This article tackles the issue of aesthetic experience from the pathologized everyday discourse viewpoint in the system of relations between I and symbolic order, where transgressed and close to symbolic death I is predominant. The stage, in which I, crossing the symbolic borders, stay readable, appears to be the process of continuous constituting the aesthetic experience and its transforming into the primordial a priori structure of everyday discourse.

The problem lies deeply in the preserving of evanescent borders which are said to exist in the cultural palpability and simultaneously to be exited from the system. The article exemplifies pathological discourses by referring to the Bekinski works, namely his numerous ways of articulating the ineffable. However, articulated ineffable, similarly to such culturally conditioned reactions as abjection and melancholia, declares double death of the discursive subject: the first time when the separation from primordial presymbolic world takes place and the second time during problematizing the symbolic borders and paradoxical immortalization concerning postulated frontiers. The aim of this article is to dig out kaleidoscope of images and sub-images from Bekinski works through the motive of crucifixion resulting in the specific value of Christ's body and chimerical things inside the dehumanized catastrophic space. It is demonstrated how pathological discourse of melancholia could be intertwined with the discourse of abjection in the common point of transgressing the limits, making the symbolic space full of details indicating the risk of Ego being disintegrated, staying inside the transgressed limits as constituting aesthetical experience. Inexplicability of terrible post-apocalyptic world is readable via symbolic coordinates insofar as the main primal object (the body of Christ) occurs to be banished. Appearing of aesthetic experience is paralleled to the stages of psychosexual development in the existence of symbolic being where in opposition to classical feminism maternal authority is accentuated. That's how Kristeva style of psychoanalytic ruminations looks like.
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Formulation of the problem. The analysis of the processes taking place in the modern city shows that there is a deep imbalance not only between the interests of the present and future generations, but also within the generations themselves. These problems of the city shoe the urgency of dramatic changes in the system and models of production and consumption of cultural products. The imbalance in the ability of the citizens to create and consume a quality cultural product is no less a serious threat to the city than climate change, environmental pollution and urban mobility problems. In addition, there was a situation where "a person no longer knows what he wants ... he becomes alienated, subjected to manipulation and mystification" [3, p. 209].

The sociocultural space at the present stage of its development, with the characteristic complication of value self-identification of both a particular individual and social groups, the possibilities of their understanding and interaction, actualize the special humanitarian analytics. The diversity of socio-cultural practices has led to a corresponding diversity of expertise. Its need is determined by the well-known situation of devaluation, the complexity and controversy of those transformations that take place in modern Ukrainian society. The need to deepen and "modernize" the methodological basis of humanitarian expertise is becoming apparent. If we talk about relevant expert practice in science, art, politics, we have accumulated considerable experience. But there is a lack of systematic research on those problems of expert technologies, that are based on a comprehensive knowledge of socio-cultural reality, would allow to exist effectively and responsible in different forms and at different levels of cultural creation.

Dynamization of transformational processes that take place in modern society and, as a result, the formation of prefigurative culture, fundamentally change the communicative system of exchange of experience, the logic of information continuity. As a result, the previous experience (both own, personal, and gained by previous generations) ceases to be indisputably valuable to the following actors - creators of the cultural space of the city. Therefore, there is an urgent need for objective peer review. In addition, the reason for this is, unfortunately, unproductive use of resources of urban culture, indifference to their value.

The interaction of the spatial composition of the city, its elements, design forms, historical and architectural context is not only a need for the development of scientific and theoretical discourse. Urban space planning, its various elements of the landscape is visualized in the integral face of the city, which, in turn, is the part of the picture of the world that citizens have. If a city is viewed as a complex multifunctional open system with a number of constantly updated (up-to-date) problems, it is not possible to solve these problems without providing objective, knowledge-based information during any intervention in the urban spatial environment, about the "human factor", how much these changes, responding to the needs and ideas about the comfortable life of new residents of the city affect the value quality of this life, how new technologies not only work for economic efficiency, for creating favorable conditions for business, but also are correlated, as a
harmonious element, with the interests of human development in the long perspective. In the current conditions of society development, cultural expertise is a representative of the social demand for cultural knowledge.

