

UDC 1(091)O. M. KORKH^{1*}, V. Y. ANTONOVA^{2*}^{1*}University of Customs and Finance (Dnipro, Ukraine), e-mail korh54@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0001-7175-5011^{2*}University of Customs and Finance (Dnipro, Ukraine), e-mail batumi1508@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0003-0244-4142**Metaphysical and Anthropological Principles of the Self-Made-Man Idea in Western Philosophy of the 17th Century**

Purpose. The main purpose of this research is to comprehend the philosophical principles in the spread and legitimation of the Self-made-man idea in the worldview transformations of the 17th century. **Theoretical basis.** Historical and comparative methods became fundamental ones for the research. The research is based on the creative heritage of R. Descartes, T. Hobbes, J. Locke, as well as the works of modern researchers. **Originality.** The analysis shows that the Self-made-man idea, which originated in the ancient world and gradually spreads in the Christian Middle Ages, gained a powerful impetus in the philosophical and moral-legal metamorphoses of the 17th century. These metamorphoses theoretically substantiated and radically accelerated the transition from mystical to rational, from theocentric to the anthropocentric worldview, and, as a result, to the recognition of the intellectual autonomy of the individuals and the freedom of their own will, the emergence of the construct of natural human rights, the requirements of religious tolerance and freedom of conscience, ultimately, to the principle of reliance on one's own strength and the individual's personal responsibility for one's own destiny. Exactly these ideas in interaction with the ideas of Puritanism became the theoretical basis for the formation of B. Franklin's views and the corresponding cultural code. **Conclusions.** The philosophy of the 17th century, having laid the principles of a new – subject-centric – metaphysics, as well as the philosophical and legal foundations of liberal ideology, provided philosophical and moral-legal legitimation to the sporadic attempts of man to break out of the triple circle of fatalism, paternalism, and conformity to a rationally founded and the ever-growing orientation of the individual towards active self-determination and self-realization, self-reliance and personal responsibility for their own destiny as key principles of the Self-made-man concept.

Keywords: Self-made-man idea; self-defined personality; worldview legitimation; philosophy of the 17th century

Introduction

A noticeable trend in the modern world is the gradual increase in the number of people who try to go beyond the boundaries of an inherited, externally imposed or one that has lost personal attractiveness, social "niche" and role and "make themselves", relying on their own choice, their own forces and personal responsibility for its consequences. The most essential features of this type of people are reflected in the "Self-made-man" idea. This idea attracts the attention of representatives of various fields, including philosophy. Obviously, a historical and philosophical analysis of this idea is important, which allows us to reveal its sociocultural origins and historical metamorphoses. As a result – to adequately explain the essence of the corresponding phenomenon, the possible consequences of its spread, and thus outline the appropriate attitude to it not only of specialists in various fields but also of the ordinary person who determines one's own life strategies. And this is quite natural because it is not by chance that the "Self-made-man" concept is very often synonymous with the concept of a "successful person". It is clear that the achievement of success in life directly depends on one or another interpretation of the issues that form the problematic field of the Self-made-man concept, stimulating or, conversely, suppressing the creative activity of the individual; it causes him/her to rely on own strength and personal responsibility in solving important problems of their existence or paternalistic attitudes and conformism; ultimately contributes or hinders a person's success in life. The comprehension of this phenomenon is especially relevant for societies that are in a state of deep value transformations. Despite this, if foreign researchers pay versatile attention to the understanding of the Self-made-

