



Larysa MOISIEIENKO

Mistake as an anthropological phenomenon

Introduction. In the “Philosophical Encyclopedic Dictionary” activity is considered as a form of activity that characterizes the ability of a person or systems related to him to be the cause of changes in being. Human activity is characterized by the choice of opportunities and, accordingly, decision-making. The activity carries out the permanent transformation of the subjective into the objective and vice versa. This transformation reveals the characteristics of the human spirit, which ultimately creates the potential for action. Activities that include both goal setting and self-simulation (as in some game situations), as well as a wide field of creativity, are called life. Varieties - labor, game, amateur, etc. (Philosophical Encyclopedic Dictionary, 2002).

Activities are always objective, from the subjective side, it certainly correlates with the subject adequate to it and with other activities, in other words, it is objectively specific and objectively oriented (Ivanov, 1977, p. 133). A human realizes his rights through activities. And the very activity makes it possible to understand the nature of man. Human activity is purposeful, expedient, practically comprehensible and subject-mediated. Since the object itself is the intermediary, which determines the nature of human activity can have any form, it provides human activities of a universal nature (Safin, 2013, p.159).

Activity is one of the key points in understanding human nature. According to the conviction of the Ukrainian philosopher V. Ivanov, practice is a universe of human existence, since in this sense, practice makes it possible to understand the specifics of human unity with the world, the cognition of the world, and the most important world-view fact that a person accumulates from his "essential powers" and abilities in itself not only a direct genetic heritage along the evolutionary line but the universality of all-natural bonds that one way or another became a support and a form of its life. The fact that the practice unites both the forms of being and the general nature of man in its historical development and communication, it also serves as the boundary of self-consciousness ... (Ivanov, 1977, p. 33). According to V. Ivanov, any concrete activity has its real object and its specific goal, which it implements through the formation (transformation) of this object" (Ivanov, 1977, p. 118).

The subject - intermediary of human activity - is its characteristic. This mediator can be of any shape, which makes human activity universal.

Subject fullness and specificity of the activity manifests itself in labor. Labor is traditionally regarded as a significant, expedient, strong-willed, positive and creative activity. According to B. Porshnev, work in the strict human sense implies something more than a "commonality" of actions; it provides for forcing one to another. What during development is internalized into "self-imposed" (Porshnev, 1974).

Traditionally, within the framework of classical philosophy, labor is described as a creative, positive human activity. Although in reality, labor has another side, dramatic for various reasons. The drama of labor adds the presence of such a phenomenon as "error" in it. The activity includes elements of the dramatic process; it can be accompanied by disappointment, complicated by erroneous decisions and actions. Thus, a scientist, at the stage of conducting research, in which an objectively historical necessity arose, is experiencing a conflict between new facts and the old categorical composition of his thinking. The philosopher, at the stage of reflection, when there is a significant difference between subjective opinion and his knowledge, understands the latter as mediated and therefore needs proof of the movement of thinking to the truth, that is, to an adequate reflection of an object that is only in feelings but is not yet known in other words, when the true, first of all, the mind displays the foreseeable content of the object - then the question of the place of experience (sense data) in the knowledge of reality and, more generally, in the relation between the subject and the object shows its acuteness, "taking in certain conditions a

kind of fundamental philosophical problem (Ivanov, 1977, p. 121)

An important component of an erroneous situation is its negative consequences, which are often destructive, not only for the person who makes a mistake but also for other people. And the feature of determining the error and its evaluation lies, on the one hand, in the subjectivity of determining the degree of fallacy, and on the other the field of human activity and the scale of its consequences.

Analysis of recent research and publications, in which the solution of this problem has begun. The phenomenon of error is the object of scientific research in various scientific fields. Philosophy and logic study the mistakes that have resulted from the wrong thinking in reasoning. Attempts to take a comprehensive look at sources of error which affect knowledge of the natural world go back as early as the work of Francis Bacon. In *Novum Organum*, Bacon (1620) identifies 'idols' or properties of human perception, personality, and enculturation which constitute biases that prevent us from achieving a 'true interpretation of nature'. He even defines a category of idols whose origin lies in the ways that we conduct science. (Zachos et al., 2003, p. 947-957).

