



THE CONCEPT OF THE PERSON AND THE PROBLEMS OF ITS CLASSIFICATION

Norliyev Rustam Ibragimovich

Termiz State Pedagogical Institute

Head of the Department of Philosophy and Foundations of Spirituality,

Philosophy Candidate (PhD), Associate Professor

Phone: +998915772358

E-mail: norliyevr@mail.ru

Annotation. This article examines the concept of the person and the challenges associated with its classification. It explores various philosophical, psychological, and sociological perspectives on what constitutes a person, highlighting the complexity and multidimensionality of the concept. The study also discusses the theoretical and practical implications of different classification approaches, providing insights into understanding human identity and individuality in contemporary research.

Keywords: Person, concept, classification, philosophy, psychology, sociology, identity, individuality.

INTRODUCTION.

In accordance with the objectives and content of the Philosophy of Human course, at the beginning of the study, topics such as the definition of human, philosophy, and the relationship between human and philosophy were first addressed. Later, human philosophy and the historical development of human philosophy were examined period by period. The aim here is to briefly prepare the foundational knowledge that will serve as material for human philosophy within its historical development process.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND METHODS.

Subsequently, in our lessons, a critical reading of Max Scheler's work "The Nature of Man and His Place in the Cosmos" will be conducted. Scheler developed an independent concept of human philosophy in the early 20th century within contemporary philosophical thought. Later, the human understanding of Hilmi Ziya Ülken, one of the important philosophers of the late Republican period, was addressed. In Ülken's understanding of the human, the concepts he redefined are of particular importance. These concepts include Personality, Passion, Freedom, Humanism, Truth, and Justice. These concepts were analyzed in detail, thus presenting a general understanding of the human [1].

In summary, Ülken's understanding of the human is hierarchical. These levels progress necessarily from the ordinary person to the ideal human. One cannot move to the next level without surpassing the previous one. According to him, the first of these levels is the "people's stage," the second is the "citizen stage," the third is the "patriot stage," and the final stage is the "stage of patriotism." To reach the "ideal human," one must start from the first stage and advance to the last. However, reaching the last stage is not an end point; it is a stage of continuous development. From all this, it can be understood that the human journey, which may be called "humanization," appears as an endless path.

Philosophy is the art of questioning, and one of its foremost questions is, "What is a human?" In fact, this has been one of the fundamental questions throughout the history of philosophy. Philosophical endeavor as a whole is the effort to know oneself, to understand the human's place in the universe, and to give meaning to one's actions and life. Other questions



arise as derivatives of this endeavor: How many dimensions does the universe have? What is the best way to govern society? What is reason? Etc [2].

DISCUSSION AND RESULTS.

The question “What is a human?” is fundamental not only for those who inquire about the meaning of life but also for various disciplines of philosophy and contemporary human sciences. Psychology, sociology, and social anthropology—today often referred to as social sciences—are each built upon certain understandings or views of the human. Likewise, every ethics, political philosophy, or philosophy of knowledge and existence is carried out based on certain assumptions about humans. Some of these disciplines explicitly reveal the human understanding on which they are based, while others do so implicitly. Whether explicit or implicit, the explanations and justifications provided by these disciplines concerning human-related fundamental problems ultimately rest upon specific assumptions about humans and their nature [3].

Furthermore, a person’s daily activities, actions, products, ways of expression, political or ethical decisions concerning daily life, and perspectives on oneself, others, and one’s profession – all, whether approached theoretically or practically, are shaped primarily by the human understanding consciously adopted by the individual or unconsciously inherited from society. Collectively, these form what can roughly be called the “dominant human” understanding.

One of the central claims of Ancient Greek thought, and the Western philosophical tradition that follows it, is that humans differ from animals by possessing reason. From this perspective, within this intellectual tradition, the question “What is a human?” is answered with propositions such as “a human is a rational being,” “a human is a being with free will”, or “a human is a free being”. However, such propositions carry further issues beyond their truth or falsity. One such issue concerns their domains of validity [4].