The study of the phenomenon of expert knowledge, its cultural component, is based on an interdisciplinary approach. The analysis of expert activity, its peculiarities, determination of the place of cultural studies and philosophy in modern expert practice, in particular in the sphere of protection of cultural heritage and cultural values is carried out in the works of N. Krivich, V. Panchenko, O. Sungurov, G. Tüchlynsky. The content and functions of philosophical, anthropological, ethical expertise are analyzed in the works of S. Goncharov, L. Nikiforova, M. Uvarov. Expert support of legislative and rule-making activity in the field of cultural heritage protection are considered by T. Antipova, T. Gudyma, L. Gumenyuk, Y. Izbachkov.

The separate, especially demanded by modern society, area, that requires serious expert work, is the creation of information space of the city, as well as – image support of the authorities, their separate bodies (research by A. Suvorova, T. Shmelev, S. Shaykhildinov). Examination of research projects, as well as the processes and results of educational activities, problems of criteria for assessing the quality of scientific texts and cultural education are analyzed by V. Yegorkin, N. Krivich, L. Mosolova, L. Nikiforova, S. Tikhomirov, T. Sholomova.

Purpose of the article is to cover a spectrum of objects and problems in the context of the formation of the urban cultural space that may (and need) to be the focus of the cultural expertise.

Exposition of the main material of the study. The entry of civilization humanity into the post-industrial stage of development has given rise to many challenges for the modern city, on which its vitality and self-progression depend. To paraphrase the famous expression of V. Churchill, we can say that humanity first created the city, and then it created the humanity.

Indeed, the problem of coexistence of different cultural spaces, tensions, even conflict of which is increasing, remains urgent for the modern city. Within each space a dominant style of consumption of culture, habits, certain types of cultural practices are concentrated, and the characteristic perception of transformations take place in the city. The urban suburbs and central districts concentrate their collective memory, which is hidden by the aesthetics of everyday life of their inhabitants, by the ways of their self-expression, the need for certain symbolic forms of fixation of cultural experience.

One solution to this conflict of experiences of the creation of a productive way of blurring social and cultural boundaries that is necessary for the interaction of different types of cultures. As example, modern urbanists (E. Amin, E. Hirsch, etc.) offer transformational work with public spaces. First of all, they create the conditions for organizing new connections between media of different types of cultural activities. Now the recreation of old depressed industrial spaces, the creation of ecological parks, educational, cultural centers there is becoming a popular way communication between people of different social and cultural level, which allows not to view the stranger as an enemy, but to interact with him, create new connections. Due to the multifority of cultural and artistic practices presented in these spaces, new conditions for bringing people of different social and cultural levels who are ready to discover and perceive new things together, to revise their ideas about culture [10], for the emergence of a new culture of communication and interaction of people, “Social correctness” [8, 299], which forms the social cultural environment of the new city, are created.

At the same time, the high level of inequality in various spheres, ranging from gender, income, socio-economic circumstances to the disproportion in distribution of cultural goods, despite the overall socio-economic progress, directly affects the quality of cultural and social institutions and the level and quality of cohesion of urban society. Ensuring inclusive sustainable urban development is directly linked to the creation of a cultural space in which equal access to socio-economic benefits (education, medicine, employment, natural resources, etc.) coexisted with empowering urban populations to participate directly in the formation of cultural factors that determine their lives, to obtain the necessary experience for life. In addition, “Today it is not about the technology of production of things (as it was in modern times in the period of development of industrial technologies), but the creative technologies of production of people “(Das Man, The Men), their needs, lifestyle, values, which are embodied in the forms of cultural and symbolic products, on the basis of... image-making technologies, myth-design, creative marketing, discursive techniques, neurolinguistic programming, reframing and other numerous socio-cultural, multicultural and anthropic technologies” [5].

