to the Other. Let us give an explanation of this specificity based on the ideas of Heidegger, Sartre, Ricoeur, and Mamardashvili about the “hermeneutics of personality”.

Reflexive developmental model of the I's potential towards the Other

Following the examined hermeneutic guidelines, using techniques of personological reading of philosophical and literary texts, we developed a theoretical model of personality in its aspect of multidimensional abilities of the I in its relationship to the Other. This model is based on the ideas of Heidegger, Sartre, and Barthes that are explicated and comprehended in the context of the said problem, and systematized. Key categories of this model are: personality, significance, consciousness, the I, relationship, action, reflexivity, potential, project, relationship spaces, the Other, achieving oneself, and surpassing oneself. We present a set of propositions, which provide an outline of the present model.

I. Personality is a human being in the unity of the essence and existence, life of his body, soul, spirit, and activity. Personality as “life” acts as the way of connecting the person and the world, which calls on him, “challenges” him, contains him, makes him part of it, and is open and concealed at the same time. In its vital activity, personality takes itself onto the “stage of life”, singles out the significances (valuable for itself), changes the existing interrelations of the world, and “questions” the world. Participation of the personality in the being of the world denies its present state, and turns new sides of the existing things towards one another. These sides may be accessible, hidden, or “obscured by shadows” for the personality. Through the changes in the world that the personality has provoked and comprehended changes in the world personality acquires its own “presence”, its “I am”, “ecstatic standing out and withstanding in the clearing of being”. This constitutes the unique human way of being, or “existence” (10).

Personality problematizes and tries the world out by its ability to sense, perceive, imagine, think, feel and act, moving towards the significances. Generation and subjective recreation of these active vital states are related to the presence and the “work” of consciousness, which gives personality the status of Self, which signifies a “self-instating”, “self-providing”, “self-installing” principle in the world and in life. The essence of such a position of personality in the world, using the example of representation, is that

“Because in every representing there is a representing person to whom what is represented in representation is presented, the representing person is involved with and in every representing — not subsequently, but in advance, in that he, the one who is placing before, brings what is represented before himself. Because the representing person has already come on the scene, along with what has been represented within representation, there lies in every representing the

essential possibility that the representing itself take place within the scope of the one representing. Representation and the one who is representing are co-represented in human representing. This is not really to say that the I and its representing are, as it were — outside the representing, as additional objects for it — chanced upon and then subsequently introduced into the ambience of what is represented. In truth, the easily misunderstood talk about the co-representedness of the one representing and his representing in every act of representation wishes to express precisely the essential cohesion of the one representing with the constitution of representation... This doesn't require special return of appeal to me-representing... A representing person can be co-presented in a distinctly imperceptible way" (7, P.124)

In the bright light of consciousness the personality simultaneously knows what exactly exists, what it imagines, knows the image, knows itself imagining and knows the "I-concentration" of all this knowledge. And even if the I does not become a special object of self-thought in the conception (object of reflection), the imagined still necessarily belongs to him as "the representative of any conception".

During life the I generalizes, "gathers" a multitude of personality acts of cognition, feeling, and activity, addressed to the significances; it becomes a self-developing subject of recreation and renewal of these acts. Significance reveals itself to the Self alternately in the following forms: objective (as it is), intrapersonal (as it is given), transpersonal (as it is really transformed), reflection of the "personal" (preservation of the transformation in itself), and a new question to the personality (the existential challenge).

The I creates, fulfills, and acquires the potential to connect in a firm and diverse way to what it sees as significant. It also concerns its connection with another personality, the Other, which is established in an active and reflexive way. The I in its aspects of "I am able", "I have been able", "I will be able" acts as that, where "the human being keeps the source of its identification", that what "a person should be in its being, which makes something come into being" (13, p.61), the source of activity, and of establishing its boundaries in its relationships with the significances. "To be I" for the personality is to exist in the dimension of its conscious abilities. This means to live by the use of oneself, enriching oneself with the phenomena of its vital diffusion into the being of significant, parting with oneself, coming to a new encounter with oneself, reaching oneself, and slipping away from oneself into the unknown future, to the new significances.

