

## UDC 141.319.8“17”

A. M. MALIVSKYI<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1\*</sup>Dnipropetrovsk National University of Railway Transport named after Academician V. Lazaryan (Dnipro),  
e-mail telepat-57@mail.ru; ORCHID 0000-0002-6923-5145

## THE DEMAND FOR A NEW CONCEPT OF ANTHROPOLOGY IN THE EARLY MODERN AGE: THE DOCTRINE OF HUME

*“Nature is the only science of man;  
and yet has been hitherto the most neglected”  
Hume D.*

**Purpose.** The purpose of the investigation is to outline the main points of Hume’s interpretation of the basic anthropological project of the era based on radical cultural transformations of the early modern age; to represent a modern vision of Hume’s anthropology as a response to the demand of the era and necessity to complete its basic project. **Methodology.** The research was based on phenomenological and hermeneutic approaches. **Originality.** Contemporary understanding of the position of anthropological project in Hume’s philosophy is regarded as unsatisfactory by the author. Development of the basic project as anthropological is rooted in scientific revolution and needs to be continued and completed. Contemporary prevalence of deanthropological versions of Hume’s philosophy is the result of underestimated significance of the concept of nature in the broad sense. According to the philosopher’s texts, heuristic potential of Hume’s position is emphasized by the author. The modern version of the basic project in the early modern age is criticized and demands significant changes to become anthropological. **Findings.** Modern perception of Hume’s philosophy as an anthropological project is unsatisfactory in terms of historical and philosophical science and needs detailed analysis. In order to understand the conditions of anthropological project significance, it is advisable to focus on: a) scientific revolution and the necessity to complete it; b) determine the role of the concept of nature in its broad sense. Nowadays the way of Hume’s rethinking of the basic project of modern philosophy as insufficiently anthropological is quite heuristic. Empiricism, dogmatism, superstition and skepticism are the manifestations of the latter. For Hume, the era was as an incomplete anthropological project and its legacy as the most complete form of explication. Today the interest in the phenomenon of a human provides a reasonable basis to define that modern period is related to the era of Hume, and therefore, to give some reasoning for his remarkable ideas as New Hume’s era.

**Keywords:** Hume; anthropological project; nature; human nature; nature in the broad sense; nature in the narrow sense; morality; metaphysics

### Introduction

Modern philosophy emphasizes the increased attention to the phenomenon of a human (man), mainly revealed in the history of philosophy. The early modern age deserves special attention as a significant milestone in the development of technogenic civilization. The current context is focused on the problem of humanization ways and forms of the basic project. It is necessary to find possible ways of humanization of this project by rethinking fundamentally some philosophical interpretations, primarily, the underestimated anthropological project, that was well-defined in Hume’s works.

In modern literature there are three main possible answers to the question about the presence

of anthropology in modern philosophy: it is either denied or understood as a secondary and simplified, or perceived as a significant project. In the first and second cases, the pursuit of humanistic values refers to antiquity, in the third one – the issues concerning forms of anthropological interest and ways of reasoning anthropology objectivity are prioritized. Our attention is turned to the third option, which is the most heuristic in the current situation.

### Review

Nowadays there is a growing tendency to understand modern philosophy not only as a demand for a new concept of scientific worldview, but as a demand for a new doctrine of human nature (although the demand and

## ІСТОРИЯ ФІЛОСОФІЇ

available responses are recognized), but their interpretation is not satisfactory from a modern point of view.

Note. A scientist Romano Guardini has no doubt in the demand for a new concept of anthropology, as well as its response. Emphasizing the complexity of the problem of human nature, he is right to notice a significant difference between the theory of human nature created by existing category tools and a real person. He defines a wrong vision of human nature referring to positivism, materialism, idealism, and existentialism. The main reason for dissatisfaction is certain orientation to -isms, as well as the lack of appropriate categories. Therefore, his conclusion does not cause any substantial objections: "There is not such a person as presented by the early modern age" [1, p. 152].

The anthropological project of the early modern age, which was not sufficiently explicit, attracted the attention of Martin Heidegger. According to the German thinker, the doctrine of Descartes as a cornerstone of a world view is one of the early precursors of modern philosophical anthropology: "Interpreting man as subjectum, Descartes creates the metaphysical precondition for the future of anthropology of all types and directions. With the ascent of anthropology Descartes celebrates his Supreme triumph" [7, p. 54]. Although observations of the founder of existentialism refer only to Descartes, it is undeniable that philosophical anthropology is rooted in the early modern age research. Moreover, it is reasonable to work with texts since they reveal new dimensions of knowledge that are in tune with the current context.

The issue concerning the foundation of modern anthropology in the given context is not appropriate.

