

A Man as Anthropological Integrity: Philosophical Reflection

Lubov E. Motorina*
lubov-motorina@yandex.ru

UDK: 1:572
141.319.8

Izvorni znanstveni rada / Original scientific paper
Primljeno/Received: 1. studenog 2016. /1 Nov 2016
Prihvaćeno/Accepted: 28. veljače 2017. / 28 Feb 2017

The aim of the paper is to analyse anthropological integrity as a subject of philosophical anthropology and to develop a new methodological approach. The paper analyses formation of the subject of philosophical anthropology in the history of philosophy and science. Two possible approaches are revealed: attributive and existential ones; the limitation of the first one is demonstrated and the priority of the second one is shown. It is claimed that existential approach allows overcoming the existing contradictions between the data of different human sciences, which study particular attributes, or projections, and these of the philosophical idea of the man, which has evolved from the perception of the substance (attributive approach) to the comprehension of the human existence through studying the man's relations to the world and himself. The methodology proposed by the authors is an integration of three complementary elements: categorical modeling, systematic approach, and hermeneutical procedures. Categorical modeling with the use of fundamental anthropological constants forms the area of human studies. The systematic approach specificates anthropological integrity by revealing the main forms of the human existence. Hermeneutical procedures open up possibilities for understanding initially nonsegmented experience manifested in its ontological differences. The interaction of the three complementary elements of the method is demonstrated, in which methodological potential of the fundamental anthropological constants is revealed. The fundamental anthropological constants, on the one hand, are the categorical definitions, and, on the other hand, existentialias, i.e. structural "definitions" of the integral human experience. Considering the fundamental anthropological constants together with systematic approach and hermeneutics

* Lubov E. Motorina, PhD, Full Professor, Chair of Philosophy at Moscow Aviation Institute (National Research University); Address: 4, Volokolamskoe highway, Moscow, Russia.

as a methodological basis of the study on anthropological integrity is coherent to the tasks of the man's self-determination under the present conditions.

Keywords: *man, anthropological integrity, ontological differences, challenges of the man, synthesis of methodologies, categorical modeling, systematic approach, hermeneutics, anthropological constants, existentialia, sameness, self-transcendence.*

Introduction

Enhancing anthropological crisis in modern geopolitical situation and growing existential tension (the challenge of human adaptation to the rates of sociocultural changes, enlarging sphere of forced communication, replacement of personal element in culture by its system foundations, destroying self-value of life and loss of meaning) reactivate anthropological problems.

The subject of modern philosophical anthropology is a special kind of reflection associated with the challenges of a man and his cultural and historical self-identification in both theoretical and practical dimensions. The search for adequate methodology of studying a man as an anthropological unity manifested in its ontological differences becomes more relevant. The synthesis of methodologies will also allow to some extent to overcome a gap between the organizing principle of a man (conceptual unity) and the results of particular scientific studies (particular projections), which is still deepening nowadays.

Nowadays, there is a great variety of the definitions of philosophical anthropology in all the traditional areas of studies: human nature and purpose of his being, potentials and limits of human cognition, a man in the world of culture, the issue of man's freedom and responsibility, the issues and perspectives of modern civilization, humanity in front of global issues, anthropological justification of moral values, etc. The term "philosophical anthropology" itself, its subject and functions are disputable.

1. Evolution of the subject of philosophical anthropology

As we know, M. Scheler was the first to call philosophical anthropology an independent discipline and to define its vast program and subject in his work *Man and History* (1926). He defines philosophical anthropology as a "fundamental science of the essence and essential organization of a man, as well as of his metaphysical essential origin and his physical, mental and spiritual element in the world. This should be a science of the forces and impulses, which stimulate him to move and on which he influences (...) Only this anthropology

can help all the sciences, which have a man as a 'subject': natural sciences and medicine, ethnology and ancient history, history and social sciences, psychology and characterology acquire philosophical foundation and. at the same time, definite and clear goals in his studies only thanks to anthropology".¹

Scheler's program has never been fulfilled. Philosophical anthropology, despite some its scientific and philosophical achievements did not become an integral study of a man and finally was transformed into particular anthropological theories: biological, psychological, cultural, social, religious, pedagogical, and others.

Philosophical anthropology, developed by M. Scheler and his followers was criticized, among others, by M. Buber. "Scheler, he writes, bases a special human status only on a principle of spirit that is beyond everything we call 'life'. 'Spiritual' man, in whom a spirit lives, which does not appear elsewhere and masterfully restraining from any life, is possible only as an anecdote. The spirit is laid in the spark of any life; in the being of living creatures, it burns with a flame, and sometimes there is a huge spiritual fire here and there. This is all one essence and one substance. There is no other spirit except the spirit that feeds from the unity of life and unity with the world".²

M. Scheler's attempt to arrange an integral concept of a man based on the synthesis of scientific and philosophical knowledge, received critical evaluation from modern philosophers-anthropologists. Thus, the American researcher H. Rickman is skeptical about Scheler's intention to arrange the encyclopedic system of knowledge about a man. Besides, he poses some questions: Is it really possible to achieve such overall empirical system? Should a philosopher perform this role? In his opinion, it is more important to understand how philosophical anthropology is associated with the prerequisites and methods of human sciences³.