The dynamics of "I" and its potential unfolds through specific moments of existing "for itself", or situational "places", positions, states, personality attitudes, given in self-awareness. "For itself" doesn't embrace the I in its totality, it is never fully identical to it, threatens its currently formed identity, and is necessary for him/her for self-development and the recreation of

being based on the reflexive reencounter with oneself. Actualization, denial and the appropriation “for oneself” provides stability, preservation, and variability of the “I, myself”. “The one who is reflecting on me is not some sort of non-temporal regard but myself, myself who am enduring engaged in the circuit of my selfness, in danger in the world, with my historicity” (13, P.181). II. The I has many hypostases, which indicate the diversity of ways the personality can connect to itself, its life and values. We mean here the primary and acquired during life irrational, significant, discursive, individualizing, bodily and sensual, ideal and interpersonal methods, which correlate differently within self-awareness, self-knowledge, reflection, which shape the I. “This self with its a priori and historical content is the essence of man” (13, P.71).

1. The I exists as a primary, profound, non-signifying, non-verbal, pre-reflexive “Ego”, which is vaguely perceived by the intuitive mind of the personality. “The consciousness which I have of the "I" never exhausts it, and consciousness is not what causes it to come into existence; the "I" is always given as having been there before consciousness-and at the same time as possessing depths which have to be revealed gradually” (13, P.135).

2. The “I” serves as “the label of personality”, the means of denomination of the sensory bodily-psychical “Ego” and as a self-denomination for the center of the consciousness. The sign of “I” is a cultural gift, by the use of which the existence of “for itself” as the presence of personality in relationship to itself is made possible.

3. “I” is a word, which is used by personality towards the unique “me” just once, in the only moment of life. It is the name of the individuality, which lives, cognizes, names itself in the irreversible continuum of the unique events of here-and-now.

4. The I exists in the shape of the bodily I, which is formed, felt and denoted under the impressions of the personality about the bodies of others, under their looks, and direct responses to its appearance. Also in the experience and awareness of the bodily I (or “the outer, the deepest inner”) are included those cultural images, which are transmitted to the personality by the means of pictures and texts, which remind or reflect its appearance. At the same time, in the view and understanding of others the body image of the personality is excessive comparing to its bodily I. “Actually if after grasping "my" consciousness in its absolute interiority and by a series of reflective acts, I then seek to unite it with a certain living object... I try to unite my consciousness not with my body but with the body of others” (13, P. 303). In the existence of

others and through them the bodily I is “extended outside in a dimension of flight which escapes me” (13, p.370).

5. The I is the source and the subject of thought, which belongs to itself, carries the knowledge about its corporal and psychological world, alienates it from itself, creates new knowledge about it and returns it to itself, in total the subject of reflection. “By reflection the for-itself, which has lost itself outside itself, attempts to put itself inside its own being. Reflection is a second effort by the for-itself to found itself; that is, to be for itself what it is” (13, p. 153).

6. Interacting with other people, creating its presence in their worlds, personality acquires the “collective Self”, which is partly accessible for reflection, and partly transpires as an “unknown Self”. Experiencing this “diffusion” in the multitude of Selves-in-Others, the personality strives to assemble itself, enduring frequent defeats by encounters with impassible places in the mysterious spaces of another’s being. “But neither do we apprehend a plural look. It is a matter rather of an intangible reality, fleeting and omnipresent, which realizes the unrevealed Me confronting us and which collaborates with us in the production of this Me which escapes us” (13, P. 282).

7. In the “circulation of Self” the I is trying to reach the ideal of coincidence with itself, fulfillment, realization of all the potential, which opens “for itself” in situations of encounters and relationships to the significances. These potentials and the effects of their realization are perceived by the I as a perspective for its widening and strengthening in the overall and integral participation in the new encounters with the significant. The ideal border of the I is the achievement of oneself in the ascent towards its significances in the dimension of their cultural values. This is the fundamental project of individual existence, which is constituted by the potentials of the I.

III. The richest world, where the personality can open and self-center its potentials, is the Other as specific, significant personality. The Other with his view, understanding, action towards the personality is necessary for the I to experience and acknowledge its facticity, its freedom in the context of joint existence. The dynamic “for itself” of the personality gets involved with the life of the Other, involves his in its life, appears “for the Other”, and becomes his own “for itself”. The Other creates and allows the personality to understand the “structures” of its existence.