The contemporary realities of urban life are connected with the activation of a large number of different cultural practices (among which the visual ones remain dominant), which have filled the cultural space of modern cities, especially metropolitan areas. They create a specific information system for the preservation and transformation of cultural and historical memory. The "Memory City” (according to A. Grunbach’s statement) [9, p.56] is filled with new actors, new impressions, value ideas, “executive technologies”, which are represented in all fragments (material and intangible) of the urban environment along with the objects that record a multidimensional previous experience, its history. Due to this background, the questions are: how does the
emergence and placement of certain objects contribute to social integration, the inculturation of urban citizens, push them into dialogue and thus break the isolation of both interpersonal and socio-cultural? How do these actions ensure and intensify the effective functioning of human (= cultural) capital ("knowledge, enlightened part of labor resources, tools of intellectual and managerial work, living and work environment" [6]) as a productive level of urban space development? Are actions driven by temporary mercantile interests that are far from focused on truly improving the quality of life? Are there initiatives that expand the subjectivity of each citizen, expand and enhance his or her cultural choices? One of the most important issues of the modern city, its cultural space, in which the place of cultural expertise is indisputable, is the problem of urban planning, the ecology of its planning, visual peculiarities in particular. Modern materials, constructions, technologies along with large, often elementary volumes of architectural forms, the incomplete implementation of the architectural plan of the city (if any), the lack of a holistic architectural vision of the visual face of the city are the only tip of the iceberg that creates space alienated from a citizen. All these conditions (the lack of individualization of the whole residential complex, the area, not individual houses, subordination of its parts) are not just technical aspects of the city's construction. Plans for expanding urban space largely ignore the importance of the significant factors of contemporary urban culture, which, in turn, are not merely the artistic part of a small creative part of the inhabitants. The absence of a harmonious expressive composition of the city, geometry of space forms of living space is usually an important element of the absence of urban planning, in which there would be a functional division of the territory into zones of business and social activity, relative quiet life, inclusion in the natural environment with the organization of perception environment (light, geometric and other contrasts and additions). Such kind of development of the territory of the city leaves a person in a situation where there is no such level of arrangement of its own territory, where it would not be limited only to an apartment.

The construction and reconstruction of a city should not violate its identity, its own history, which is embodied in historical buildings, natural landscapes. Ultimately, it threatens to impoverish both the city itself and its inhabitants, who fall into an exclusion zone where personal prosperity cannot be achieved, where there is no sign-symbology of space in which everyone consider himself a harmonious part of society.

In view of the above, it should be mentioned that, since 1990, since the "Human Development Report", the discourse around it has been fundamentally shifting. The anthropocentric approach became dominant. The emphasis changes from the optimization of economic growth, its diversity, material wealth (although it continues to be an actual and necessary means of human development) to the optimization and diversity of human potential, the entire spectrum of human well-being. The latter provides the growth and enjoyment of citizens' rights and freedoms. In our view, a concept that considers human development both as the ultimate goal of the development of any cultural space, and as "the process of empowering human choice, ... human development through the formation of human potential, carried out by people (through active participation in processes, that shape their lives) and for people (by improving their lives)" [2], the process of extending people's freedom to live long, healthy and creative lives, to the fulfillment of other goals that they believe are valuable; to take an active part in ensuring justice and sustainability on the planet [4], gives the opportunity to find the optimal answers to the questions of the need and opportunities of cultural expertise. The interdependence of alternative choices is always obvious to the cultural expert. That is why any initiative is considered by the cultural expert from different points of view, which relate to opportunities not only to live a long life, but also to live happily, to acquire relevant knowledge. Society needs to answer the questions: how to measure the loss from past cultural practices, products that have not been created, how to compare it, measure the depth of morality, tastes, including taste for quality mental effort, personal "costs" for quality cultural production and consumption? The specificity of cultural expertise in which the production and circulation of goods and services in any sphere of construction and existence of urban space.

Ideally, one of the main tasks of the city government is the promotion of cultural enrichment, the development of artistic practices and the issue for the preservation of cultural heritage. Accordingly, there is a problem of determining priority investments (material, informational, etc.) in certain aesthetic, artistic and other innovations. But, unfortunately, the space of the modern city is predominantly shaped in accordance with the economic feasibility and rules of the market, which is becoming increasingly aggressive. Due to the constant migration of the population, products are becoming standardized, unified, there is a demarcation of standards. The quality of a cultural product and the corresponding cultural goods are difficult to measure, so it is commonly ignored. Equally problematic is the objective measurement and comparison of losses and the acquisition of new quality capital with the change in cultural practices. "In order for markets of goods and services of implicit quality to progress, it must be supported by specialized institutions that would eliminate information distortions. Otherwise, markets will not emerge at all or will degrade due to the outflow of dissatisfied participants" [3, p. 115]. This problem is common in many cities, especially in metropolitan areas where there is increasing demand for a clear vision of prospects, a desire to receive the same clear quality signals. It is expert work that help to protect this area from low-profile enthusiasts and agents who, using the aforementioned "implicit quality" of cultural products, playing on consumer incompetence, their variety of tastes, fill the cultural space with low quality goods. The danger is exacerbated by the fact that if this trend continues, people will generally lose the ability to identify the quality and, consequently, the need for it. Cultural expertise can become one of the instruments of counteraction to the "business colonization of culture" [3, p.25], provided that it will function as an independent body, which must be impartial in terms of lobbying the temporary beneficial interests of certain economic entities, economic, socio-political, artistic and other spheres of activity.

