

ARTICLES

UDC 130.2(477)(045)

DOI 10.25128/2225-3165.19.01.01



Yaroslav Kalakura

PhD hab. (History), Professor,
Department of Archival Studies and Special Branches of Historical Science,
Kyiv National University named by Taras Shevchenko (Ukraine)
kalajar@ukr.net
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9007-4991>

Ярослав Калакура

Доктор історичних наук, професор,
Кафедра архівознавства та спеціальних галузей історичної науки,
Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка (Україна)



Mykhailo Yurii

PhD hab. (History), Professor,
Department of Social and Humanitarian Studies and Law,
Chernivtsi Institute of Trade and Economics of
Kyiv National University of Trade and Economics (Ukraine)
mjuriy@ukr.net
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4969-052X>

Михайло Юрій

Доктор історичних наук, професор,
Кафедра соціально-гуманітарних наук та права,
Чернівецький торговельно-економічний інститут Київського національного
торговельно-економічного університету (Україна)

ANTHROPOCENTRISM OF UKRAINIAN CULTURE AND CIVILIZATION

Summary. The article deals with the philosophical ideological principle, the content of which is the understanding of the world in connection with the inclusion of the Ukrainian person as an amateur factor. It is noted that in the history of Ukrainian philosophical thought the problem of human, his essence and meaning of life is one of the central. Even in the times of Kyiv Rus the human was perceived not only as a part of the cosmos, which is inherent in paganism, but also as the peak of nature. A new manifestation of the human view manifests itself in XVI–XVIII centuries when the national self-determination of Ukrainians awakens, which, in turn, exacerbates the interest of the society to the universal foundations of European civilization – antiquity, Christianity and enlightenment, that is, the ideas of anthropocentrism that were widespread and in Western Europe. A human was viewed not only from the point of sin and salvation, but as the highest value, the creator of himself through involvement in God as a perfect creation. S. Orikhovskiy, K. Sakovych, K. Trankvilion-Stavrovetskiy affirmed the idea of unity of micro- and macrocosm. Anthropocentrism was conceived as a leading tendency of Ukrainian philosophy and classical literature of XIX–XX centuries. The philosophical and literary heritage of T. Shevchenko, M. Drahomanov, I. Franko, M. Pavlyk, Lesia Ukrainka, M. Kotsiubynskiy, P. Grabovskiy, T. Zinkivskiy, Yu. Vassyan, D. Dontsov, M. Mikhnovskiy is imbued with it. In general, the Ukrainian human in the anthropocentric type of culture positions himself to the world, but not the world to the human. While the world is a background, a human observes the world.

Keywords: anthropocentrism, sociocentrism, world outlook, anthology, human, society, culture.

АНТРОПОЦЕНТРИЗМ УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ КУЛЬТУРИ І ЦИВІЛІЗАЦІЇ

Анотація. У статті йдеться про філософський світоглядний принцип, змістом якого є розуміння світу у зв'язку з включеністю в нього української людини як самодіяльного фактора. Зазначено, що в історії української філософської думки проблема людини, її сутності та сенсу життя є однією з центральних. Ще за часів Київської Русі людину сприймали не лише як частину Космосу, що притаманне язичництву, а й як вершину природи. Новий прояв погляду на людину проявляється у XVI–XVIII ст., коли пробуджується національне самовизначення українського народу, що, своєю чергою, загострило інтерес суспільства до універсальних основ європейської цивілізації – античності, християнства та просвітництва, тобто виникають ті самі ідеї антропоцентризму, що були поширені і в Західній Європі. Людина розглядалася не лише з позиції гріхопадіння та

спасіння, а як найвища цінність, творець самої себе через причетність до Бога, як досконале творіння. С. Оріховський, К. Сакович, К. Транквіліон-Ставровецький утверджували ідею єдності мікро- та макрокосмосу. Антропоцентризм замислився провідною тенденцією української філософії і класичної літератури ХІХ–ХХ ст. Ним пронизана філософська і літературна спадщина Т. Шевченка, М. Драгоманова, І. Франка, М. Павлика, Лесі Українки, М. Коцюбинського, П. Грабовського, Т. Зінківського, Ю. Вассіяна, Д. Донцова, М. Міхновського. Загалом українська людина в антропоцентричному типі культури позиціонує себе світові, а не світ людині, вона фігура, тоді як світ – тло, людина спостерігає за світом.