The Other is another I for me, as I am another I for him. Both are in the space “out of oneself” enter the organization of each other, affirm the reality of each other, widen the limits of their “I can”, their reflection, subjectivity and the drawn mutual “objectivity”. “There is no privilege for my self: my empirical Ego and the Other's empirical Ego appear in the world at the

same time. The general meaning of "Others" is necessary to the constitution of each one of these "Egos." (13, P. 233). Staying in this necessary dependence, the Other and the I do not dissolve into one another; the freedom of one is not the basic condition for the freedom of the other. In the mutual exchange of potentials both give each other a new free existence, defining him and becoming its part. "The Other is that "myself" from which nothing separates me, absolutely nothing except his pure and total freedom; that is, that indetermination of himself which he has to be for and through himself" (13, P.271).

The basic identity with each other as "also a personality" and "also the I" is disintegrated, when in front of each I appears a particular Other. The I establishes a connection with the Other at the levels of a steady gaze, external "penetrating" action, mutual reflection and mutual presence of the I and the Other, as well as reflective exposure and integration of one's being within the Other, the being of the Other within oneself, the being of oneself within oneself, and being outside of oneself and of the Other. Participating in the "mirror game of the world", the I grows its potential for reflection. "Thus through the look I experience the Other concretely as a free, conscious subject who causes there to be a world by temporalizing himself toward his own possibilities. That subject's presence without intermediary is the necessary condition of all thought which I would attempt to form concerning myself" (13, P.271). The Other in his interested appeal to I connects it with itself. IV. In his life connections to the personality and in its reflection the Other gains various hypostasis and qualities.

1. For the personality, he is a real object of space and time, a specific fact, a situation in the world, an essential challenge from life, which the personality has to answer. He is a value, without which the personality feels lack of existence. The personality directs its activity at the Other, addresses its desires, feelings, cognitive acts, deeds and actions towards him, captures part of his inner world, shares his being, places him in the world of its subjective significances, and unfolds "within itself" its relationship with him.

2. Not reduced to the position of an object, the Other is a "personal presence"; he awakens in the personality a feeling of reality, by acknowledging it through the appeal of another person to it. The Other is given to me as a clear and obvious presence, "the Other is given to me as a concrete evident presence which I can in no way derive from myself and which can in no way be placed in doubt nor made the object of a phenomenological reduction or of any other Epoché" (13, P.271).

3. The Other's presence, transmitted through look, through verbal address, through evaluation and interiorisation of the personality's image, shows it the life "beyond" the I-being. "The Other-as-object is only an object, but my apprehension of him includes the comprehension of the fact

that I could always and on principle produce from him another experience by placing myself on another plane of being" (13, P. 296).

4. The present Other possesses for the personality a perceived and unknown subjectivity: the ability to be the incentive, the initiator, the model, the connoisseur and the continuer of its activity. The Other becomes a co-author of the consciousness and life story of the personality, and also acts as its world, as the space of the "reflected subjectivity" (10), where the personality finds itself alive and significant for another person. The Other gives the personality an opportunity to "be", feel, see, imagine, understand; it allows it to open and actualize its potential, gives its creations a place in the world, defines its role in the community of cultural creators.

5. In his references to cultural creation, and by participating directly in cognition and practice of the personality, the Other demonstrates his "instrumentality". He shows his belonging to the universe of tools, the enhancers of potentials, which the personality can master and use in its vital activity, thus increasing its freedom and the freedom of many others.

6. The Other is an addressee for the personality, the "place" for implementation of vital potentials of the I. It is also the "global potential of the I", which has to do not only with the presence of the Other, but also with the possible future of his absence. The Other is a project, a sketch, a meaning for the I-being of the personality, which makes it possible on a wide perspective of life.

7. The Other is, in fact, I (myself), as it unites the I given to the Other, the I which contains a representation of the Other, the I which reflects "in itself" the relationship with the Other, as well as such aspects of Me myself as I-object, I-subject, I-instrument, I-personal freedom that are represented in the mind and in the existence of the Other.

V. The vital appeal of the personality to the Other is in a form of "relationship" which is a universal way of building, living and reflecting an individual existence in the world of significances. The realizing relationships create a united flow, an ever-changing "fabric", objective and subjective answers of personality to the world's questions that touch it. We say "correlation" also when talking about the supply and demand of commodities... man, in his very being, is in demand, is needed, that he, as the being he is, belongs within a needfulness which claims him (7, P.290).