The concepts of authors who recognize a significant connection between scientific and anthropological project and focus on the humanistic (anthropological) potential of the science about human nature can be considered more profound and meaningful.

Note. The fact of non-reduced feature of philosophical project of the early modern age as a development of science about nature is obvious for western historians, Desmond M. Clarke in particular. He noticed axiomatization of Rene Descartes heuristic potential of Copernicus doc-

trine. "Descartes was already aware of a fundamental challenge to the traditional picture of the universe that was implicit in the work of Copernicus. "On the Revolutions" (1543) was not just a new technical theory for astronomers. It was an emphatic displacement of man from the centre of universe and his relocation to a tiny planet in space, as a much less significant creature than given in Genesis suggested to generations of Christians"[9, 69].

The meaningful relationship of "new cosmology" and the "new anthropology" was emphasized by Ernst Cassirer. The "new cosmology, and the heliocentric system, introduced by Copernicus, is the only sound scientific basis for a new anthropology" [3, p. 16].

Rene Descartes is acknowledged to be a predecessor of anthropology. His texts make it possible to trace a meaningful relation between scientific and anthropological project in the heritage of a scientist [4].

Unfortunately, this approach is rarely implemented in historical and philosophical works. Indirect evidence and arguments for the latter statement is the prevalence of stereotypes concerning a dominance of subjectivism and anthropocentrism in the current era in philosophical literature.

The manner of interpretation of the greatest English philosopher – David Hume's heritage in research literature is a remarkable example of dissatisfaction with anthropology perception in the early modern age. The explanation and understanding of his anthropology is inaccurate due to insufficient attention to methodology. It could be found on the pages of the Foreword to the Ukrainian translation of outstanding works of the English philosophy "A Treatise of Human Nature", written by Professor Mossner E. K. [5, p. 11-28]. After the words of praise of Hume and his first paper, the text on the following pages demonstrates the author's intention (deliberately or not) to downplay the importance of this distinguished person and his outstanding ideas and concepts.

Note. "David Hume, the most distinguished of the English philosophers, and his greatness, as we now believe most fully revealed in his first and the most substantial systematic work, "a Treatise of Human Nature" [5, p. 11].

It is difficult to agree with the approach of

## ІСТОРИЯ ФІЛОСОФІЇ

Mossner, who reduces the doctrine of Hume to the following: first, it is proposed to take the words of the English thinker and accept this "Treatise" as "deadborn"; secondly, to take his refusal of "Treatise" in favor of a written one later; in the third place, to take on trust that the main ideas of this work are associated only with causal connections [6, p. 19, 20, 24].

Researchers of skepticism don't also pay due attention to essential significance of anthropological project.

Note. Convincing examples of such negligence are reflected in the works of a well-known researcher Popkin [15]. This idea was justified by Neto J. in the proceedings of the conference dedicated to the memory of Popkin R. in 2007. "The most important part of the recent research is a tendency to identify anthropological vision of human being either as a basis or as an important aspect of modern skepticism. The originality is in a certain relationship between skeptical and anthropological views that gives new value to the legacy of Hellenistic philosophical schools of skepticism". The thesis given in the note is extremely important. The idea is about a lack of special attention to anthropology as a long neglecting tradition. Understanding early modern skepticism, Popkin does not pay any special attention to anthropological aspect. Referring to the mentioned feature on the next page, the author points to a quite different position of early modern skeptics from ancient ones, namely, the focus is on the basic concepts, which seem similar to Christian doctrine of human nature dominated in 16th and 17th centuries. It is essential that modern skepticism researchers don't pay attention to anthropology importance. But the author does not see any rational for paying special attention to the review of these models. Christianity is one of the reasons – probably the main one – for this difference. Christianity provides or implies doctrines about the nature of man which were nonetheless hegemonic in the 16th and 17th centuries [13, 309-310].

A significant phenomenon of native literature is a thorough attempt to give some new value to Hume's philosophical heritage in the context of British skepticism of the early modern age by O. Panich [6]. The author emphasizes widespread skepticism in philosophical thought of that peri-

od researching the legacy of Hume as a stage of British empiricism, i.e. as a continuation of the ideas of Locke and Berkeley. Although the author mentions a certain relation between the concepts of nature and human nature, its value is still secondary and sporadic.

For about two centuries the positive aspect of Hume's thought was not given a proper attention, but over the course of recent decades the attention to the neglected anthropology has increased. [14, p. 1].

According to the recent publications of Hume's researchers, a scrutinized study of his texts proves that the content and direction of his scientific thought is quite debating. There are still arduous discussions about the meaning of his own judgments [8, p. 10].

