

UDC 130.2+172V. V. HAVRYLENKO^{1*}^{1*}Sumy State University (Sumy, Ukraine), e-mail Viktoriavangogh@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0002-5892-3129**HUMAN AS A CARRIER OF THE WORLDVIEW: INDIVIDUAL AND COLLECTIVE DIMENSIONS**

Purpose. The purpose of the study is to outline the links between individual and collective dimensions of the human worldview. This purpose requires solving two tasks: to update philosophical ideas formed by reflection on human and community worldview; to identify and generalize the relationship of singular and general in the context of the problem of human worldview. **Theoretical basis.** The study is based on philosophical reflections about manifestations of singular and general worldviews. Such reflections appeared in European philosophy quite a long time ago (Dilthey, Rickert, Jaspers). Ukrainian and foreign philosophical discourse considers both measures of the worldview. And a role of the carrier of worldview plays either human or society. We can see that in researches of S. Krymskyi, I. Nadolny, V. Popov, N. Rozhanska, V. Tabachkovskyi, V. Shynkaruk, V. Poythress, D. Rousseau, D. Billingham, C. Gianolla and others. However the links between individual and collective dimensions of worldview are not clearly outlined. It is possible to note the research of V. Popov who focuses on the problem of socio-collective and individual dimensions of worldview. But the scientist focuses more on the use of the concept of worldview in these two meanings. Human as a social being interacts with worldviews of other individuals. That is why we can speak of two dimensions of the worldview function: individual and collective. This problem became topical due to acuteness of the links between human and society in modern life. **Originality.** The author outlined key links between individual and collective dimensions of human worldview functioning. The study identified a role of human as a carrier of the worldview in formation of collective worldview. **Conclusions.** Human as a worldview carrier plays a key role in formation of collective worldview. In philosophical discourse thoughts about links between individual and collective worldviews are different and sometimes conflicting. We have a discussion problem of uniformity and diversity of collective worldview. Collective worldview is showed as a circulation of different ideas and views of individuals. But collective worldview is showed as a whole system of individual views too. Collective worldview manifests as integrated phenomenon because it is based on common worldviews of individuals. At the same time the human is influenced by collective worldview in particularly as a past generation heritage.

Keywords: human; individual worldview; collective worldview; world perception; world attitude; world understanding

Introduction

In the modern scientific and information space, the concept of "worldview", which is included in a variety of contexts, is increasingly appearing. Scientific discourse often involves consideration of the worldview in the context of the study of psychological, ethnopsychological, ethnological, environmental, anthropological, sociological problems. The concept of human community (as a collective worldview carrier) is now often hidden behind toponyms. Hence the appearance of such phrases as the American worldview, European worldview, Ukrainian worldview, African worldview and others. In fact, there is a specific meaning behind such word usage: the worldview of Americans, Europeans, Ukrainians, etc. That is, the worldview does not exist out of man (or human community). A worldview is a product of consciousness associated with a human carrier. This does not exclude the possibility of studying the imprints of former worldviews, engraved in the samples of spiritual culture – philosophy or art. Any manifestation of the spiritual life of man in one way or another relates to the worldview. At the same time, the understanding of the phenomenon of worldview as a specific characteristic of the human essence relies on philosophy. The problem of worldview is compli-

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

cated by the fact that it functions in two dimensions: individual and collective. However, in both cases, the measure of worldview is a person.

Modern scientists consider the worldview as a specific quality of man that distinguishes him from other living beings. Moreover, both aspects of the problem are covered: a person appears as a bearer of an individual worldview, and as a bearer of his link in the general, collective worldview. Among the current considerations that cover the problem of man and community (team) as carriers of worldview, in the Ukrainian context there are notable works of V. Artyukh, V. Didenko, V. Zablotskyi and S. Krymskyi, A. Liovochkina, I. Nadolnyi, V. Popov, N. Rozhanska, O. Savytska, L. Spivak, V. Tabachkovskyi, V. Shynkaruk. In the world discourse, the worldview of man in the individual and collective dimensions is a problem of the researches by Vern S. Poythress, David Rousseau, Julie Billingham, Cristiano Gianolla. But often the relationship between the individual and collective dimensions is focused rather indirectly, although this issue is of great interest in today's socially active world. Therefore, there is a need to update the ideas that reveal these relationships.

Purpose

Given the above, the purpose of the article is to outline the links between individual and collective dimensions of the human worldview. This purpose requires solving two tasks: to update philosophical ideas formed by reflection on human and community worldview; to identify and generalize the relationship of singular and general in the context of the problem of human worldview.

Statement of basic materials

In the historical and philosophical sense, the purposeful separation of the worldview concept appears quite late – in the works of the thinkers of classical German philosophy. These, of course, were only the beginnings of interpretation of the phenomenon. According to V. Artyukh (2011), it was I. Kant who first used the term "Weltanschauung", which means "worldview" or "world outlook". V. Popov emphasizes that today the authorship of the term is attributed to other representatives of German philosophical thought – F. Schelling, F. Schleiermacher, A. von Humboldt. And yet the critical reflection on this leaves no doubt that the term "Weltanschauung" first appeared in Kant's "Critique of Judgment" (Popov, 2016, p. 83). And the above philosophers used this concept in their works aimed at studying the peculiarities of the worldview. In particular, the philosopher of romanticism F. Schleiermacher also paid attention to this problem. According to V. Artyukh, the new term quickly moved to perception within the sphere of reason. Thus, G. W. F. Hegel uses the concept of "theoretical worldview", and F. W. J. Schelling – "scientific worldview" (Artyukh, 2011, p. 24).

