

UDC (1.091):141.144A. S. SYNYSIA^{1*}^{1*}Ivan Franko National University of Lviv (Lviv, Ukraine), e-mail andrii.synysia.edu@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0002-0983-7187**Analysis of Oleksandr Kulchytskyi's Anthropological Research in the Context of European Philosophy**

Purpose. The paper is aimed at studying the peculiarities of the Oleksandr Kulchytskyi's doctrine of human, taking into account the context of European philosophy and especially in comparison with the paradigm of philosophizing in the Lviv-Warsaw school. **The theoretical basis** of the study is determined by Kulchytskyi's scholarly works in the field of philosophy and philosophical anthropology, as well as the latest researches that reinterpret the influence of Twardowski's theoretico-methodological ideas on the formation of the philosophical worldview of the Ukrainian thinker. **Originality.** Based on the appeal to primary sources, Kulchytskyi's philosophical doctrine of human in the unity of its basic principles and theoretico-practical results is reconstructed. The ways of forming the key ideas of his philosophical anthropology are determined, their originality is substantiated, despite the cooperation with Twardowski's school, as well as despite numerous discussions and researches of Western European philosophico-anthropological, existential-ideological and socio-psychological issues. **Conclusions.** It is found out how the philosophical worldview of Oleksandr Kulchytskyi was formed and how he gradually came from the research of the human psyche within the framework of anthropological structural psychology to the realization of the need to study philosophical anthropology. The personalistic features of his philosophical doctrine of human are characterized; in particular, attention is paid to the distinction between the concepts of person and personality, determining the importance of the social factor for the formation of human worldview, didactic aims of anthropological studies. It is shown how in Kulchytskyi's philosophical anthropology the analysis of the existential-worldview dimension of human existence, manifested in different spiritual situations and socio-cultural conditions that influence the specifics of thinking and the nature of the personality mentality, acquires special importance. The originality of Kulchytskyi's arguments about human in the context of both Ukrainian philosophy and in general European philosophical thought is stated.

Keywords: Oleksandr Kulchytskyi; philosophical anthropology; existence; personalism; person; personality; Lviv-Warsaw school

Introduction

Just a short time ago, Ukrainian historians of philosophy have initiated a study of the local receptions of the "mainstream" of world philosophy. This initiative aims, on the one hand, to demonstrate which philosophical ideas of world-famous thinkers have been rethought at the local level, and, on the other hand, to find out how significantly local contexts influenced various kinds of rethinking of "great" philosophies, and at the same time the cultural identity of a particular community was preserved (Yosypenko & Khoma, 2020). It is clear that this kind of initiative only marked the tendencies that have emerged in the works of Ukrainian researchers in recent years. These tendencies are especially clear on the example of Stepan Ivanyk's (2014, 2015), Olha Gonczarenko's (2020), Ihor Karivets' (2019) researches, devoted to the Lviv-Warsaw school. They decided to demonstrate how the theoretico-methodological achievements of some European philosophers (including Twardowski and Brentano), whose works influenced the formation of the analytic tradition in philosophy, were later rethought by Ukrainian thinkers. The reason for this is more than compelling: many Ukrainians studied under Kazimierz Twardowski at Lviv University and had the opportunity to continue their studies in Western Europe.

In this respect, a special place is occupied by Oleksandr Kulchytskyi (1895-1980), a native of Skalat (Ternopil region), a student of Lviv University and Sorbonne University, an active public

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

figure and organizer of Ukrainian science abroad (in Germany and France). He was one of the few Ukrainian intellectuals who, of course, at the cost of forced migration, managed to develop Ukrainian philosophical thought, free from ideological distortions, during the period of ideologization of socio-political life and the realities of national education and science in the 1940-1980s, being in line with world philosophical discussions in their European dimensions of existentialism, phenomenology and philosophical anthropology. In fact, Kulchytskyi devoted a lot of his work to the study of anthropological issues: he assigned to them an important role in his university lectures, summarized in "Fundamentals of Philosophy and Philosophical Sciences" (Kulchytskyi, 1995a), in a special script "Introduction to Philosophical Anthropology" (Kulchytskyi, 1973), in which he significantly expanded the ideas of his "Essays on Structural Psychology" (Shumylo-Kulchytskyi, 1949), in numerous journalistic, psychological, philosophical socio-political articles, scientific reports and manuscripts (in Ukrainian, Polish, English, French, German, Spanish), many of which are still awaiting publication and discussion (see: Yerzhabkova (1981, 1982a, 1982b, 1983, 1985a, 1985b)).

The proposed study will demonstrate how Oleksandr Kulchytskyi's philosophical worldview was formed and he gradually came to realize the need to investigate human nature – a topic that significantly distinguishes his philosophical ideas from the analytic worldview of Twardowski's school and demonstrates his enduring spiritual ties with the Ukrainian philosophical tradition developed by Hryhorii Skovoroda, and with the schools of continental philosophy. In the process of analyzing his research on the formation of philosophical anthropology as a science, the formation of a personalistic conception of human nature, the study of characteristic worldviews of human existence, it will be shown that attempts to correctly interpret Kulchytskyi's legacy must be sufficiently balanced, and any attempt to immediately correlate it with a particular school or tradition in order to correctly demonstrate these local contexts of global philosophies will not achieve its goal if only certain aspects of its philosophical heritage are taken into account.