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

man phenomenon, then among domestic authors it is clearly not enough. An exception is the article by L. Smalko and V. Panchenko (2020), devoted to the analysis of the historical and linguistic-cultural aspect of the Self-made-man idiom in the context of American culture, as well as individual publications of the authors of this article. In addition, the issue of cultural-historical origins and ways of philosophical legitimization of the Self-made-man idea remains highly debatable, since many researchers limit its comprehension to the analysis of the process of forming the American cultural code and the views of B. Franklin. More acceptable, in our opinion, is the point of view according to which the origins of this idea go beyond American culture which is, in fact, a symbol, ideal, or even a cult (Smalko & Panchenko, 2020, p. 199). However, this point of view, unfortunately, was not given any historical-philosophical or culturological justification by the authors of this article. In the course of previous research, we established that already ancient culture shows a clear intention to at least formally recognize the ability and right of an individual to independently create one's own destiny. And in the conditions of the Middle Ages, this intention does not disappear, but on the contrary, acquires a potentially universal character, at least in the depths of Christian theology. However, this idea receives the first prerequisites for real universalization only in the conditions of early modernism, primarily in the context of the worldview of Protestantism, which paradoxically transforms the mentioned intention of the individual toward self-determination and self-realization into practically obligatory life guidelines for millions of people (Korkh & Antonova, 2022, pp. 100-101). The essence of the mentioned paradox, in our opinion, was well expressed by Louis Blanc, who pointed out that the practical results of the Reformation were in many ways the opposite of its spiritual intentions, because

The Reformation ascribed humiliation to reason in front of faith, meanwhile rationalism prevailed. It recognized the Holy Scriptures as the only unchangeable rule of faith, and meanwhile, the right of criticism prevailed. Depriving people of free will, chained them to fatalism, and meanwhile human communities became more active than ever. It declared that Adam's race was defeated by original sin into the abyss of impotence and depravity. Meanwhile, a person given to one's own strength has recognized oneself as mature enough to be satisfied with oneself. (Blanc, 1907, p. 44)

Purpose

However, were the *rationalism, right of criticism, focus on one's own strength and activity* indicated by Blanc the result of exclusively reformatory, albeit paradoxical, influences? Did they not also have another, in particular, philosophical basis, which also, but from their own positions,

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

determined the process of constituting a modern worldview and, in this way, the formation of the American cultural code in general and the B. Franklin's opinions in particular? In view of this, the *main purpose* of this article is to comprehend the philosophical principles of the spread and legitimization of the Self-made-man idea in the worldview transformations of the 17th century.

Statement of basic materials

The starting point for such a comprehension should be Hegel's well-known words that any system of philosophy is the philosophy of its era, which is strongly connected with the latter, in particular, by its focus on satisfying its interests. Realizing the complexity and inconsistency of the social life of that time, which has become the subject of numerous studies, let us, first of all, pay attention to the fact that the understanding of faith and ways of personal salvation initiated by Luther caused a rapid radicalization of the individualistic intentions of Christianity. After all, the demand for free will for a Christian quite unexpectedly turned into a demand for free will for an individual as such, the recognition of his/her, albeit relative, autonomy, rights to freedom of conscience, speech, unions, and ultimately, to the independent determination of one's own destiny. In addition, after the extremely violent clashes of the counter-reformation, the ideas of religious, more broadly, cultural pluralism and a tolerant attitude towards dissent and individual uniqueness, in general, began to spread rapidly in Western society, the authority of universal norms of morality and the personal reason is growing. All this, in interaction with changes in the objective forms of an individual's existence (its economic, social and political connections), caused the emergence of *a new subjectivity that considers itself as the basis* and, accordingly, initiated the search for a transition from a holistic paradigm of society in which the individual is perceived as naturally subordinate to the one in all its guises, to a paradigm in which the individual is seen as *logically, chronologically, and value-first*. But the emergence of such subjectivity was determined not only by the ideology of Protestantism and capitalist socio-economic transformations but also by new European metaphysics.