The relation (relationship) to any significance is caused and defined by the personality. It is as a complex activity and a phenomenon of consciousness created by interrelation of conscious (those which include the I in their constitution) aspirations and feelings, perceptions and conceptions, cognition and intuition, actions and deeds. Each of the constituents of a relation in interaction with others can become a separate "relation", where there can be defined the

processes and effects, which have their genesis, dynamics and localization in the space “between the personality and the significance”, “in the personality” and “in the significant”. Whether we talk about the cognitive, the imagery, the emotional, the practical or the integral relationship, in its own existence it provides a multidimensional **co-presence** of the personality and the significance.

A relationship is a continuum of integral, productive acts that have a complex psychic and practical architectonics; they are initiated by the I, addressed by it to the significance and returned to itself. The I in the context of a realizing relationship can take a reflective position, which promotes formation and development of a complicated subjective configuration of the relationship to the significance. In this configuration:

The I comes into a relationship with itself as experiencing an encounter with the significant;

The I comes into a relationship with the significant;

The I puts the significant in the relationship to itself;

The I relates to the significant as present in itself;

The I relates to itself as present in the significant;

The I relates to itself as renewed by the connection to the significant.

Through reflection the I actualizes and comprehends these moments of relationship, interprets and correlates them, finds and solves their contradictions, synthesizes them and grasps their perspective. The I shows a deep disposition towards the significant, perfects it, embraces and alternately moves to inner and outer spaces of the personality and the significant, develops on the basis of the “correlation of relationships”, becomes the relationship itself.

Relationship of the personality to the significant in specific life situations gains multistage dynamics. In its making of action, actualization of meaning, awareness of “I can”, motivation, goal-setting, actions of choice, making decision, action, reaching a goal, assessment of results of an action in aspect of realization of meaning and perspectives of its problematization are mutually caused and interchanged.

Separation of these stages and their outlined sequence are connected by the accentuating of meaning, which projects future activity of the personality in respect to the possible, the desired, the goal-related, and the chosen. In this project, apart from other dynamics of relationship to the significant, the main part is played by the awareness of the possibilities. “We act before positing our possibilities and that these possibilities which are disclosed as realized or in process of being realized refer to meanings which necessitate special acts in order to be put into question” (13,

P.73). In the vital connection with possibilities, meanings direct towards acting with desire, love, enthusiasm, understanding, and for the good of others.

Relationship is a transcendence to the significant, the most important moment “for itself”, strengthened by the reflection of relationship in the modus of: “I act”, “I have meaning”, “I can”, “I want”, “I know the goal”, “I choose” etc. Each of the reflective events can reveal and define the “fate” of a stage in the relationship in different spaces of co-presence of the significant and the I, and also condition the general movement of the personality towards renewing and achieving itself. It has to do especially with reflection of possibilities (“I know that I can”) in situations which free the personality’s potential at most. “The possible is that lacks in “for itself” to become “Oneself” (13, P.134).

VI. In the relationship of the personality to the Other, as in other relationships to the significant, the possibilities given in reflection and the actual possibilities of the reflection act as “the possibilities of the I”. The personality that possesses them in relationship to the Other is able to put “itself” at the same time in the focus of active relationship. The relationship to the Other logically includes in its structure the process of the implementation of the relationship of the personality to itself (17).

Reflection in the context of its relationship to the Other gives the personality knowledge about its possibilities, allows it to include them in the structure of its I, favors the opening of the “potential I” in situations of development of the other personality. These situations cover three main dimensions of interaction and co-presence of the I and the Other: between the I and the Other, I-in-Other, Other-in-I. In each dimension there are specific potentials of the I, reflection and realization of which shape the completeness of the achievement of itself by the personality in the relationship to the Other. In particular, it is about the potential to act, direct the look, create, talk, cognize, interpret, comprehend, accept, deepen, generalize, evaluate, overcome the unknown, define the perspective. All of them come “from the I” and return “to the I” on the horizon of the Other’s perspectives.