Purpose

This paper aims to investigate the features of Oleksandr Kulchytskyi's philosophical conception of human, given the context of the Lviv-Warsaw school and European philosophico-anthropological research.

Statement of basic materials

From a student of Twardowski to an original personalist thinker. There is no doubt that the formation of Oleksandr Kulchytskyi's philosophical worldview was influenced by his studies at the Faculty of Philosophy at Lviv University in 1913-1914, 1924-1926, after which he received the academic title of Master of Pedagogy and Psychology (Yerzhabkova, 1996, p. 51). The fact is that having become a student, Kulchytskyi immediately enrolled in a philosophical pro-seminar, which was conducted by Kazimierz Twardowski (Ivanyk, 2014, p. 55). In order to read, analyze and interpret philosophical works, to discuss them at classes and meetings of the philosophical circle organized by Twardowski in the university library (Woleński, 1985), a thorough academic training was required: knowledge not only of the history of philosophy but also of European languages, in which the works were written. Therefore, it is no coincidence that Kulchytskyi, in addition to philosophy, studied German and French at the university. Moreover, he joined the activities of the "Polish Philosophical Society" founded by Twardowski (which de-

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

fined the organizational structure of the Lviv-Warsaw School) and the "Philosophical movement" ("Ruch Filozoficzny"), the journal of this society (Ivanyk, 2014, p. 64).

Investigating Twardowski's influence on the formation of Kulchytskyi's philosophical, pedagogical and psychological ideas, Olha Gonczarenko (2020) notes the following: "... through his courses at university, Kulczycki transmitted to the Ukrainian students the methodological and philosophical ideas of the LWS, namely: analytical method, psychologism, introspectionism, intentionalism, epistemological and ethical absolutism" (p. 35). Indeed, Kulchytskyi's philosophical statements are characterized by a clear formulation of the problem, its division into separate sub-questions, special attention to the definition of concepts, an attempt to combine philosophical reflection with the data of psychological science, and so on. However, it should be noted that the scientific interests of Kulchytskyi himself do not always coincide with the key thematic areas of research of the Lviv-Warsaw school and it seems debatable that Twardowski's philosophical ideas were "the main source of Kulczycki's philosophy" (Gonczarenko, 2020, p. 35). It must be admitted that the nature of his scientific interests was also influenced by his studies at the Sorbonne in 1919-1920, where he studied philosophy and Romance philology. It is no coincidence that his first work, "The Unknown Guest" ("Ukrainian Literary and Scientific Bulletin", 1924), was devoted to the analysis of the parapsychological ideas of Maurice Maeterlinck, who wrote mainly in French, and his doctoral thesis "Scientism in the teachings of Renan" (a famous French orientalist and historian of religion), written in 1930 in French, when Twardowski's school was at the zenith of its development (Yerzhabkova, 1996, pp. 51-52).

In addition, it will not be difficult to notice what radical changes the Lviv-Warsaw school has undergone since the beginning of the Second World War. Not only because 34 of the more than 80 thinkers of this school did not survive the hardships of the war, many scholars (like Kulchytskyi in 1940) emigrated abroad. Ties were severed, and the political situation at the time prevented individual members of the school from teaching. Changes in accents in philosophy under the influence of ideology, did not allow reviving the school as a certain social structure. At the same time, under the influence of new existential, phenomenological trends, due to the need to take into account moral and worldview issues, the attachment to Twardowski's school has significantly weakened. If the school continued to exist (as long as Twardowski's students lived), it was not as a collective formation, but only in the works of individual authors (Woleński, 1985). However, Kulchytskyi hardly belonged to them. And not only because he did not actually mention Twardowski's legacy in his works. In conclusion, his interest in human and political issues, somewhat uncharacteristic of Twardowski's school, his strong critique of the worldview and anthropological principles of Marxist ideology, his interest in Ukrainian national identity were the result of a much wider range of authors, including such personalistic psychologists as Emmanuel Mounier, Carl Gustav Jung and Philipp Lersch, as well as such philosophers as Max Scheler, Nicolai Hartmann and especially Hryhorii Skovoroda and Immanuel Kant. In the latter, as noted by Kyrylo Mytrovych (1985), "<Kulchytskyi> finds two basic principles of his own philosophizing: critical rationalism and anthropological approach to all problems of philosophy" (p. 7). Therefore, it can be assumed that anthropological motives in Kulchytskyi's philosophizing should be found not so much taking into account Twardowski's legacy as considering the historico-philosophical background of the formation of his views more broadly – given the theoretic-methodological ideas of thinkers from previous epochs and from other traditions.

In general, it can be argued that the theme of human being is central to Kulchytskyi's philosophical studies (and so little characteristic of Twardowski's school). It is no coincidence that

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

fascinated by Kulchytskyi's research on human person and discussions with him Mytrovych (1985) even remarked that "He <Kulchytskyi> believed, from the point of view of his profession and from life experience, that philosophical thought is a deepening and totality of those essential knowledge and values that are necessary for the full self-awareness of man and the whole community" (p. 6). Indeed, for Twardowski (2009), the philosophical study of human beings was limited to the study of the metaphysics of the soul, and therefore, at most, the study of the epistemological aspects of the human self, the existence of which is a directly obvious truth that does not require proof (p. 37). Our Self, according to Twardowski, cannot be reduced to a set of mental phenomena, because it is single and does not consist of parts. However, the results of the study of the self, or the human psyche, are not yet the answer to the question of what a human being is. Therefore, for Kulchytskyi, and this is not the case with Twardowski, it is important to take a step away from the study of the human psyche in the direction of philosophical understanding of human person. It is no coincidence that he returned to the subject of human almost throughout the period of his work and paid much attention to the formation of the science of philosophical anthropology.