Ключові слова: антропоцентризм, соціоцентризм, світогляд, антологія, людина, суспільство, культура.

Introduction. Anthropocentrism is a philosophical ideological principle, the content of which is the understanding of the world in connection with the inclusion of human as a conscious activity factor. In the development of philosophy, the problem of human in the surrounding world has always been a leading, and now it plays a decisive role in understanding the modern world. Its formation was associated with its separation from the natural environment, the animal world, with the awareness of himself not only as a representative of the human race, but also as an individuality and personality. The content of the principle of anthropocentrism has been historically changed, based on an understanding of the essence of human within the limits of humanitarian ideas of various philosophical schools and doctrines, as well as in connection with the different levels of development of concrete historical knowledge about human, the results of his self-knowledge and self-consciousness.

Analysis of recent research and publications. Thinking about the essence of anthropocentrism of Ukrainian culture and civilization, the authors relied on the achievement of the historiography of the problem, taking into account that the Ukrainian anthropocentrism and its comprehension have long traditions, whose roots reach the princely age and the Cossack-Hetman times. Any way, this problem arose in the process of the formation of scientific basis of Ukrainian historiography, the foundation of which was laid by M. Hrushevskiy, paying attention to such traits as originality, isolation and organic closeness to European civilization.

The founders of Ukrainian studies and the history of Ukrainian culture were M. Kostomarov, P. Kulish, T. Shevchenko, figures of the Kiev community, the Russian Trinity, the Scientific Society named by T. Shevchenko, and such prominent intellectuals as M. Maksymovich, V. Antonovych, V. Vernadskiy, M. Hrushevskiy, D. Dontsov, D. Doroshenko, M. Drahomanov, I. Franko, Lesia Ukrainka, I. Nechui-Levytskyi, V. Vynnychenko, D. Antonovych, F. Vovk, P. Voropai, V. Lypynskiy, I. Krypiakevych, O. Kulchytskyi, Yu. Lypa, V. Mirchuk, I. Ogienko, O. Potebnia, M. Sumtsov, D. Chizhevskiy, P. Chubynskiy, P. Yurkevych, D. Yavornytskyi and others. In addition, we recall that one of the pioneers of professional Ukrainian studies in Ukrainian anthropology was Fedor Vovk. His scientific works, written and published in French and Russian at the turn of the ХІХ–ХХ centuries, are now republished in Ukraine. S. Vozniuk pointed out the continuity of the tradition of anthropocentrism in Ukrainian philosophy and historiography, emphasizing that he became the main philosophical paradigm of Ukrainian studies.

One of the peculiarities of modern Ukrainian historiography is that it increasingly takes over and implements the experience of human-centered and anthropological direction in Western European humanities, a new stage of which has begun in the middle of the twentieth century. The transition from “the history of events” to “the history of humans” is inseparable from the civilization approach to the historical process, which focuses on the priority role of a human in it. In this connection the authors tried to involve as much as possible research on the civilization history of Ukraine, in particular O. Gorelov, O. Motsi and O. Rafaelskiy, as well as two volumes “Ukraine: the civilization context of cognition” by M. Yurii, L. Aleksievets, Ya. Kalakura and O. Udod, individual monographs by Yu. Pavlenko and M. Yurii,

devoted to the civilization comprehension of world history and socio-cultural world of Ukraine. Particular attention was paid to the study of V. Andrushchenko, L. Guberskyi, M. Mikhalchenko, V. Sheik, devoted to the civilization dimension of Ukrainian culture, and local civilization.

The aim of the article. The article is based on the general theory of anthropological understanding of culture and civilization to answer the question: what is Ukrainian human, the priorities of his origin, how the human changed his place in nature and society, culture and spirituality, which evolution has Ukrainian human undergone himself. The authors seek to track the leading trends in the growth of the role of a human in the development of Ukrainian culture and civilization, from ancient times to modernity.

