"Self" as a Condition and Mechanism of Personality Formation

Rosin VM*

Institute of Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Russia

*Corresponding Author: Rosin VM, Institute of Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Russia.

Abstract

The article examines the conditions and mechanisms of the formation of personality and selfhood in phylo and ontogenesis. The research methodology is characterized, cases are offered as empirical material. The stages of personality formation are outlined: the prerequisites when the integrity and certainty of behavior is set from the outside (parents or social collective), the crisis of prama or belief in gods, the transition to independent behavior, involving the creation of private schemes, as well as individual ideas about the world and oneself, assembly into integrity I am separate events and states, the formation of the governing instance of the personality. The formation of the personality and the subject is compared. The article ends with the author's recollections of the emergence and development of his own personality.

Keywords: Personality; Self; Subject; Individual; I; Formation; Crisis; Resolution; Integrity

Introduction

The considerations below are inspired by reflections after reading an interesting article by Vadim Petrovsky UNIFORM "I" ("Over-situational interview". Research results), which discusses the phenomena of "I", "self", "subjectivity", "individuality" and others. Interest in these topics has clearly intensified, since at present there is an awareness and theoretical design of new types of education (tutor, open, family, foreign language, ecosystem, integrative, inclusive), in which the listed phenomena underlie the corresponding limiting ontologies. For example, in tutor education, one has to comprehend the dilemma "individualization or personalization" and re-establish itself in the concepts of "I", "personality", "subject", "subjectivity", "individual", "individuality", "self", "self-education" and others [13,14,18, p. 66-75]. But even earlier, Efim Passov, discussing the concept of foreign education, wrote: "Development occurs in the process of human interaction with the environment, in the process of teaching, upbringing and mastering linguistic means, due to the inclusion of a person (student) in creative activity, as a result of which his consciousness and self-awareness are formed".

It is the latter that determines all the "self" necessary for the formation of a person: the transition of "learning" into self-study, discipline into self-discipline, organization into self-organization, determination into self-determination, etc. and finally, education into self-education <...> psyche is not just some kind of capacity, which is filled with information, the psyche is a process, a process of interaction with the environment, as a result of which it is formed and developed <...>.

Education is the creation of an image - oneself, the world, one's actions in the world ("the whole space of images" - VP Zinchenko). Image - a sample can be set from the outside, but it is better if a person builds it himself; therefore, any education is, ultimately, self-education: a person transforms himself, becomes an individuality" [8, p. 9, 48, 32].

Starting to consider the concepts of self, personality and subjectivity, I will point out the methodology. It includes the formulation of problems, a combination of phylo and ontogenetic approaches, a comparison of normal and abnormal forms of an individual's behavior.

The author's approach is set by two disciplines - the humanities and the author's version of the methodology. In addition, he considers the formation of personality and "I", on the one hand, as it happened in history, on the other hand, it took place in ontogeny. In the historical consideration of personality development, the features of ontogenetic development are used as analogies and vice versa. The step of formation and development, the author believes, is set by the problem situation, its resolution with the help of schemes, the construction of ideal objects and concepts on their basis, and finally, the comprehension of the new reality and the objects included in them. The personality and "I" go through many steps in their formation and development that need to be reconstructed and described. I'll start with a hypothesis about early childhood. We usually think that both the adult and the young child are holistic subjects. For example, they distinguish between their different states - reality and dream, ordinary objects and their images. We are convinced that a person understands what kind of relationships I connect different realities, for example, he does not identify events in a dream and during wakefulness, considering the first non-existent, illusory, similarly, he distinguishes drawn objects from real ones. But here are two facts from early childhood. The author recalls a dream he had during the war near Kuibyshev when he was five years old.

"My mother worked day and night at an aircraft factory and only occasionally snatched a few hours a month to visit me and my brother in kindergarten. But almost always she brought something delicious - cocoa in a thermos, or chocolate or something else. And so I stubbornly began to dream a dream with my mother and tasty things in addition. It is understandable how upset I was when I woke up: there was neither mom nor cocoa. Finally, in order not to be deceived and not be upset in vain, I decided to test myself: pinch my ear, if it hurts, I do not sleep, if it doesn't hurt, I sleep. And on the same night I had another dream. Mom arrives, I tug at my ear, make sure I'm not sleeping, drink cocoa and then... wake up. Then everything is clear. The power of grief has firmly imprinted this dream in my memory" [15, p. 97].