From philosophy and psychology to the science of philosophical anthropology. Analyzing the sphere of human existence, Kulchytskyi (1947) noted: "It is impossible not to call *the very problem of human* the oldest, the most difficult and sensually closest to human" (p. 6). Various humanities and natural sciences only touched on certain aspects of human being. However, to comprehend human as such, so to speak, *sub specie aeternitatis*, did not seem a feasible task, because "human as a microcosm is essentially as infinite as the macrocosm of the Universe" (Kulchytskyi, 1947, p. 6). Therefore, philosophical anthropology arose from the need not to lose understanding of what human being is in general, and in the light of the differentiation of human sciences to take a step towards the integration and consolidation of these sciences.

Anthropological issues, according to Kulchytskyi (1995a), form philosophical knowledge, which is accordingly concentrated around the issues of being, knowledge and values (pp. 100-131). He is firmly convinced that it is not so much the focus on the philosophical substantiation of truth that is characteristic of Twardowski's studies as "the subject of philosophical anthropology should become the central sphere of philosophical thinking" (Kulchytskyi, 1973, p. 17). The subject of anthropology is so closely intertwined with the key branches of philosophy that it is difficult to draw demarcation lines between them. To clarify this fact, Ihor Bychko (1996) even concludes that the philosophical anthropology proposed by Kulchytskyi "integrates the achievements of such components of philosophical knowledge as ontology, epistemology and axiology ... forming a pluralistic integrity of philosophical knowledge about human" (p. 23). Of course, in the perspective of studying human being, the very ideas of ethics and aesthetics as special axiologies allow a person (a human from the social perspective) to consider human value as self-worth, and ontology and epistemology are rather auxiliary tools that help to manifest the world for human beings and find themselves in it.

Among the basic characteristics of philosophical anthropology, Kulchytskyi (1947) determined the focus on human wholeness and essence of human being (p. 6). To interpret a human person as a whole means not just to pay attention exclusively to intellectual sphere (the ability to think, comprehend or know the outer and inner world). "The whole person", according to the thinker, is "physical-psyche-mental-spiritual one, with all his/her feelings and will, premonitions and fears, experience and hope..." (Kulchytskyi, 1966, p. 23). Under such an interpretation, every aspect of human existence becomes important for understanding the essence of human person

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

both by others and in the process of one's own self-awareness. At the level of theory, a person is considered in various aspects (psychological, social, biological, moral, etc.); *de facto*, everyone is identical with oneself. Being of a person is characterized by a whole, by which Kulchytskyi means "such an order of parts to which nothing can be added or subtracted without a substantial change of the object, which as a result is closed, complete" (Shumylo-Kulchytskyi, 1949, p. 12). When scientific analysis tells us about the different layers of human existence – material (or physical), organic, mental and spiritual, we still need to understand that in human integrity, each of these layers performs its clearly defined functions and tasks. To investigate their functional purpose, we must first understand what is a whole, that is, a human who is not the sum of individual structural layers. There are likely to be integrative links between them. At the level of the human psyche and spirituality, the whole has precedence over the individual parts. This state of affairs distinguishes the sphere of the mental from the physical, because the study of the latter begins with the study of individual elements.

As can be seen, philosophical anthropology considers human person more broadly than anthropological structural psychology, even in the holistic-structural perspective developed by the author (Shumylo-Kulchytskyi, 1949). Philosophical anthropology significantly complements the knowledge of psychology, because it allows us to look at human beings from the perspective of the integrity of reality, which is objectified in the universal knowledge of being. Thus, philosophical anthropology differs from such anthropologies as cultural (focuses primarily on the works of the human spirit) or social (studies the behavior of people in social groups) or anthropology in the broadest sense of the word (which focuses on the study of human physical nature).

Kulchytskyi (1973) rightly noted that Kant was the first to formulate the subject field of philosophical anthropology when he made distinctions between the concepts of theoretical anthropology (knowledge of human beings in general and their abilities), pragmatic anthropology (knowledge of practical human skills) or moral anthropology (as a study of human action from the ethical aspect) (p. 6). Later in Heidegger's existentialism, it became clear that anthropology was the basis of the fundamental ontology, because it reveals the nature of being precisely through human existence. Such a focus on knowing human as immersed in being opens up metaphysical perspectives to philosophical anthropology, because it becomes important to consider human from extra-experiential perspectives, when the mind seeks to go beyond the phenomenon and comprehend the essence of things. However, importantly, Kulchytskyi himself, probably under the influence of Twardowski, is not inclined to consider philosophical anthropology as a result of the development of philosophy (or metaphysics). A meaningful philosophical view of things arises after the actual scientific progress. Kulchytskyi (1973) agrees with Bernard Groethuysen that the formation of philosophical anthropology as a reflection on the essence of human was due to the progress of psychology, history, linguistics, and the humanities in general (pp. 7-8). However, he considers it important to emphasize that the main role in this process has been played by holistic-structural psychology. The fact is that it made it possible to analyze how man differs from the animal world, namely the mental and spiritual structure, which we discover through the categories of "I", "consciousness", "person", "personality". Denotations of these categories are a common object of study for philosophical anthropology and psychology, with the difference that the former considers the content of relevant concepts in a generalized form, and the latter – at the level of manifestations of a particular person. For philosophical anthropology, it is first important to reach the level of analysis of the moral meanings of human existence on the basis of knowledge about the nature of the human psyche (in the spiritual sphere).