Based on literature review, current understanding of the position of the anthropological project in the philosophy of Hume can hardly be considered as satisfactory.

### Purpose

The purpose of the investigation is to outline the main points of Hume's interpretation of the basic anthropological project of the era based on radical cultural transformations of the early modern age; to represent a modern vision of Hume's anthropology as a response to the demand of the era and necessity to complete its basic project.

### Methodology

The research was based on phenomenological and hermeneutic approaches.

### Theoretical basic and results

In order to understand the philosophical heritage of Hume, it is necessary to deal with the issues concerning a key point of a new worldview and an ideal of philosophizing. In other words, what is the absolute for a human in the early modern age? Among the key factors are the influence of the first scientific revolution and the urgent need for new ideological orientations in the era of radical secularization of consciousness. The answer is evident to Hume's predecessors and contemporaries. The concept of nature in its broad sense is one of the key notions in the "Metaphysical Meditation" of Descartes.

## ІСТОРИЯ ФІЛОСОФІЇ

As it is known, it is wrong to associate Descartes with understanding a human as an absolute in order to find deductively an answer to a significant question about the sense of nature. And although Hume does not explicitly criticize his theory, he could be right to find some imperfections concerning the ideas of dehumanization of man in the theories focused on ideals and norms of scientific knowledge. It is essential to understand that provided limited interpretation of nature can neither clarify the specifics of morality nor help to find meaningful responses to questions about the proper principles of human behavior.

A substantial prerequisite for authentic comprehension of Hume's position is the explanation of the subtitle of *A Treatise*—"An attempt to introduce the experimental method of reasoning into moral subjects." This refers to those things that were obvious in the age of Hume. Nature is seen as a boundless ocean which is imperceptible to human mind, yet a human feels a strong desire and confidence to master it. Experience here is a way of reconciling human nature with nature. In other words, human nature can and should exist in accordance with nature, synchronized with her and aimed at achieving the good. The concept of nature is used here as a nature in the broad sense, as external reality that exists according to its own laws.

It is very important to understand that the nature in the broad sense is quite different from the nature in its narrow sense. In the broad sense it is more than a harsh and mechanical necessity that looks like something which is complete and perfect. The nature here includes possibility and potency as its distinctive features. A perfect philosophy of human (man) for Hume is not the study of an autonomous human being, but a human as a part of nature with certain obligations to the nature. The author of *"A Treatise of Human Nature"* had a goal to eliminate the hypothetical character of moral philosophy. As it was mentioned in the Introduction, Hume perceived himself as a follower of empirical tradition started by Bacon «and as the science of man is only solid foundation for the other sciences, so the only solid foundation we can give to this science itself must be laid on experience and observation» [12, p.10].

The interpretations of the concept of nature

in its broad sense can be observed when Hume referred to prominent scientists of his era. For him, the names of Copernicus and Newton, however, meant much more than the names of great physicists. Their breakthroughs and great accomplishments represented axiological features of an entire era. They marked new values, which represented the vision of a man as the cornerstone of the meaningful universe. It becomes evident from the beginning of the second book of *A Treatise* where he emphasized the necessity to reconsider traditional approaches. "Here, therefore, moral philosophy is in the same condition as natural, with regard to astronomy before the time of Copernicus. The ancients, though sensible of that maxim, that nature does nothing in vain, contrived such intricate systems of the heavens, as seemed inconsistent with true philosophy, and gave place at last to something more simple and natural" [12, p. 194]. Direct effect of Newton's doctrine about the nature is observed in the text of the "Abstract", where there is about a fundamental ability of man in science, about human nature to achieve "the highest level of accuracy."

Hume sees his own mission in the maximum secularization of ideas about human nature. He consistently focused on its existence and proper perspective, in other words what it is and what it should be. The last one is possible if the nature is understood in the broad sense, which includes humans. In the introduction to *"A Treatise,"* there is an attempt to develop broader concepts of science than natural. "This evident, that all the sciences have a relation, greater or less, to human nature; and that however wide any of them may seem to run from it, they still return back by one passage or another. Even Mathematics, Natural Philosophy, and Natural Religion, are in some measure dependent on the science of Man" [12, p.10].

According to Hume, the philosophical thought in the early modern age is a grand incomplete anthropological project, his further development task. In other words, he is aware of himself as a thinker who needs to make every effort to complete the great «edifice» of Early Modern philosophy (especially the upper floors). The paradox of the present situation is seen in the fact that human nature is the most important and the most rejected at the same time. As ex-

## ІСТОРИЯ ФІЛОСОФІЇ

pressed by Hume at the end of the first book of *A Treatise* "Human nature is the only science of man; and yet has been hitherto the most neglected" [12, p. 186].