Second fact. Very young children, from one to two, two and a half years old, do not distinguish between ordinary objects and their naturally created images. For example, my little daughter has repeatedly tried to pick up a beautiful apple painted on oilcloth. I also remember my impressions of the disease (autometamorphopsia) when I was about four years old: I see my hands as huge and existing independently of me.

So, the hypothesis is as follows: a small child goes through a period in which he does not perceive himself as a single being, does not perceive the world, where everything has its place and understandable relations between individual events, instead of such a unity before him there are separate wholes - events in a dream, objects, including images, organs of your body, and all these events and wholes are not interconnected and live their own lives. Similar observations take place in phylogenesis. For example, some aborigines confuse events in a dream and in reality (travelers I. Hanzelka and M. Zikmund describe one tribe in South America, where one of the aborigines shot his neighbor, because he had a dream in which the latter killed his relative [4]). My former graduate student Ivan Manin formulates a similar hypothesis about human consciousness in Homeric times.

"How does Homeric's husband function? It cannot be presented as some kind of integrity (subject, individual or personality), since it does not have any independent organization (conscious or volitional). The husband has separate organs, not assembled into something whole (we can talk about their independence from each other). They do not form a joint unity. Each of them serves as a whole.

The organs of Homer's husband act (move, twitch, etc.) by themselves: now one, then the other. Moreover, this applies not only to the so-called "bodily" organs, but also to those that researchers cannot identify otherwise than "psychic" (ητορ, θυμος, φρην and others).

In addition, every single organ immediately suffers from any impact. The specificity of such organic suffering (suffering) is that it is non-reflective. The husband's consciousness with its reflexive function has not yet been formed. The non-reflexivity of enduring allows the husband to directly experience what is happening (to be present "here" and "now") [7].

The second hypothesis characterizes the way of controlling behavior in the "culture of childhood" [16]: the parents make decisions for the child, they guide him and explain how to behave, and why this is and not otherwise. Comprehending this fact, L.S. Vygotsky even intro-

duced the strange concept of "prama", designed to emphasize that in childhood, the child and the parents form one whole. In the reality of prama, the governing principle is the parents, and the child, as a part of the prama, is led by their instructions and support. In phylogeny, there is a similar whole, but instead of parents there were pagan gods who, the man of the Ancient World was convinced, not only created the world and himself, but also guide and support man. Modern cultural studies show that a person of that time was not aware of himself separately from the social collective and did not act independently, i.e. was not a person.

The idea of prama makes it possible to understand how a child in childhood acts and realizes himself adequately, despite the fact that his consciousness is not whole. Integrity and adequacy are ensured by the parents.

One of the first preconditions of personality and itself (so far we are talking only about preconditions) were problematic situations caused by the crisis of prama in ontogeny and belief in gods in phylogeny. Parents send their children to school and induce them to behave independently; man of the ancient world in the second millennium BC lost faith in the support of the gods. In the Old Babylonian poems about the "Innocent Sufferer" and "Babylonian Theodicy" you can read:

"You are standing on the ground, God's plans are far away

Will you teach God to follow you like a dog?...

Either he wants rituals from you, then "Do not ask God!"

Then something else [6, p. 122, 140]

"I would like to know that God is pleased;

What is good for a man is a crime against God,

What is disgusting for him is good for his god!

Who will know the will of the gods in heaven"? [6, p. 120].

Solving this problematic situation, a person begins to act independently, provided that he succeeds in taking a fresh look at the world and at himself. He comes to the idea that the gods for a while can provide a person with freedom, they, of course, are and can help, but only in the most urgent situations, and in ordinary situations, a person must act himself. A person himself can act because he is not like everyone else, special. As Socrates says at the trial that he is a special person, the gods will take care of him even after death, that his "daimony", genius (probably descended from a "personal god"), on the one hand, gives Socrates freedom, on the other - in difficult situations comes to the rescue.