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

Personalistic aspect of philosophical anthropology. Obviously, if a person were focused only on solving practical problems, one would not hope to understand human spiritual essence. Appreciating Max Scheler's attempts to characterize the spiritual nature of human through the analysis of the spirit, the new "that just makes human a human" (Kulchytskyi, 1973, p. 11), Kulchytskyi seems to be more inclined to pay attention to those manifestations of the spirit that can be studied as psychological phenomena (volitional and sensory acts, perceptions, mental reactions and the physiological states that cause them). Such phenomena form the mental layer of human being, which is only the basis for understanding the spiritual layer. The importance of psychological analysis is that it clearly indicates the need to take into account not only what seems to us fully aware of human actions, but also what person cannot fully understand. After all, on the one hand, a person is an active subject of his/her actions (when everyone thinks, shows willpower, concentrates on a particular subject). On the other hand, a person can be simply a passive object of those states or processes (for example, passions or affects) that captivate his/her thoughts. Moreover, some of the processes, "emerging from the depths of the soul and falling into the scope of active functions, retain part of one's original deep character" (Shumylo-Kulchytskyi, 1949, p. 16).

Thus, analyzing the human psyche, Kulchytskyi comes to those metaphysical truths, which Heidegger, for example, defined as *Angst*, which already exists at the ontological level of human existence, and Wittgenstein defined as *unspeakable* (*unspoken*), which is extremely important for understanding human behavior (Synytsia, 2020). Philosophical anthropology, as can be concluded, in a metaphysical way shifts the emphasis in psychological research of human. For example, mental processes are replaced by analysis of human events, the intentionality of acts of consciousness is reinterpreted in terms of caring about being, another person or oneself, and the attempt to define our attitude to the unconscious and, therefore, uncontrolled, in ourselves is transformed into a reflection on existential angst (or anxiety) – something causeless that determines human existence, but can not be clearly understood. Thus, a number of mental phenomena acquire not a psychological but an ontological meaning and it becomes possible to think about the moral dimensions of the human personality as something objectified on a spiritual level.

This makes it possible to interpret the human "I" (Self) not only as a center of conscious mental life, a center of mental meanings and consciousness, but also personally – as something spiritual-ideal, social or biographico-historical (see: Kulchytskyi, 1973, pp. 64-70; Shumylo-Kulchytskyi, 1949, pp. 35-43). Each of these dimensions of our "I" is based on a certain structural-real "I" defined by a set of our conscious and unconscious mental states, thoughts and feelings, extrapolated to the level of intersubjective interaction. At this level, the person grasps, comprehends and develops the moral, aesthetic, religious, theoretical values of society; carries out the introjection of universal and national spiritual values into the way of being one's own phenomenal "I".

Kulchytskyi separately emphasized that human existence never stands apart from the fate of society. He wrote: "Human actions and reactions are so completely woven into the web of social relations that they are never deprived of social significance and are never socially indifferent: everything is related to the social environment" (Shumylo-Kulchytskyi, 1949, p. 40). It does not matter whether it is about a person thinking alone on past events, the current state of affairs or planning future actions. Each time a person uses the language he or she has learned in the process of socialization, he or she takes into account the potential social assessment and determines the extent to which his or her actions will be welcomed or condemned by others.

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

In the community, a person has the opportunity to compare his/her actions with the actions of others, to build certain patterns of behavior in society and to determine his/her attitude to them. Therefore, it is good when a person's philosophical reflection will help in this matter. Kulchytskyi (1995a) wrote: "Philosophical anthropology gives reason to think not only about human who is, but also about human who should be, not only about human nature, but also about its transformation, not only about human reality, but to some extent about the human ideal" (p. 148). Guidelines for certain ideals are of practical use, because they make it clear that the understanding of human nature is not limited to itself, it also fulfills certain axiological, didactic goals. The educational ideal to which the researcher aspires is to focus on the best examples of culture (including Ukrainian). It is not simply in the gaining of knowledge, but in the education, cultivation of values; in strengthening spiritual and cultural ties in society and, in general, taking into account the best experience of one's own culture, as well as the cultural heritage of other peoples (Kulchytskyi, 1969, p. 23). As we can see, combining the goals of anthropology and pedagogy, Kulchytskyi aims to strengthen the practical significance of philosophical anthropology. If the statements in philosophical anthropology were exceptionally about the universal, they would be nothing more than an abstraction or idealization; it would not matter to the everyday life of the average person. Therefore, it is no coincidence that Kulchytskyi moves from the concept of person to the analysis of Ukrainian person, Ukrainian cultural tradition and Ukrainian values, reveals ethnopsychological, ideological, spiritual and cultural-historical factors of formation of the Ukrainian national character (see, e.g.: Kulchytskyi, 1995b). In this way, he makes a kind of transition in his reflection from psychology to anthropology, and then returns to the study of the individual, whose cognitive and moral autonomy is extremely important from the standpoint of personalism.