Results. Anthropocentrism is a worldview according to which human is the center of the universe and the purpose of all events that are carried out in the world. A human in the anthropocentric type of culture positions himself in the world, but not the world to the human; a human is a figure, whereas the world is a background, a human influences the world, he is relatively active and mobile in the world, and the world is static, a human observes the world, and not vice versa. The general ribbon of anthropocentric paintings of the world is human gnosis, but is indecisive. Probably due to this anthropocentric ontology is a doctrine of the cumulative integrity of being, that being was considered only from the standpoint of the human mind, and the question of whether this single point of view and whether there may be a non-human logos of the world did not arise. Only when the world is “aged” for so many centuries of its awareness, being as the unity has “split up” on the plurality of orchestrated ontologies. Human activity in relation to the world manifests itself in the theoretically established and almost feasible opportunity to influence, modify, adapt to their needs the surrounding world (from the point of view of a human – to improve), with what the civilizational paradigm of human society development is connected with.

Even the fact that each epochal consciousness corresponded with its own outlook, which can be read as an outlook of a human about the world, and in which each of its components (sensory-spatial, spiritual, cultural, metaphysical) was determined by the human conception of the world. This testifies anthropocentrism as a guide for the ensemble of eras from antiquity to the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Just as the soul was the enthalfe of the body (Aristotle), a human became an enthlete of the anthropocentric picture of the world (Vytel, 2009: 203).

Some problems of anthropocentrism have already been established in the philosophy of the ancient society, where they found their logical reasoning in the works of ancient Greek philosophers. Already at that time, Protagor (V century BC) proclaimed a position that retained its significance to this day that “a human is the measure of all things”. It was refined by Socrates (V century BC) in the sense that only “a person who thinks is a measure of all things”. Of great importance to the development of anthropocentrism was the natural materialist doctrine of Democritus (V–VII centuries BC) about a human as a microcosm; the definition of Aristotle (IV century BC) of a human as the deepest essence of being. Within the philosophy of ancient society, anthropocentrism was essentially ontological, considering a human as the necessary constituent part of the immense Cosmos, as its highest state. Even then, installations have been placed in the interpretation of the world in connection with its alignment with man, or in other words – the anthropocentric idea in antiquity appeared in its embryonic form as a complex of future invariants of future development. Each of the following eras “removed” from antiquity as from the pantry, the elements of its future cultural and civilizational model, and delivered outside the updated version of the anthropocentric idea. In this sense, antiquity was with respect to other epochs as the base system, and without it anthropocentrism is devoid of integrity.

If for anthropology anthropocentric idea is not at all distant, then the collocation “anthropocentrism of the Middle Ages” seems absurd, since it is literally interpreted as the centralized position of a human in relation to the cause which gave birth to it – God, which, of course, is not true. We agree that the medieval picture of the world is geocentric, but the notion of “the picture of the world” fits into the horizons of anthropocentric culture, as it turns out to be much wider than the concrete plan of the epochal expression, which allows speaking of anthropocentrism in a broad sense. A human recognizes himself as a means and meaning of Creation, for the sake of a human, God the Father sent His Only Son to death. God exalted and magnified a human by creating him according to the image of God and raising him to such vertices, from which the mystery of eternal life is revealed (Chikarkova, 2010: 16–26).

Obviously, in the center of medieval aesthetics, there is not only God; it is a two-way inseparable vertically built relationship between Human and God. In the bimonthly unevenly large-scale and axiologically incompatible main binary opposition, the absence of one member means the impossibility of the existence of another. At one pole of the system is the absurdity of being without God and the “deification” of human in the act of salvation, on the other – the impossibility of the existence of a world without human and Christ as the God-man.

Understanding the invincibility of the distance, the inaccessibility and incomprehensibility of God contributed to the development of such a believer’s consciousness, which, if necessary, directed a human to God, and all being subordinated to this connection with Him.