The world-famous Austrian scientist and philosopher V. Frankl paid attention to the issue of relations between philosophical anthropology and data of particular human sciences. He, like many other researchers dealing with the issue of a human, wanted to answer a traditional question about how to unite isolated scientific and philosophical representations about a man into a single picture. Frankl was convinced that specialization of human sciences does not prevent from cognizing a man as a special anthropologic integrity. On the contrary, Frankl stressed that it is necessary and important to have particular scientific knowledge for addressing particular theoretical and practical issues. He wrote that we live in the century of specialization and the wheel of develop-

¹ Max SCHELER, *Chelovek i istoriya* [Man and History], *Chelovek: obraz i sushchnost: (Gumanitarnye aspekty). Yezhegodnik* [Man: image and essence (Humanitarian aspects). Annuary]. Moscow, INION, 1991, 133–159.

² Martin BUBER, *Problema cheloveka* [The Issue of a Man]. Moscow, INION, 1992, 129.

³ Hans Peter RICKMAN, Is Philosophical Anthropology possible?, *Metaphilosophy*, 6 (1985) 1, 29–46.

ment cannot be turned back. Therefore, he tried to search for the unity not in the variety (i.e. not in the sum of particular representations of a man) but in the opposition to this variety. Frankl stated that the anthropological unity of a man is given on his hands, in spite of his ontological differences between various forms of life. In his opinion, the distinctive feature of human existence is this unity and its manifestation in various life situations. It is not covered either by numerous human sciences or numerous images of a person created in the philosophy. Frankl tries to base his understanding of a man on “dimensional ontology” using geometrical analogies. He writes, “The first of the two laws of dimensional ontology is as follows: One and the same object projected from its dimension into the lower dimensions is reflected in these projections so as various projections can contradict each other. Thus, if I project a glass in the geometrical form of a cylinder from three-dimensional space into two-dimensional planes corresponding to its cross and longitudinal section, I will have a circle and a rectangle. Apart from discrepancy, the projections are contradictory because in both cases we have closed figures, while a glass is an open vessel. The second law of dimensional ontology is as follows: Not one, but various subjects projected from their dimensions not into different but into one and the same lower dimension are reflected in their projections as not contradictory but polysemic. Thus, if I project a cylinder, a cone, and a globe from three-dimensional space into two-dimensional plane, we have a circle in all the three cases”.⁴

Viktor E. Frankl applies these laws to a man and concludes that if we project a man into the plane of biology and psychology, for instance, these projections will contradict to each other. Projection into a biological dimension reveals somatic phenomena, while projection in a psychological dimension reveals a mental phenomenon; however, this contradiction of projections does not doubt the unity of a man within a framework of this methodology. Therefore, Frankl asks to remember that it is useless to look for the unity of the human way of being that overcomes the variety of its various forms of life in the dimensions, into which we project a man. We can reveal it only in the higher dimension, the dimension of specific human manifestations. If we mechanically sum projections (data about a man obtained in various specific sciences), we will come to utterly improper conclusions. We never deal with an integrated, multidimensional man as he is, we always refer only to one of his parts (projections). Any knowledge of a man, any life situation is only a manifestation of single anthropological integrity called the *measurement of specific human manifestations* by Frankl.

The status of philosophical anthropology is far from being clear; therefore, there are large disputes on the issues of its origin, subjects and challenges. The

⁴ Viktor FRANKL, *Chelovek v poiskah smysla* [Man searching for meaning]. Moscow, Progress, 1990, 50.

study of M. Buber and his book *The Issue of a Man* can be considered the most successful experience of restoring the history of philosophical anthropological thought. M. Buber assumed that the philosophical anthropology appears when a man loses his place in the world and *becomes a problem for himself*. “In the history of human spirit”, he writes, “I distinguish between the epochs of accommodation and homelessness”. In the epoch of accommodation, a man lives in the Universe as if at home, while in the epoch of homelessness, he lives as if in the wild field, where he can hardly find a stick for a tent. In the first epoch, the anthropological thought is only a part of cosmology, while in the second epoch, it acquires special depth together with independence⁵. M. Buber thinks that the main anthropological issue is always associated with some anxiety of spirit, sense of enchant and surprise with regard to a man as a great mystery — without it, we cannot penetrate into the anthropological challenges. He notes that if a question “What is a man?” does not become torturous, there is no philosophical anthropology.