The phenomenon of worldview acquired a meaningful understanding in the concept of W. Dilthey, who pointed out its close connection with philosophy, in turn, considering its essence in terms of position in the spiritual world. In "The Essence of Philosophy" (published in 1907), W. Dilthey points to its significance, first of all, as the doctrine of worldview in its numerous expressions and interpretations. Already at that time the philosopher noticed the essential feature of the human worldview – its ability to spread from the individual to the general. According to the philosopher's concept, the earth is full of intertwining numerous forms of individual life views, artistic manifestations of worldview, religious dogmas and philosophical formulas, each of which competes for existence and affirmation (Dilthey, 2011, p. 77). In this way, indi-

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

vidual views, ideas or manifestations of worldview are a kind of human contribution to the substantially heterogeneous cycle of worldviews.

Worldview, according to W. Dilthey, includes a combination of such components as "life experience", "picture of the world" and derived from their relationship "life ideal". And the very concept of "worldview" is applied to spiritual education, which includes world cognition, ideal, setting the rules and higher purpose (Dilthey, 2011, p. 78). According to Dilthey's concept, the worldview comes in three types (and functions in the following forms): philosophical, religious, poetic. And all these forms are interacting: thus, the tendency to move to a philosophical worldview is inherent in the soul tendency to give strength and coherence to their own actions (Dilthey, 2011, p. 80). Thus, the philosophical worldview requires a person to focus on individual thoughts and ideas and achieve universal thinking.

Dilthey theorizes around the forms of worldview, without revealing the question of its origin. Instead, in O. Spengler's thoughts we find attempts to deduce the origin of this characteristically human ability. The philosopher deduces the emergence of worldview, as a phenomenon of human consciousness, from the awareness of mortality. It is the understanding of one's own mortality and the fear of death, according to Spengler, that gave birth to love, family, nation, and, in general, the history of mankind. In a global sense, the general worldview of mankind includes numerous ideas (guilt, punishment, requital in the other world, new life on the other side of the world) related to the awareness of mortality (Spengler, 1998, p. 19). Thus, the worldview is a specifically human formation that distinguishes man from animals. In turn, since the worldview is generated by the awareness of death, the very understanding of mortality is primary and fundamental for man.

It seems doubtless that the individual worldview has an impact on the general worldview of the community. However, according to H. Rickert, the importance of man as a carrier of worldview is not unconditional. To understand the essence and genesis of the worldview, the philosopher emphasizes the need to take into account the empirical path of each individual and his role in world progress (Rickert, 1998). According to Rickert, the worldviews of ordinary people arise from personal experience, grow with the carriers and perish with them. Such worldviews are isolated by the consciousness of one person and cannot influence other worldviews. Instead, the worldviews of historically significant thinkers are based on the awareness of the connection to the past. The ordinary person is not always the carrier of an original worldview, because the fear of death can force him to "hide in someone else's system, like in a shell" (transl. by V. H.) (Rickert, 1998, p. 406). Rickert's worldview is figuratively represented by analogy with the house that a man builds for himself. The construction of such a "house", from the window of which the individual will "look" at the world, is nothing but an important need. The fundamental requirement for this "construction" is strong principles, without which the construction is impossible. That is, the person himself is the creator of his own worldview (based on his own or others' principles).

Nowadays, Rickert's idea of inequality of worldviews is recognized as correct. In particular, Cristiano Gianolla (2019) argues that not all worldviews are significant in the context of human history: "History registers the worldview of the winner and ignores the worldview that are marginalized or destroyed". In this way, the worldviews of those who are at the top of society play an important role in historical progress. In general, the scientist defines the worldview as a universal property of man and community. In his understanding, the worldview is a combination of ideas, beliefs, impressions, experiences and traditions through which the subject understands the

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

world and responds to it. Herewith, the subject (carrier) of the worldview can be an individual or a group of people. Collective worldviews are becoming increasingly important in terms of modern understanding of the world. Thus, Gianolla emphasizes that Western worldviews advocate collective efforts aimed to strengthen scientific knowledge and to reduce non-scientific ones. That is, the collective role of worldview in the study of the world is largely positivist.

K. Jaspers sought to define the essence and mechanisms of the worldview rather than its origin in his thorough work "Psychology of Worldviews" (1918). The philosopher gives the following definition of the concept: "Weltanschauung ist nicht bloß ein Wissen, sondern sie manifestiert sich in Wertungen, in der Rangordnung der Werte" (Karl Jaspers. *Psychologie der Weltanschauungen*. Berlin, 1919). Considering the multiplicity of worldviews, K. Jaspers (2009) notes that when we talk about them, we mean ideas, in the subjective manifestation – the experience, effort, way of thinking, and in the objective one – the objectively formed world (p. 13). Thus, Jaspers sees in the worldview of man a tool for influencing his life path. By extrapolating the problem of individual and collective dimension of worldview to Jaspers' reflections, we can consider subjective experiences and human reasoning as manifestations of individual worldview, and objective ideas of the objective world as manifestations of collective worldview.

Actually, V. Popov focuses his attention on the problem of socio-collective and individual dimensions of the concept of "worldview". The philosopher emphasizes:

Despite a certain metaphoricity, a vague meaning of the concept of "worldview", it is intuitively understood by the philosophical community as something individual, intimate, inherent only in a certain person. At the same time, people in our time of global information technology form their beliefs and values on the basis of existing social patterns.

(transl. by V. H.) (Popov & Popova, 2019, p. 118)

If the first part of the judgment can be argued, because the reasoning around the worldview always somehow affects both its aspects (as a characteristic of the individual and the community), the second thesis of the philosopher is acutely relevant. Popov takes the position of a clear division of worldviews into two types. Thus, the first type includes the worldview as a social scheme of beliefs and values derived from collective experience, and the second type – the worldview as an internal activity of man, which creates a world of his own beliefs and orientations (Popov & Popova, 2019, p. 119).