Due to this, human emphasized not only God, but also to a greater extent, the attitude of the human to the divine, mortal to immortal, earthly to heavenly, dark to light, false to the truth. By transferring the attitude of “human–God”, human began to think of himself as an ambivalent entity, finding himself lower and higher, material and spiritual, isolating his soul from his integrity. The soul of a person acquires the status of an independent of the body of matter, becomes a special organ of communication with God, the only able to feel and understand His will.

This “outburst” of the soul, deliberately “taken away” from its sinful body, is clearly shown by Aurelius Augustine in “Confessions.” In his open and frank prayers with God, it appears that there is nothing else but Her (soul) and His – God: “My God! Is there anything in me that can include you? Is not the heavens and the earth that you have created, and on which also did you create me? But without You there would be nothing that exists – hence, everything that exists includes you” (Augustine, 1991: 53–54).

The impossibility of placing in the center of medieval thinking of God apart from human shows the fact that in the main Christian sacrament of Communion there is a connection between human and God. Thus, anthropocentric paradigm in the Middle Ages not only does not disappear, but on the contrary, it finds its further continuation in the reflection of human himself, his inner spiritual essence as a condition of understanding God and practically carried out with the help of the central binary opposition “human-God”.

Significant importance in the development of anthropocentrism was the Renaissance, when religious ideas about the materialized person were overcome and new views on its essence and purpose were formed on a consciously humanistic background. This became possible in the process of further individualization of the person, the allocation of human himself not only from another world, but also from the community of their own, the use of dialogue and communication as a means of self-knowledge and self-affirmation.

For man there was a real opportunity to achieve good, beautiful, true, it was necessary only to find the tool of knowledge, raising himself, his abilities and opportunities. The Renaissance person has set himself at the center of the universe. The

question of what gave the humans confidence in their forces, suggests the role of medieval self-reflection, which enriched human with the experience of analyzing the self-being of the soul in the world. Therefore, the thesis of Protagoras was raised on shields by a “new human”, in which the spiritual power and body spirit were united.

Speaking about the continuity of the anthropocentric idea, we point out that the very idea that the person belongs to the central place in the Divine universe was affirmed by the religious dogma of a human as the summit of Creation. (Vytel, 2009: 205). That is, the cult of God began to be identified with the cult of a human. In particular, M. Kuzanskyi wrote about a human as a “human God”, that it is a microcosm, or “human world” (Kuzanskyi, 1979: 271).

During the New Age, the awareness of human of his being in the surrounding world was carried out on the basis of a scientific and humanistic approach. Anthropocentrism receives its subsequent development primarily in the field of epistemology and psychology. New European rationalism has divided the world into a free and active subject, and everything else that opposes the subject. In this period, by means of the absolutization of the active role of human, the idea of his possibility of unlimited domination in the world is established. F. Bacon believed that human could and should be majestic. He removes research tasks from the competence of science, leaving them for metaphysics. Increasing the intellectual abilities of people in the era of Enlightenment went along with the development of mechanistic ideas about its nature. According to certain social conditions, J. Laametri believed that a monkey could become a “little Parisian”. Thus, sociocentrism was formed as a worldview that continues to dominate in modern philosophy. “Human is born to a society” – the most beloved aphorism of J. Herder. However, the philosophy of the New Age saw in human first of all his spiritual essence, which determines the essence of the very philosophy (J. Fichte). With the development of philosophical thought, attention is paid to the problem of human essence, its place and significance in the world, interaction with the universe. I. Kant believed that human should act as if he was God that is to assume all responsibility for independent decisions and for the consequences of his actions.

With the development of natural science, anthropocentrism gradually left the field of science and focused on theology. The discovery of M. Copernicus and G. Galileo destroyed the notion of human as the center of the universe. The founder of psychoanalysis, Z. Freud, dissipated illusions about the domination of rational consciousness in human behavior. Modern American philosopher and sociologist G. Simon reduces human to an entity for the processing of information and refuses him in any uniqueness. The ideas of exaltation and humiliation have their own outlook. The notion of poverty changes at the turn of the twentieth century by the belief in the infinite possibilities of man, and in the short time – skepticism about its mental abilities and prospects of progress. To some extent, the idea of anthropocentrism was used and developed by the philosophy of existentialism. These ideas coexist, mixed with nature, logo-, theo-, sociocentrism.