"Thanks to divine destiny," Socrates says, from early childhood I have been accompanied by a certain genius - this is a voice that, when I hear it, always, no matter what I am about to do, tells me to give up, but never encourages me to do anything. And if, when one of my friends consults with me, I hear this voice, it warns me in the same way and does not allow me to act [9, p. 122].

Socrates tries to justify his specialness also socially.

"Indeed," he explains to the judges and prosecutors, "if you kill me, it will not be easy for you to find another person who, funny to say, is assigned to the city like a gadfly to a horse, large and noble, but lazy from obesity and needy is to be customized. In fact, it seems to me that God sent me to the city as someone who all day, without ceasing, to sit down everywhere and wakes each of you, persuades, reproaches" [10, p. 85].

The transition to independent behavior presupposes two important conditions: the creation of "private schemes" and a special construction of oneself. It is the schemes (both "coherent", common for everyone, and private, created by individuals for themselves) that allow us to resolve problem situations. At the same time, they create a new reality in which it becomes clear what is happening, and there is an opportunity to act in a new way. So, Socrates at the trial opposes his convictions (they can be interpreted as private schemes) to the convictions of the Athenians (coherent schemes). He says that the Athenians are afraid of death and live for the sake of glory and wealth, and death is rather good and one must live for the sake of truth and virtue. In addition, Socrates argues that a person can stick to their beliefs, even despite the fear of death.

Historical material suggests that for a long time the construction of oneself, which ensures independent behavior, is not "I", and not a person. For Plato, for example, this is a soul that has two mismatched characteristics: on the one hand, it seems to be no different from the archaic soul (it leaves the body and enters it, is eternal), but on the other hand, it resembles a person in the sense that it can ponder your life and choose your destiny.

Thus, in The State, Plato describes the vicissitudes of souls in the afterlife. Although the fate of a person is completely determined by the gods of the afterlife, however, the choice of further fate (lot) is interpreted by Plato as quite natural, due to how a person lived, what his mind and personality are.

"After these words of the soothsayer, the one who got the first lot immediately approached, he took the life of a powerful tyrant (above the goddess of fate Lachesis, who threw lots into the crowd of souls, said: "Virtue is not the property of anyone alone, honoring or not honoring her, everyone participates in it more or less. This is the fault of the elect, God is not guilty"- VR). Because of his folly and insatiability, he made a choice without thinking, and there was a fateful fate for him - devouring his own children and other all kinds of misfortunes. When he then, without haste, reflected, he began to beat himself in the chest, grieving that, making his choice, he did not take into account the warning of the soothsayer, he blamed not himself for these troubles, but fate, the gods - everything except himself <...> By chance, the last of all the lot fell to go to the soul of Odysseus. She remembered the old hardships and, casting aside all ambition, wandered for a long time, looking for the life of an ordinary person, far from business; finally, she forcibly found her, lying somewhere, after all, everyone neglected her, but the soul of Odysseus, as soon as she saw her, happily took it for herself" [11, p. 417, 418-419].

It turns out that the Platonic soul is both outside a person (then it is not it that determines the actions of a person, but the gods) and in him (in this case, it behaves like a person). And Plato says about himself, not I, but in the third person "such a person". It can be assumed that the construction of oneself at this stage of formation of self and personality is twofold - it is determined by the gods and determines itself. Technically, this duality could be expressed, for example, by the figure of speech - "I say to myself" and by action in relation to myself (I perform in relation to myself what I said to myself). As you can read in the codes of the Nagua people:

He had merits, he reprimanded himself:

Things were going well for him...

He was beside himself, did nothing,

Was worthy of nothing: he deserved only

Humiliation and destruction [12, p. 215].

It is easy to see that another condition for the formation of independent behavior was the "management structure". The individual acting independently had to split himself into two persons - the subject, the manager, making the decision (the one who "pronounced"), and the subject, executing the decision, controlled (the one who was reprimanded).