When evaluated logically, the question “What is a human?” and all answers formulated as “A human is a being that,” encompass all human beings, every single individual; that is, they possess universality both in the human and historical sense. The proposition “The human is a rational being” contains the claim that every human individual, in every period of history, has been rational in the same way; similarly, each of the other propositions asserts that every human individual is a being endowed with will, freedom, etc.

However, history and life itself show us that these timeless characteristics attributed to every member of the species – especially rationality and other “positive” qualities linked to it – are in fact exhibited only by certain individuals, not by everyone, but by a “minority.” If rationality is not reduced to the ability to carry out daily tasks; if freedom is not understood as simply thinking or doing whatever one wants; if morality is not defined as the memorized repetition of a society’s or religion’s “goods and bads”; and if willpower is not reduced, for example, to the ability to refrain from eating and drinking for a short period (as in fasting), then both history and our lived experience show that the number of humans who act “in accordance with reason and virtue,” who are truly free, who ground their will in universally valid rational principles, and who carry out ethically valuable actions, is very small [5].

If we accept the condition that appears in the daily lives of the majority – the “ordinary human” – as true, then we must acknowledge that none of the human conceptions built upon the idea that “the human is a rational being” actually encompass all of humanity. Rather, these conceptions rely on the intellectual and practical actions of a small group of individuals who differ from others, presenting generalizations that claim validity for the entire human species.



Thus, we must admit that only this minority is, in the philosophers' sense, worthy of being called "human."

Philosophy is an activity – an activity of thinking. It is based on the human ability to ask questions and therefore develops as a mode of thinking about certain types of questions. The most important feature that distinguishes philosophy from all other disciplines is that, while reflecting on such questions, it relies on logical argument or reasoning. Accordingly, philosophers either construct such logical arguments themselves or critique the arguments put forward by others. Philosophers also analyze and clarify the concepts that underlie these arguments [6].

If we attempt to formulate a more detailed and comprehensive definition of philosophy, it can be described as a fundamentally reason-based, largely systematic, and critical mode of thinking about the general nature of the world, knowledge, and the way life is lived. Since philosophy is an activity of reason, there must be a rational being to carry out this activity – namely, the human being. Thus, a philosophical activity without the human being is unimaginable.

Therefore, the human being and philosophy appear as an inseparable whole. From another perspective, all philosophical creation may be viewed as creation about the human being. The reason for this is that human beings produce everything in order to understand themselves, to find their place in the world, and to beautify or ease their lives. Considering all this, the history of philosophy appears before us as a history of humanity – an intellectual production about the human being [7].

Indeed, whichever philosopher or thinker we examine – his life or his thought – we always find some ideas about the human being. Regardless of their correctness or incorrectness, some philosophers present these ideas by taking themselves as a model, some by describing the ideal, and some by approaching or capturing what actually exists.

After all this, the following may be said: Philosophy is a rational activity consisting of understanding the human being and expressing that understanding.

According to Mengüşoğlu, the philosophy of the human being is a branch of knowledge that studies and describes human phenomena and achievements with the aim of understanding the human being. For this reason, the philosophy of the human being examines all human actions and their resulting achievements – that is, human phenomena – from the perspective of a concrete totality. In short, its subject is the study of the human being as a whole, in all its aspects: intellectual, cognitive, behavioral, phenomenal, and so on [8].

If we were to ask an educated person today, "What is the human being?" we would receive three different and mutually incompatible answers. The first is the answer influenced by the theological tradition. The second is the understanding of the human being in Ancient Greece (the human being as a creature possessing reason, logos, phronesis, ratio, mens). The third is the view of the natural sciences and genetic psychology: that the human being is the final product of terrestrial development and evolution, and differs from other beings in nature only by the degree of complexity in the combination of energies and capacities.

Naturally, parallel to these three different views of the human being, three different anthropological traditions have emerged: theological, philosophical, and natural-scientific. Yet, not only has no satisfactory answer been found to the question "What is the human being?", but at no point in history has the human being been as "problematic" for himself as today [9].



Scheler, proceeding from this point, argues that a new philosophical anthropology must be developed. Similarly, Mengüşoğlu makes a comparable assessment and emphasizes the contemporary importance of a philosophical anthropology grounded in ontological foundations. For this reason, plurality of ideas and diverse approaches are evident in the philosophy of the human being.