Despite all its attention to issues of an epistemological and methodological nature, Western philosophy of the 17th century was not at all indifferent to anthropological issues as it sometimes appears from the point of view of its individual researchers. It is primarily about the oeuvre of one of the founders of the new European rationalism, R. Descartes, in the context of which a person is increasingly viewed as something from which everything must be meaningful. After all, having put the thesis "I think, therefore I exist" as the basis of his system, he initiated a view of an individual's mind as *the logical first*, as that *self-sufficient reliability* from which one can and should start building a system of reliable knowledge. Of course, this mind is inextricably linked with God, who created the world itself, free will, and "God in man" (Descartes, 1996, AT X, p. 218). However, due to this overemphasis, the individual receives a completely different status, since the very existence of God is evidenced only through his self-awareness ("I exist, therefore God exists"), which is endowed with the ability for objectivity and projectivity. It is important that if in earlier times philosophers and theologians often talked about his/her (the individual's) religious feelings, then Descartes shifts the emphasis to the *intellectual autonomy of the individual*. In addition, unlike most of his predecessors, who professed the principle of intellectual superiority of the elite, Descartes assumes that the mind is a universal human property. Therefore, in principle, *everyone*, regardless of their origin and social status, can reason correctly, distinguish the true from the false, choose and defend an independent position, naturally, under the condition of proper application of it (mind). In this context, the main methodological instruction of Des-

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

cartes became quite logical – taking nothing on faith, subjecting everything to doubt and independent verification of the *personal mind*; starting from such provisions that do not cause any doubts and objections from his side.

The recognition of the individual's ability for self-determination is extremely important. Descartes considers this ability as one of one's attributive, i.e. inherent, properties. All properties (of the soul), he claims, are reduced to two main ones – the perception of the intellect and the self-determination of the will (Descartes, 1996, AT VIII, p. 363). At the same time, Descartes stubbornly dissociates himself from the traditional Christian view of the free will of the individual as the source of exclusively human distress. For him, a person's ability to make and implement one's own, independent decisions is the source of their true dignity. After all, a free decision, giving us the opportunity to rule over ourselves (primarily our own passions), likens us to a certain degree to God, if only we do not lose the rights to such a high calling and can subjugate our feelings of reason. Thus, "free will is in itself the noblest thing we can have, since it makes us in a way equal to God... and so its correct use is the greatest of all the goods we possess" (Descartes, 1996, AT V, p. 85).

But what exactly should this good be used for? To subjugate one's own passions, self-discovery and, ultimately, self-development – the creation of one's own spiritual world, and thus one's own self. The task of self-knowledge and self-development in Descartes' oeuvre, according to A. Malivskiy (2020), has a cross-cutting nature since he constantly outlines the possibility for a person to choose herself/himself, his/her own proper image (p. 63). At the same time, Descartes' position can hardly be characterized as voluntarist. His ethics, according to Mark Smith (2022), is essentially only advice to a person, firstly, to clearly distinguish what depends on him/her from what is "fatal", and, secondly, to be well aware that only the first is the sphere of personal will and choice.

The self-consciousness of a particular individual in this way and at the metaphysical level becomes a higher and independent judge of everything that had been previously taken on faith or according to tradition, that absolute authenticity from which all his/her knowledge about the world and all manifestations of his/her free will are derived. In view of this, Heidegger's (1986) opinion is quite fair, according to which Descartes, interpreting man as a subjectum, creates metaphysical prerequisites for the future anthropology of all its types (p. 109). For us, in the context of this study, it is important that such a metaphysical transformation, supported by the objective individualistic-activist intentions of the New Age, further strengthened the reorientation of the individual from the authority of someone else's opinion to one's own mind (since it is precisely in the person's rationality one's divinity is seen), from paternalistic views and expectations to rely primarily on oneself, from apathetic obedience to God's will (*fatum*, *fate*, etc.) to active intervention in one's own destiny and personal responsibility for it.

At the same time, it should be noted that the recognition of the individual's subjectivity, his/her intellectual freedom and ability to self-determination in the philosophy of that time is increasingly associated with the demand to respect the freedom, dignity and right to self-determination of other people. This demand became especially relevant in those days. The fact is that the rapid disintegration of feudalism and the formation of bourgeois social relations resulted not only in the intensive emancipation of individual initiative but also in the clash of many often polar opposite interests, which led to a mass of collisions, which are often blamed on the "intolerable" individualism of that era. And to a certain extent, such accusations are not unfounded, because the recognition of the logical primacy of the individual's self-consciousness quite natu-