It can be assumed that it is the second hypostasis of the construction of oneself, which controlled and made the choice, after the alienation of the gods (the disintegration of prama) begins to integrate and collect separate states of a person (separate events of consciousness, organs of the body, images of the world) into the integrity of the "I" Another mechanism of integration and assembly was given by social communication. As Anatoly Akhutin shows, the consciousness of the ancient man was formed on the stage of the city and the theater within the framework of public communication. In the face of the public and the townspeople, a person had to demonstrate certain, consistent decisions and behavior, which presupposed the unity of consciousness. In turn, this unity was achieved through the integration and assembly of unrelated states of consciousness.

"Zeus," Akhutin explains, analyzing Aeschylus Oresteia, "puts Agamemnon in a situation of purely tragic amechania" [p. 35] (that is, the impossibility to act in conditions of necessity to act. - V.R.). Orestes finds himself in a similar situation of amechania, forced to kill his own mother). "In this place, which will not be passed, at this moment, which will not pass, everything recedes from him: the wills of the gods and the cosmic colossus of destinies, as it were, are waiting at the threshold of his consciousness, waiting for his own decision, which no god will prompt him in the ear and which will activate all these immensely superior forces [3, p. 35]. (The decision to kill his mother) is taken by Orestes because only in this way he can escape from blind obsessions - whether by rage of anger, or by panic or fear - into the bright field of consciousness [3, p.33].

(Akhutin explains why theater is in this case). "The hero, caught in a situation of tragic amechania, turns, as it were, turns to the viewer with a question. The viewer sees himself under the gaze of the hero and changes places with him. The theater and the city are mutually reversible. The theater is located in the city, but the whole city (and, in fact, the polis, ancient society. - V.R.) converges in the theater to learn life in front of the spectator, in front of a witness, in front of the face. This gaze of a possible witness and judge, the gaze under which I do not just do something bad or good, but for the first time I can appear as a hero, in the aesthetically finished body, face, fate - in a word, in "who", is the gaze of consciousness, from which one cannot hide. Consciousness is the witness and the judge is the spectator. To be conscious means to be in sight, in the square, in shame" [3, p. 20-21].

With the help of theatrical communication, the concept of personality also begins to form. As you know, the word "personality" comes from the Latin "persona", which in etymological terms coincides with the word "theatrical mask". Here, the construction of oneself under the influence of theatrical communication is differentiated into an internal "I" (under the mask, making a decision, managing) and an external "I" (for the public). Moreover, in the beginning, a person can do little in terms of independent behavior. This is evidenced by the poem "Metamorphoses" by Apuleius.

The hero of "Metamorphosis", a man in the body of a donkey, thinks and speaks from the first person - I am, but practically powerless.

"I was (recalls the hero of "Metamorphosis", Lucius, who turned into a donkey. - VR) rather dead than alive, from the weight of such a load, from the steepness of a high mountain and the length of the journey. Here, though late, but it seriously occurred to me to turn to the help of the civil authorities and, using the honored name of the emperor, to free myself from so many hardships. Finally, when, in the bright light of the sun, we were walking through some crowded village, where on the occasion of the market day there was a large crowd of people, in the midst of the crowd, in the native language of the Greeks, I tried to appeal to the name of the divine Caesar; but he exclaimed loudly and distinctly only "O" and could not pronounce the rest of the letters of Caesar. The robbers did not like my wild cry, and they trimmed my unfortunate skin so that it was no longer suitable even for a sieve" [2, p. 150-151].

However, at the beginning of the Middle Ages, St. Augustine's "I" has clearly gained strength and can already do a lot: to collect its different hypostases and states into a single whole, to be aware of itself, to project into the past and future. Perhaps, here we can already talk about the I, partly similar to the modern, about the personality and the very.

"I had nothing," writes Augustine, "to answer your words: "Wake up, sleeping one; Rise from the dead, and Christ will illumine you"... It was in vain that I sympathized with "Thy law, which was in accord with the inner man", when "another law in my members opposed

the law of my mind and made me a captive to the law of sin that is in my members". The sinful law is the power and force of habit, which attracts and holds the soul even against its will...

What thoughts did I not scourge my soul so that it would agree to my attempts to follow You! She resisted, renounced and did not excuse herself... as she was afraid of death, that she would be pulled out of her usual life, in which she had withered to death...