A free creative person, not burdened by the external environment, capable of self-knowledge and immersion in the depths of his/her heart – such an ideal of Skovorodian person in Kulchytskyi's personalism acquires a psychological dimension (Kultschytzkij, 1974). "Heart" (inner world of a person) is understood as a set of mental and spiritual phenomena that manifest themselves in the process of functioning of the human psyche, which serves as a basis for formulating the spiritual dimension of human existence. This dimension is characterized by self-awareness, personal activity and the desire for self-development. At the level of spirituality, the human "I" becomes an axis for the formation of a person (aimed at realizing pragmatic goals and social tasks) and a personality (able to perceive, realize and determine the attitude to spiritual, including religious values). In general, the basic criteria of a person are individuality, teleology, axiology (self-worth) and phenomenology (ability to self-knowledge) (Shumylo-Kulchytskyi, 1949, p. 46). Compliance with these criteria is a necessary condition for the formation of personality as an individual and a unique subject of socio-cultural reality.

Existential-worldview dimension of human being. However, Kulchytskyi does not dwell too much on the study of human person as such, because he understands that knowledge of the nature of human being requires a clear understanding of all the variety of challenges a particular person is facing. Therefore, his analysis of human person is also characterized by attention to the study of human existence.

In this aspect, again, we can point to a certain difference from the methodology of Twardowski, for whom it was important to focus on some problem, to give an opinion in a critical-analytical way (see, e.g. Twardowski, 1921). For his part, Kulchytskyi preferred to consider the problem in the context of the history of philosophy, to cite the views of predecessors that

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

could confirm his own views. For example, he described the concept of spirit according to Scheler (Kulchytskyi, 1973, p. 11), which corresponded to his idea of spirituality as one of the layers of reality (Shumylo-Kulchytskyi, 1949, p. 3). In the context of the progress of philosophical anthropology, he paid attention primarily to the anthropological views of Plato, St. Augustine, existentialism or Scheler (Kulchytskyi, 1995a, pp. 140-145). He combined them with his own religious and ideological views of human person (Kulchytskyi, 1966); he gave a definition of the situation according to Jaspers, Sartre or Hartmann, and then defined this concept (Kulchytskyi, 1966, p. 4). That is, it was important for him not only to discuss, but also to seek the views of those thinkers who would confirm his own reasoning.

In particular, Kulchytskyi drew attention to the context of the situation in order to understand the nature of human behavior. The fact is that the person manifests oneself in the context of the situation. Under the influence of the existential tradition, Kulchytskyi (1966) defined the *situation* as "a set of factors of the physical and spiritual environment of person, each of which simultaneously affects human and among which human acts, thereby acting on these factors as well" (p. 4). Thus, there is an external and internal dimension of a certain situation, which the person gets in. Sometimes external factors are so unfavorable that a person will not be able to show oneself as usual. Such situations, following Jaspers, can be defined as boundary. But neither under boundary conditions nor under normal ones, the situation itself does not contain instructions for action. Therefore, a person is able to show freedom and decide how to interpret a situation correctly and how to act in it. As Kulchytskyi (1966) remarked: "Every human situation is a piece of ethical existence" (pp. 4-5). Thus, even in completely new circumstances, a person, based on his ethical experience, will decide how to act. The inner dimension of the situation in which a person will be, will contain a number of spiritual factors of individual being. These factors will shape the spiritual situation, which is determined by religious facts, thoughts or ideas, largely interconnected with the processes of the outside world.

A human can be considered as being in different types of situation ("cosmic", historical, socio-public, personal and family). And at the same time each of us constantly builds a certain system of relations to the world, sometimes without even guessing about it. The human worldview is formed as existentially pluralistic – a person simultaneously interacts with a multitude of other worlds, and is not in the same world with a clearly defined line of events. Under certain conditions, a person finds oneself in extreme situations, which is an integral part of human existence – it is about struggle, suffering, accident, guilt and death (Kulchytskyi, 1995a, p. 144). Such situations make you think about how to be and how to act, what to change and what to take for granted. When faced with difficulties, a person tries to preserve the integrity of one's own personality, which is manifested in spiritual harmony and peace of mind. In some cases, such borderline situations take the form of inevitable crisis situations. Kulchytskyi wrote about it as follows:

In two phases of human life, the integrity of life becomes a problem for us: when we pass through the gates of our youth and see before us paths and roads and their intersections and impassability, we look for our own way, and then, when we pass through the gates of old age, coming out of life before the "wall of death" that Franko writes about in "Moses", we

look from afar at our journey and in what has *been*, and we find that

which is *lasting* and *imperishable*. (Kulchytskyi, 1985, p. 18)

Of course, a person constantly finds oneself in a situation of choice, not only at a young age or at old age, when everyone chooses what will inevitably come. A difficult situation arises whenever it is difficult to make a choice and make a decision, because you find yourself in the unknown and do not know what decision to make. Kulchytskyi (1985) believes that in such circumstances the decisive role should be given to the worldview as a set of values that allow a person to make the right choice in unexplained life situations (p. 18). Worldview is constantly changing throughout life. It becomes the end result of our perception of the world. It is no coincidence, as Kulchytskyi (1981) wrote, "for a clearer definition of the concept of *worldview* ("Weltanschauung") it is good to understand in advance the concept of *world-picture* ("Weltbild")" (p. 28). Characterizing the worldview, Kulchytskyi, following Jaspers, points to the semantic-spatial, mental-cultural or metaphysical nature of this concept. The world-picture itself clarifies to us how the transition takes place from a set of visual knowledge about the world and individual subject contents to a holistic picture of the world.