The basic concept of Hume's philosophy is the attention to human nature – existing self (what I am) and proper perspective (what I should be). "Moral philosophy" as a philosophical understanding of the most significant features of human nature is of crucial importance for him. Modern scientists consider it reasonable to explain the concepts of "moral" as synonymous with "humanitarian" and anthropological.

Note. The term "moral" was used in broader sense in his times than it is understood nowadays. According to Anthony Flew, referring to "moral objects", Hume meant the range of problems which are now determined by "humanitarian" concept, i.e. everything beyond mathematics and natural sciences [6, p. 152. note].

Hume's position in understanding the nature is quite definite and explicit and his works are a form of its narrative. Although it is impossible to deny that the thought of a thinker was more profound, and the ambiguity of the concept of nature in the broad sense was not taken into account. It is worth noting that Hume was aware of considerable difficulties in the way of new interpretations of traditional concepts. The last section of the first part in the third book of *A Treatise* demonstrates the following: "Nature, than which there is none more ambiguous and equivocal" [12, p. 322].

To what extent is Hume's ambiguous position adequately evaluated in modern research literature? It is known that in the days of Hume there was a tendency to associate the concept of "Nature" with the concepts of "God" and "matter" turning it into a metaphysical absolute. It is essential that the last one, fairly noticed by Popkin, can only be perceived in a subjective way or taken on trust. "One was only left to believe as one had to, and doubt as one had to, hoping that somehow nature was benevolent" [15, p. 179].

In literature the subjective perception of nature is often seen as Hume's vulnerability, as manifestation of skepticism overcome by naturalism.

Note. S. Greenberg emphasizes a certain confrontation between naturalism as a form of implementation of constructive ambitions of

Hume and his skepticism in the final part of the first book of the *"Treatise"* [10].

The emphasis on the strained relations between skepticism and naturalism is given and described in the work of I. Kasavin in the journal *"Voprosy filosofii"*. Although he acknowledges paradoxical nature of Hume's doctrine as existential dilemma, he thinks that a human should not be given any special attention. Based on the heritage of the thinker concerning skepticism and naturalism, there is the following idea: "so, the man doomed to a fundamental split between everyday reliability and lack of its conceptual foundation. It should be concluding the need for an existential dilemma: either the refusal of philosophy, or disappointment in life" [2, p. 164].

Understanding the above-mentioned ambiguity of the notion of nature (i.e. simultaneous truth of the concept of nature in its broad and narrow sense), it is important to emphasize certain dualism – nature should not only be subdued and controlled, but it is also necessary to "listen" to it and reciprocate. This thesis could be proved by the following extract, where two key principles in his system are stressed: "Nature is obstinate, and will not quit the field, however strongly attacked by reason; and at the same time reason is so clear in the point, that there is no possibility of disguising her. Not being able to reconcile these two enemies, we endeavor to set ourselves at ease as much as possible, by successively granting to each whatever it demands, and by feigning a double existence, where each may find something, that has all the conditions it desires" [12, p. 151].

The above mentioned idea may completely seem to demonstrate earlier opposition of naturalism and skepticism in Hume's works. But Hume is not limited to it, because in his later works there is an attempt to look for and find a more authentic form of concretization of two competitive principles, pointing to the opposite concepts of nature in the broad sense and a man (human). Hume's own credo is a well-known aphorism at the beginning of his *"An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding"*: "Be a philosopher: but, amidst all your philosophy, be still a man" [11, p. 7].

It is significant that Hume doesn't stop on these profound insights. One more possible way

## ІСТОРИЯ ФІЛОСОФІЇ

to look at this issue is to specify the thesis about intrinsic relationship between human and nature in the broad sense.

It necessary to consider the significant evolution of the philosopher's position concerning the nature of man and his prospects in the introduction and conclusion of the first book of the "Treatise". A radical change of thinker priorities can be observed -from Columbo ambitions to skeptical, pessimistic self-estimation.

The form of his credo implementation is his determined decision to take up new tactics, which are fundamentally different from previous approaches. "Here then is the only expedient, from which we can hope for success in our philosophical researches, to leave the tedious lingering method, which we have hitherto followed, and instead of taking now and then a castle or village on the frontier, to march up directly to the capital or center of these sciences, to human nature itself" [12, p.10].

The final part of the first book is very different in style, self-estimation and purpose. The latter is much more modest; namely, it sets priorities and draws attention to the problem of human nature: "Twill be sufficient for me, if I can bring it a little more into fashion" [12, p. 186].

Does Hume's modest self-assessment of the possibilities of human nature provide direct subordination to nature? At first glance it seems that he verifies expediency of orientation to nature: "I may, nay I must yield to the current of nature, in submitting to my senses and understanding; and in this blind submission I show most perfectly my skeptical disposition and principles" [12, p.184].