Within the perspective of human as “the measure of all things” (Protagoras), during the last century of the development of philosophical thought, three directions of the concept of anthropocentrism were formed. Metaphysical anthropocentrism – human appears as an absolute existence existing in historical space and time (S. Kierkegaard, F. Nietzsche, existentialists); cosmological anthropocentrism – considers human as the center of the universe through the prism of the evolution of nature (T. Huxley, P. Teilhard de Chardin); axiological anthropocentrism – sees in human all possible values (L. Feuerbach, M. Scheler).

Nowadays anthropocentrism has been further developed both in connection with new discoveries in the field of natural and technical sciences, as well as from the standpoint of modern philosophical and sociological approaches. Promoted and

developed by natural scientists based on the data of astrophysics, system engineering, artificial intelligence, biology and other sciences, the anthropic principle specified the conditions and possibilities of physical existence of human in the universe. At the same time, a human as thinking material deeply perceives himself as an active factor in the social and environment surrounding his natural environment, all being on the scale of the universe. This determines the idea of a person as a conscious partner of world evolution, makes him responsible for the results of his activities, imposes increased demands on the level of the subjective factor in general, and highlights the professional, organizational, moral and spiritual traits of the individual. Meaning acquires his self-knowledge and self-consciousness, the definition of mechanisms of regulation and self-regulation, the spiritual sphere, the acquisition of knowledge of the functioning of the intelligence, the establishment of control over the results of their activities.

Pointing out the growing importance of the principle of anthropocentrism in the knowledge and transformation of the modern world, it is worth emphasizing the danger of its absolutisation, the need to consider its content only in correlation with the objective laws of being and, accordingly, with all other principles of knowledge and activities of human and humanity. Modern anthropocentrism not only further develops the ideas of the era of revival of human, his properties and place in the world, but also in a certain way returns to the ideological grounds of cosmocrism of the ancient society on the basis of the new, enriched by modern scientific data. The development of anthropocentrism historically reflects a change in its content: at early stages, human acted as the result of the evolution of the world, and then it gradually became an accomplice to the world process, and now – it becomes a decisive factor in its organization.

However, the transition of humanity to a qualitatively new stage of development in the social spiritual and cultural relations – for today only a real opportunity to get out of the global crisis, but not yet implemented state. Difficulties and danger in the implementation of this task are mainly from the human himself: not low level of his consciousness, the lack of understanding by society of the causes and mechanisms of the functioning of natural, anthropological and social phenomena in their interaction as specifically specific elements of a single world being. Humanity must master the full achievements of spiritual culture, the science of wise management and regulation of world processes. This task cannot be solved beyond the modern philosophical knowledge of the world.

In the history of Ukrainian philosophical thought, the problem of human, his essence and meaning of life is one of the central. Even in the times of Kiev Rus people were perceived not only as part of the cosmos, which is inherent in paganism, but also as the peak of nature.

Anthropocentrism of Ukrainian culture has been observed since the very beginning of the existence of the ancient Russian state, which borders on the east with the Great Steppe. The waves of nomadic raids of this steppe element, covering the two continents, could be confronted not only materially but also spiritually. The “Chaos”, “the abyss”, “outer darkness” of the enemy’s Kyivska Rus found an alternative in the “smart oikumen” of the city as a “sophia beginning”.

The concept of the sophia world, that is, the search for a reasonable beginning not only in intelligence, but also in the substantive being, which had to be revealed as a book of wisdom, as a meaningful life, was developed by ancient civilization. In the tenth century it was picked up in an unproduced form by Kiev Rus. And it began to produce a new, Greco-Slavic type of European culture. During the Middle Ages, Kyiv acts as a translator of the ancient tradition in Eastern Europe, whose representative was Kiev Sofia.