In the philosophical studies of E. Husserl, the "being" of error is comprehended in the context of the phenomenon of false perception. Mistakes are also studying psychology. Psychological description of errors was first made by Z. Freud. Erroneous actions are understood by Z. Freud as compromise neoplasms created by corresponding conscious intention and partial simultaneous realization of unconscious desire. (Freud, 2010, p. 55). Much attention is paid to the concept of error in cognitive psychology. So, according to A.A. Leontiev, a mistake is "actions, for one reason or another, are inappropriate in this situation".

The peculiarities and nature of legal errors within the general theory of law were given by such scholars as V. Baranov, M. Voplenko and others.

Separately, there are works by philosophers who consider the phenomenon of error through the activities of aspects of human existence (Ivanov, 1977, Safin, 2013)

However, it should be noted that there is still no single integrated approach to the definition of a mistake that significantly complicates the elaboration of the principles of legal or ethical evaluation of false positives and their consequences. That, in turn, requires systematization of the conceptual apparatus of the concept of error, requires the integration of the achievements of various branches of scientific knowledge. In this way, the gap between the existing research paradigms can be filled, which

significantly affects the understanding of the most important issues of the theory of errors.

The aim of the work is to analyze the concept of "error" as an anthropological phenomenon, an integral part of the practical and substantive human activity.

Result. Exploring the nature of human, philosophical anthropology tries to consider human in all the diversity of his being, to cover the origin and essence of the human, the connection of its physical, mental and spiritual foundations, the driving forces and the direction of its development, as well as the forces that human himself sets in motion.

And during the entire period of the study, the statement that the phenomenon of error is an integral part of human being and evidence of its non-ideal nature is unchanged.

Recognizing a human being as a spiritual being, philosophers of various schools and trends focused on the imperfections of the spiritual nature of man, his destructive nature.

Thus, the German philosopher and sociologist Max Scheler (1874 - 1928) regarded human as a spiritual creation, reducing all the central problems of philosophy to the question of the essence of humanity in its spiritual and physical manifestations. In his work, "The Human Place in the Cosmos", Scheler proves the idea that human in his concreteness is fundamentally different from other living beings, calls a human a "sick animal," in which all forms of life impulse come together (Sheler, 1988).

Philosopher N. Berdyaev insisted that Christian anthropology can understand human nature, to see all the paradox and tragedy of man. The philosopher is convinced that this tragic principle makes a person unadapted to the world in which he lives (Berdiaev, 1993, p. 55-57).

Berdyaev in his work "Appointment of a Man" writes: "As a creature belonging to two worlds and capable of overcoming itself, man is a contradictory and paradoxical creature that combines polar opposites. It is equally possible to say about a man that he is a tall being and low, weak and strong, free and independent. The mystery and inconsistency of a person are determined not only by the fact that he is a creature, fell from a height, a terrestrial being, which retained in itself the memory of the sky and the reflection of heavenly light, but slit deeper in that it has from the beginning a child of God. Its roots in heaven, in God and the bottom of the abyss".

In his work, Berdyaev characterizes man as a contradictory and paradoxical creature, and the philosopher sees the reason for this is that

man is a creature created by God and bears the image and likeness of God in himself, that man is a free being and in his freedom fell away from God, and that, as a fallen and sinful being, he receives from God the grace that regenerates and saves him. According to the philosopher, the cause of human suffering is that a person does not like himself; feels disgusted to himself, and cannot love himself. " The philosopher notes that a person must love and respect the image of God in himself. This love is the opposite of egoism and egocentrism, that is, a madness that puts itself in the center of the universe (Berdiaev, 1993, p. 78).

An important understanding of the ambiguity and complexity of the phenomenon of human existence in the light of ontological perspectives in Ukrainian philosophy was initiated by Doctor of Philosophy V. Shinkaruk. The philosopher interprets human existence as a set of life practices, the vital world of man, which is extremely existentially tense since it requires constant willful efforts to solve the collisions of being. V. Shinkaruk derives the problem of human existence through the problems of not a person as such, but from a separate human person (Andros, 2017).