VII. The following is a model of reflection of the I’s potential in relationship to the Other.

In a multidimensional reflection of its relationship to the Other the I understands that it can (“I know I can”):

1. accept the encounter with the Other, gain an impression of the aspect of the Other as positive for itself;
2. initiate various psychic and practical activities towards the Other and call for reciprocal activity about the significant objects;

3. understand the position of the Other and his response to the I's activity through a look, a gesture, a feeling, an expression, a deed, a call for action;
4. create a generic inner Image of the Other based on the analysis of his activity and the revealed qualities of the subject;
5. capture and understand the I-Image, formed in the Other based on his involvement in the interaction, achieve the "transparence of the Other's body";
6. mentally put the real Other in relationship to this Image, and interpret this relationship;
7. clarify how the Other wants to be represented in the I and compare this desired Image with the Image of the Other-in-I;
8. mentally take the place of the real Other and with his "eyes" see the his Image in the I;
9. establish and deepen its relationship to the presence of the Other-in-I towards strengthening the identity and independence of the I and the Other;
10. set a task of widening and enriching the world of significant objects and the ways of interaction of the I with the Other;
11. understand what interaction with the I and involvement in its being mean in the life of the Other;
12. raise the value of the presence of I-in-Other for the Other, make it developing and full;
13. understand what in the life of the I is done by the Other, how big is his investment in this life;
14. make an I-generalization of its activity and its reflective steps in all dimensions of co-being with the Other, access the level of "reflection of reflection";
15. assume the might of the "unknown I" in correlation with the "known I", understand that the consciousness, the reflection is "the mystery of being in full light";
16. cast doubt on the efficiency of its efforts in realizing certain potentials of the I, addressed to oneself and to the Other;
17. question oneself and the Other about the new potentials of the I and the Other, born through interaction and co-presence;
18. create a project of relationship with the Other and initiate a new cycle of realizing the potentials of the I to multiply the potentials of the Other.

Examples of the fulfillment of all the I's potentials listed above are presented in Russian literature, particularly in works of F. Dostoyevsky. We would like to provide an excerpt from the novel "The raw youth" to demonstrate how these I's potentials are discovered and realized during the hero's encounter with his beloved. The I's potentials are explicated on the basis of the hero's reflexive statements and marked according to the list above.

"No, no, sit down," I said, stopping her; "there, you shuddered again, but you smile even when you're frightened... (*Potentials 1, 3, 5*).

"You are raving."

"Yes, I am."

"I am frightened ... " she whispered again.

"Frightened of what?"

"That you'll begin knocking down the walls ... " she smiled again, though she really was scared.

"I can't endure your smile... !" (*Potentials 3, 5, 6*)

And I talked away again. I plunged headlong. It was as though something had given me a shove. I had never, never talked to her like that, I had always been shy. I was fearfully shy now, but I talked; I remember I talked about her face. (*Potential 2*).

"I can't endure your smile any longer!" I cried suddenly. "Why did I even in Moscow picture you as menacing, magnificent, using venomous drawing-room phrases?..When I was coming here I dreamed of you all night in the train. For a whole month before you came I gazed at your portrait, in your father's study, and could make nothing of it... I saw you then, but if you were to ask me how I went out of the room or what you were like, I could not tell you—I could not even have told whether you were tall or short. As soon as I saw you I was blinded. Your portrait is not in the least like you... You are plump, you are neither tall nor short, you have a buxom fullness, the light full figure of a healthy peasant girl. And your face is quite countrified, too, it's the face of a village beauty—don't be offended. Why, it's fine, it's better so—a round, rosy, clear, bold, laughing, and ... bashful face! Really, bashful. Bashful! of Katerina Nikolaevna Ahmakov! Bashful and chaste, I swear! More than chaste—childlike!—that's your face! I have been astounded by it all this time, and have been asking myself, is the woman so, too? ... I never imagined that you had such a brow; it's rather low, like the foreheads of statues, but soft and as white as marble, under your glorious hair. Your bosom is high, your movements are light. You are extraordinarily beautiful, but there's no pride about you. ..."
(*Potentials 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13*).

She listened to this wild tirade with large wide-open eyes... (*Potentials 5, 6, 8*). As soon as I stopped she held out her hand, and in a voice that was still even, though it had a note of entreaty, said:

"You must not say that ... you can't talk like that... ." (*Potentials 3, 7, 15*).

And suddenly she got up from her place, deliberately gathering up her scarf and sable muff (*Potential 2*).