It is worth emphasizing that Hume is fundamentally ambiguous. The validity of the final idea is reflected in the question "does it follow, that I must strive against the current of nature"? His own view is conditional: "only when" we escape from those gloomy deserts and rocky roads that came across due to naivete. This refers to a quite different position of skepticism based on a lack of attention to nature in the broad sense of the word. And therefore, it is necessary to go beyond "the force of reason and convictions" [12, p.184].

In other words, the schematic correlation of the introduction and the final part of the Treatise

gives the possibility to interpret them as a kind of theses and antitheses. It is like the evaluation of the route as an adventurous journey on the battered ship, which had a narrow escape, but the captain is still dreaming of a round-the-world trip. As it is seen, for Hume the main factor of current unfortunate situation is the lack of adequate assessment of his own nature, which is weak and limited. It refers to him as a person and about human nature in general: "For with what confidence can I venture upon such bold enterprises, when beside those numberless infirmities peculiar to myself, I find so many which are common to human nature?" [12, p.181].

The issues concerning limitation and weakness of human nature are becoming meaningful, since every adult face them: "Where am I, or what? From what causes do I derive my existence, and to what condition shall I return? Whose favour shall I court, and whose anger must I dread? What beings surround me? and on whom have I any influence, or who have any influence on me? I am confounded with all these questions, and begin to fancy myself in the most deplorable condition imaginable, environed with the deepest darkness, and utterly deprived of the use of every member and faculty"[12, p. 184].

A person is becoming more emotionally imbalanced in an attempt to determine moral principles. "The cause of those several passions and inclinations, which actuate and govern me" [12, p.185]. Though a human knows neither ultimate principles of the universe nor the maxims of his own behavior, Hume hopes for a successful realization of his own vocation: "my own weakness" impels me to superstition with more convincing and powerful arguments than philosophy, only the latter can and should be a worthy leader of our lives. A school of the Cynicis an example of superstitious belief – "an example of the extraordinary instance philosophers". They neglect the concept of nature in its broad sense, limiting to a narrow understanding of the nature -they narrow down human life to animal life. They are engaged in "interfering in natural inclinations," and "Since therefore 'tis almost impossible, – says Hume – for the mind of man to rest like those of beasts, in that narrow circle of objects, which are the subject of daily conversation and action", this statement is a form of problem ag-

## ІСТОРИЯ ФІЛОСОФІЇ

gravation of human behavior foundations – namely, "we ought only to deliberate concerning the choice of our guide" [12, p.185].

Critically evaluating contemporary approaches to the interpretation of a human and appropriate basis of his existence, Hume distinguishes and rejects as insufficient the forms of manifestation of naivety, which (as dogmatism) neglect nature characteristics in the broad sense of the word. It is a "natural propensity" of belief in the existence of universal laws (which determine the inner world of human feelings and consciousness), i.e., "indolent belief in the general maxims of the world" [12, p.184]. The last words seem to clearly indicate the direction of Hume's thought against metaphysics.

It is often said that metaphysics and human nature are incompatible from the standpoint of Hume. He seems to say about it when he writes: "Very refined reflections have little or no influence upon us" [12, p.183]. First of all, it is necessary to understand if Hume is straightforward to naive empiricism and metaphysics denial? The philosopher sees "manifest contradiction" beyond univocal and recognizes that the thesis of the incompatibility of human nature and metaphysics is wrong: But what have I here said, that reflections very refined and metaphysical have little or no influence upon us? «This opinion I can scarce forbear retracting, and condemning from my present feeling and experience» [12, p.184].

An example of Hume's interpretation of metaphysical human nature should be considered in Chapter XII "An Inquiry Concerning Human Understanding" – namely, requirements to the ethics as basic philosophical project – a positive orientation to the good, which should be permanent in all its power and vitality. Understanding and conceiving pyrrhonian as an example of nature neglecting in its broad sense, Hume does not accept it, because it poses the threat to human life destruction in general: "All discourse, all action would immediately cease; men would remain in a total lethargy, till the necessity of their nature unsatisfied put at end so their existence." [11, p.187]. But he is not inclined to increase tensions and predict terrible scenarios of the future. In his opinion, it is a virtual hardly probable scenario, because its principles do not have a real reason. Real life sorts everything out

quickly, since "Nature is always too strong for principles" [11, p 187]. As for us the important point of Hume position is a kind of "dream", it still means its unequivocal condemnation. It is important to avoid the temptation of creating the image of an enemy that needs to be expelled and defeated. The more important for Hume is the ability to understand main factors of the current state of things and reflect on the possibility how to overcome it by using available human resources.