Exploring the nature of man and defining man as part of nature, philosophers and anthropologists separate man from the animal world. Philosopher B. Porshnev thoroughly noted that the properties of man cannot be derived from the properties of an animal by raising to a mathematical degree (Ivanov, 1977, p. 24).

Moreover, it is the animal that is considered "infallible", it is not capable of thinking in the abstract, it does not have a goal-setting, it is not able to determine the means to achieve the goal, it cannot predict the sequence of its actions, it cannot change nature.

All living creatures in nature (except man) live and act according to the program laid down in their hereditary mechanisms. It is carried out through a whole set of instincts necessary for all occasions and is a kind of innate "rulebook" of animal behavior, their relationship to their kind and to other creatures. Scheler calls the first act of an animal's drama in relation to the outside world; its source is physiologically psychological certainty (Sheler, 1988). Therefore, the behavior of animals is quite predictable, they have no possibility of choice and the ability to act on their own will or interest. The animal acts situationally, instinctively, per the laws of nature. In the event of a mistake, the animal must die. In human life, instincts, although they play an important role, are noticeably weakened (Sheler, 1988). A program embedded in the human hereditary mechanism does not operate according to the principle of "iron necessity", and a person

can step over the "rule book" of behavior incorporated in this program. Also, human existence takes place simultaneously in a natural, social, and cultural environment (Sheler, 1988).

Freed from natural dependence, man creates a new social system. In the social system, the error becomes part of social relations and begins to play a special significance for the human community, since it acts as a catalyst for the development of society. The mistakes of individuals or their groups become the content of collective experience, the achievement of a kind. Unlike an animal, only a person can, having made a mistake, bring it into the collective experience and thereby protect against the mistakes of other people. The animal that made a mistake perishes, and for a person as a creature of the human race, an individual's mistake becomes a condition for the survival and preservation of the race and, according to the law of "irony of history," the possibility of making new mistakes.

Thus, philosophical anthropology determines the nature of man as complex, multifaceted, capable of changing nature, acting according to the will and interest and, at the same time, imperfect, contradictory, tragic, with the inherent nature of the ability to make mistakes and the ability to complement the collective experience of humanity with mistakes.

The "Error", then in the "Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language" (Academic Explanatory Dictionary (1970-1980)) is represented in the meanings: incorrectness in counting, spelling, incorrectness, inaccuracy in any mechanism, device, in any scheme, map; actions, actions, misconception, misperceptions of someone, something. Besides, the category "False" is added - without a specific purpose, without any intention, inadvertently (Slovnyk ukrainskoi movy, 1976, p.118).

Consequently, the linguistic meaning combines mental activity and practical actions of a person, points to the mechanism of the implementation of the error: from misinterpretation and understanding in the mind, the wrong form of fixing information in it to the wrong actions. In the philosophical dictionary, a logical error is singled out as an error in the implications, reasoning, selection of definitions, evidence and refutations caused by violations of laws and distortions in the forms of thinking. Also, logical errors are divided into purely logical and semilogical. If a logical error can be corrected without knowledge of the subject, the substantive errors related to the content of the clause can be noticed and corrected only by those who know the subject (Filosofskyi entsyklopedychnyi slovnyk, 2002).

In the logical dictionary described the method of attempts and errors, as "heuristic search for the solution of any problem in the space of possible solutions; choosing the right decision is done at random, starting with the blind attempt, until, finally, one of the attempts will not lead to a positive result. " (Kondakov, 1975, p. 479)

"Formal logic does not separate objects, but true and false judgments, which may not be true just because they are combining, linking two different elements (as for the "mistakes" animals, then this is a violation of the experimenter's intention, the animal is always right), and in the situation of "trial and error" "errors" are not at all false, they are expedient) (Porshnev, 1974).