"Are you going?" I cried. (*Potential 16*).

"I'm really afraid of you... you are abusing ... " she articulated slowly and as it were with compassion and reproach (*Potentials 5, 6, 11*)..

...

"I will open the door myself, but let me tell you I've taken a tremendous resolution; and if you care to give light to my soul, come back, sit down, and listen to just two words" (*Potentials 9, 10, 14, 17, 18*)....

She looked at me and sat down again" (*Potentials 2, 3, 12*) (3, P. 268-271).

The hero achieves himself when he tells his beloved about a ‘tremendous resolution’. At this moment the hero’s expectations of himself, the results of his realization in the relations towards the Other, and Other’s resonance coincides with each other. Steps towards ‘achieving oneself’ strengthen the hero’s I (by the means of integration of different “I can”). It also increases his presence in the Other, who “gives light” to his soul in return. However, the situation of “achieving oneself” is replaced by avoidance, or escape from himself, once he enters his new life.

We would like to emphasize that this way of interpretation can be used in counseling and psychotherapy. Clients’ texts can be analyzed in three dimensions (between the I and the Other, I-in-Other, Other-in-I) to reveal new possibilities and limitations of I’s potential.

Coming back to the model described above, it is necessary to add the following. The potentials of the I reveal themselves to the personality in connection to the “impossibilities of the I”, or its “I can’t”. For example, the I can’t reliably know for itself how the world’s objects are given to the Other and to him only; how is the Other-for-himself; how does the Other see the I; how does the Other directly perceive the relationship of the I with other significances; how does the relationship of the I to the Other change in the presence of others; what is the mystery of the presence of I-in-Other, unknown to the Other; what is the meaning beyond the personal of the I and the Other being presented and entrusted to each other.

The possibilities of the I towards the Other differ in their accessibility for reflection and realization. There are such potentials that are not revealed in reflection, not tried out in interaction with the Other, the potentials, to which “I is not the master”. There are possibilities not known and not claimed by the Other, thus “dead potentials”. There are possibilities unknown to the Other and those that exceed his/her necessities. There are possibilities that should be renounced in relationship to the Other. There are potentials in relationship to the Other that surpass the limits of the possibilities, characteristic of other relationships with the significant. There are potentials, which are experienced and understood as limitless in co-creation with the Other.

Achieving oneself in a loving relationship to the Other

In this chapter we would like to reveal how the hermeneutic method and the reflexive developmental model of the I’s potential towards the Other may be applied to study a specific type of relationship – a loving relationship. The brightest and deepest experience of a

relationship to the Other, which awakens the maximum possibilities of the I is love of a person. We use extended understanding of a “loving relationship” as a form of ethic relationship to the Other.

Love is a primary relationship to the Other and a powerful intention that elevates every vital relationship it penetrates. A loving relationship of the I to the Other is a freely unfolding project of “giving oneself and the Other more being” (13). The loving-I by fulfilling its specific potential in the diversity of a loving relationship goes towards achieving oneself through the affirmation of the Beloved’s value.

We believe, based on our inquiry into the ideas of Sartre and Barthes, that the I in its loving relationship to the Other has the following possibilities:

- To become aware of a strong impression, of being touched by the aspect of the Other. From the first meeting, the facticity of the Beloved can be perceived by the I fully and directly, without concealment or secrecy. Knowledge and experience that the I acquires in its exciting, direct impressions of the Beloved, form his “psychic body”, which exists as an Image, Imaginary, Symbolic, Text;
- To be inspired by, filled with the Beloved, overcoming his difference, objectness, leaving him freedom to be himself, returning to his personal presence in one’s own life. This is a possibility to discover each other’s subjectivity in the field of the life together and one’s own inner world;
- To put the Beloved together from the best impressions transmitted by many other people, who connected with him in different situations, and “from all the dots scattered as stars there will arise a perfect figure – “My Other”” (1, P.147)
- To identify with the Beloved’s Image, to lose the inner singleness, but at the same time respect and be responsible for his and my own autonomy resorting to the double negation: he is not I, and I am not him. The I desires to “own” the Beloved specifically as the Other, who gives it being;
- To achieve full identification with the Beloved, becoming the Other for myself; to see it as an ideal, as the highest value of love. The basis for identification is the freedom of the Loved One as an integral personality, which can fill the I, turning to it with many sides, including the ones revealed by the Lover;
- To withdraw the Beloved from the traditional system of identity, based on the others’ assessment by the criteria of “qualities”. In this sense he cannot exist for the I as “small”, “insignificant”, “cowardly”, “insecure”, etc. “I love the Other not for his qualities but for his existence; I love not what he is but the fact that he is” (1, P.372).