The formation of worldview, i. e. the way a person understands the world and understands what is happening in it, as Viktoriia Havrylenko (2020) points out, according to Kulchytskyi's philosophy, is influenced by origin, geographical living conditions and natural factors (p. 67). However, it should be added that the nature of a person's worldview is influenced by the peculiarities of mental composition of thinking and mentality. The process of forming a mentality as a set of socio-psychological guidelines for understanding the processes occurring in the world around depends on the cultural environment of the person. Under such conditions, culture forms the ontological basis of the human worldview and the uniqueness of the worldview of different peoples (Kulchytskyi, 1995b). And to understand the nature of human behavior, as well as the existential dimensions of human worldview, it is necessary to take into account the spiritual, psychological and socio-historical foundations of the cultural environment in which the individual is formed.

Originality

The preconditions of origin and peculiarities of the philosophico-personalistic conception of human by Oleksandr Kulchytskyi are analyzed. The boundaries of Twardowski's influence on the nature of Kulchytskyi's worldview are determined and the originality of his reasoning in the study of existential-worldview and socio-psychological aspects of philosophical anthropology is stated.

Conclusions

Thus, thanks to reflections on person and his/her existence, as Kulchytskyi demonstrated, philosophical searches in the ontological, epistemological, and axiological spheres acquire integrity and completeness. Investigating the values and senses that fill human existence, he seems to go far beyond the paradigm of philosophizing, focused on substantiating the truth, which followed Twardowski. The practical value of anthropological reflections is manifested in the fact that they build a certain educational ideal, but also in the fact that the thinker is able, without resorting to excessive abstraction, to explore the specifics of being an individual. For this,

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

worldview aspirations, beliefs and knowledge (life experience), mentality, the nature of the cultural and historical situation in which the formation of the human personality took place are important. Studying the basics of philosophical anthropology, Kulchytskyi built an original concept of Ukrainian personalism, within which he combined general philosophico-theoretical ideas with specific observations of the way of life of the Ukrainian people. His philosophical anthropology is developed as a synthesis of ideas of European philosophy in the context of Ukrainian intellectual and spiritual culture. Combining the ideas of psychology, culturology and philosophy, Kulchytskyi created an original conception of philosophical anthropology, in which reflections on human nature and existential-worldview dimensions of human being acquire new meanings and values within both Ukrainian culture and European philosophical thought.

REFERENCES

- Bychko, I. V. (1996). Ukrainyskyi natsionalnyi kharakter: Personalistskyi pidkhyd. *Filosofsko-antropologichni chytannia*'96, 2, 20-26. (in Ukrainian)
- Gonczenko, O. (2020). Oleksandr Kulczycki's Philosophy and the Lviv-Warsaw School. *Analiza i Egzystencja*, 50, 19-39. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18276/aie.2020.50-02> (in English)
- Havrylenko, V. V. (2020). Human as a Carrier of the Worldview: Individual and Collective Dimensions. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, 18, 62-75. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i18.210988> (in English)
- Ivanyk, S. (2014). *Filozofowie ukraińscy w Szkole Lwowsko-Warszawskiej*. Warszawa: Semper. (in Polish)
- Ivanyk, S. (2015). What is Polish Philosophy and What Can It Give to Ukrainian Philosophy? *Sententiae*, 32(1), 128-142. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22240/sent32.01.128> (in Ukrainian)
- Karivets, I. (2019). F. Brentano and K. Twardowski: Some Traces of Their Influence on the Contemporary Ukrainian Scholars. *Problemos*, 96, 96-106. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15388/Problemos.96.8> (in English)
- Kulchytskyi, O. (1947). Filosofichna antropohiia. Nova nauka – stara problema. *Arka*, 5, 6-7. (in Ukrainian)
- Kulchytskyi, O. (1966). *Ukrainskyi myrianyu u dukhovnii sytuatsii suchasnosti*. Paris. (in Ukrainian)
- Kulchytskyi, O. (1969). Psykholohichni aspekty ukrainskoi osvity v diaspori. *Pedahohichni problemy ta dydaktychni porady* (pp. 18-39). Munich. (in Ukrainian)
- Kulchytskyi, O. (1973). *Vvedennia u filosofichnu antropohiuii*. Munich: Ukrainyskyi Vilnyi Universytet. (in Ukrainian)
- Kulchytskyi, O. (1981). Vvedennia v problematyku sutnosti filosofii. In *Memoirs of the Shevchenko scientific society* (Vol. 191, pp. 1-86). Paris-New York-Munich. (in Ukrainian)
- Kulchytskyi, O. (1985). Svitohliad ta molod. In *Ukrainskyi personalizm: Filosofska etnopsykholohichna synteza* (pp. 15-19). Munich-Paris: Ukrainyskyi Vilnyi Universytet. (in Ukrainian)
- Kulchytskyi, O. (1995a). *Osnovy filosofii i filosofichnykh nauk*. Munich-Lviv: Ukrainyskyi Vilnyi Universytet. (in Ukrainian)
- Kulchytskyi, O. (1995b). Rysy kharakterolohii ukrainskoho narodu. In *Entsyklopediia ukraïnoznavstva: Zahalna chastyna: Perevydannia v Ukraini* (Vol. 2, pp. 708-718). Kyiv. (in Ukrainian)
- Kultschytzkij, A. von. (1974). Hryhorij Skovoroda, Philosoph der Selbsterkenntnis und Vorläufer des Personalismus. *Mitteilungen*, 10-11, 31-41. (in German)
- Mytrovych, K. (1985). Profesor Kulchytskyi mizh namy. In *Ukrainskyi personalizm: Filosofska etnopsykholohichna synteza* (pp. 5-14). Munich-Paris: Ukrainyskyi Vilnyi Universytet. (in Ukrainian)
- Shumylo-Kulchytskyi, O. (1949). *Narys strukturnoi psykholohii*. Munich: Ukrainyskyi Vilnyi Universytet. (in Ukrainian)
- Synytsia, A. S. (2020). Comparative Analysis of Ludwig Wittgenstein's and Martin Heidegger's Views on the Nature of Human. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, 18, 132-143. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i18.195967> (in English)
- Twardowski, K. (1921). Symbolomania i pragmatofobia. *Ruch Filozoficzny*, VI(1-2), 1-10. (in Polish)
- Twardowski, K. (2009). Metafizyka duszy. *Studia z Historii Filozofii Polskiej*, 4, 35-48. (in Polish)
- Woleński, J. (1985). *Filozoficzna Szkoła Lwowsko-Warszawska*. Warszawa: PWN. (in Polish)
- Yerzhabkova, B. (1981). Bibliohrafiia naukovykh prats Oleksandra Kulchytskoho, 1895-1980. *Liberation Path*, 2, 220-229. (in Ukrainian)