An important component in the study of errors in actions is the forecast - foresight, prediction) - a set of possible judgments based on the knowledge of the laws of nature, society and thinking and the ability of the human brain to reflect the reality in the near or distant future. Forecasting - (knowledge in advance) - the process of prediction, prophecy, the presentation of trends and prospects for the further development of certain objects and their future state based on knowledge of the laws governing their development in the past and the modern period. The forecasting methodology is based on special and universal scientific methods and principles. (Kondakov, 1975)

No less important is the analysis of such a concept as inference - a form of thinking or a logical action, as a result of which, from one or several related and well-known judgments, we obtain a new judgment, which contains new knowledge. New knowledge is acquired subject to certain conditions: as a result, the ratio of these judgments in the process of inference; between judgments should be a logical connection, which reflects the interdependence of objects and phenomena of the objective world.

Besides, in the dictionary, there are several types of errors: error regarding the consequences - a logical error, which consists in ignoring the possibility of a plurality of causes; the mistake of a hurried generalization; error in the conclusion by analogy;

It also contains the definitions of logical error - errors in reasoning, reasoning, highlighting definitions, evidence, and refutations, caused by a violation of laws and distortion of forms of thinking. (Kondakov, 1975, p. 314). Also, logical errors are divided into purely logical and half-logical. Logical errors differ from the object or factual errors, which are a distortion of the mental relations between objects in the objective world.

Subject errors include errors of this kind as error of chance, a reverse error of chance, violation of inference, false reason, and the like. If a logical error can be corrected without knowledge of the subject, then object errors related to the content of the inference can be noticed and corrected only by those who know the subject (Kondakov, 1975.).

Consequently, the concept of a mistake in logic is concentrated in the thoughts of a person when he makes inferences, but they can manifest themselves in reality through the implementation of erroneous actions by a person.

Obviously, the following criteria should be considered as the basis for the definition of "error": error - an unintentional (without a certain intent) deviations from the correct actions, deeds, thoughts; incorrect reasoning caused by the violation of the laws of thinking; the difference between the expected and the actual result.

Since the activity is structured, directed to achieve the goal through purposefulness or goal-setting, moreover, it distinguishes human activity from the actions of an animal, human labor becomes meaningful in its particular incarnation. Meaningfulness, in turn, allows a person to reflect on the process of their activities. And in the process of this reflection to identify alternative scenarios or the fallacy of the discrepancy (undesirability) to the variant that was thoughtful from the very beginning.

We agree with Safin, that the goal of the activity to a greater or lesser extent almost always differs from the result. We must take into account the fact that there is a certain range of deviations, being in which the result of an activity can be defined as meeting the set goal. The error, in this case, can be determined by such a result that goes beyond a certain range of deviations (Safin, 2013, p. 157 - 162.)

The ability of a person to reflect on the process of their activities, to evaluate its results allowed a person to show an error. In this case, a prerequisite will be the presence of a unit of measurement for comparison with the result of human activity. In analyzing the error and its place in the structure of human activity, the modern Russian philosopher Safin focuses on the fact that the purpose of the activity to a greater or lesser extent almost always differs from the result. This state of affairs implies the existence of a range of deviations, according to which the result of an activity can be defined as what corresponds to or does not correspond to the set goal. In this case, an error may determine such a result that goes beyond a certain range of deviations (Safin 2013).

So, if you focus on the fact that the error can take on different meanings - discrepancies, irregularities, real otherness conceived with the (planned) result (strategy) - This state of affairs suggests the existence of specific rules (rules) or the ideal model (behavior model) with which comparison and evaluation takes place (Safin, 2013).

The social system is based on certain rules of behavior, act as a role model and criterion for assessing the behavior of the subject. Thus, in the legal space, anthropological spheres are reflected through legal consciousness in legal or unlawful behavior in the process of interaction between personality and community (Zavalniuk, 2009).

The criteria for determining organizational and behavioral errors are regulations, instructions, and regulations corresponding to the level of culture, traditions, and religion of a separate community. The rules of behavior developed by a particular community in the appropriate time and space, possessing signs of imperialism and compulsoriness for individuals, exist to ensure the conditions of harmony between the existence and development of a separate community. Moral principles and norms, although laid down in the basis of law, but have a subjective dimension, act as an internal regulator of our life activity, allows us to judge about good and evil, good and bad, both around us and in ourselves. In different ways, the observance of the norms of law and morals is also ensured, and the consequences of their violation are different.