- To unfold before the Other the vast picture of the world of possible values (knowledge, beauty, good, kindness to others, creativity), to become a generous mediator between myself and the Other in mastering extensive spheres of life, to model new potentials of the I, fulfilling which would draw a return feeling. “There occurs that brilliant and rare thing which is called exuberance and which is equal to Beauty” (1, P.382). Love in its essence is a large-scale project of the I to be loved, to renew the value being, involving the freedom of the Other in a relationship with me.
- To become similar to a Sage and a King, who try to be “owned” by the other person, so as to fill his inner world, “give him my world for living”, to summarize and symbolize the events of his life, to spread through all his intentions for freedom, to become an all-embracing value, to stand above all judgment. The purpose of such an expansion of the I is to create two individualities, which have mutual space for vital dialogue;
- To possess the word and the text of love so that they would magically attract the Beloved, flow into him, deeply influence his imagination, fantasy, ideas, and desires. In an opposite awakening of love, the speech of the Beloved slips into his free involvement as an “enchanted force”. The Beloved becomes an “ideal interlocutor”, who creates the maximum resonance around the Lover. The words of the I-Lover strive to become truth for the Beloved and the response is accepted as truth;
- To create a constant inflow of impression about relationships for the Beloved; to overcome difficulties in the lives of two, which are open to the view of many other people; in difficult situations to return myself and the Beloved to the personal responsibility for the Other, to the loneliness of choices and decisions made in favor of the Other;
- To understand that the Other in his care and protection should not absorb the I, because the I, fully given to the Beloved, is unable to accept his independence. The dialogue of love is based on distance, which permits to subjectively elevate each other, and let the Other go, when he wants to leave the relationship;
- To know oneself from the point of such aspects of love, that restrict creative potential of the I and freedom of self-determination of each one in the relationship:
“Suffering”, when the Other’s Image-in-I becomes unbearable, and the Other is called to answer. “Turn back, look at me, see what you have made of me” (1, P.92).
“Power”, when arises the desire to make the Other fully dependent on my presence in his world. “Because what I do is subjugate: by obeying and wanting to subjugate, I in my own way feel the desire to rule” (1, P.99).

“Shock”, when the Other in a joke, irony, rudeness demonstrates himself as “not-my” Other. “He is possessed by a demon who speaks through his mouth, out of which emerge, as in the fairy tales, no longer flowers, but toads. Horrible ebb of the Image” (1, p.184);

“Abduction”, when it feels like the Other voluntarily or not appropriated me, and the I is fully projected on the Other and lost for myself. “Each time a subject “falls” in love, he revives a fragment of the archaic time when men were supposed to carry off women (in order to ensure exogamy): every lover who falls in love at first sight has something of a Sabine Woman (or of some other celebrated victim of ravishment)” (1, P.107);

“Unknown”, when the innermost essence of the Other eludes me, and it seems that I will not be able to know what the “unknown Other” thinks of me, how he sees me. “The other is impenetrable, intractable, not to be found; I cannot open up the other, trace back the other’s origins, solve the riddle. Where does the other come from? Who is the other? I wear myself out, I shall never know (1, P.209);

“Discrepancy”, when a confusing collision entangles my possibilities, and what the Other is capable of gaining from me. “Desire is to lack what one has-and to give what one does not have: a matter of supplements, not complements” (1, P.144);

“Loss”, when the Other deprives me of presence in him, lives where I am not, alienates me into the space where there is no mutuality. “I am spending my “qualities” for nothing: a whole program of affects, doctrines, awareness, and delicacy, all the brilliance my ego can command dies away, muffled in an inert space, as if – culpable thought – my quality exceeded that of the loved object, as if I were in *advance* of that object (1, P.206);

- To possess the art of reflection, understanding that on a life’s scale it can be lost in a “great flow of unconscious”; to summarize my impressions of love in a firm Image, Symbol, Text of the I-Lover; to open in myself an inexhaustible ability to love. The other is my good and my knowledge: only I know him, only I make him exist in his truth... Conversely, the other establishes me in truth: it is only with the other that I feel I am “myself” (1, P.185). Reflective foundation of love, that is open to the future, doesn’t let its constructive dynamics to run out. Love directs the I towards the affirmation of values beyond the boundaries of relationship to the Other: in aesthetic, ethic, intellectual, practical sense. An inspiring Project is being born: the project of reconstruction and renewal of my being in the world of creativity and culture.