It should be noted that in the Ukrainian research area, from the beginning of interest in the problem of worldview, there was developed an aspect of its collective manifestation. In such studies, the carrier of the worldview is a larger or smaller community – local groups, people, nation. This can be already seen in the works by I. Nechuy-Levytsky, who has the most probable primacy of the use of the concept of "worldview" and the first attempts to reveal it (in 1876). He reduces the understanding of the Ukrainian worldview to the analysis of the mythology of the Ukrainian people. For Nechuy-Levytsky, to comprehend the worldview of Ukrainians meant to comprehend the "basis, purpose and form" of ancient mythology. It is through myths and beliefs

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

that he seeks to reveal the thoughts, worldview, world outlook, and hopes of the ancient Ukrainian (Nechuy-Levytsky, 1992, p. 4). We can say that Nechuy-Levytsky moves deductively, trying to comprehend the worldview of the abstract Ukrainian through the collective mythological worldview of the people. T. Rylsky soon also turned to the consideration of the people's worldview. His observations, published in 1888, were based on the analysis of life and daily routine of a local group of Ukrainians – residents of several villages – and on the understanding of the specifics of religious beliefs and folklore texts (Rylsky, 1888, p. 267). Again, the scientist uses the life of a group of people, based on a generalized worldview, as material to comprehend the worldview of a Ukrainian man.

As we can see, in the Ukrainian context, the worldview of a group (community) or even the people was of greater interest than the worldview of a particular person or a person in general. This is enshrined in the emerged terms "national worldview", "people's worldview" in scientific usage. D. Chyzhevskiy and I. Mirchuk were the first ones to address the systematic study of the national aspect of the worldview phenomenon. D. Chyzhevskiy (2005) uses the phrase "folk worldview", considering it as an integral part of the "folk character". The philosopher states: "Folk worldview is a nationally determined position of the people to the world and life. It is manifested in what these people love in the world, what they avoid in life, what they value most in a person, what they treat negatively, etc." (transl. by V. H.) (Chyzhevskiy, 2005, p. 14)

D. Chyzhevskiy emphasizes the dynamism of the process of creation and formation of the worldview of a certain folk under the influence of foreign cultures and internal changes. And according to this, the "folk worldview" is a combination of "superhistorical" and historical elements. At the same time, the elements determined historically change more easily than those caused by the internal "mental structure" of the nation. However, the philosopher takes into account the fundamental role of individual worldviews in creating a collective, general worldview of the community. In this regard, Chyzhevskiy emphasizes the heterogeneity of the collective (folk) worldview, which reflects the differences of psychological types of people, different social strata and even local – "tribal" – differences. This, according to D. Chyzhevskiy, determines the complexity of the description of the national character, in which certain worldviews depend on this diversity.

One of the most important works is I. Mirchuk's (1942) reflections "Worldview of the Ukrainian people. An Attempt of Characterization", where he tries to establish the idea of the influence of the collective worldview on philosophizing as a manifestation of human thinking. Mirchuk insists on the importance of distinguishing national elements in the philosophy of each nation. The worldview is so important that philosophy, according to Mirchuk (1942), cannot be non-national and be perceived as the product of an independent unit, detached from the community. On the contrary, the affiliation of a person-creator to a certain nation will inevitably be reflected in his work (Mirchuk, 1942, p. 227). Mirchuk generally adheres to V. Dilthey's point of view on the interpretation of philosophy as a science of worldview, and therefore considers the connection between the problems of national worldview and national philosophy to be deeply essential. In trying to characterize the worldview of Ukrainians, Mirchuk turns to the analysis of national values and ideals, and therefore, he chooses these categories as the most important components of the phenomenon of worldview. Continuing the consideration of the issue raised by Mirchuk, N. Rozhanska (2015) clarifies in her reflections that the worldview of a person or a people is an image of the world, and "the nature of worldview is determined by experience (in relation to the national worldview, by experience of the whole nation)" (transl. by V. H.) (p. 26).

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

In this way, the scientist perceives the worldview as a universal phenomenon, applicable to the individual and to the people as a social organism.

During the same period, Ukrainian philosophers and scholars in the diaspora M. Shlemkevych and O. Kulchytskyi relied on the achievements of Western, mostly German philosophy, referring to W. Wundt, W. Dilthey, K. Jaspers and others. This makes it possible to perceive the worldview more broadly and integrated into the European context. Certain ideas about the actual worldview of man in the individual dimension are set out in the work "The Essence of Philosophy" (1926) by M. Shlemkevych (1981). The thinker uses the ideas of the German philosopher W. Wundt, according to which the purpose of philosophy is "to combine some of our knowledge into one common view of the world and life, which would meet the requirements of reason and the needs of the heart" (transl. by V. H.) (Shlemkevych, 1981, p. 104). Thus, philosophy synthesizes the worldview of man from disparate knowledge and views of the world. Schlemkevych recognizes the fundamentality of the individual in the worldview: he emphasizes Wundt's vision of philosophy as inseparable from the worldview (and philosophy is always based on individual thinking). Moreover, according to W. Wundt, metaphysics is precisely "an attempt to acquire a worldview that would connect the components of a single knowledge" (transl. by V. H.) (Shlemkevych, 1981, p. 105).

O. Kulchytskyi (1981) in his work "Introduction to Problems of the Essence of Philosophy" tries to reveal the essence of worldview and world picture. The scientist's reasoning presents the idea of the influence of the human psyche (individual) on the formation of worldview and world picture. Thus, the worldview means "the totality of the subject meanings perceived by our worldview, as the sum of our 'pictorial' (visual) knowledge about the world" (Kulchytskyi, 1981, p. 28). In general, the worldview is a "kind of clarification", the interpretation of the world by man. It also presupposes a holistic coverage of the purpose, meaning and structure of the world as a whole that contains everything and is the plane of human action and cognition (Kulchytskyi, 1981, p. 29). At the same time, Kulchytskyi is actively developing the problem of the collective dimension of worldview in his studies. To do this, he uses the concept of "national psyche". In particular, the philosopher develops the idea of the determinism of human worldview by its origin, geographical living conditions and the influence of natural factors.