An important sign of "error" is temporality. The activity is structured, directed to achieve the goal through dedication or goal-setting. Through labor, the activity becomes meaningful in its concrete incarnation. Meaningfulness, in turn, allows a person to reflect on the process of their activities. And in the process of this reflection to identify alternative scenarios or the fallacy of the discrepancy (undesirability) to the variant that was thoughtful from the very beginning. Consequently, the phenomenon of "error" in the structure of human activity is directly related to the ability to reflect on the process of its activity. A person realizes a mistake after the fact when the action has already been performed, i.e. there is already a certain result. Its paradox is that the error cannot be included in the action plan, foreseen in advance - in this case, as we have already explained, it ceases to be an "error", and the subsequent analysis of such actions and their assessment will be carried out in the field of legal discourse. (Safin, 2013)

A characteristic feature of the "error" is its ability to split the human being. The ontological space is determined by the impossibility of

returning the result to the original state, the goal. A person, who analyzes his activity, identifies his mistake, approaches his immediate consequences that occur in the real world, and analyzes possible (other) ways to prevent an error. So, as a result of reflection, a split of being arises, another, virtual reality, another perspective is created. Moreover, an attempt to beat up alternative ways of a person's fate, to admit the very fact of an error, an attempt to fix this fork, split the life (before the error / after the error) - only by relying on social experience (Safin, 2013).

So, virtual space puts a person in the need to exist simultaneously in two realities (real and virtual), these realities are in conflict, they have several options for getting out: forget, not pay attention, avoid reflection, put in the subconscious, pretend that nothing happens, be confident, hope in your irresponsibility, or live with a sense of remorse and guilt.

Thus, research has shown that the sense of shame and guilt of employees who have made a mistake is transformed. They had a feeling of guilt for a long time, which negatively influenced their future work and formed an underestimated self-esteem and uncertainty in the choice of further actions. (Banister et al., 1996; Manasse et al., 2002).

The anthropological and ontological components of the error phenomenon associate it with the social phenomenon. Social manifests itself as a space in which a person not only makes mistakes but also works to correct them. Thus, the error not only forms the personal experience of man, it becomes the heritage of mankind. Here, a person can rely not only on his personal experience but also on the practical knowledge of his fellow tribesmen, relatives, neighbors. The error can be one of the most important components of not only social consciousness but also social being. It becomes a kind of catalyst for public relations. Even if we consider an error in its utilitarian-pragmatic function (the derivation of norms and rules to maintain a minimum level of vital activity), it will be obvious that the error carries a huge potential for anthroposociogenesis.

Conclusion Error is an integral part of the practical-objective human activity, is an anthropological phenomenon, in turn, is the result of the formation of "reasonable man", an integral part of human nature, and therefore, as there is no "infallible person" in nature, so there is no insured against errors. The error is inseparable from the person, associated with reflection, has signs of temporality, causes a split in human existence. An accidental, unplanned, unintentional, irrevocable error that occurs in a person's thoughts due to misinterpretation or misunderstanding, is reflected in her actions, is the difference between expectation and result, has

negative consequences. The anthropological and ontological components of the error phenomenon associate it with the social phenomenon. Social manifests itself as a space in which a person not only makes mistakes but also works to correct them. Thus, the error not only forms the personal experience of a person, but it also becomes the property of mankind, it carries a huge potential for anthroposociogenesis.

Prospects for further work may be in the study of the phenomenon of error in the further study of the socio-anthropological characteristics of society and man.