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

- Yerzhabkova, B. (1982a). Bibliohrafiia naukovykh prats Oleksandra Kulchytskoho, 1895-1980 (II). *Liberation Path*, 6, 759-763. (in Ukrainian)
- Yerzhabkova, B. (1982b). Bibliohrafiia naukovykh prats Oleksandra Kulchytskoho, 1895-1980 (II): Zakinchennia, 2. *Liberation Path*, 7, 865-870. (in Ukrainian)
- Yerzhabkova, B. (1983). Bibliohrafiia naukovykh prats O. Kulchytskoho (1895-1980) III. *Liberation Path*, 6, 730-739. (in Ukrainian)
- Yerzhabkova, B. (1985a). Bibliohrafiia naukovykh prats Oleksandra Kulchytskoho (1895-1980) IV. *Liberation Path*, 5, 612-619. (in Ukrainian)
- Yerzhabkova, B. (1985b). Bibliohrafiia naukovykh prats Oleksandra Kulchytskoho (1895-1980) IV: Zakinchennia, 2. *Liberation Path*, 6, 735-740. (in Ukrainian)
- Yerzhabkova, B. (1996). U stolittia narodzhennia Oleksandra Kulchytskoho (1895-1980). *Liberation Path*, 1, 50-58. (in Ukrainian)
- Yosypenko, S., & Khoma, O. (2020). Local Contexts of Global Philosophies. *Sententiae*, 39(2), 6-7. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31649/sent39.02.006> (in Ukrainian)

LIST OF REFERENCE LINKS

- Бичко І. В. Український національний характер: персоналістський підхід. *Філософсько-антропологічні читання '96*. 1996. Вип. 2. С. 20–26.
- Gonczenko O. Oleksandr Kulczycki's Philosophy and the Lviv-Warsaw School. *Analiza i Egzystencja*. 2020. Vol. 50. P. 19–39. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18276/aie.2020.50-02>
- Navylenko V. V. Human as a Carrier of the Worldview: Individual and Collective Dimensions. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*. 2020. No. 18. P. 62–75. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i18.210988>
- Ivanyk S. *Filozofowie ukraińscy w Szkole Lwowsko-Warszawskiej*. Warszawa : Semper, 2014. 223 s.
- Іванік С. Що таке польська філософія й що вона може дати українській філософії? *Sententiae*. 2015. Т. 32. № 1. С. 128–142. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22240/sent32.01.128>
- Karivets I. F. Brentano and K. Twardowski: Some Traces of Their Influence on the Contemporary Ukrainian Scholars. *Problemos*. 2019. Vol. 96. P. 96–106. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15388/Problemos.96.8>
- Кульчицький О. Філософічна антропологія. Нова наука – стара проблема. *Арка*. 1947. Ч. 5. С. 6–7.
- Кульчицький О. *Український мирянин у духовній ситуації сучасності*. Париж, 1966. 32 с.
- Кульчицький О. Психологічні аспекти української освіти в діаспорі. *Педагогічні проблеми та дидактичні поради*. Мюнхен, 1969. С. 18–39.
- Кульчицький О. *Введення у філософічну антропологію*. Мюнхен : Український Вільний Університет, 1973. 198 с.
- Кульчицький О. Введення в проблематику сутності філософії. *Записки наукового товариства ім. Шевченка*. Париж – Нью-Йорк – Мюнхен, 1981. Т. 191. С. 1–86.
- Кульчицький О. Світогляд та молодь. *Український персоналізм: філософська етнопсихологічна синтеза*. Мюнхен – Париж : Український Вільний Університет, 1985. С. 15–19.
- Кульчицький О. *Основи філософії і філософічних наук*. Мюнхен – Львів : Український Вільний Університет, 1995. 164 с.
- Кульчицький О. Риси характерології українського народу. *Енциклопедія українознавства. Загальна частина*. Перевидання в Україні. Київ, 1995. Т. 2. С. 708–718.
- Von Kultschytzkj A. Hryhorij Skoworoda, Philosoph der Selbsterkenntnis und Vorläufer des Personalismus. *Mitteilungen*. 1974. No. 10–11. S. 31–41.
- Митрович К. Професор Кульчицький між нами. *Український персоналізм: філософська етнопсихологічна синтеза*. Мюнхен – Париж : Український Вільний Університет, 1985. С. 5–14.
- Шумило-Кульчицький О. *Нарис структурної психології*. Мюнхен : Український Вільний Університет, 1949. 146 с.
- Synytisia A. S. Comparative Analysis of Ludwig Wittgenstein's and Martin Heidegger's Views on the Nature of Human. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*. 2020. No. 18. P. 132–143. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i18.195967>
- Twardowski K. Symbolomania i pragmatofobia. *Ruch Filozoficzny*. 1921. Т. VI. No. 1–2. S. 1–10.
- Twardowski K. Metafizyka duszy. *Studia z Historii Filozofii Polskiej*. 2009. Т. 4. S. 35–48.
- Woleński J. *Filozoficzna Szkoła Lwowsko-Warszawska*. Warszawa : PWN, 1985. 347 s.