It should be noted that the Ukrainian philosophers and researchers (including diasporas) of the late XIX – early XX century in their works consider not only the worldview and character of the people, but also the "soul of the people", "spirit of the people", "national type" or "national psyche", "folk temperament", etc. M. Kolotylo (2017) interprets such studies of the people's spirit or soul as a study of mindset and mentality. At the same time, considerations about the people's soul, spirit or character have no clear boundaries and often cover issues of worldview. This indicates, first of all, the inadequacy of the terminological apparatus, the vague delineation of the boundaries of the concept of worldview. Therefore, considerations of national character are often considerations of the collective dimension of the worldview. Such are, for example, the thoughts of N. Grygoriyiv. The philosopher interprets the temperament of the individual and the people broadly. He includes in the concept not only spiritual, but also biological and psychological properties (based on his own knowledge of behavioral theory as well): "The character of a people is the properties that peculiar if not to all of its members, then at least to the most. This is what all persons of one nation have in common" (transl. by V. H.) (Grygoriyiv, 1941, p. 3). This vision of collective nature is somewhat opposed to the understanding of the collective worldview as a whirlpool of different individual worldviews.

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

Grygoriyiv, on the other hand, sees the collective nature as a concentration of common features of individuals. Yet it concerns both physical and mental traits.

Thus, the temperament of the people is the common properties of individuals. In addition, in the matter of collective nature N. Grygoriyiv acts as a supporter of the idea of geographical determinism (which is largely a tribute to the then scientific trends). Thus, the philosopher argues that the main thing in the formation of folk customs is the specifics of the place of residence. And among other factors there are "work, movement, activity, both physical and mental" (Grygoriyiv, 1941, p. 7). Consequently, temperament may differ depending on the layer (due to the difference in the work performed). According to Grygoriyiv's ideas, one of the ways to study the temperament of the people (and to study the worldview) is to generalize the common, typical of its representatives, because the nature of individuals and is the nature of the whole nation. "The sum of properties" is the people's temperament" (transl. by V. H.) (Grygoriyiv, 1941, p. 12). If we paraphrase Grygoriyiv's judgment about temperament as follows: "The worldview of individuals constitutes the worldview of the people", we will notice how universal it is for understanding both the folk temperament and worldview, character, type, and so on.

It is significant that Grygoriyiv's idea of a collective worldview as a concentration of common features of the worldviews of individuals is still relevant today. Thus, we find a similar understanding in the thoughts of David Rousseau and Julie Billingham (2018). First of all, we note that scientists emphasize the comprehensiveness of the worldview. They claim: "The scope of worldviews covers all the domains of experience, decision-making and action and cover all the kinds of information we might have about the nature of the world and our place in the scheme of things" (Rousseau & Billingham, 2018, p. 3).

Typical characteristics of the worldview in general are individuality and dynamism: constant mobility, change and development due to the integration of new and new knowledge and experience. However, despite this individuality, worldviews may be common to community members. Or it may not be holistic worldviews that are common, but certain portions of them. In this way, the collective worldview consists of common individual worldviews or significant portions of worldview. Such generalized worldviews constitute a paradigm (Rousseau & Billingham, 2018, p. 4). In general, the understanding of the worldview in the reasoning of Rousseau and Billingham (2018) is human-centered: the worldview appears as a personal philosophy of man (p. 4). At the same time, it is not absolutely unique for an individual. This explains the possibility of creating paradigms (collective worldview).

In modern scientific discourse, the problem of worldview in the collective dimension (worldview of the national community) is at the intersection of philosophy and ethnic psychology and is related to a number of ethnopsychological problems. For example, A. Liovochkina (2002) argues that "Ethnic mentality is a holistic system of images, ideas, values and semantic formations, and 'unique rules of life' that stimulates and regulates the most appropriate in these cultural and natural conditions type of behaviour" (transl. by V. H.) (p. 48). As you can see, this interpretation is about values and ideas that are part of the mentality, but also the worldview. It turns out that in the collective dimension, people's worldviews (their ideas and values) are formed into a holistic system, creating an ethnic mentality. Similarly, worldview in its collective dimension (as the worldview of a people or a nation) becomes a specific basis of mentality.

In their ethnopsychological studies, modern researchers O. Savytska and L. Spivak generally identify worldview and mentality. In this context, a purely collective dimension of worldview is

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

considered, because, as researchers note, "Mentality (synonym for worldview) is an integrative characteristic of a community of people with a certain culture, which allows to describe the uniqueness of these people's vision of the world and to explain the specifics of their response to it" (transl. by V. H.) (Spivak & Savytska, 2011, p. 63). That is, the collective worldview integrates group-specific features into a single holistic response to the world.

Scientific progress on the problem of worldview, as a result, leads to a balance of individual and collective dimensions of worldview. Thus, the worldview is seen as a phenomenon of human consciousness and as a phenomenon of collective consciousness (that of group, people, nation). V. Didenko and V. Tabachkovskiy (2002) interpret the worldview as a person's self-determination about his place in the world and relationships with it. In a broader sense, the scientists define it as follows: "Worldview is a spiritual and practical formation, based on the ratio of existing and imaginary, desirable, appropriate, synthesis of experience, evaluation of knowledge and beliefs, focused on ideals" (transl. by V. H.) (p. 569).

This understanding of the individual worldview of man resonates with Dilthey's idea about the "ideal of life" as a component of the worldview, which in this case is perceived as its driving force and goal. The scientists emphasize the multiplicity of meanings of the term "worldview", which can affect the form of human (individual) and society (collective) consciousness, the form and method of the world perception and so on. In connection with the discovery of worldview in practical human activity V. Didenko and V. Tabachkovskiy (2002) define it as follows: "Worldview is a system of principles, knowledge, ideals, values, hopes, beliefs, views on the meaning and purpose of life, which determine the activities of the individual or social group and are organically included in human actions and norms of behaviour" (transl. by V. H.) (p. 569). Worldview has a multilevel structure, consisting of such links as vision of the world (based on principles), world attitude (based on life experience), world understanding (based on knowledge), world outlook (based on purpose), world perception (based on values) (Didenko & Tabachkovskiy, 2002, p. 569).