The ideological and artistic concept of Sophia Kiev is unique in combination with ancient and Christian ideas. The theme of Sophia is united in it through the philosophers of Neoplatonism with the idea of ontological optimism and apocatastasis – the blessed return of mankind to the blessed purity of the earthly life. In the paintings of Sophia there are no compulsory for the Christian church scenes of a terrible trial, apocalyptic images, pictures of death – “Laying in the coffin”, “Mourning”, “Dipping”, etc. The scene of the Eucharist, communion with bread and wine, which symbolized the transformation of the carnal into the spiritual, and in the broader sense – the atoning of the flesh, its purification and ascension to the supersensible primitive image, was put on the foreground. The tense conflict of intellect and body that has definitively dramatized the whole system of Western spirituality in Orthodoxy is removed by the concept of “deification of the flesh”. This flesh in the Ukrainian mentality is compared not to the alternative of intelligence, but to the spiritual mind (the essence of the soul) which according to Isaiah Kopynskyi’s characteristic, leads to God (Krymskyi, 2003: 3).

This clearly manifests itself in the XVI–XVII centuries when the national self-determination of the Ukrainian people awakens, which, in turn, exacerbates the interest of society in the universal foundations of European civilization – antiquity, Christianity and enlightenment, that is, the same ideas of anthropocentrism arise that were widespread in Western Europe

Human was viewed not only from the position of sin and salvation, but as the highest value, the creator of himself through his involvement in God as a perfect creation. S. Orichovskiy, K. Sakovych, K. Tranquilion-Stavrovetskyi affirmed the idea of unity of micro- and macrocosm. According to L. Zyzania, the world has four levels and the lower one is subordinate to the higher one. The highest level is human. M. Smotrytskyi and others believed that the indispensable condition for the knowledge of God and unity with him is self-knowledge, since God, like the kingdom of heaven, is contained in the man himself. Knowing God, one can attain bliss not only in heaven, but also on earth, because the mind of human is inextricably linked with supernatural Intelligence (God). The true anthropological retelling in Ukrainian philosophy begins with the work of G. Skovoroda, which emphasizes that man is the main key to solving the problems of being, and the shortest path to God passes through the center of our own Self. In his opinion, in the micro- and macrocosmic one there is one beginning and one end, a common root, which is interpreted as the essence of God. Thus, a human between heaven and earth is trying to unite them. Through self-knowledge, there is a transformation of human and the world, the elimination of world evil.

Although the first steps of Ukrainian civilization were marked by the influence of Byzantium, however, the main principle of Byzantineism was not adopted in Ukraine: the domination of the general over individual. On the forefront of Ukraine’s history, there have always been people of free spirit, from which nobody wanted to be a spectator of the world drama, but only its actor. This element of free self-acting of the personality without which it would not be possible to survive under the terms of the civilian civilization (which opposed the barbarism of steppe raids). It fed both the republic of Cossacks and the freaks of the Bursaks, and the manner of traveling detachments and the private initiative of citizens in cities that were granted Magdeburg Law, and the independent position of a woman as a friend in a family, “wife”. The same development of free individuality also relied on the boundary civilization of the American pirate prairies, from which the history of the United States began.

As for Ukraine, certain elements of awareness of the values of the person were present already in Yaroslavl Pravda (which established a fine for the offense of a woman and did not apply in the legal sense of the death penalty or corporal punishment). In the context of the development of ideas of representative power there

was the constitution of Pylyp Orlyk, and the democratic federalism of the Cyril-Methodius (“The Book of the Being of the Ukrainian People”).

Anthropocentrism remained the leading tendency of Ukrainian philosophy and classical literature of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. It was expressed in the philosophical and literary heritage of T. Shevchenko, M. Drahomanov, I. Franko, M. Pavlik, Lesia Ukrainka, M. Kotsyubynsky, P. Grabovsky, T. Zinkivskyi, Y. Vassyian, D. Dontsov, M. Mikhnovskyi, V. Lypynskyi and others. It can undoubtedly be stated that Ukrainian anthropocentrism is most clearly expressed in the works of T. Shevchenko. This feature of D. Chyzhevskyi called “the main feature of the whole spiritual personality” of the poet, “the leading feeling in his entire work, the main pathos of his life ... And nature, history, and culture – art, science, religion – all matters and value only and exclusively depending on this universal point of departure – from a person, his experiences, desires, needs, sufferings”. (Chyzhevskyi, 1983: 128). Even for the characterization of a nation, the poet chose a particular human figure – “mother”, “old mother”, “cried mother”, Prometheus, and others like that.