In conclusion, the model of ‘achieving oneself’ in relationship to the Other has been discussed. We revealed the method, the reflexive developmental model of I’s potential towards the Other which leads to “achieving oneself”, and illustrated its application in the field of a loving relationship to the Other. This model describes the specific aspect of personal development referring to one’s experience of “I can”, which often escapes scientific attention. This model may be used in counseling and psychotherapy to analyze possibilities and limitations operating in client’s relationships to Others. From the perspective of personality psychology, we find it significant to stress the importance of *reflection* of I’s potentials.

“Achieving oneself” in the aspect of reflection and fulfillment of the I’s potentials is essentially a continual life journey, where moments of encounters with oneself and exceeding oneself constantly change. It is also a perspective problem for science, a solution for which can be found in a new area of “personality search” – the personology of the I.

Bibliography

1. Barthes R. A lover’s discourse, fragments (transl. R. Howard). HarperCollinsCanadaLtd, 2001
2. Richardson F.C., Fowers B.J. Critical theory, postmodernism, and hermeneutics: Insights for critical psychology. In: D. Fox, I. Prilleltensky, S. Austin (Eds.), Critical psychology: An introduction.. Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, 1997. , (p. 265-283).
3. Dostoyevsky F. A Raw Youth (transl. C. Garnett). Digireads.com Publishing, 2009.
4. Flick U. An introduction to qualitative research. 4th edition (2009). Sage, London.
5. Foucault M. The History of Sexuality. Vol.1: An introduction. (transl. R. Hurley) Vintage Books Edition, USA.
6. Foucault, M. The hermeneutics of the subject : lectures at the Collège de France, 1981-1982. New York: Picador.
7. Heidegger M. Being and time. Trans.: J. Stambaugh. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996.
8. Mamardashvili M.K. Psychological topology of path. Spb: RHGI, 1997 (Russian Edition)
9. Messer, Stanley B. (Ed); Sass, Louis A. (Ed); Woolfolk, Robert L. (Ed) Hermeneutics and psychological theory: Interpretive perspectives on personality, psychotherapy, and psychopathology. Rutgers symposia on applied psychology, Vol. 2. Piscataway, NJ, US: Rutgers University Press. (1988). xix 424 pp.
10. Petrovsky V.A. Person above the situation. M. Smysl, 2010 (Russian Edition)

11. Petrovsky V.A., Starovoytenko E.B. Personality science: four projects of general personology. / Psychology, Journal of the Higher School of Economics T.9.№1. 2012 p. 21-39. (Russian Edition)
12. Ricoeur P. Oneself as another (transl. K. Blamey). University of Chicago Press, 1992
13. Sartre J-P. Being and nothingness. (Transl. H.E. Barnes). Washington Square Press, 1992.
14. Shweder A.R. Rethinking Culture and Personality Theory Part III: From Genesis and Typology to Hermeneutics and Dynamics. American Anthropological Association Issue Ethos Volume 8, Issue 1, pages 60–94, Spring 1980.
15. Starovoytenko E.B. Cultural time of the personality / World of psychology №3. 2011. P.62-75. (Russian Edition)
16. Starovoytenko E.B. New personology – the integral science of personality / World of psychology №3. 2012. P.59-71. (Russian Edition)
17. Starovoytenko E.B. Psychology of relationship with oneself / World of psychology №4. 2010. P.13-25. (Russian Edition)

About the author

Dr Elena B. Starovoytenko, Professor, Head of Department of Personality Psychology, National Research University Higher School of Economics (Moscow, Russia).E-mail: hstarovoytenko@hse.ru, Tel. +7 (903) 794-99-65

© Elena Starovoytenko, 2013

Any opinions or claims contained in this Working Paper do not necessarily reflect the views of HSE.