As can be seen from such structuring of worldview levels, all the links are presented in a certain hierarchy and can be applied both to the person as the carrier of the worldview, and to the collective as the carrier of the generalized worldview. In this system, we see that one of the links – world understanding – is based by the scientists on knowledge. However, it is expedient and logical to include ideas in this link. After all, not only knowledge, but also ideas (as responses to the problems inaccessible to knowledge and rational understanding) are ways to understand the world. Thus, we have the following chain of sequence of formation of worldview components: I see – I feel – I understand – I contemplate – I perceive the world and life and evaluate them. Thus, the most general and voluminous component is the principles necessary for a certain vision of the world, and the top component that requires passing the previous levels are the values (happiness, love, goodness, beauty, justice, truth and others). If we give this sequence a logical continuation in terms of expressing the worldview in spiritual culture, it will look like this: I see – I feel – I understand – I contemplate – I perceive – I express in general my perception / understanding of life and the world and my ideas about them. Such spiritual expression in the forms of culture reveals, makes visible and accessible for detection specific features of vision of the world, world attitude, world understanding and world outlook.

If the ideas considered above revolved more around the worldview in its collective dimension or around the worldview universality, then we briefly outline its human-centred understanding. Thus, V. Shynkaruk conceives the worldview as:

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

A set of generalized ideas about reality, beliefs and ideals that reflect, reveal and determine a certain practical and theoretical attitude of man to the world, his way of perceiving, understanding and evaluating the surrounding reality and himself as a concrete historical subject of cognition and practice. (transl. by V. H.) (Shynkaruk, 1986, p. 462)

In addition, it was Shynkaruk who first substantiated the crucial importance of such ethical categories as faith, hope and love for a person's worldview. In this regard, O. Farion (2015) emphasizes: "Transcendental feelings 'faith', 'hope' and 'love', according to V. Shynkaruk, are decisive for the human worldview and world transformation. As philosophical and ideological categories, they were for the first time conceptually substantiated by him" (p. 32). Like Shynkaruk, the modern Ukrainian philosopher S. Krymskyi considers the worldview of man to be the driving force of choosing a way of life, and the choice of a person's own image, destiny and role ("meeting with oneself") relies on spirituality. Nadolnii also comprehends worldview through the prism of man as a carrier. According to the philosopher, the worldview can be considered in several aspects, namely: as a methodological intention through which a person forms his attitude to reality; as a basis for the establishment of man in the spiritual, practical and other spheres of activity; as a way of interpreting human existence and a form of assimilation and interpretation of knowledge and values of the surrounding world (Nadolnii, 2015, p. 51). Herewith, the structural core of the worldview is considered the beliefs, i.e. a set of views and ideas of the individual, formed under the influence of knowledge, social experience, etc. According to the scientist, the worldview can be perceived in a broad and narrow sense. A broad view of the worldview involves the inclusion in the essence of the concept of a set of different views of the world, such as ethical, aesthetic, religious, economic, social ones, etc. In a narrow sense, the worldview means a philosophical vision of the world (Bazaluk & Balinchenko, 2020). Thus, I. Nadolnii outlines the worldview as an intention through which a person's attitude to the world and his interpretation of the world is formed. This judgment echoes the arguments of the American philosopher Vern S. Poythress, who argues that the worldview of man does not reflect the world, but only shapes the attitude to it. It follows that, a person's worldview is deeply subjective and individual. According to Poythress (2019), "We can distinguish the world from human views about the world, that is worldviews. We can distinguish events in the world from human views about the events" (p. 35).

Thus, a person with his worldview revolves around the sphere of subjective perception. While the world is objective, unmoving and independent of human opinion about it. At the same time, the worldview for Poythress means a person's point of view that contains answers to global ontological questions. However, such subjectivity of the worldview does not fix it on one person, on one specific carrier. After all, the philosopher outlines the worldview as a phenomenon long in time. Thus, the worldview can cover more than one generation of people, i.e. it has a vertical collective manifestation (passed down from generation to generation, and not only functions in the community of contemporaries). It is because of this, according to Poythress (2019), a person's worldview may contain answers that he himself did not find, but received from past genera-

tions (p. 37). In this way, we see that man is not only attached with his worldview to creating of the collective worldview, but also forms his own vision of the world, using the accumulated experience of past generations.

Originality

The author outlined key links between individual and collective dimensions of human worldview functioning. The study identified a role of human as a carrier of the worldview in formation of collective worldview.

Conclusions

A review of ideas related to understanding the worldview of man as an individual or collective phenomenon shows that this problem is diverse and complex. Wilhelm Dilthey started to interpret the general (hence collective) worldview as a whirlpool of various individual views and ideas. In this case, each person with an individual product of his own thinking joins the creation of this plurality of worldviews. The problem is that Heinrich Rickert's opinion on the influence of a significant independent worldview on a less independent one, and therefore on the selectivity of the influence of the worldview in general, also seems valid. This is the influence that everyone faces in everyday life (especially in our time of developed information technology, mechanisms for manipulating the thinking of others, etc.). Today, Cristiano Gianolla considers the exceptional influence of worldviews-winners on the historical progress. In this context, according to the philosopher, on the margins there are ordinary, lost worldviews. However, the current desire for the highest tolerance for man forces us to recognize such a vision true in view of only the most important historical events. After all, the worldviews of individuals (even ordinary ones) are hardly lost without a trace: in addition to historical progress, there are such conservative manifestations of the collective worldview as the traditional culture of the community (group, ethnic group, people). Gianolla himself emphasizes that in today's world, which revolves around the problem of man, the importance of all worldviews (both individual and collective) is undeniable. The philosopher manifests this, emphasizing the importance in modern interaction of "ecological thinking", which leads to a dialogue between different worldviews (Gianolla, 2019). Taking into account the studies of Ukrainian philosophers, we can conclude that there is a tendency to derive a collective worldview (folk, national) from a set of common worldviews of individuals. Because of this, the collective worldview appears as a heterogeneous but holistic formation. Yet, the individual is also ideologically attached to the collective worldview of his community (people or nation). Thus, following I. Mirchuk, the collective worldview environment forms a specific vision of the world. Therefore, a person (and especially a philosopher) cannot be detached from the worldview of his people, and therefore can be best perceived only by it.