The issue of the subject of philosophical anthropology also remains rather complicated and disputable. “The philosophical anthropology, writes M. Buber, is not going to limit all the challenges of philosophy to the man... It only strives for cognizing a man itself. Therefore, its task completely differs from other areas of thought, since a man has himself as a subject of philosophical anthropology in the most accurate meaning of this word. Here, as this is the point of integral approach, a researcher cannot be satisfied with treating a man as one of the many parts of the nature (this is what anthropology as a special discipline demonstrates us) and forget that he, being a man, cognizes his humanity in his own internal experience”⁶.

The difficulties of defining the subject of philosophical anthropology are associated with fact that the term “philosophical anthropology” combining *scientific and philosophical criteria* is not sufficiently defined yet. At the beginning of the 20th century, this term was a “historical meeting” of anthropology and philosophical idea of a man as two main sources of philosophical anthropology. Let us refer to history and see what preceded this “meeting” in science and philosophy.

The term “anthropology” is of Greek origin. Allegedly, it was used by Aristotle when he studied the spiritual nature of a man. The term “anthropology” with respect to the physical organization of a man first occurred in the title of M. Hundt’s book *Anthropology about Human Dignity, Nature and Properties and About Elements, Parts and Organs of Human Body* published in 1501 in Leipzig. This work is purely anatomic. In 1596, there comes the work of a Protestant humanist Kasman titled *Anthropology*, where he defines anthropology as a science of spiritual and corporeal nature of a man. This double

⁵ Martin BUBER, *Problema cheloveka* [The Issue of a Man]. Moscow, INION, 1992, 40–41.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 38.

understanding of the term “anthropology” namely the science of a man body, on the one hand, and the human soul, on the other hand, is gradually rooted in the Western European literature. The example is an English work published anonymously in 1655 under the title *Unrelated Anthropology, or the Idea of Human Nature Reflected in Brief Philosophical and Anatomic Conclusions*. French encyclopaedists gave a very broad meaning to the term anthropology and understood it as the entire knowledge of a man. German philosophers, including I. Kant, included the issues of psychology into anthropology. Throughout the 19th century and up to now, the scientists in England, the United States, and France treat anthropology as a science of physical organization of a man as well as the culture and everyday life of various nations and tribes in the past and present. In the Russian science, the anthropology studies the variations of physical type of a man in time and space. In this sense, anthropology seems to crown natural sciences. Therefore, anthropology that originally had appeared as a science about spiritual and corporeal nature of a man was gradually losing any philosophical signs and turning into a particular science or system of sciences.

Immanuel Kant bequeathed anthropology to acquire philosophical nature. In Kant’s opinion, a man is the endless dialogue with everything around, therefore, to study a man means in a certain sense to study all the existing things. The setting of anthropological challenge depends on a researcher’s attitude to metaphysics. Thus, anthropology, in Kant’s view, had to become a philosophical discipline.

2. *Attributive and existential approaches*

If we sum the discussions around the subject of philosophical anthropology that were held and are still being held,⁷ we can reveal two main approaches. The first approach (let us call it “attributive”) acknowledges that a man has atemporal, originally set essence or nature. The second approach (let us call it “existentialist”) considers the particular self-realization of a man in cultural creation a subject of philosophical anthropology, when limitlessness of culture leads to the uncertain essence of a man. In the question “What is a man?”, the first approach highlights the word “what” and fixes attention on studying the essential properties and attributes of a man. It is quite rooted in the history of science and philosophy, and there is no doubt that entire philosophical systems were based and are still based on the absolutization of some properties. The attributive approach enabled to establish human images: human reasonable, hu-

⁷ See Pavel S. GUREVICH, Elvira M. SPIROVA, *Razmezhevaniya i tendentsii sovremennoy filosofskoy antropologii* [Dissociations and tendencies of modern philosophical anthropology]. Moscow, Institute of Philosophy RAS, 2015.

man religious, human active, human symbolic, human — machine, and human playing based on one of the human attributes taken for his significant sign.

The essence of the second approach is to shift the accent from the word “what” (essence) to the word “is” (being). The man is challenging, and there is no sense to ask what a man is by his essence and designation under these conditions (M. Scheler).

“When I pose a question about myself, wrote R. Zaner, a philosopher-anthropologist, in this respect, I am neither an object no a subject in this moment, but face an unusual ‘meta-problem’, which cannot be solved by methods elaborated in empirical sciences and traditional philosophy. I understand a man as a creature who is in a permanent search for himself, and who should consider and thoroughly examine the conditions of his existence at every moment of his existence. ‘What is a man?’ is not an abstract question implying an abstract idea, but a task: surprise, bewilderment, and search are focused on me, on my own being”.⁸ We assume that the second approach is more perspective for studying a man in modern conditions of numerous risks and challenges.