One has only to want to go, and you are not only walking, you are already at the goal, but you need to want to strongly, from the bottom of your heart, and not rush back and forth with your half-sick will, in which one desire fights with another, and then one thing takes over then another...

Where does this monstrous phenomenon come from?... The soul commands the body, and it immediately obeys; the soul commands itself - and meets a rebuff... The soul commands the soul to wish: after all, it is one and, nevertheless, it does not do according to the order...

"Let them perish at Thy presence," Lord, how they perish are "quibbles and seducers" who, noticing the presence of two desires in a person, declared that there are two souls of two natures in us: one is good and the other is evil...

When I was thinking about serving the Lord my God (as I put it long ago), I wanted this and I did not want this - and I was the same me. I didn't quite want to and didn't quite want to. Therefore, I fought with myself and was divided in myself, but this division did not testify to the nature of another soul, but only to the fact that my own was punished" [1, p. 104, 107, 108, 109].

Let us pay attention to how rich I am St. Augustine: these are two oppositely directed I (towards God and from God), I as a natural process and as an activity, I am reflective, deciding that in Augustine there are not two souls, but one, finally, I as a whole directed by God. But what kind of Self prevails and rules is not very clear; it seems that which is connected with God, however, why then this believing I do not obey other I?

This situation is somewhat similar to that which the author analyzed in the book "The Phenomenon of Multiple Personality". The subject of my research was an American young man Billy Milligan, consisting of two dozen individuals who Billy took for real people, for his family. One of Billy's family members, the intellectual Arthur, tried to control the rest of the people, claiming to represent Billy's whole personality. But nothing came of it, the rest of the family periodically escaped from under his leadership and committed antisocial actions, one of which (rape) led Billy to be arrested. Psychotherapists persuaded Billy to assemble himself with the help of psychoanalysis from individuals. For a while it seemed that it worked out, but, faced with a threat to his life, Billy again broke up into two dozen of his persons (people) [15, p. 28-30]. Of course, the personages of Billy Milligan bear little resemblance to the personalities of Augustine, however, there are similarities in terms of the feeling of incompleteness and the desire to find this wholeness.

Already in ancient culture, work begins, aimed at finding a power authority in a person, to which different hypostases of personality would obey. It was natural to use the right. Cicero indicates that a person is a legal entity. Tertullian continued this tradition in the Middle Ages. It is interesting that if the first virtue medieval knights considered victory in a duel, then the second - victory in court; defending one's rights for a medieval person characterized the personality.

But truly, a person as a power authority becomes a complete master of the situation only in the New Time, when a person is placed in the center of the world, where God used to stand, and is characterized as a master who, according to his own desire and image, can make himself ("Speech about dignity" Pico della Mirandola). As a "second God" (Nikolai Kuzansky), the person finally gathers himself as a whole, subjugating his other hypostases. Immanuel Kant already has such a person in mind when he defines it as "freedom over natural necessity". At the same time, working to strengthen the state, Kant argues that a person must voluntarily follow morality and law.

Unlike the concept of personality, the introduction of which allows Kant to resolve the dilemma of autonomy and social conditioning of the European man, the concept of the subject is introduced by Kant for assembling in cognition the diversity of individual impressions, which, according to the great German philosopher, threaten the splitting of the I into separate persons.

"Everything that is manifold in contemplation," writes Kant, "has... the necessary relation to [representation] I think in the very subject in which this diversity is located... only because I can comprehend the manifold representations in one consciousness, I call everything their ideas of mine; otherwise, I would have as motley and diverse I (Selbst) as I have conceived of ideas... " [5, p. 191-193].

It turns out that if the concept of personality solved primarily a social problem - the autonomy of a person and his relationship with society, then the concept of a subject - the problem of the nature of this autonomy in terms of cognition. Another thing is that by now these concepts, as well as the concepts of "I", "individual", "subjectivity", "individuality", "self" in many ways began to converge, blur and intersect [18, p. 66-75].

These are the stages and some mechanisms of the formation of self and personality, from the point of view of phylogenesis. It is the personality itself that acts as a condition; without it, neither independent behavior, nor self-knowledge, nor self-awareness, nor self-education are possible.