The growth of social mobility is accompanied by the problematization of the processes of self-identification,
inculcation and self-positioning in new environments and communities. The reference points for recognizing "one's" and "other's" are objects that people surround themselves with. The system of codes, their symbolic language, assimilated by the masses, are transformed into imitation strategies that allow to create a winning image. Visuals, stereotypes become more of a priority than true, genuine strategies that allow to create a winning image. Visuals, with the system of codes, their symbolic language, and "other's" are objects that people surround themselves with.

Communities. The reference points for recognizing "one's" sick with the deterioration of selection in culture, the shift of balance in the direction of mass inquiry, which, in turn, is focused mainly on low quality unified products. There are many reasons for this phenomena. One of them is that "some cultural products that does not contain any great humanity or even a small individual innovation, but which is properly exhibited under the sign of art, can give rise to a strong reaction from the recipient... Experiences are born of imagination, memory of a human being, her willigness and ability to aesthetize and spiritualize any object... People confuse the real and the fake" [3, p. 157, 158]. Cultural expertise can be an indicator of cultural product quality, socio-economic and artistic activity, an element of support for quality cultural production and consumption. By contributing to the "exposure of cultural goods created just for the sake of money and surviving through misinformation" [3, p.336], it can become an influential one in reforming the urban cultural space, "in the face of demand for creative innovations designed for territorially dispersed groups" [3, p. 336].

For example, modern visual practices, street art in particular, have become an effective mechanism for creating a monotonous urban environment. Monumental murals, a variety of graffiti and media forms, LED art, green street art, public art offer the city residents a new language of interaction. Making intervention to the traditional visual forms of communication, it become not only the way of creative expression, but also "places of sound of their voice" and "articulation of other voices", creating "effect of presence", involvement in the whole one [11]. The unique face of the city is revealed only in the presence of a holistic perception of the organization of its space. Urban architecture, both individual buildings and entire complexes, in any case (whether it is typical impersonal building or creative, unique, "living" space) is always a representation of the memory of the cultures, aesthetic models. The value of an innovation as an element of a figurative system of shaping the picture of the world can be much greater than its activity as an individual unit. Detection of such a semantic mean is possible due to the presence of perspective vision from an expert. This promising vision involves identifying the presence or the absence of the appropriate cultural context for the activity, its integration into the linguistic (symbolic) environment, and the perspective on the latest communication technologies, regarding the degree of coincidence of institutional, group and personal goals.

Conclusion. In the era of "rational chaos" one of the central problems of modern urban culture is the problem of consumer navigation. It is about the production and information "assets" of the urban population as creator and consumer. The cultural space of the modern city is characterized by the predominance of eclecticism, collage. It combines many different interests and needs of different populations. They are not always equal in a heterogeneous modern urban space, while tensely coexisting. Cultural expertise is an instance, transversal (penetrating) in its nature, which, taking into account cultural, discursive, sign-symbolic and other differences, passing through their bipolarity, particularity, finds the expert basis for their constructive interaction. The importance of such activities is constantly amplified in a situation of globalization, when cultural differences are smoothed, the boundaries between "fosters" and "other's" are blurring, the individual is rigidly identified with one (own) cultural circle or the whole culture, and each individual space is increasingly diversified to specific segments and audiences [1].