The worldview of an individual in the creation of a collective vision of the world plays a decisive role. According to N. Grygoriyiv's vision, the collective worldview (the worldview of the people) is not a whirlpool of different ideas and views, but a concentrate of common features of individual worldviews. A. Liovochkina, O. Savytska and L. Spivak mean the same thing, outlining the collective worldview as a holistic system in which the common features of the worldviews of individuals are integrated. Such a vision presupposes a collective worldview as a horizontal phenomenon (concentration of common views of community members). But there is also a collective worldview in the vertical manifestation: as the influence of the worldview of past generations on the worldview of descendants, which is justified by Vern Poythress. Active

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

interrelations and mutual influences of individual and collective worldviews force to recognize as its carriers both the individual and the community. This is what V. Didenko and V. Tabachkovskiy do, claiming that the worldview of a person and the worldview of a group have the same components and characteristics. Thus, a person as a carrier of the worldview in any case with his individual vision of the world joins the formation of the general worldview of the community. In the modern dimension, the question of the strength of the influence of individual worldviews on the state of affairs is problematic. Indicative of this is the emergence of such a social phenomenon as thought leadership. Having actualized the problem of interrelations between individual and collective dimension of the human worldview, prospects of the further researches consist in definition of the power of individual worldview influence on the collective worldview.

REFERENCES

- Artyukh, V. A. (2011). Dmytro Chizhevs'ky about the Worldwide View Basis of the Ukrainian Philosophical Process. *Philosophical Ideas in the Culture of Kievan Rus*, 5, 23-38. (in Ukrainian)
- Bazaluk, O., & Balinchenko, S. (2020). The Ethics Laws as a Basis for Building a Cosmic Civilization. The Sofia Republic. *Philosophy and Cosmology*, 24, 131-139. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/24/13> (in English)
- Chyzhevskiy, D. (2005). Narysy z istorii filosofii na Ukraini: Filosofiia Hryhoriia Skovorody. In *Filosofski tvory* (Vol. 1). Kyiv: Smoloskyp. (in Ukrainian)
- Didenko, V., & Tabachkovskiy, V. (2002). Svitohliad. In *Filosofskiy entsyklopedychnyi slovnyk* (pp. 569-570). Kyiv: Abrys. (in Ukrainian)
- Dilthey, W. (2011). *Das Wesen der Philosophie*. M. Tselter, Trans. from German. Moscow: Intrada. (in Russian)
- Farion, O. O. (2015). The Spiritual Basic Concepts in the Writings of Thinkers of Kiev School of Philosophy. *Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University Journal*, 1(79), 31-37. (in Ukrainian)
- Gianolla, C. (2019). Worldview. *Dicionário Alice*. Retrieved from https://alice.ces.uc.pt/dictionary/?id=23838&pag=23918&id_lingua=1&entry=24326 (in English)
- Grygoriyiv, N. (1941). *Ukrainska natsionalna vdacha*. Winnipeg. (in Ukrainian)
- Jaspers, K. (2009). *Psychologie Der Weltanschauungen*. O. Kysliuk & R. Osadchuk, Trans. from German. Kyiv: Yunivers. (in Ukrainian)
- Kolotylo, M. O. (2017). Mentality and mental thinking as a sociocultural phenomenon: the ontological status and anthropological dimensions. *Current problems of philosophy and sociology*, 15, 66-69. (in Ukrainian)
- Kulchytskyi, O. (1981). Vvedennia v problematyku sutnosti filosofii. In *Memoirs of the Shevchenko scientific society* (Vol. 191, pp. 1-86). Paris-New York-Munich. (in Ukrainian)
- Liovochkina, A. (2002). *Etymosykhologia*. Kyiv: MAUP. (in Ukrainian)
- Mirchuk, I. (1942). Svitohliad ukrainskoho narodu. Sproba kharakterystyky. *Naukovyi zbirnyk Ukrainskoho universytetu v Prazi*, 3, 225-243. (in Ukrainian)
- Nadolniy, I. F. (2015). Worldview – a key problem of knowledge and activity. *Herald of the National Academy for Public Administration under the President of Ukraine*, 4, 50-54. (in Ukrainian)
- Nechuy-Levytsky, I. (1992). *Svitohliad ukrainskoho narodu: Eskiz ukrainskoi mifologii*. Kyiv: Oberehy. (in Ukrainian)
- Popov, V. (2016). The birth of the concept of "Weltanschauung". *Universytetska kafedra*, 5, 81-89. (in Ukrainian)
- Popov, V., & Popova, O. (2019). Sotsialno-kolektyvni ta individualni vymiry poniattia "svitohliad". In D. Shevchuk (Ed.), *Liudyna i kultura* (pp. 117-133). Ostroh: The National University of Ostroh Academy. (in Ukrainian)
- Poythress, V. S. (2019). Does redemptive history have priority to worldview? With implications for preaching. *Westminster Theological Journal*, 81, 35-47. Retrieved from <https://frame-poythress.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/PoythressVernDoesRedemptiveHistoryHaveAPriority.WTJ-81.1.pdf> (in English)
- Rickert, H. (1998). *Die Philosophie des Lebens*. Trans. from German. Kyiv: Nika-Tsentr, Vist-S. (in Russian)
- Rousseau, D., & Billingham, J. (2018). A Systematic Framework for Exploring Worldviews and Its Generalization as a Multi-Purpose Inquiry Framework. *Systems*, 6(3), 27. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/systems6030027> (in English)