In ontogenesis, these stages and mechanisms are also evident, but since the formation of the personality proceeds in other conditions (prama, family, school, modern society and state, etc.) and the stages and mechanisms of the formation of the personality are modified. For example, differently than in the history of culture, the relationship of the individual with the social collective is formed, the governing authority is found with great difficulty, individual persons and human events are integrated into one whole in other ways. Following Vadim Petrovsky, who relied on personal experience and self-awareness, I want to end with a memory that characterizes the formation of your humble servant in the personality (that is, we are talking about the ontogenetic plan).

"I remember very well how my personality cut through. It was September 1st, after the summer vacation. I came to fourth grade and seemed to wake up. It was from this time that I perceived myself, looked closely at myself, observed myself. The sense of personality was so unusual that I well remembered my state and experiences. It seemed to me that everything that came before was disappearing into complete darkness. Only a few pictures were scattered in this dark past.

Quite different starts with the fourth grade. I just open myself, it seems to me that now I remember myself continuously, although this, of course, which I realized later, was an illusion. Thinking over why this happened, I found the reason, on the one hand, in reading books, it was by this time that I began to read quite confidently and a lot, on the other, that I went to school, and I was always alone at home (my father was in the army, and my mother disappeared at work). Books gave a form of self-awareness, and independent life at school and at home forced me to rebuild. I could no longer, as before counting on my mother's help, I had to rely on myself. Books suggested how to do this - to look at yourself from the outside, to see yourself, to characterize your I.

In general, by this time (fifth - sixth grade) I was completely living in books. Artistic events interested me much more than the poor post-war life around me. In those years, there were no TVs and players yet, there were practically no toys either. We lived in a huge house of the Wool-Cloth factory with a corridor system. At one end of the corridor was a communal kitchen, where I once watched a fantastic dance of fat rats for two minutes, at the other end of the corridor there were two shared toilets.

There were only two Jewish families in the house. Anti-Semitism flourished among both adults and their children. My brother and I had to defend our independence with the help of fists more than once, I remember, for example, how we stood in the courtyard surrounded by peers who were spitting at us in unison. All this also did not stimulate the desire to live with ordinary events, as soon as the opportunity arose, I tried to dive into the world of books, where noble ladies, gentlemen and villains walked, passions boiled, heroes tormented and

thought about life. When the opportunity did not stand out, I tried to create it myself, I read even at night under the covers, turning on the flashlight, and carefully, so as not to wake up my mother, I turned the pages.

Naturally, with such a lifestyle, I did not have time to prepare lessons. Every day I waited with fear to see if the teacher would call. But sooner or later my name was pronounced. As a result, I was so neglected that I was already afraid to go to school. For about two weeks or more, I took the subway instead of school. I found several badly torn tickets in ballot boxes behind the Electrozavodskaya station, and, holding the torn edge with my fingers, I passed the control room. In the subway I found a free bench and sat on it, swallowing another book. In due time, as if nothing had happened, I returned home. It would have gone on like this, no one knows how long, if someone from the class had not seen me on the subway and told the class teacher about it. I obeyed everything, promised to catch up with my studies and only asked not to tell my mother. She learned about this story just a few years ago from myself.

Around this time I read Oblomov and was shocked. For some reason I decided that I was an exact copy of Ilya Ilyich, in particular, I was as weak-willed as the latter, because I could not sit down to my lessons or clean up the room for the sake of a book. I was truly frightened, the prospect of overgrowing with scabs and the death of a living soul, brilliantly outlined by Goncharov, clearly appeared before me. I decided to save myself, educate my will. He started with a simple task - he tried not to say a word for two days. The next task was more difficult, then even more difficult. So, I entered the warpath with myself. Here, no doubt, there was an act. On this path, he suffered more failures than victories, but still did not stop fighting for many years. Gradually, my efforts, to my surprise, began to bear fruit, and by the ninth grade I became a fully organized young man. By this time, the family moved to the city of Anapa, which also contributed to the improvement of my personality.

Looking back from afar, I think that, oddly enough, a big role in the formation of his personality was played not only by the literature of the 19th and 20th centuries, which mother and father collected with love, but also by the general disorder of the life of that time, which led to the fact that I lived as if without parents. I either had to disappear, as happened with many peers, or become a person capable of independent behavior and comprehension of reality. For some reason, the last thing happened" [17, p. 47-49].