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

rally stimulated the recognition that, in terms of value, an individual person weighs incomparably more than it was previously believed. And not only because s/he is involved in something more personal – divine or estate-corporate, but simply as such, in one's soleness and uniqueness. Whatever it is, the aforementioned conflicts, repeatedly intensified by decades of extremely cruel and devastating religious wars, not only completely destroyed the individual's former confessional, corporate and communal ties, but also prevented the formation of alternative – bourgeois relations and the inclusion of the individual in them. As a result, society "atomized" unprotected individuals who were left alone with the most acute problems of their existence, had to rely primarily on themselves. Ultimately, this instability and "war of all against all" gave rise to a total feeling of despair and fear and, accordingly, a passionate desire to get rid of them, to find peace and guarantees of one's own security. On this socio-psychological basis, the idea of strong, unlimited state power as the only means capable of ensuring public order and "God-given rights", primarily the right to life, arises and spreads. This is how the idea of an authoritarian-despotic state protecting people from self-destruction, and guaranteeing their safety and "natural rights" appears. However, this spread of the idea of authoritarianism, which is quite natural for any troubled time – the breakdown of usual social ties and the desire for authoritarianism always go hand in hand – was never able to erase the tempting "taste" of free self-determination from the individual's consciousness.

The socio-philosophical concept of T. Hobbes, who tries to combine individualism and absolutism, is a demonstrative expression of ambivalent interests and sentiments arising on this historical ground. Hobbes explains the need for such a combination by the fact that in their natural striving for happiness, people follow different, sometimes diametrically opposed paths, which leads to a devastating "war of all against all" and "the fear of each before the other". Therefore, out of a sense of self-preservation and under the influence of their own rational choice, they enter into a social contract and voluntarily surrender part of their natural rights to the state power, by taking on themselves the responsibility to be content with such a degree of freedom in relation to other people as they would allow to others about myself. In turn, the state undertakes to guarantee the security of the individual, as well as its own sovereignty from everything that would prevent it from fulfilling this obligation. Freedom of conscience, the principle of popular sovereignty, the principle of inviolability of private property, and many other rights and freedoms that are supposedly contained in natural law fall into the most sinister requirements in this regard. At the same time, Hobbes (2000) even declares that all these dangerous demands have a common ground – the moral autonomy of a person, according to which each individual person can be a judge in deciding which actions are good and which are bad (pp. 297-298).

A detailed analysis of Hobbes' reasoning reveals, however, a few provisions that are quite different from the original intention of justifying the legitimacy of unlimited state power. This is primarily due to the distinct influence of Protestant theology on Hobbes' views (Lungu, Urlica, Firu-Negoescu, & Suba, 2021). It is about his understanding of human nature, supposedly, irredeemably spoilt by original sin, and about the recognition of the exclusive role of divine grace, which alone can save a person, and about relying on the search for a way out of the situation of "war of all against all" not on religion as such, but on the human mind. And eventually, it is about the very interpretation of natural law, first of all, as *the rights of everyone at their own discretion* to do what is necessary to achieve their goal, in particular, to preserve their own life.

At the same time, Hobbes recognizes that not all of the natural human rights can be alienated and assigned to the custody of the state Leviathan. The number of such inalienable rights in-

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

cludes, first of all, the right of each individual to one's own life and self-preservation. No normal person can, according to Hobbes, renounce this right and transfer it to someone else, including the state. The individual's right to intellectual autonomy is endowed with the same inalienability. No one can make him/her think otherwise than their own mind tells them. After all, people are simply not capable of arbitrarily, no matter whose it is, changing their rationally developed beliefs. Moreover, the individual has the right to resist anyone who requires him/her to renounce his/her own beliefs. That is, like Descartes, whose ideas were also inspired by (although he did not advertise it) Hobbes, he recognizes the *intellectual autonomy of the individual*, from which, contrary to the "basic" caveat regarding the destructiveness of the autonomy of moral judgments, it quite logically followed the recognition of the individual's right to *independence of decisions* on matters concerning him/her personally. Which ones exactly? Of those that are not regulated by law. And since, according to Hobbes (2000) himself, there is no such state in the world where all (this is impossible) actions of people would be regulated, "it necessarily follows that within the framework of various actions, about which the rules are silent, people have the freedom to do at their own discretion what is most profitable to them" (p. 217).