Analyzing the reasons for Hume's refusal from unambiguous judgments, it is necessary to pay attention to his vision of a quite new position of human in the Early Modern Era. This position is determined with the help of notions "eccentric" and "whimsical". It is an illustration, embodiment of the paradoxes of human nature that simultaneously implies the presence of some knowledge, and makes this presence impossible: "...who must act, and reason, and believe; though they are not able, by their most diligent inquiry, to satisfy themselves concerning the foundation of these operations, or to remove the objections which may be raised against them" [11, p 187].

According to the thoughts of Hume, he is far from not only unambiguous understanding of nature, but also man (human) reflected in his theories in text books.

### Originality

Contemporary understanding of the position of anthropological project in Hume's philosophy is regarded as unsatisfactory by the author. Development of the basic project as anthropological is rooted in scientific revolution and needs to be continued and completed. Contemporary prevalence of deanthropological versions of Hume's philosophy is the result of underestimated significance of the concept of nature in the broad sense. According to the philosopher's texts, heuristic potential of Hume's position is emphasized by the author. The modern version of the basic project in the early modern age is criticized and demands significant changes to become anthropological.

### Findings

Modern perception of Hume's philosophy as an anthropological project is unsatisfactory in

## ІСТОРИЯ ФІЛОСОФІЇ

terms of historical and philosophical science and needs to be given detailed analysis. In order to understand the conditions of anthropological project significance, it is advisable to focus on: a) scientific revolution and the necessity to complete it; b) determined role of the concept of nature in its broad sense. Nowadays the way of Hume's rethinking of the basic project of modern philosophy as insufficiently anthropological is quite heuristic. Empiricism, dogmatism, superstition and skepticism are the manifestations of the latter. For Hume, the era was as an incomplete anthropological project and its legacy as the most complete form of explication. Today the interest in the phenomenon of a human provides a reasonable basis to define that modern period is related to the era of Hume, and therefore, to give some reasoning for his remarkable ideas as New Hume's era.

## LIST OF REFERENCE LINKS

1. Гвардини, Р. Конец нового времени / Р. Гвардини // Вопросы философии. – 1990. – № 4. – С. 127–163.
2. Касавин, И. Т. Юм Дэвид. Парадоксы познания / И. Т. Касавин // Вопросы философии. 2011. – №2. – С. 157–171.
3. Кассирер, Э. Опыт о человеке: введение в философию человеческой культуры / Э. Кассирер // Проблема человека в западной философии [пер. с нем. А. Н. Муравьев]. Москва : Прогресс, 1988. – С. 3–30.
4. Маливский, А. Н. Антропологизация базового проекта Декарта в современной историко-философской литературе / А. Н. Маливский // Sententiae. – 2013. – Т. XXVIII, № 1. – С. 51–63.
5. Моссер, Е. К. Передмова / Е. К. Моссер // Трактат про людську природу: Спроба запровадження експериментального методу міркувань про об'єкти моралі [за ред. та з передм. Е. К. Моссера. з англ. пер. П. Насада]. – Київ : Вид. дім «Всесвіт», 2003. – С. 11–28.
6. Панич, О. О. Розвідки з історії скептицизму в британно-американській епістемології. Частина перша: британська модерна філософія (Гоббс, Локк, Барклі, Х'юм, Рід) / О. О. Панич. – Донецьк : Дон. нац. ун-т, 2007). – 524 с.
7. Хайдеггер, М. Время картины мира / М. Хайдеггер // Время и бытие: Статьи и выступления [пер. с нем., комм. В. В. Библихина] – Москва : Республика, 1993. – с. 41–62.
8. Butler, A. M. Humes Early Biography and A Treatise oh Human Nature / A. M. Butler // The Cambridge Companion to Hume's Treatise [ed. by D. C. Ainslie and A. Butler]. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2015. – P. 1–13. doi: 10.1017/cc09781139016100.003
9. Clarke, D. M. Descartes: A Biography / D. M. Clarke. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2006. – 520 p. doi: 10.1017/cbo9780511498077
10. Greenberg, S. 'Naturalism' and 'Skepticism' in Hume's Treatise of Human Nature / S. Greenberg // Philosophy Compass. – 2008. – Vol. 3, Iss. 4, – p. 721–733. doi: 10.1111/j.1747-9991.2008.00143.x
11. Hume, D. An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding / D. Hume // The Philosophical Works of David Hume. – Edinburg; London : Little, Brown, 1826. – P. 1–233. doi: 10.1037/12868-000
12. Hume, D. A Treatise of Human Nature / D. Hume. – Oxford : The Clarendon Press, 1896. – 435 p. doi: 10.1037/12868-000
13. Neto, J. R. M. «Acquired Skepticism in the Seventeenth Century». Skepticism in the Modern Age: Building on the Work of Richard Popkin / J. R. M. Neto, G. Paganini, J. C. Laursen // Proc. of the Conf. (22.11–25.11.2007): "Skepticism from the Renasissance to the Enlightenment: a Conference in Memory of Richard H. Popkin (1923 – 2005)". – Brazil, 2009 – P. 309–324.
14. Norton, D. F. An introduction to Hume's thought / D. F. Norton, J. Taylor // The Cambridge Companion to David Hume. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2009. – P. 1–39. doi: 10.1017/cc09780521859868.001
15. Popkin, R. Hume and Jurieu // R. H. Popkin // The High Road to Pyrrhonism. – San Diego : Austin Hill Press Inc., 1980. – P. 179.