A man in T. Shevchenko is an embodiment of both national and actual human, all-human. The genius poet and thinker saw truly human in the national, and vice versa. Hence his constant appeal and warning: “Be a human being!”

Expressing thoughts about human and his relationship with nature, I. Franko claims that here “... it’s not about some individual worlds that have nothing to do with, but that there are only different manifestations of one force” (Franko, 1986: 35). However, the very human, skillfully operating the word, gives things a poetic color, while the things and ideas themselves do not carry aesthetic: “beauty lies not in the material that serves as its basis, not in the models, but in the fact, which impression on us this work makes and how the artist managed to grasp the impression” (Franko, 1981: 118).

Thus, as A. Yaremak emphasizes, the key to realizing the aesthetic ideal in life is the active creative activity of human (Yaremak, 2013: 696–701).

Throughout his life, I. Franko pursued the harmony of the national, universal, considering it as the basic social, and moral value.

“... I love the universal ideals of justice, brotherhood and freedom too much” he wrote in the article “Something about myself” (1897). The writer sought to escape to a height, “where the light can be seen, where the smell of will, where allhuman ideals are revealed (Franko, 1981: 31).

Another representative of the new generation of Ukrainian intellectuals is Lesia Ukrainka. “Lesya Ukrainka’s aesthetic views,” wrote I. Ogorodnik and V. Ogorodnik, “were characterized by the requirements of the nationality and ideology of art, where the reflection of life should include the dream of an ideal for which the progressive forces of society struggle. She was convinced that art is intended to perform high social and national functions in the life of people, in particular, educational” (Ogorodnik, Ogorodnik, 1999: 437).

Based on the work of these researchers, one can safely assert that both theoretical works and works of Lesia Ukrainka contain research in the areas of ethics and aesthetics.

The writer pays considerable attention to the problem of human, who in his ideological convictions combines two principles: universal and nationally distinctive. She traces these two traits both in art and in reflections on ethical values (Yaremak, 2013: 696–701).

I. Mykhailiak, analyzing the work of the writer, draws attention to the fact that “freedom and determinism in the work of thinker combine national and universal, elitist and mass, content and form. All this diversity has created a unique and individual style, style of writing, aesthetics and philosophy of Lesia Ukrainka”.

Humanistic approach and anthropocentric ideas can be traced in many works by M. Kotsiubynskyi. An example of this is the image of the executioner in “Persona Grata”,

where attention is focused on believing in human, whatever his inner world would be neglected: “You are better than those who commanded to kill, because they do not cut with the ax, kills who keeps it... Something has trembled Lazar’s heart. Joy or sorrow? To her? To himself? ... Lazar was lying in the midst of the ruins and inside him the joy of evil was trembling, that today there will be no punishment and that those unknown who has the power to kill depend on him. “(Kotsyubynskyi, 1979: 214–216). The beauty of human the author reveals through the prism of his moral values, which he carefully analyzes in each work. This belief in the power of spirit is also presented in the work of “Fata Morgana”: “The people themselves are making their fate, if only they do not interfere” (Kotsyubynskyi, 1979: 77).

In the nineteenth century, the philosophical thought of Ukraine was aimed at further substantiation and theoretical and political understanding of the place of human in culture and society. In the first years of the century, the idea of an independent of Ukraine became clear (M. Mikhnovskyi, D. Dontsov, V. Lypynskyi). It nourished Ukrainian social and political thought over the next decades of struggle of Ukrainian people for national liberation. According to her national orientation, a human was seen. This anthropocentrism was manifested in the concepts of “Ukrainian lost human” by M. Schlemkevych. It also can be traced in the national elite like V. Lypynskyi and D. Dontsov, the person as the spiritual personality of Y. Vassyian, the personalities of O. Kulchytskyi and others.