That is, the deed of an individual is de facto freed from religious or state sanction and acquires a frankly utilitarian, i.e. fundamentally, completely *rational* character. It is significant that Hobbes does not claim that an individual's own judgments and decisions regarding the ways and means of achieving his/her interests are unmistakable. His attitude to human cognitive abilities is quite skeptical. But, despite this, he persistently denies any form of authoritarian guardianship in matters related to his/her personal well-being. Whether the individual is right or wrong will be shown by the real result of his/her activity, expressed in the received benefit or loss. The main thing is that Hobbes repeatedly emphasizes that in this activity he admitted others as his equals and adhered to the "golden rule of morality", that is, he did not do to others what he would not want to do to himself. In other words, he was satisfied with such a measure of freedom as he would recognize other people in relation to himself (Hobbes, 2000, p. 156).

It is quite obvious, in this way, that, contrary to the declared and formally dominant instruction on virtually unlimited powers of the state, Hobbes de facto does not deny the individual in his/her desire for independence in solving the key issues of own life. And such individualism, according to Nicholas Jolley (2022), in no way contradicts Hobbes' teaching about the submission of our personal mind to the public mind of the sovereign (p. 208). The philosopher intuitively feels that the total interference of the state in the life of an individual is not only unnatural, since it denies the very essence of natural law, but also dangerous, since it kills the main premise and the very essence of human existence – freedom of will. In view of the above, it is possible to understand the position of those researchers (Lungu, Urlica, Firu-Negoescu, & Suba, 2021; Strauss, 2011) who consider Hobbes essentially the first modern philosopher who shifted the emphasis from the individual's *moral duties* to higher forces to one's *personal rights* and for this reason, he almost became the founder of the liberal ideology of the New Age.

Under the influence of the final political victory of the bourgeoisie in England, John Locke takes the position of further worldview justification of the individual's right to self-determination and self-realization. It is important that raised in a Puritan family, Locke, even criticizing Cartesianism, further strengthens the metaphysical primacy of the individual. After all, according to his conviction, in principle, there cannot be any "innate ideas" in the mind of the latter. Neither theoretical nor practical (including the idea of God), since all knowledge of a person comes to his/her consciousness (tabula rasa at the time of birth) exclusively from their

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

personal life experience. Locke's transition to the position of deism, in the context of which the idea of divine predetermination of human destiny loses all meaning, undoubtedly contributes to this strengthening. As for society, following the logic of the philosopher, it determines only the most general direction of human actions – the achievement of good, that is, according to Locke, that which causes or increases the individual's pleasure and reduces his/her suffering. At the same time, no one better than the individual oneself is able to realize what exactly his/her own good is and to determine the paths that lead to it. After all, apart from the individual oneself, this problem does not concern anyone. On the other hand, the nature of the human mind is such, Locke argues, following Hobbes, that no external force can force it to change the judgment, that it (the mind) has formed about things. Therefore, an individual must *independently* determine the goals of one's life, and the means of achieving them, and bear *personal responsibility* for one's actions.

This imperative to self-determination and self-responsibility is inherent, according to the philosopher, to the "natural state" of man, the main attributes of which are freedom and equality. As for freedom, following Locke (2008), it has an absolute character here, since all people in this state manage their actions, dispose of their property and personality in a way that they believe is best, regardless of the will of any other person (p. 328). However, since "where there is no law, there is no freedom", and in order to avoid the "war of all against all", people abandon the state of nature and form a state that allows the arbitrariness of individuals to be subordinated to the requirements of the law and, thanks to this, to ensure their natural rights and freedoms. It is quite obvious that John Locke derives the theory of the social contract from Hobbes, but, unlike his predecessor, for whom the observance of individual rights is unthinkable without the virtually unlimited power of the sovereign, Locke confidently declares that such unlimitedness is incompatible with the true interests of either the individual or society. After all, any government that is guided by its unconnected will certainly take the path of abuses and violations. Therefore, it is proposed to limit it by dividing it into separate branches.