А. М. МАЛІВСЬКИЙ<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1\*</sup> Дніпропетровський національний університет залізничного транспорту імені акад. В. Лазаряна (Дніпро), ел. пошта telepat-57@mail.ru; ORCID 0000-0002-6923-5145

## ЗАПИТ НОВОГО ЧАСУ НА РОЗРОБКУ АНТРОПОЛОГІЇ: ВЧЕННЯ ЮМА



## ІСТОРІЯ ФІЛОСОФІЇ

**Мета.** Виходячи з радикальних трансформацій культури Нового часу, окреслити основні моменти тлумачення Юмом базового проекту епохи як антропологічного. Викласти сучасне бачення антропології Юма як форми відповіді на запит епохи та завершення базового проекту Нового часу. **Новизна.** Автор оцінює сучасну рецепцію місця антропологічного проекту в філософії Юма як незадовільне. Розробка базового проекту як антропологічного для нього укорінена в науковій революції, є його продовженням та завершенням. Поширеність деантропологізованих версій філософії Юма автор вважає результатом недооцінки ключової значимості поняття природи в широкому значенні. Звертаючись до текстів філософа, автор наголошує на наявності евристичного потенціалу позиції Юма. Мова йде про критику ним сучасної йому версії базового проекту Нового часу, котрий потребує радикалізації, тобто антропологізації. **Висновки.** Сучасні рецепції філософії Юма як антропологічного проекту є незадовільними з позицій історико-філософської науки та мають бути уточнені. В ході осмислення умов виходу на перший план антропологічного проекту доцільно послідовно зосередити увагу на: а) науковій революції та необхідності її завершення; б) детермінуючій ролі поняття природи в широкому значенні слова. Нині є евристичною форма переосмислення Юмом базового проекту філософії Нового часу як недостатньо антропологізованого. До числа форм прояви останнього належать емпіризм, догматизм, марновірство та скептицизм. Епоха постає для Г'юма як незавершений антропологічний проект, а його спадщина – як найбільш повна форма експлікації. Нині посилений інтерес до феномену людини дає достатні підстави для кваліфікації сучасності як змістовно спорідненої з епохою Юма, а отже, правомірності тези щодо доцільності розробки його непересічних ідей як неюміанства.

*Ключові слова:* Г'юм; антропологічний проект; природа; природа людини; природа в широкому значенні; природа в вузькому значенні; мораль; метафізика

А. Н. МАЛИВСКИЙ<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1\*</sup>Днепропетровский национальный университет железнодорожного транспорта имени академика В. Лазаряна (Днепр), эл. почта telepat-57@mail.ru; ORCID 0000-0002-6923-5145

## ЗАПРОС НОВОГО ВРЕМЕНИ НА РАЗРАБОТКУ АНТРОПОЛОГИИ: УЧЕНИЕ ЮМА

**Цель.** Исходя из радикальных трансформаций культуры Нового времени, обрисовать основные моменты истолкования Юмом базового проекта эпохи как антропологического. Изложить современное видение антропологии Юма как формы ответа на запрос эпохи и завершение базисного проекта Нового времени. **Новизна.** Автор оценивает современную рецепцию места антропологического проекта в учении Юма как неудовлетворительную. Для него разработка базового проекта как антропологического укоренена в научной революции, выступает его продолжением и завершением. Распространенность деантропологизированных версий философии Юма автор считает результатом недооценки ключевой роли понятия природы в широком значении. Обращаясь к текстам Юма, автор подчеркивает эвристический потенциал позиции Юма. Речь идет о современной ему версии базового проекта Нового времени, который требует радикализации, то есть антропологизации. **Выводы.** Современные рецепции философии Юма как антропологического проекта неудовлетворительны с позиций историко-философской науки и должны быть уточнены. В ходе осмысления условий выхода на первый план антропологического проекта целесообразно последовательно сосредоточить внимание на: а) научной революции и необходимости ее завершения; б) детерминирующей роли понятия природы в широком значении слова. Ныне явным является эвристический потенциал переосмысления Юмом базового проекта философии Нового времени как недостаточно антропологизированого. К числу форм обнаружения последнего принадлежат эмпиризм, догматизм, суеверие и скептицизм. Современная эпоха для Юма – незавершенный антропологический проект, а его наследие – наиболее полная форма экспликация. Сегодняшний усиленный интерес к феномену человека дает весомые основания для квалификации современной эпохи как содержательно родственной со временами Юма, а, следовательно, правомірности тезиса о целесообразности развития его неординарных идей как неюміанства.