In this case, the "book binge" led to the fact that my barely formed personality begins to degrade: it disintegrated into separate persons, but not pathological, like in Billy Milligan, but simply asocial (I did not prepare lessons, skipped school, was weak-willed). And the very same books helped to accomplish a miracle (in general, the development of an individual person is often a real miracle). I realized that I was not well, no matter how adequate this awareness was. Fortunately, my governing authority turned out to be intact, which allowed me to start working on myself. In the course of this work, which stretched out over many years, I was able to reassemble myself, get rid of asocial persons, come up with the idea of self-education and the conscious construction of my life.

It's not for me to judge what came of it. As it is right, Sergei Averintsev once remarked that "a man is not his own judge". However, in the process of personality formation, he himself is sometimes forced to become something like a judge and manager in relation to himself. However, not only in the process of personality formation, but also in periods of resolution of existential crises of individual life. I personally do not know people who have managed to avoid such crises. However, not everyone managed to cope with them with dignity.

Conclusion

The proposed reconstruction of the formation of personality and selfhood shows that they do not take shape at once, but go through several stages before the disparate states of consciousness of the individual are assembled into an "I" capable of making choices, reflection and work in relation to oneself. At the same time, the processes of personality formation in ontogeny repeat structurally phylogenetic processes, but only structurally, because formation in ontogenesis proceeds under different conditions. The necessary conditions for the formation of a personality are the resolution of existential problem situations, the construction of private schemes, the formation of a governing authority, and in terms of phylogeny, the next anthropological challenges of the time. Currently, humanity is again facing a similar challenge, to which it is likely to respond with another personality transformation.

Bibliography

1. Augustine Aurelius. "Confession". M: Respublika (1992): 322.

2. "Apuleius Apology, or speech in defense of oneself from accusations of magic". Apology. Metamorphoses. Florida. M: Nauka (1960): 434.

3. Akhutin AV. "Opening of consciousness. Man and culture". Moscow: Nauka (1990): S5-S43.

4. Hanzelka I and Zikmund M. "Between two oceans". M: Young Guard (1961): 101.

5. Kant I. "Critique of Pure Reason". Op. 6 t. Volume 3. M: Mysl (1964): 799.

6. Klochkov IS. "Spiritual culture of Babylonia: man, destiny, time". M: Nauka (1983): 210.

7. Manin I. "Formation of the ancient man and the practice of oneself (philosophical and anthropological analysis)". Auth. Cand. diss. (manuscript).

8. Passov EI. "Program-concept of communicative foreign language education. "Development of individuality in the dialogue of cultures"". M: Education (2000): 161.

9. Plato Theagus. "Collected works in 4 volumes". Volume 1, M., "Mysl" (1990): 112-125.

10. Plato Apology of Socrates. Sobr. op. in 4 volumes. T. 1. M: Mysl (1994): 70-97.

11. Plato. State. Sobr. op. in 4 volumes. T. 3. M: Mysl (1994): 79-421.

12. Portilla M. "Philosophy of the Nagua. Research of sources". M: Inost. lit. (1961): 384.

13. Rozin VM and Kovaleva TM. "A look at personality development: features of the modern context". *Pedagogy* 1 (2021): S25-S34.

14. Rozin VM and Kovaleva TM. "Personanalization or individuation nalration ration or cultural and environmental approaches". *Pedagogic* 9 (2020): 18-28.

15. Rozin VM. "The Phenomenon of Multiple Personality: Based on Daniel Keyes's book "Billy Milligan's Multiple Minds"". Edition. 4th. M: LENAND (2015): 200.

16. Rozin VM. "Cultures of childhood and old age: the formation of individual life and its completion". *Culture and Art*. 2-3 (2014): 138-170, 263-275.

17. Rozin VM. "Philosophical and pedagogical studies". Yoshkar-Ola: Volga State Technological University (2015): 184.

18. Rozin VM. "Education in the era of the Internet and individualization (wake-up self-determination to help a tutor)". M: New chronograph (2020): 200s.

Volume 10 Issue 6 June 2021