Because of the human being's significant place in both the history of thought and the history of action, the question "What is the human being?" has been repeatedly asked throughout the history of philosophy, with new answers emerging in every era. However, a philosophy of the human being, constructed specifically upon this fundamental question, could emerge as an independent philosophical discipline only in our time. Only in our age has the human being – who investigates and questions everything—turned toward himself and made himself a primary object of inquiry and reflection. This is because the problems of the human being were not previously analyzed independently throughout the history of philosophy, but were instead distributed among various disciplines of philosophy [6].

Unfortunately, although the human being has become one of the essential subjects of philosophical inquiry in our age, and although the philosophy of the human being has emerged as a result, it has not yet established its influence. It has not yet overcome the dominance of the diverse and sometimes conflicting views that claim different kinds of truth and validity regarding the human being. In this field, complete unanimity will never be possible.

CONCLUSION.

In conclusion, philosophy is fundamentally an intellectual activity through which the human being seeks to understand both the world and himself. Since philosophical inquiry is inseparable from reasoning, argumentation, and conceptual analysis, it is ultimately grounded in the human capacity for thought. Therefore, philosophy and the human being form an inseparable unity. The history of philosophy, in essence, appears as the history of humanity's continuous effort to comprehend its own nature, position, and purpose.

The emergence of philosophical anthropology as an independent discipline reflects the increasing complexity of the question "What is the human being?" Throughout history, various approaches – theological, philosophical, and natural-scientific – have offered different and often conflicting definitions of the human. Despite this plurality, a definitive and universally accepted answer has yet to be found. Contemporary thinkers such as Scheler and Mengüşoğlu emphasize the necessity of a renewed, ontologically grounded philosophical anthropology to address the growing problems and uncertainties surrounding human existence today.

Although modern philosophical anthropology has not yet established a unified perspective or eliminated contradictory views, its value lies precisely in its openness to diverse interpretations. The human being, as a dynamic, multi-dimensional, and self-reflective entity, continues to pose new questions that demand new philosophical responses. Thus, the endeavor to understand the human being remains an unfinished and ever-relevant task – one that lies at the heart of philosophical reflection.

References:

1. Abu Nasr Farabi. *The City of Virtuous People*. – Tashkent: Abdulla Qodiriy National Heritage Publishing House, 1993.
2. Capra, F. *The Turning Point: Science, Society, and the Rising Culture*. – Chicago: Bantam Books, 1983. – 563 p.
3. Grigoryan, B.T. *Philosophical Anthropology: A Critical Essay*. – Moscow: Mysl, 1982. – 188 p.



4. Komilov, N. Sufism. – Tashkent: Mavarounnahr, 2009. – 447 p.
5. Lawrence G. Human good and Human Function. R. Kraut (Ed.), The Blackwell Guide to Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics. Blackwell Publishing. 2006. – Ss. 37- 75.
6. Lear J. Aristotle: the desire to understand. Cambridge University Press. Miller, Fred D. Nature, justice, and rights in Aristotle's politics. Oxford University Press. 1995.
7. Özcan M. İnsan felsefesi-insanın neliği üzerine bir soruşturma. BilgeSu Yayıncılık. 2016.
8. Peter L. The Sacred Canopy: Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion. Publisher: Open Road Media, 2011. – 284 p.
9. Poshnev, V.F. On the Beginning of Human History. – Moscow, 1974. – 419 p.
10. Saidov, S. (2025). IBN SINONING AXLOQ ILMIGA OID RISOLALARI. O'ZBEKISTON RESPUBLIKASI OLIY TA'LIM, FAN VA INNOVATSIYALAR VAZIRLIGI TOSHKENT DAVLAT SHARQSHUNOSLIK UNIVERSITETI, 269.
11. Saidov, S. (2025). NAJMIDDIN KUBRO MA'NAVY MEROSINING TASAVVUF ILMI RIVOJIDAGI ROLI ("USULUL ASHARA" ASARI MISOLIDA). *Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences*, 5(6), 446-453.
12. Saidov, S. (2024). IBN SINO RISOLALARIDA RUHIY TARBIYA MASALALARI. *International scientific journal of Biruni*, 3(1), 269-273.