*Ключевые слова:* Юм; антропологический проект; природа; природа человека; природа в широком значении; природа в узком значении; мораль; метафизика

### REFERENCES

1. Gvardini P. *Konets novogo vremeni* [The end of modern period]. *Voprosy filosofii – Problems of Philosophy*, 1990, no. 4, pp. 127-163.

## ІСТОРИЯ ФІЛОСОФІЇ

2. Kasavin I.T. Hume David. Paradoksy poznaniya [Hume David. Paradoxes of understanding]. *Voprosy filosofii – Problems of Philosophy*, 2011, no. 2, pp. 127-163.
3. Cassirer E. *Opyt o cheloveke: vvedeniye v filosofiyu chelovecheskoy kultury. Problema cheloveka v zapadnoy filosofii* [Experience about a human: introduction in philosophy of human culture. The problem of a human in western philosophy]. Moscow, Progress Publ., 1988. pp. 3-30.
4. Malivskiy A.M. Antropologizatsiya bazovogo proekta Dekarta v sovremennoy istoriko-filosofskoy literature [Anthropologization of basic project of Descartes in modern historical and philosophical literature]. *Sententiae*, 2013, vol. XXVIII, pp. 51-63.
5. Mossner E. Peredmova. Hume D. *Traktat pro liudsku pryrodu: Sproba zaprovadzhennia eksperymentalnoho metodu mirkuvan pro obiekty morali* [Preface. Hume D. A Treatise of Human Nature: An attempt to introduce the experimental method of reasoning about objects morality]. Kyiv, Vsesvit Publ., 2003. 552 p.
6. Panich O.O. *Rozvidky z istorii skeptyzmu v brytano-amerykanskii epistemologii. Chastyna persha: brytanska moderna filosofia* [Research into skepticism history in British and American epistemology. Part one: modern British philosophy]. Donetsk, National University Publ., 2007. 524 p.
7. Heidegger M. *Vremya kartiny mira* [The age of the World Picture]. Moscow, Respublika Publ., 1993. 447 p.
8. Butler A.M., Donald C. Ainslie. *Humes Early Biography and a Treatise on Human Nature. The Cambridge Companion to Hume's Treatise*. Cambridge University Press Publ., 2015. pp. 1-13. doi: 10.1017/cc09781139016100.003
9. Clarke Desmond M. *Descartes: A Biography*. Cambridge University Press Publ., 2006, 520 p. doi: 10.1017/cbo9780511498077
10. Greenberg S. 'Naturalism' and 'Skepticism' in Hume's Treatise of Human Nature. *Philosophy Compass*, vol. 3, issue 4, pp. 721-733. doi: 10.1111/j.1747-9991.2008.00143.x
11. Hume D. *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding. The Philosophical Works of David Hume*. Edinburg, LONDON Publ., 1826. 603 p. doi: 10.1037/12868-000
12. Hume D. *A Treatise of Human Nature by David Hume*. Oxford, Clarendon Press Publ., 1896. 435 p. doi: 10.1037/12868-000
13. Neto J.R. M. «Acquired Skepticism in the Seventeenth Century». *Skepticism in the Modern Age: Building on the Work of Richard Popkin; [Proceedings of the Conference "Skepticism from the Renaissance to the Enlightenment: Conference in Memory of Richard H. Popkin (1923 — 2005)"]*, Brazil, 2009, pp. 309-324.
14. Norton D.F., Taylor J. *An introduction to Hume's thought. The Cambridge Companion to David Hume*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press Publ., 2009. pp. 1-32. doi: 10.1017/cc09780521859868.001
15. Richard Popkin. *Hume and Jurieu. The High Road to Pyrrhonism*. San Diego, Austin Hill Press Inc. Publ., 1980. 385 p.

*Prof. Dr. Philos. V. V. Khmil, (Ukraine) recommended this article to be published*

Received: 25 May, 2016

Accepted: 20 Sept., 2016