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

- Єржабкова Б. Бібліографія наукових праць Олександра Кульчицького, 1895–1980. *Визвольний шлях*. 1981. № 2. С. 220–229.
- Єржабкова Б. Бібліографія наукових праць Олександра Кульчицького, 1895–1980 (II). *Визвольний шлях*. 1982. № 6. С. 759–763.
- Єржабкова Б. Бібліографія наукових праць Олександра Кульчицького, 1895–1980 (II). Закінчення, 2. *Визвольний шлях*. 1982. № 7. С. 865–870.
- Єржабкова Б. Бібліографія наукових праць О. Кульчицького (1895–1980) III. *Визвольний шлях*. 1983. № 6. С. 730–739.
- Єржабкова Б. Бібліографія наукових праць Олександра Кульчицького (1895–1980) IV. *Визвольний шлях*. 1985. № 5. С. 612–619.
- Єржабкова Б. Бібліографія наукових праць Олександра Кульчицького (1895–1980) IV. Закінчення, 2. *Визвольний шлях*. 1985. № 6. С. 735–740.
- Єржабкова Б. У століття народження Олександра Кульчицького (1895–1980). *Визвольний шлях*. 1996. № 1. С. 50–58.
- Йосипенко С., Хома О. Локальні контексти глобальних філософій. *Sententiae*. 2020. Т. 39. № 2. С. 6–7. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31649/sent39.02.006>

А. С. СИНИЦЯ^{1*}

^{1*} Львівський національний університет імені Івана Франка (Львів, Україна), ел. пошта andrii.synytisia.edu@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0002-0983-7187

Аналіз антропологічних досліджень Олександра Кульчицького в контексті європейської філософії

Мета. Дослідити особливості вчення про людину, яке розвивав Олександр Кульчицький, зважаючи на контекст європейської філософії й особливо у співставленні з парадигмою філософування Львівсько-Варшавської школи. **Теоретичний базис** дослідження визначений науковими розвідками Кульчицького в царині філософії й філософської антропології, а також новітніми напрацюваннями, що по-новому інтерпретують вплив теоретико-методологічних ідей Твардовського на формування філософського світогляду цього українського мислителя. **Наукова новизна.** На підставі звернення до першоджерел, реконструйовано філософське вчення Кульчицького про людину в єдності його вихідних положень і теоретико-практичних результатів. Визначено способи формування базових ідей його філософської антропології та обґрунтовано їхню самобутність, попри співпрацю зі школою Твардовського, а також, не зважаючи на численні дискусії й дослідження західноєвропейської філософсько-антропологічної, екзистенційно-світоглядної і соціально-психологічної проблематики. **Висновки.** З'ясовано процес становлення філософського світогляду Олександра Кульчицького; його поступовий перехід від досліджень людської психіки у межах антропологічної структурної психології до усвідомлення необхідності вивчення філософської антропології. Охарактеризовано персоналістичні особливості його філософського вчення про людину. Зокрема, звернено увагу на дистинкцію понять "особи" і "особистості", визначення важливості соціального фактору для формування світогляду людини, дидактичні цілі людинознавчих студій. Продемонстровано, як у філософській антропології Кульчицького набуває особливої ваги аналіз екзистенційно-світоглядного виміру людського буття, проявленого в різних духовних ситуаціях і соціально-культурних умовах, що впливають на специфіку мислення й природу ментальності особи. Констатовано оригінальність міркувань Кульчицького про людину як у контексті української філософії, так і європейської філософської думки загалом.

Ключові слова: Олександр Кульчицький; філософська антропологія; екзистенція; персоналізм; особа; особистість; Львівсько-Варшавська школа

Received: 18.01.2021

Accepted: 24.05.2021