Thus, in the last quarter of the 20th century, there is broader meaning of philosophical anthropology, not limited to either human science (anthropology) or philosophical idea of a man or their synthesis. Its various trends and schools were united by *the awareness of the insufficiency of traditional approach to a man (as a subject or an object); widening methodological limits of study; justification of original messages of human sciences; the elaboration of single conceptual basis to coordinate various ideas and models of a man*. As for M. Scheler’s philosophical anthropology, its emergence became a kind of summary of enlarging scientific and philosophical knowledge of a man. It was so powerful that it could not be bound within a framework of science, philosophy or its any particular trend and needed some independence. The emergence of philosophical anthropology as an independent area of knowledge became a reflection of this tendency.

If we speak of the specifics of philosophical anthropology as an independent area of knowledge, we can reveal some common things in spite of the variety of schools and trends. First, the principle of individuation is a characteristic feature of philosophical anthropology. A philosopher-anthropologist should catch a live integrity of a personality, its specific “Ego”. The task of philosophical anthropology is to destroy the previous human image that was too abstract. *The idea of a man is replaced by the issue of his self-identification.*

Second, the history of philosophical anthropological thought cannot be represented only as the development of ideas, notions, and principles. “Anthropological philosophy, in E. Cassirer’s opinion, is of another nature. In pursuit of understanding its real significance, we should rely on... the dramatic man-

⁸ Richard M. ZANER, An approach to a philosophical anthropology, *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 27 (1966) 1, 55–68, 62.

ner of narration, since here we have rather the clash of struggling forces than the peaceful development of ideas and theories. The history of anthropological philosophy is full of deepest man's sufferings and emotions. Therefore, the philosophical anthropology as an independent field of knowledge is designed to study a man as a certain *anthropological integrity*.

In the scientific literature of the last two decades,⁹ the philosophical anthropology is mainly represented either through the analysis of problems or through the analysis of trends and approaches. The ideas of M. Scheler, M. Buber, E. Cassirer, M. Heidegger, i.e. a kind of classics of the 20th century philosophical anthropology, are still crucial in the development of philosophical and anthropological thought. *Taken from the perspective of being, man's uncertainty is, on their opinion, not merely theoretical, but also a practical issue, where we deal with man's self-actualization.*

Man's uncertainty cannot be objectivized¹⁰ up to the end, therefore, the methodology of the study changes. It is man's attitude to the world of things (object being), attitude to another man (being of the society and culture) and attitude to Absolute (eternal, universal measurement of a man) that become key objects. The study of the essence (attributes and projections) involves *categorical definitions*, while the study of the relations involves *existentialias*¹¹ as structural definitions of integral human experience. In this respect, philosophical anthropology as a methodology teaches us to proceed not from the multiple projections of a man to his integrity, but, on the contrary, from multidimensional unity of a man to situations, where this unity is revealed and actualized and where new possibility of its infinitely elective behaviour appear. Thus, there is a task of looking for new untraditional methods of interpreting, learning and understanding how to identify a man in his endless manifestations, how to rise from one-dimensional projections to volume dimension. Many isolated scientific data that sometimes contradict to each other do not cancel human unity;

⁹ See Pavel S. GUREVICH, *Filosofskaya antropologiya* [Philosophical anthropology]. Moscow, Omega-L, 2010; Boris MARKOV, *Filosofskaya antropologiya* [Philosophical anthropology]. St. Petersburg, Piter, 2008; Valeiy GUBIN, Elena NEKRASOVA, *Filosofskaya antropologiya* [Philosophical anthropology]. Moscow, Forum, 2008; Boris MARKOV, *Lyudi i znaki: antropologiya mezhlchnostnoy kommunikatsii* [People and signs: Anthropology of interpersonal communication]. Moscow, Nauka, 2011; Vyacheslav S. STEPIN, *Filosofskaya antropologiya i filosofiya kultury* [Philosophical anthropology and philosophy of culture]. Moscow, Akademicheskii proekt, 2015; Pavel S. GUREVICH, Elvira M. SPIROVA, *Grani chelovecheskogo bytiya* [The edges of human being]. Moscow, Institute of Philosophy RAS, 2015.

¹⁰ I.e. defined in rational terms.

¹¹ According to M. Heidegger, regardless of whether the categories are understood in their ontological or epistemological sense, they inherently presume the classification of everything in the world as an object or a subject, and can't capture the initially nonsegmented whole. In order to comprehend the integrity, the other means are necessary – the concepts of the different nature. Such special means Heidegger calls existentialia (Germ. „Existenzial“). In the study of anthropological integrity, we will apply the term existentialia in the same sense as it is used in the fundamental ontology by M. Heidegger (cf. Martin HEIDEGGER, *Bytie i vremya* [Being and time], Moscow, Akademicheskii proekt, 2013, 12–13).

on the contrary, they manifest it in a special way. Therefore, it is necessary to enlarge the dialogue (to create some dialogical space for mutual agreement of viewpoints) between all the contexts of being, into which a man is involved.