Conclusions. Summing up, it is worth pointing out that the manifestation of human selfhood and then individuality brought anthropocentric form to the surface. Explication of the cultural and civilizational content of anthropocentric idea has been left in the shadow: the binarism as the inevitable desire of human to a better, just, and beautiful, true so deeply enters into the “body” of anthropocentrism that becomes invisible, merging with its “eidos”.

The deployment of anthropocentric type of culture turned out to be final, the idea of human primacy existed until there was space in the real world, not absorbed by cultural practice, and until the world had much to emulate. In the culture of the second half of the twentieth century, which denied the very idea of succession, the entire diversity of “isms” focuses around a single sense of understanding – conceptualism, when cultural consciousness models a new cultural reality according to its cultural canons, based on objective reality.

References

- Augustin, 1991 – Augustin, A. Yspoved [Confession]. Kn.1. Publishing Science, Moscow, pp. 53–54. [in Ukrainian].
- Vyttel, 2009 – Vyttel, E. Cultural perspective of anthropocentric idea. Vestnyk KHU ym. N. A. Nekrasova. [Bulletin of the KSU them. N. A. Nekrasov], Moscow, N. 3, p. 203. [in Russian].
- Kotsyubynskyi, 1979 – Kotsyubynskyi, M. Persona grata [Person grata]. Works in 3 volumes, V.2. View of the Dnipro, Kyiv, pp. 214–216. [in Ukrainian].
- Kotsyubynskyi, M., 1979 – Kotsyubynskyi, M. Fata Morgana [Fata Morgana]. Works in 3 volumes, V.3. View of the Dnipro, Kyiv, p. 77. [in Ukrainian].
- Krymskyi, 2003 – Krymskyi, S. Universals of Ukrainian culture. Den [Day], May 17th, p. 3. [in Ukrainian].
- Kuzanskyi, 1979 – Kuzanskyi, N. Sochynenyia [Writings]. In 2 t., T.1. Politizdat Publishing House, Moscow, p. 271. [in Russian].
- Ogorodnik, 1999 – Ogorodnik, I., Ogorodnik, V. Istoriia filosofskoi dumky v Ukraini: kurs lektsii [History of philosophical thought in Ukraine: a course of lectures]. Graduate School, Society “Knowledge”, Kyiv, p. 437. [in Ukrainian].
- Franko, 1981 – Franko, I. Descho pro sebe samoho [Something about myself]. Works in 50 volumes, V. 31. Scientific Opinion Publishing House, Kyiv, p. 31. [in Ukrainian].
- Franko I., 1981 – Franko, I. Iz sekretiv poetychnoi tvorchosti [From the secrets of poetic creativity]. Works in 50 volumes, V. 31. Scientific Opinion Publishing House, Kyiv, p. 118. [in Ukrainian].

Franko, 1986 – Franko, I. Nauka i ii vzaiemyny z pratsiuiuchymy klasamy [Science and its relationship with working classes]. Works in 50 volumes, V. 45. Scientific Opinion Publishing House, Kyiv, p. 35. [in Ukrainian].

Chikarkova, 2010 – Chikarkova, M. Anthropocentric aspect of humanism as a methodological problem. Human studies studios. Zbirnyk naukovykh prats Drohobyt'skoho derzhavnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu im. Ivana Franka. Serii: Filosofiia [Collection of scientific works of Drohobych State Pedagogical University named after. Ivan Franko Series: Philosophy], Drohobych, 22, pp. 16–26. [in Ukrainian].

Chyzhevskiy, 1983 – Chyzhevskiy, D. Narysy z istorii filosofii na Ukraini [Essays on the history of philosophy in Ukraine]. Ukrainian Free University, Munich, p. 128. [in Ukrainian].

Yaremak, 2013 – Yaremak, A. The anthropocentric foundations of the mutual moral aesthetic and moral ideals in worldview orientations of Ukrainian thinkers of the nineteenth century XIX–XX century. Hileia. Naukovyj visnyk. [Galley. Scientific Herald], V. 72, pp. 696–701. [in Ukrainian].