Expert activities in the field of culture will "greatly optimize the process of urban planning, allowing to take into account the human factor on the level of general planning of urban structures", "to direct and build more expressive urban planning compositions that develop in space and time, taking into account their visual perception by man on the basis of a pre-developed scenario" [7]. Cultural expertise can be the transversal mechanism and tool of finding the optimal analytical evaluation of relationships, their intersections, depth structures, and the various kinds of chronotopes that are inherent in a modern city. It is a kind of humanitarian project, that space of relatedness between different interests, needs, requests and actions of certain groups of the population, which is aimed at finding a certain common basis for their mutual penetration and complementarity, without losing their identity in the dynamics of creative sustainable self-development. The issue of cultural expert knowledge is a matter of optimizing the use of the urban cultural capital, removing restrictions on access to its resources. The value consequences of these actions, projects, practices will only emerge over time. Therefore, the ultimate "beneficiary" of cultural expertise, whatever it may be, are the next generations, their interests, the presence of humanity in an individual, who often do not take into account the modern market that shapes urban space.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ:
ДОСЛІДНИЦЬКІ ПЕРСПЕКТИВИ КУЛЬТУРОЛОГІЧНОЇ ЕКСПЕРТІЗИ
В КОНТЕКСТІ ФОРМУВАННЯ КУЛЬТУРНОГО ПРОСТОРУ МІСТА

У статті в контексті формування культурного простору міста здійснюється аналіз спектра об'єктів та проблем, які можуть і потребують бути в якості предмета уваги експертної діяльності в сфері культури. Висновується, що в епоху "раціонального хаосу" одна з центральних проблем сучасної культурної міської - проблема споживчої навігації. Мова йде про виробничі та інформаційні "актуали" міського населення в якості творця і споживача. Культурний простір сучасного міста характеризує перевагу експерту, колективності. У ньому переплітаються численні інтереси і потреби різних груп населення. Вони є не завжди рівноправними в гетерогенному сучасному міському просторі, іскрізь спійміючим. Культурологічна експертиза - інстанція, трансверсальна (пронизуваючи за своїм характером, яка, враховуючи культурні, дискурсивні, знакові-символічні і т.д. відмінності, проходячи крізь позиї певної біологічності, конкретності, знаходять експертне підтвердження для тіньового конструктивного спійміювання через взаємозавдання і взаємодопомогу. Питання культурологічного експертного знання розглядається в контексті оптимізації використання культурного капіталу міста, з точки зору доступ до якого ресурсів, створення інструментів пропаганди "бізнес-колонізації культури".

Зазначається, що дієвим механізмом креативізації індивідуального міського середовища стали сучасні візуальні практики. Дослідження зазначені на розумінні того, що взаємодія просторової композиції міста, її елементів, дизайн-форм, історично-архітектурного контексту не є лише потребою розвитку науково-тематичного дискурсу. Планування міського простору, різноманітних елементів іого ландшафт візуалізується в цілісне обличчя міста, яке, в свою чергу, є складовою картини світу мешканців міста. Якщо місто розглядається як складну багатофункціональну єдність систему з цілою низкою проблем, які поступово освоюються, то просторові ці проблем неможливо про відкриття об'єктивної інформації, яка б надала знання щодо статусу враження, під час було-їого впливу в організації місько-просторового сепаратизму, "людського фактора", того, наскільки ці зміни, відіграють на нових потребах і уявлення про комфортне життя нових мешканців міста, кардинально впливають на цісність якості життя, наскільки зіставлення нові технології "раціонельно" не тільки на економічну ефективність, на створення сприятливих умов для економічного розвитку на довгострокову перспективу. В сучасних умовах розуміння суспільства культурологічна експертиза і є репрезентуваним соціальної затребуваності культурологічного знання.

Ключові слова: культурологічна експертиза, культурний простір міста, сучасні візуальні практики, культурний капітал.
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ІССЛЕДОВАТЕЛЬСЬКІ ПЕРСПЕКТИВИ КУЛЬТУРОЛОГІЧНОЇ ЕКСПЕРТІЗИ
В КОНТЕКСТІ ФОРМУВАННЯ КУЛЬТУРНОГО ПРОСТОРУ ГОРОДА

В статье в контексте формирования культурного пространства города проводится анализ спектра объектов и проблем, которые могут (и уждаются) быть предметом знакомства экспертной деятельности в сфере культуры. Вопрос культурологической экспертизы рассматривает в контексте процесса оптимизации использования культурного капитала города, снятия ограничений доступа к его ресурсам, создания инструментов противодействия "биения-колонизация культуры". Уделяется внимание, что культурологическая экспертиза может стать трансверсальным механизмом и средством нахождения оптимальной аналитической оценки взаимосвязи, их пересечений, глубинных скрытых, разновидности рода, которые присутствуют в современном городе.
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