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

- Rozhanska, N. V. (2015). National outlook and national philosophy: A structural analysis. *Naukovi pratsi. Filosofiia*, 257(245), 25-28. (in Ukrainian)
- Rylsky, T. (1888). K izucheniyu ukrainskogo narodnogo mirovozzreniya. *Kievskaya starina*, 23, 266-306. (in Russian)
- Shlemkevych, M. (1981). Sutnist filosofii. In *Memoirs of the Shevchenko scientific society* (Vol. 191, pp. 87-243). Paris-New York-Munich. (in Ukrainian)
- Shynkaruk, V. (1986). Svitohliad. In *Filosofskiy slovnyk* (pp. 462-464). Kyiv. (in Ukrainian)
- Spengler, O. (1998). Vsemirno-istoricheskie perspektivy. I. Makhankov, Trans. from German. In *Zakat Yevropy: Ocherki morfologii mirovoy istorii* (Vol. 2). Moscow: Mysl. (in Russian)
- Spivak, L., & Savvytska, O. (2011). *Etnopsykholohiia*. Kyiv: Karavela. (in Ukrainian)

LIST OF REFERENCE LINKS

- Артюх В. Дмитро Чижевський про світоглядну основу філософського процесу на Україні. *Філософські ідеї в культурі Київської Русі*. 2011. Вип. 5. С. 23–38.
- Bazaluk O., Balinchenko, S. The Ethics Laws as a Basis for Building a Cosmic Civilization. The Sofia Republic. *Philosophy and Cosmology*. Vol. 24. P. 131–139. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/24/13>
- Чижевський Д. *Філософські твори* : у 4 т. Т. 1: Нариси з історії філософії на Україні. Філософія Григорія Сковороди. Київ : Смолоскип, 2005. 440 с.
- Діденко В., Табачковський В. Світогляд. *Філософський енциклопедичний словник*. Київ : Абрис, 2002. С. 569–570.
- Дильтей В. *Суцність філософії* / пер. с нем. под ред. М. Цельтера. Москва : Интрада, 2011. 155 с.
- Фаріон О. О. Наріжні концепти духовності у працях мислителів київської філософської школи. *Вісник Житомирського державного університету. Філософські науки*. 2015. Вип. 1 (79). С. 31–37.
- Gianolla C. Worldview. *Dicionário Alice*. 2019. URL: https://alice.ces.uc.pt/dictionary/?id=23838&pag=23918&id_lingua=1&entry=24326
- Григорієв Н. *Українська національна вдача*. Вінніпег, 1941. 60 с.
- Ясперс К. *Психологія світоглядів* / пер. з нім. О. Кислюка, Р. Осадчука. Київ : Юніверс, 2009. 460 с.
- Колотило М. О. Ментальність і менталітет: онтологічний статус та антропологічні виміри. *Актуальні проблеми філософії та соціології*. 2017. Вип. 15. С. 66–69.
- Кульчицький О. Введення в проблематику сутності філософії. *Записки наукового товариства ім. Шевченка*. Париж – Нью-Йорк – Мюнхен, 1981. Т. 191. С. 1–86.
- Львовичкіна А. *Етнопсихологія*. Київ : МАУП, 2002. 144 с.
- Мірчук І. Світогляд українського народу. Спроба характеристики. *Науковий збірник Українського університету в Празі*. 1942. Т. 3. С. 225–243.
- Надольний І. Ф. Світогляд – ключова проблема пізнання та діяльності людини. *Вісник Національної академії державного управління при Президентові України*. 2015. № 4. С. 50–54.
- Нечуй-Левицький І. *Світогляд українського народу. Ескіз української міфології*. Київ : Обереги, 1992. 88 с.
- Попов В. Народження концепту "Weltanschauung". *Університетська кафедра*. 2016. № 5. С. 81–90.
- Попов В., Попова О. Соціально-колективні та індивідуальні виміри поняття "світогляд". *Людина і культура* / за ред. Д. Шевчука. Острого : Видавництво Національного університету "Острозька академія", 2019. С. 117–133.
- Poythress V. S. Does redemptive history have priority to worldview? With implications for preaching. *Westminster Theological Journal*. 2019. Vol. 81. P. 35–47. URL: <https://frame-poythress.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/PoythressVernDoesRedemptiveHistoryHaveAPriority.WTJ-81.1.pdf>
- Риккерт Г. *Філософія життя*. Киев : Ника-Центр, Вист-С, 1998. 507 с.
- Rousseau D., Billingham J. A Systematic Framework for Exploring Worldviews and Its Generalization as a Multi-Purpose Inquiry Framework. *Systems*. 2018. Vol. 6. Iss. 3. 20 p. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/systems6030027>
- Рожанська Н. В. Національний світогляд і національна філософія: структурний аналіз. *Наукові праці. Філософія*. 2015. Т. 257. № 245. С. 25–28.
- Рыльский Т. К изучению украинского народного мировоззрения. *Киевская старина*. 1888. Т. 23. С. 266–306.
- Шлемкевич М. Сутність філософії. *Записки наукового товариства ім. Шевченка*. Париж – Нью-Йорк – Мюнхен, 1981. Т. 191. С. 87–243.
- Шинкарук В. Світогляд. *Філософський словник*. Київ, 1986. С. 462–464.

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

Шпенглер О. *Закат Европы. Очерки морфологии мировой истории*. Т. 2: Всемирно-исторические перспективы / пер. с нем. И. Маханькова. Москва : Мысль, 1998. 606 с.

Співак Л., Савицька О. *Етнопсихологія*. Київ : Каравела, 2011. 264 с.