References:

1. Andros, Ye.(2017) Volodymyr Shynkaruk: antropohichnyi povorot v ukrainskii filosofii druhoi polovyny XX storichchia. *Filosofska dumka*, № 1, 66-73. (in Ukrainian)
2. Banister, G., Butt, L., Hackel, R. (1996). How nurses perceive medication errors. *Nursing Management* 27(1),31-34. [PubMed] doi: <https://doi.org/10.1097/00006247-199601000-00009> .(in English)
3. Berdiaev, N. (1993) *O naznachenii cheloveka*. Moscow: Respublika, 383 (in Russian)
4. *Filosofskiy entsyklopedychnyi slovnyk* (2002) / holova redkol. V.I. Shynkaruk. Kyiv: Abrys, 163 -164. (in Ukrainian)
5. Freyd, Z. Oshibochnyie deystviya : Vvedenie v psihoanaliz / Z. Freyd; per. s nem G.B. Baryshnikovoy. – M. : AST Moskva, 2010. – 253 s. (in Russian)
6. Gusserl, E. Kartezijskie meditatsii [Tekst] / E. Gusserl // *Sobr. soch. / per. s nem. V.I. Molchanova*. – M. : Dom intellektualnoy knigi, 2001. – 141 s. (in Russian)
7. Ivanov, V. (1977) *Chelovecheskaia deiatelnost - poznanie - iskusstvo*. Kiev: Naukova dumka, 252 (in Russian)
8. Kondakov, N.(1975) *Logicheskii slovar-spravochnik*. Moscow: Nauka, 722 . (in Russian)
9. Manasse, H., Turnbull, J., Diamond, L. (2002). Patient safety: A review of the contemporary American experience. *Singapore Medical Journal*, 43(5), 254–262. [PubMed]. - Retrieved from :<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK216181/>. (in English)
10. Porshnev, B. (1974) *O nachale chelovecheskoi istorii (problemy paleopsikhologii)*. Moscow: Izdatelstvo "Mysl", 488 (in Russian)
11. Safin, A. (2013). *Fenomen oshibki v strukture chelovecheskoi deiatelnosti*. *Uchenye zapiski Kazanskogo universiteta*. 133, kn. 1: Gumanitarnye nauki. 159 - 162. Retrieved from: <http://docplayer.ru/44949436-Fenomen-oshibki-v-strukture-chelovecheskoy-deyatelnosti-a-m-safin.html>). (in Russian)
12. Sheler, M. (1988) *Polozhenie cheloveka v Kosmose* / M.Sheler [Perevod Filippov A.] // *Problema cheloveka v zapadnoi filosofii*. - Moscow: Izdatelstvo

- «Progress», 31-95 Retrieved from: <http://sophia.nau.edu.ua/2010-07-29-11-48-45/2010-07-29-11-55-07/101-2010-07-31-11-59-14>. (in Russian)
13. Slovník ukraïnskoi movy: v 11 tt. (1976) AN URSR. Instytut movoznavstva; za red. I. K. Bilodida. Kiev: Naukova dumka, 7, 118. (in Ukrainian).
14. Zachos P., Pruzek R., Hick T.(2003) Approaching Error in Scientific Knowledge and Science Education. 7th International History, Philosophy of Science and Science Teaching Conference Proceedings, Winnipeg, 2003, 947-957. Retrieved from: <https://acase.org/files/approachingerror.pdf>). (in English)
15. Zavalniuk, V. (2009) Antropolohichni vymir sfer buttia liudyny: henezys pohliadiv. Naukovi pratsi Odeskoi natsionalnoi yurydychnoi akademii, T.8, 63-71. (in Ukrainian)

The Author

Moisieienko Larysa

*Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor
of Management Department, Acting Dean
of the Faculty of Technology and Production
Management, Industrial Institute of the State Higher
Educational Institution "Donetsk National
Technical University",
Pokrovsk, Ukraine
ORCID. 0000-0001-6581-6789
E-mail. larisamoiseenko14@gmail.com*

Abstracts

MOISEENKO LARYSA. Błąd jako zjawisko antropologiczne. Celem pracy jest zbadanie pojęcia „błądu” poprzez pryzmat antropologii filozoficznej i aspektów działalności ludzkiej egzystencji. Teoretyczne podstawy pracy obejmują systematyczne podejście w połączeniu z metodami ogólnej wiedzy naukowej i metod specjalnych (kategorycznych, formalno-logicznych), metod analizy, porównywania, w tym środków analizy dyskursywnej i ogólnych zasad nauki historycznej i filozoficznej. Autor przeprowadził istotną i pouczającą analizę pojęcia „błądu” przez pryzmat antropologii filozoficznej. Pokazano, że błąd jest integralną częścią praktycznie obiektywnej działalności człowieka, jest zjawiskiem antropologicznym, z kolei jest wynikiem formowania „rozsądnej osoby”, integralnej części ludzkiej natury. Błąd związany jest z refleksją, ma oznaki czasowości, powoduje rozłam w ludzkiej egzystencji. Przypadkowy,