The proposed method is an associated unity of three levels of study: *fundamental anthropological constants as categorical modeling of a man, systematic approach, and hermeneutical procedures.*

3. Categorical modeling: fundamental anthropological constants

Fundamental anthropological constants (sameness, self-transcendence, integrity, openness, spirituality, freedom, responsibility, creative activity, embodiment, and others) are, on the one hand, categories, when we deal with the idea of a man, and, on the other hand, existentialia, through which a man enters various relations and experiences himself as a problem. *Fundamental anthropological constants are certain limits; when they are destroyed, a man stops being a man.* Fundamental anthropological constants as categories fulfil the role of regulative ideas in the cognition of a person as anthropological integrity. Sameness and self-transcendence, performing the function of methodological ground for revealing “man’s external” and “man’s internal” in a single problem field, are system-forming categories. “Sameness” is a property of a man “internal” or “Ego” revealed in a man’s relations to himself. Sameness implies man consent with himself, harmony of his wishes, spiritual strivings, values, and actions, unity of self-esteem and self-actualization. Sameness defines how a man can realize himself in life, and thus feel happy or unhappy. Any unbalance between goals, wishes, values, and actions lead a man to anxiety and painful feelings that he has done something wrong. This side of being can be denoted as “the world of a man”.

“Self-transcendence” expresses constant striving of a man to overcome his own limits and transcend himself in various spheres of being: in the world of objects, the world of man’s relations, and the world of Absolute. The richness of “Ego” of any man is defined by the degree of his involvement into the world. A man is originally oriented at the world, in which he exists, from which he derives sense and basic values, learns to live and act like a man, realize himself in this endless world and thus enlarge his finiteness. This form of being can be called “a man in the world”. Anthropological constants (sameness and self-transcendence) enable to consider “the world of a man” and “a man in the world” in their indissoluble unity and mutual penetration as *main ontological differences of a single anthropological integrity.*

Let us consider other fundamental anthropological constants: integrity, openness, spirituality, embodiment, freedom, creation. In this context, human integrity is not simply a sum of his attributive characteristics (physical, men-

tal, social, cultural-historical and others). It means mostly its involvement into another more fundamental integrity. (Cosmos, God, Absolute, World, Nature, Being). The idea of an integral man was always associated with the intuition of the power of transcendent Absolute. Having left the power of the Absolute, a man's personality itself wanted to get the functions of the Absolute at a certain stage (with the emergence of subjectivity¹²). However, the Absolute is omnipotent and infinite, while a man individual is finite and not omnipotent at all. After a man individual had become transcendent Absolute, he transferred all the meanings of the world into himself and they became exclusively subjective. There emerges opposition of a subject urging for transformations and dead and desolate world-object. These oppositions caused the break of the whole. Thus, the viewpoint of the whole gave place to the viewpoint of the part. The change of viewpoint on the world meant that the part acquired independent meaning toward the whole. A man becomes more and more fragmented and an integral man is replaced by a partial man. Sometimes, the value of a partial man becomes higher than the value of an integral man. We, who live in the 21st century, go on getting fragmented. V. V. Bibikhin, a famous philologist and philosopher, explores the etymology of the words "part" and "whole" in his book *Uznay sebya* ("Cognize yourself", 1998) and reveals the original sense of the notion "part" as something torn, "gnawed". He writes that a part as something bitten from the whole does not grow back to the whole, since the whole, from which a part is "gnawed" is damaged for good.¹³ If a part is bitten and gnawed, a whole is cured and healthy.¹⁴ The repression of this historic meaning was not occasional, as nowadays we deal mainly with "torn", damaged (as if with global pathology) and we cannot live in another way. We used to put the parts mechanically into the whole. We even agree that the whole goes on existing after the parts are torn, and that parts can be changed and summed. The acknowledgement of the significance of this anthropological constant will contribute to more adequate choice of strategy for overcoming deeper splitting of man's attitudes to himself and the world.

The integrity and self-transcendence of a man are indissolubly related to such fundamental anthropological constant as openness to the world. Human openness to the world is his striving to leave the limits of current state with his ability to transcend. Animals are limited by the habitat, while a man overcomes the limitations of environment and enters the open world realizing it as world. M. Scheler related human openness to the world with his ontological freedom, in which the pursuit of creation becomes a basic value. M. Heidegger paid much attention to the issue of human openness to the world. In his words,

¹² The human status crucially changes in the modern age, when the world becomes an object, while a human becomes a subject. See Martin HEIDEGGER, *Vremya i bytie* [Time and Being]. Moscow, Respublika, 1993, 118.