Due to the specified subordination of the individual to social laws and at the same time the limitation of the powers of the authorities, the freedom of a person does not appear as a manifestation of one's arbitrariness, but as the freedom to freely do what is not prohibited by the adopted legislation, as the conscious disposal of "one's personality, one's actions, possessions and all one's property in within the framework of those laws to which it obeys, and thus not to submit to the despotic will of another, but to act freely according to its own will" (Locke, 2008, p. 336).

It is quite obvious what moods and desires such ideas encourage – God has placed on people the duty to take care of their own salvation, and they must do it (Jolley, 2022, p. 208).

Locke's interpretation of equality is certainly important in the context of the problem under consideration. True equality, in his opinion, has nothing to do with the natural sameness of individuals or the requirement of their artificial "equalization" in terms of abilities, powers, or property. We are talking only about legal equality, only about the fact that all people, regardless of their natural inequality, should be recognized by law as economically, politically and spiritually equal subjects, about their equal right to be masters, that is, independent creators of their own destiny. The latter is extremely important for Locke, since freedom, in his opinion, is the basis of everything else. Therefore, the declaration of the right to property and the right to life, which is not based on the guarantee of the individual's right to independent self-determination, free from despotic interference by the state, is more than doubtful for Locke. "This freedom from absolute, despotic power is so necessary to the preservation of man, and so closely connected with

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

him/her, that man cannot separate himself/herself from it without paying with his/her safety and life at the same time" (Locke, 2008, p. 336).

That is, a person is not guaranteed any of his/her rights, if s/he does not have the fundamental right to independently determine the ultimate goals of personal existence and the general ways and means of their achievement, what is personally useful or harmful, profitable or unprofitable for him/her in this regard.

J. Locke substantiated the provisions about the inviolability of the individual, his/her dignity, life and property, about the equality of each individual with any other. Therefore, the need for a respectful (at least tolerant) attitude towards his/her interests and choices, uniqueness and the right to independently determine one's own life path is certainly one of the most important conquests of Western European philosophy of the 17th century. As Maureen P. Heath (2019) rightly points out, Protestant literature's emphasis on individual conscience and responsibility laid the foundation for Locke's seminal work ("Two Treatises of Government") and the transition to modernity. And eventually, exactly on the basis of the above-mentioned provisions, the ideology of liberalism was formed and spread with its ideal of human freedom and self-realization, which, in interaction with the "spirit of Protestantism" of the American Puritan immigrants, gave a powerful impetus to the formation of that cultural code, where the idea of the Self-made-man became the semantic core.

Originality

The analysis allows us to conclude by calling into question the view by which the emergence of the idea of the Self-made-man is limited to the period in the formation of the American cultural code and the ideological legacy of the "founding fathers", in particular, Benjamin Franklin. It is quite obvious that the formation of this idea, which originated in the ancient world, continues in the Christian Middle Ages, especially during the Renaissance and Reformation, acquires important metaphysical justifications in the philosophical and moral-legal metamorphoses of the 17th century, presented in particular in the ideas of Descartes, Hobbes, and Locke. It is these ideas that theoretically substantiated and radically accelerated the transition from a mystical to a rational, from theocentric to anthropocentric worldview, one of the main, according to Peter A. Schouls (2018), characteristics of the enlightenment process, the recognition of the intellectual autonomy of the individual and the freedom of his/her will, the emergence of the construct of the natural state and natural human rights, requirements of religious tolerance and freedom of conscience, ultimately, the principle of self-reliance and individual responsibility for one's own destiny. And it is these ideas, in interaction with the ideas of Puritanism will become the main, in fact, the theoretical basis for the formation of the worldview of American enlighteners, including B. Franklin. As is known, the ideas of deism, the denial of divine predestination, the affirmation of the intellectual and moral autonomy of the individual, reliance on the individual's own strength, a rational attitude to life, the morality of utilitarianism, etc., will play a decisive role in it, that is, ideas and principles that find their integrated embodiment in the Self-made-man concept.