В. В. ГАВРИЛЕНКО^{1*}

^{1*}Сумський державний університет (Суми, Україна), ел. пошта Viktoriavangogh@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0002-5892-3129

ЛЮДИНА ЯК НОСІЙ СВІТОГЛЯДУ: ІНДИВІДУАЛЬНИЙ ТА КОЛЕКТИВНИЙ ВИМІРИ

Мета. Метою статті є окреслення взаємозв'язків між індивідуальним та колективним вимірами світогляду людини. Реалізація цієї мети передбачає розв'язання таких завдань: актуалізація філософських ідей, сформованих обмірковуванням людини та спільноти як носіїв світогляду; виявлення та узагальнення співвідношення одиничне-загальне у контексті проблеми світогляду людини. **Теоретичний базис.** Підґрунтям дослідження послугували міркування філософів, що стосуються проявів одиничного і колективного світоглядів. А такі міркування набули свого вираження в європейській філософії (Дільтей, Ріккерт, Ясперс) доволі давно. Як в українському, так і в зарубіжному філософському дискурсі розглядаються обидва виміри світогляду, а роль носія світогляду покладається і на індивіда, і на суспільство. Це простежується у дослідженнях С. Кримського, І. Надольного, В. Попова, Н. Рожанської, В. Табачковського, В. Шинкарука, В. Пойтресса, Д. Руссо, Д. Біллінгем, К. Джаноли й інших. Однак взаємозв'язки індивідуального та колективного вимірів світогляду чітко не окреслені. Можна відзначити дослідження В. Попова, у якому філософ зосереджується на проблемі соціально-колективного та індивідуального вимірів світогляду, хоча акцентує увагу на вжитку самого поняття "світогляд" у цих значеннях. Оскільки людина є соціальною істотою, її світогляд взаємодіє зі світоглядами інших індивідів. У такий спосіб ми можемо говорити про два виміри його функціонування: індивідуальний та колективний. Ця проблема набуває актуальності через гостроту співвідношення людина-соціум у сучасному бутті. **Наукова новизна.** Автором окреслено базові взаємозв'язки між індивідуальним та колективним вимірами функціонування світогляду людини. Визначено місце людини як носія світогляду у формуванні загального, колективного бачення світу. **Висновки.** Людина як носій світогляду посідає центральне місце у формуванні колективного світогляду. У філософському дискурсі міркування щодо взаємозв'язків індивідуального і колективного вимірів світогляду неоднотайні. Дискусійним досі є питання однорідності загального світогляду, що постає то як круговерть різних ідей і поглядів окремих осіб, то як цілісна система спільних світоглядів. Колективний світогляд може бути представлений як інтегроване явище, адже він базується на поєднанні спільних світоглядів окремих індивідів. Водночас і людина піддається впливу колективного світогляду, зокрема, як спадку минулих поколінь.

Ключові слова: людина; індивідуальний світогляд; колективний світогляд; світосприйняття; світовідчуття; світорозуміння

В. В. ГАВРИЛЕНКО^{1*}

^{1*}Сумской государственной университет (Сумы, Украина), эл. почта Viktoriavangogh@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0002-5892-3129

ЧЕЛОВЕК КАК НОСИТЕЛЬ МИРОВОЗЗРЕНИЯ: ИНДИВИДУАЛЬНОЕ И КОЛЛЕКТИВНОЕ ИЗМЕРЕНИЯ

Цель. Целью статьи является определение взаимосвязей между индивидуальным и коллективным измерениями мировоззрения человека. Реализация этой цели предполагает решение следующих задач: актуализация философских идей, сформированных обдумыванием человека и общества как носителей мировоззрения; выявление и обобщение соотношения единичное-общее в контексте проблемы мировоззрения человека. **Теоретический базис.** Основой исследования послужили соображения философов, касающиеся проявлений единичного и общего мировоззрения. А такие рассуждения получили свое выражение в европейской фило-

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

софии (Дильтей, Риккерт, Ясперс) достаточно давно. Как в украинском, так и в зарубежном философском дискурсе рассматриваются оба измерения мировоззрения, а роль носителя мировоззрения возлагается и на индивида, и на общество. Это прослеживается в исследованиях С. Крымского, И. Надольного, В. Попова, Н. Рожанской, В. Табачковского, В. Шинкарука, В. Пойтресса, Д. Руссо, Д. Биллингем, К. Джанолы и других. Однако взаимосвязи индивидуального и коллективного измерений мировоззрения четко не очерчены. Можно отметить исследование В. Попова, в котором философ сосредоточивается на проблеме социально-коллективного и индивидуального измерений мировоззрения, хотя акцентирует внимание на употреблении самого понятия "мировоззрение" в этих значениях. Поскольку человек является социальным существом, его мировоззрение взаимодействует с мировоззрениями других индивидов. Таким образом, мы можем говорить о двух измерениях его функционирования: индивидуальном и коллективном. Эта проблема приобретает актуальность в связи с остротой соотношения человек-социум в современном бытии. **Научная новизна.** Автором обозначены базовые взаимосвязи между индивидуальным и коллективным измерениями функционирования мировоззрения человека. Определено место человека как носителя мировоззрения в формировании общего, коллективного видения мира. **Выводы.** Человек как носитель мировоззрения занимает центральное место в формировании коллективного мировоззрения. В философском дискурсе соображения о взаимосвязях индивидуального и коллективного измерений мировоззрения неединодушны. Дискуссионным до сих пор является вопрос однородности общего мировоззрения, которое воспринимается либо как круговорот различных идей и взглядов отдельных лиц, либо как целостная система общих мировоззрений. Коллективное мировоззрение может быть представлено как интегрированное явление. Ведь оно базируется на сочетании общих мировоззрений отдельных индивидов. В то же время и человек подвергается воздействию коллективного мировоззрения, в частности как наследства прошлых поколений.

Ключевые слова: человек; индивидуальное мировоззрение; коллективное мировоззрение; мировосприятие; мироощущение; миропонимание

Received: 14.07.2020

Accepted: 27.11.2020