¹³ Vladimir V. BIBIKHIN, *Uznay sebya* [Cognize yourself]. St. Petersburg, Nauka, 1998, 142.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 155.

a man is a kind of thrown in his own openness. To be a man means “to be in the world”, to be always wide open to this world. The time of a man and the world inside him are measured by the degree of involvement. The more a man is open to the world, the longer his productive and adequate existence preserves. At the end of his life, a man should possess an incredible will to resist the tendencies turning him into a closed system and strapping his original “wide open” attitude to the world.

The categories of spirituality, creation, and freedom act as a kind of “key” to understand the specifics of a man. Human spirituality raises him above the rest mortal plain and enables to create his own history and culture. We should note that the category of “spirituality” is quite polysemic. In literature, there is a wide range of opinions. The discussions usually circle around the issue whether spirituality is an immanent human feature or given to him from outside as some objective givenness, which he always strives for.

“The beginning of spirituality in a man, wrote V. Zenkovskiy, is not a particular sphere, not some special and isolated life, but a creative force, which penetrates into human life in the entelechy manner...”¹⁵ “The search for the Infinite and Absolute is significant and basic in spirituality. This search is the main and the deepest thing in us, it is a source of eternal life natural for a spirit, which does not fade or die out even in those who reject the Absolute and Infinite in their consciousness”.¹⁶

The representatives of another approach reveal sociocultural dimension of spirituality outside its connection with some Absolute. V.S. Barulin wrote, “it is a real, live spiritual man in all the richness of the edges of his being that is original and crucial”.¹⁷ V. S. Barulin considered the spirituality as a basis of a man and revealed some “layers of analysis”: spirituality as a form of man’s self-conscious; spirituality as a basis for elaborating basic values in a man; spirituality as a form of acquiring social experience; spirituality as an impulse and content of human creative activity.¹⁸ The spiritual givenness has “co-presence” and “co-involvement”, it includes moral and value benchmarks. The spiritual givenness can also be called the sphere of meaning.

Man’s embodiment is defined by the continuum of his life world. Life world is an unalienated reality, in which a man originally lives. Life world has spatial-temporal dimension. It is through space and time that a man acquires higher relevance of his existence and implementation into the essence. The first space and the first connection with the world is a biological body. A home is the most

¹⁵ Vasiliy V. ZENKOVSKIY, *Problemy vospitaniya v svete khristianskoy antropologii* [The issues of upbringing in the light of Christian anthropology]. Moscow, Izdanie Svyato-Vladimirskogo Bratstva, 1993, 46.

¹⁶ Ibid., 50.

¹⁷ Vladimir S. BARULIN, *Sotsialno-filosofskaya antropologiya* [Social-philosophical anthropology]. Moscow, Onega, 1994, 108.

¹⁸ Ibid., 144.

important form of space defining a man and it is possibly the main value for a man. A home is not a world in general, but a world of a man. It is a place where a man is not an observer but a host. Everything in it is arranged in the image and likeness of a host and corresponds to his individuality, his needs, and dreams. Home is rather cultural and existential space than a physical place. Here a man occupies central position and all others can be just guests. A man can live in his apartments and feel homeless, and, on the other hand, a man can feel at home at a job or when visiting somebody. Home protects a person and provides his safety. A man treats attacking home as attacking himself. In the philosophical sense, *home is a measure of existence*.

The fundamental anthropological constants under consideration enable to conduct a categorical modeling of a man, i.e. to define problem field, delineate his limits, and define the directions of study. In their unity, they cover both worlds: "the world of a man" and "a man in the world" as a single anthropological integrity existing in the form of an open system.

4. Systematic approach

Methodological potential of systematic approach is revealed through consideration in the unity of three main ways of human being: the first way is a natural human existence as an organic essence; the second way of human being is his cultural-historical existence. The notions of a "man" and "culture" have related meanings. A man develops through acquiring culture and plunging into its semantic context. At the same time, a man himself creates culture. A man, in a sense, binds nature and culture, naturalness and artificiality of being by his life activity. A man nature itself is based on artificiality. In this respect, the culture acts as a form of overcoming oneself by a man. Thanks to culture, a man interrupts only natural regularities and genetic memory and infinitely enlarges his potentials through the memory of history and culture and its creative potential. Culture raises a man from the animal world of senses and actions into the world of meanings. A man acquires a new form of being in culture; however, he remains a natural creature and therefore he does not utterly merge with the culture, but dissolves in it and opposes it. S. Freud paid attention to this contradiction and asked a question: why does a man create culture and express "discontent" with it, i.e. as if constantly resisting it? Freud assumed that as long as the culture develops, a man constantly neurotizes, since it is difficult for him to endure all the bulk of restrictions posed on him by the society for the sake of its cultural ideals. "During the lifetime of the last generations, he wrote, people achieved marvellous progress in natural sciences and their technical applications, their dominance over nature remarkably strengthened. However, they noticed that newly acquired dominance over space and time, submission