Conclusions

Thus, the philosophy of the 17th century, having laid the principles of a new – subject-centric – metaphysics, as well as the philosophical and legal foundations of liberal ideology, provided philosophical and moral and legal legitimation to that sporadic human attempts to break out of the triple circle of fatalism, paternalism and conformity to rationally founded and

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

constantly growing its orientation towards active self-determination and self-realization, self-reliance and personal responsibility for one's own destiny as key principles of the Self-made-man concept.

REFERENCES

- Blanc, L. (1907). *Istoriya frantsuzskoi revolyutsii* (Vol. 1). St. Petersburg. (in Russian)
- Descartes, R. (1996). *Oeuvres Complètes* (Vol. 8). Paris: Vrin, publiees par Ch. Adam et P. Tannery. (in French)
- Heath, M. P. (2019). John Locke: The Individual Rights Meme. In *The Christian Roots of Individualism* (pp. 213-242). Palgrave Macmillan. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-30089-0_9 (in English)
- Heidegger, M. (1986). Vremya kartiny mira. In *Novaya tekhnokraticeskaya volna na Zapade* (pp. 93-118). Moscow: Progress. (in Russian)
- Hobbes, T. (2000). *Leviafan, або Суть, будова і повноваження держави церковної та цивільної*. Kyiv: Dukh i Litera. (in Ukrainian)
- Jolley, N. (2022). Hobbes and Religious Freedom. *Roczniki Filozoficzne*, 70(4), 193-212. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18290/rf2204.7> (in English)
- Korkh, O. M., & Antonova, V. Y. (2022). Formation of the "Self-Made-Man" Idea in the Worldview of the Renaissance and Reformation. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, (21), 94-102. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i21.260345> (in English)
- Locke, J. (2008). Два трактати про врядування. In *Antolohiia liberalizmu* (pp. 327-352). Kyiv: Knyhy dlia biznesu. (in Ukrainian)
- Lungu, M. R., Urlica, A., Firu-Negoescu, A. G., & Suba, A. R. (2021). The founding ideas of English liberalism according to Thomas Hobbes and John Locke. *Lucrări Științifice Management Agricol*, 23(2), 125-129. Retrieved from <http://www.lsma.ro/index.php/lsma/article/view/1998> (in English)
- Malivskiy, A. M. (2020). Descartes' metaphysics as a doctrine of the conditions of the self-development of personality. *Multiversum. Philosophical almanac*, 1(2), 51-68. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.35423/2078-8142.2020.1.2.04> (in Ukrainian)
- Schouls, P. A. (2018). *Reasoned Freedom: John Locke and Enlightenment*. Cornell University Press. (in English)
- Smalko, L., & Panchenko, V. (2020). The Idiom Self-Made Man as a Concept and a Token of the American Culture: Historical Background and Linguocultural Aspect. *Linguostylistic Studies*, (12), 194-202. (in English)
- Smith, M. C. R. (2022). The Uses of Thought and Will: Descartes' Practical Philosophy of Freedom. *The European Legacy*, 27(3-4), 310-320. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10848770.2021.2023993> (in English)
- Strauss, L. (2011). *Hobbes's Critique of Religion and Related Writings*. University of Chicago Press. (in English)

LIST OF REFERENCE LINKS

- Блан Л. *История французской революции* : в 2 т. Санкт-Петербург, 1907. Т. 1. 481 с.
- Descartes R. *Oeuvres Complètes* : in 11 vol. Paris : Vrin, publiees par Ch. Adam et P. Tannery, 1996. Vol. VIII.
- Heath M. P. John Locke: The Individual Rights Meme. *The Christian Roots of Individualism*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2019. P. 213–242. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-30089-0_9
- Хайдеггер М. Время картины мира. *Новая технократическая волна на Западе*. Москва : Прогресс, 1986. С. 93–118.
- Гоббс Т. *Левіафан, або Суть, будова і повноваження держави церковної та цивільної*. Київ : Дух і Літера, 2000. 606 с.
- Jolley N. Hobbes and Religious Freedom. *Roczniki Filozoficzne*. 2022. Vol. 70, No. 4. P. 193–212. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18290/rf2204.7>
- Korkh O. M., Antonova V. Y. Formation of the "Self-Made-Man" Idea in the Worldview of the Renaissance and Reformation. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*. 2022. No. 21. P. 94–102. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i21.260345>
- Лок Д. Два трактати про врядування. *Антологія лібералізму*. Київ : Книги для бізнесу, 2008. С. 327–352.
- Lungu M. R., Urlica A., Firu-Negoescu A. G., Suba A. R. The founding ideas of English liberalism according to Thomas Hobbes and John Locke. *Lucrări Științifice Management Agricol*. 2021. Vol. 23, No. 2. P. 125–129. URL: <http://www.lsma.ro/index.php/lsma/article/view/1998>