nieplanowany, niezamierzony, nieodwołalny błąd, który pojawia się w myślach osoby z powodu błędnej interpretacji lub niezrozumienia, znajduje odzwierciedlenie w jej działaniach, jest różnica między oczekiwaniem a wynikiem, ma negatywne konsekwencje.

Słowa kluczowe: *zjawisko błędu, dyskurs, antropologia, aksjologia, człowiek.*

МОЙСЕЄНКО ЛАРИСА. Помилка як антропологічний феномен. *Мета роботи полягає у дослідженні поняття “помилка” через призму філософської антропології та діяльнісні аспекти людського буття. Теоретичний базис роботи включає системний підхід у поєднанні з методами загальнонаукового пізнання та спеціальних методів (категоріального, формально-логічного), методів аналізу, порівняння; включає засоби дискурсивної аналітики і загальні принципи історико-філософської науки. Автором здійснений сутнісно-змістовий аналіз поняття “помилка” через призму філософської антропології. Показано, що помилка є невід’ємною частиною практично-предметної діяльності людини, є антропологічним феноменом, що в свою чергу є результатом становлення “людини розумної”, невід’ємною складовою природи людини. Помилка пов’язана з рефлексією, володіє ознаками темпоральності, викликає роздвоєння людського буття. Помилка випадкова, незапланована, ненавмисна, безповоротна дія, що виникає в думках людини через неправильне трактування або розуміння, відображається в її діях, є розходженням між очікуванням та результатом, має негативні наслідки.*

Ключові слова: *феномен помилки, дискурс, антропологія, аксіологія, людина.*

МОЙСЕЄНКО ЛАРИСА. Ошибка как антропологический феномен. *Цель работы заключается в исследовании понятия «ошибка» сквозь призму философской антропологии и деятельностные аспекты человеческого бытия. Теоретический базис работы включает системный подход в сочетании с методами общенаучного познания и специальных методов (категориального, формально-логического), методов анализа, сравнения, включая средства дискурсивной аналитики и общие принципы историко-философской науки. Автором осуществлен сущностно-содержательный анализ понятия “ошибка” через призму философской антропологии. Показано, что ошибка является неотъемлемой частью практически-предметной деятельности человека, является антропологическим феноменом, в*

свою очередь является результатом становления "человека разумного", неотъемлемой составляющей природы человека. Ошибка связана с рефлексией, обладает признаками темпоральности, вызывает раздвоение человеческого бытия. Ошибка случайная, незапланированная, непреднамеренная, безвозвратная действие, возникающее в мыслях человека из-за неправильного толкования или понимания, отражается в ее действиях, является различием между ожиданием и результатом, имеет негативные последствия.

Ключевые слова: феномен ошибки, дискурс, антропология, аксиология, человек.

MOISIEIENKO LARYSA. **Mistake as an anthropological phenomenon.** The aim of the work is to study the concept of "error" through the prism of philosophical anthropology and the activities of aspects of human existence. The theoretical basis of work includes a system approach in combination with methods of general scientific knowledge and special methods (categorical, formal logic), methods of analysis, comparison; includes the means of discursive analytics and general principles of historical and philosophical science. The author carried out a substantive analysis of the concept of "error" through the prism of philosophical anthropology. It is shown that the error is an integral part of the substantive human activity, is an anthropological phenomenon, which in turn is the result of the formation of a "reasonable person", an integral part of human nature. The error is related to the reflection, it has signs of temporality, causes the split of human existence. An accidental, unplanned, unintentional, irreversible action that occurs in the minds of a person due to an incorrect interpretation or understanding, reflected in its actions, a distinction between expectations and result, has a negative impact.

Keywords: the phenomenon of error, discourse, anthropology, axiology, person.