of natural forces, fulfilled wishes of thousand years old had not enhanced the pleasure from life and had not made them happier. Even now, a great part of the man's struggle focuses on one task — to find reasonable, i.e. happy balance between individual claims and cultural demands of masses. Is it possible to reach the balance through definite forms of culture or the conflict will remain inappeasable — this is one of the fatal challenges of the humanity".¹⁹ However, not only nature and culture, but also various types of cultures with their set of meanings, ideals, rules, and norms clash in a man. Various cultures conduct their constant dialogue through a man, who is able not only to cognize the meanings of his epoch, but also anticipate the future by referring to the past.

And, at last, a person is not only a *natural and cultural-historic creature, but also eternal (universal)*²⁰. The relations of the transient and the eternal in human being is an axis relation expressing all the drama, mystery and tension of human existence. Transient (historical) can be thought as a special moment of eternal. It is the context of eternity that fills human life and human history with meaning, and the history itself acts as human ability to experience eternity in time. A man is the only one from the animal kingdom to realize the finiteness of his being. This causes the main drama of his life. The definition of the reason to live of each particular man is associated with the contradiction of the eternal and the transient. The eternal in a man is understood not as the past or future, not as sources and perspectives, not as deep essential mystery of his being; *it exists in the present, in particular live daily life and is manifested in a special state of spirit, in overcoming oneself, in constant "new birth"*. A man has this state of spirit in the moments of love or creative inspiration, when he as if overcomes his spatial-temporal limits, i.e. releases from painful experiences about his finite being. This form of being is less studied; however, it is obvious that in the old age, for instance, eternity already dominates (prevails) over history in the individual life. Thus, we need other methods of interpretation in studying of so-called "years left to live".

Each of the revealed forms of life (ways of human being) has a multi-dimensional structure, and a man himself is an open system. At a certain stage of a man's (or humanity) development, some form of life becomes crucial and begins to play the role of a system-forming factor.

However, the systematic approach like all the scientific methods is limited in the study of the anthropological integrity. It does not seize the whole life experience of a man including not objectivized residue, which cannot be cognized by traditional means. The cognition of this experience implies hermeneutical procedures as the potentials of his interpretation are quite large.

¹⁹ Siegmund FREUD, Nedovolstvo v kulture [Discontent in culture] *Filosofske nauki*, 1 (1989) 94–100, 100.

²⁰ The term "eternity" is employed here for nonterminability, beginninglessness and endlessness, inseparability, wholeness.

5. *Hermeneutics*

F. Schleiermacher, V. Dilthey, M. Heidegger, H.-G. Gadamer, E. Betti are classics of modern philosophical Hermeneutics. They introduced hermeneutical methods and techniques (interpretation, authority of tradition, primary understanding (pre-understanding), hermeneutical circle, canons of interpretation) into scientific discourse.

Let us briefly consider some of these methods and techniques. The first of them is interpretation, the ability which is becoming more actual with increase of informational flow. Interpretation takes place only in the hermeneutical circle, since not only historical perception but any perception in general has a cyclic structure, that reflects repeating reinterpretation of events, or “texts” in a broad sense. Circular motion in the cycle of the comprehension never results in leaving the cycle. In the hermeneutical circle, horizons of understanding merge — the horizon of a “text” (thematic content of cognition) and horizon of nonthematic content of the interpreter’s cognition. This results in a common horizon that is the act of perception itself. Initial scheme of the event (text) as pre-logical (pre-predicative) understanding is a form of the initial givenness of the world to the man, which is the basis of all his relations at all. Primary understanding is experience, a mode of being, while secondary understanding is a kind of knowledge. Secondary understanding as text interpretation stems from the primary understanding, which is called preunderstanding. As long as one penetrates the text, preliminary preunderstanding is reinterpreted. It can be corrected but it cannot be got rid of, as well as one cannot leave the hermeneutical circle. Interpretation is directed also by tradition, the essence of which is perception of being as time. Finiteness of the person, as he or she experiences his or her being in social and historical contexts, is an ontological prerequisite for his or her being found on tradition. Tradition is a man’s belief in his roots, a kind of vector towards infinite (eternal) being, since by reconstructing old traditions and forming new ones the person overcomes finiteness of his or her individual being in history.