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

- Малівський А. М. Метафізика Декарта як вчення про умови саморозбудови особистості. *Мультиверсум. Філософський альманах*. 2020. Т. 1, № 2. С. 51–68. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.35423/2078-8142.2020.1.2.04>
- Schouls P. A. *Reasoned Freedom: John Locke and Enlightenment*. Cornell University Press, 2018. 258 p.
- Smalko L., Panchenko V. The Idiom Self-Made Man as a Concept and a Token of the American Culture: Historical Background and Linguocultural Aspect. *Linguostylistic Studies*. 2020. Iss. 12. P. 194–202.
- Smith M. C. R. The Uses of Thought and Will: Descartes' Practical Philosophy of Freedom. *The European Legacy*. 2022. Vol. 27, Iss. 3–4. P. 310–320. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10848770.2021.2023993>
- Strauss L. *Hobbes's Critique of Religion and Related Writings*. University of Chicago Press, 2011. 184 p.

О. М. КОРХ^{1*}, В. Ю. АНТОНОВА^{2*}

^{1*}Університет митної справи та фінансів (Дніпро, Україна), ел. пошта korh54@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0001-7175-5011

^{2*}Університет митної справи та фінансів (Дніпро, Україна), ел. пошта batumi1508@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0003-0244-4142

Метафізичні та антропологічні підвалини ідеї Self-Made-Man в західній філософії XVII століття

Мета. Основна мета цього дослідження полягає в осмисленні філософських підвалин поширення та легітимації ідеї Self-made-man у світоглядних трансформаціях XVII століття. **Теоретичний базис.** Основоположними для дослідження стали історичний та компаративний методи. Дослідження базується на творчій спадщині Р. Декарта, Т. Гоббса, Дж. Локка, а також роботах сучасних дослідників. **Наукова новизна.** Аналіз показує, що ідея Self-made-man, яка зароджується ще в античному світі й поступово поширюється в християнському Середньовіччі, набуває потужного поштовху у філософських та морально-правових метаморфозах XVII століття, які теоретично обґрунтували й радикально прискорили перехід від містичного до раціонального, від теоцентричного до антропоцентричного світобачення і, як наслідок, до визнання інтелектуальної автономії індивіда та свободи його волі, появи конструкту природних прав людини, вимог віротерпимості та свободи совісті, урешті-решт, до принципу покладання на власні сили та особистої відповідальності індивіда за власну долю. Саме ці ідеї у взаємодії з ідеями пуританізму стали теоретичним підґрунтям формування поглядів Б. Франкліна та відповідного культурного коду. **Висновки.** Філософія XVII століття, заклавши підвалини нової – суб'єктно-центричної – метафізики, а також філософсько-правові засади ліберальної ідеології, забезпечила філософську та морально-правову легітимацію до того спорадичних спроб людини вирватися за межі потрійного кола фаталізму, патерналізму та конформізму до раціонально фундованої і постійно зростаючої орієнтації індивіда на активне самовизначення (self-determination) та самореалізацію (self-realization), покладання на самого себе (self-reliance) та персональну відповідальність (personal responsibility) за власну долю як ключові принципи концепту Self-made-man.

Ключові слова: ідея Self-made-man; особистість, що самовизначається; світоглядна легітимація; філософія XVII століття

Received: 09.01.2023

Accepted: 15.05.2023