In the context of the proposed method, it is important to show the interrelation of hermeneutical procedures and fundamental anthropological constants. Thus, for example, openness as an anthropological constant, on one side, is considered here within the system of human categorical modeling, on the other side, it is hermeneutical criterion, since in hermeneutics, openness is a basis of the act of understanding. Openness is necessary for the horizons to merge. M. Heidegger has told, to be open and possess initial understanding, i.e. be hermeneutical, is the same. In E. Betti’s canon, there is another anthropological constant, integrity. In his opinion, parts of a “text” can be understood only against the background of the entire, and the entire can be understood only through specification (interpretation) of the parts. “Integrity criterion” is

the name of his second canon. One could also compare a fundamental anthropological constant, sameness, based on which "I-image" is formed in the person's internal experience; this "I-image" is experienced by him or her as "selfhood". There are many other examples, but the problem of interrelation of the three elements of the method is still underexplored and requires separate consideration.

Conclusion

Thus, we need a synthesis of both rational (categorical) and existential methods and methodologies to cognize a man as anthropological integrity, its various projections, dimensions and forms of being. The methodology proposed by the authors is an integration of three complementary elements: categorical modeling, systematic approach, and hermeneutical procedures. Categorical modeling with the use of fundamental anthropological constants, such as sameness, self-transcendence, integrity, openness, spirituality, embodiment, creative activity, freedom, and others) forms the area of human studies. The systematic approach specificates anthropological integrity by revealing the main forms of the human existence: natural, cultural and historical, eternal. Hermeneutical procedures open up possibilities for understanding initially nonsegmented experience manifested in its ontological differences. Methodological potential of the fundamental anthropological constants manifests itself in the interaction of the three elements of the method. The synthesis of methodologies in studying a man will also enable to somehow overcome a gap between the organizing idea of a man (conceptual unity) and the results of particular scientific studies (particular projections), which is still deepening as scientific knowledge is accumulated. Besides, hermeneutical approach enables to comprehend the phenomenon of man's becoming a *problem for himself*, to reveal basic existentialias of his integral life experience. Considering the fundamental anthropological constants together with systematic approach and hermeneutics as a methodological basis of the study on anthropological integrity is coherent to the tasks of the man's self-determination under the present conditions.

Lubov E. Motorina*

Čovjek kao antropološka cjelovitost – filozofski pristup

Sažetak

Cilj je ovoga rada analizirati antropološku cjelovitost čovjeka kao predmet filozofske antropologije i razviti novi metodološki pristup. U radu se analizira oblikovanje predmeta filozofske antropologije u povijesti filozofije i znanosti. Otkrivaju se dva moguća pristupa: atributivni i egzistencijalni; pokazuju se ograničenja prvoga i prikazuje se prioritet drugoga. Tvrdi se da egzistencijalni pristup omogućuje prevladavanje postojeće proturječnosti između podataka iz različitih humanističkih znanosti, koje proučavaju pojedinačne atribute ili projekcije, i onih iz filozofske ideje o čovjeku, koje su se razvile od percepcije supstancije (atributivni pristup) do razumijevanja ljudske egzistencije preko proučavanja čovjekovih odnosa prema svijetu i sebi. Metodologija predložena od strane autora jest integracija triju komplementarnih elemenata: kategoričkog modeliranja, sustavnog pristupa i hermeneutičkih postupaka. Kategoričko modeliranje uz uporabu temeljnih antropoloških konstanti oblikuje područje znanosti o čovjeku. Sustavni pristup specificira antropološki integritet otkrivajući glavne oblike ljudske egzistencije. Hermeneutički postupci otvaraju mogućnosti za razumijevanje početno nesegmentiranog iskustva koje se očituje u svojim ontološkim razlikama. Dokazuje se interakcija triju komplementarnih elemenata metode, u kojoj se objavljuje metodološki potencijal temeljnih antropoloških konstanti. Temeljne antropološke konstante, s jedne strane, jesu kategoričke definicije, a s druge strane, egzistencijalije, tj. strukturalne »definicije« cjelovitog ljudskog iskustva. Razmatranje temeljnih antropoloških konstanti zajedno sa sustavnim pristupom i hermeneutikom kao metodološkom osnovom proučavanja antropološkog integriteta koherentno je sa zadaćama čovjekova samoodređenja pod sadašnjim uvjetima.

Ključne riječi: čovjek, antropološki integritet, ontološke razlike, izazovi čovjeka, sinteza metodologija, kategoričan modeliranje, sustavni pristup, hermeneutika, antropološke konstante, egzistencijalija, istost, samonadilaženje.

(na hrv. prev. Dalibor Renić)

* Prof. dr. sc. Lubov E. Motorina, redoviti profesor, predstojnik Katedre za filozofiju na Moskovskom institutu za zrakoplovstvo (Nacionalno istraživačko sveučilište); Adresa: 4, Volokolamskoje shosse, Moskva, Rusija.