

---

## ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

---

UDC 141.319.8(045)

Y. O. SHABANOVA<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1\*</sup> Dnipro University of Technology (Dnipro, Ukraine), e-mail jshabanova@ukr.net, ORCID 0000-0001-5876-4140

### METAMODERNISM MAN IN THE WORLDVIEW DIMENSION OF NEW CULTURAL PARADIGM

**Purpose.** The research is based on the comprehension of the anthropological tendencies of the metamodernism, which presupposes the consistent solution of the following tasks: a) explication of the content of post-modernism in modern philosophical literature; b) identification of the ideological basis of metamodernism anthropology; c) characteristics of the problem field of metamodernism anthropology and the state of man in the modern era. **Theoretical basis.** Anthropology of the metamodernism for the first time defines socio-cultural context through the hesitant state between the values of modernism and their rejection by the postmodernism, which makes it possible to formulate the peculiarity of the time as a desire to reconstruct a Holistic Man, impartial to the dominant worldview attitudes of a social nature. Anthropology of the metamodernism is presented as the individualization of the socio-cultural space in the form of human self-reconstruction at all anthropological levels. An era without an unambiguously expressed moral guideline is based on the ethics of all-acceptance, the only justification of which is the existence of a universal right to beingness. Digitalization as a process of digital transformation of society creates conditions for the value realization of the free choice of metamodernism man, through which a Holistic Man is accomplished. **Originality.** It is substantiated that metamodernism as a descriptive position of the modern cultural dominant of the digitalized era is characterized by a state of hesitation between the values of modernism and postmodernism. The anthropology of the metamodernism manifests itself in the form of the reconstruction of the holistic man and the self-reconstruction of the inner man. The peculiarities of the human metamodernism are recognized as the mutual complete determinability of the individual and the mass. **Conclusions.** Metamodernism is the formulation of the problem of a man in a new perspective: what to be and how to survive between the extremes of semantic poles, without losing dignity and unique intrinsic value. Proceeding from this, the fate of a metamodernism man is determined in pursuit of the endlessly receding horizons of the anthropology of incompleteness, which is carried out through post-irony, naive sincerity, optimistic openness to the world.

*Keywords:* metamodernism; holistic man; hesitation; modernism; postmodernism; anthropological reconstruction

#### Introduction

The world of postmodern man is much more complex than the world of man of modernism. The instability of human life is due to the individualized society, which has replaced the society of the mass consumer. An individual is lost in the world of cyberspace, technical simulation and unjustified risks of losing personality. Postmodern simulacra and metanarratives were expressed in the extreme deconstruction of the human phenomenon. "Death of the Subject" (Foucault, 1994), "The Death of the Author" (Barthes, 1994), "The End of the History" (Fukuyama, 2009), turned out to be dead-end sentences.

After the irony, sarcasm and criticism of modernism by the postmodernism, at the end of the 90s of the 20th century, a tendency towards changes in the worldview is brewing. Infertility of

## ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

postmodernism, which generates simulacra as copies of copies, the originals of which no longer exist, is fraying. There is a need to revise the values and meanings assigned to the postmodernism, the renewal of which is increasingly taking place due to the rethinking of the ideals of modernism. At the same time, all the tools accumulated by the postmodernism are preserved, and the cultural space of the beginning of the 21st century generates a request to search for the meanings of human existence in the context of new cultural tendencies. In this hesitation between irony, skepticism, criticism of the postmodernism and the rational purity of the modernism ideals, something new appears, which has received the conditional name post-postmodernism, one of the brightest manifestations of which is metamodernism, requiring philosophical and anthropological comprehension.

### Purpose

Based on the foregoing, the purpose of the article is to comprehend the anthropological tendencies of the metamodernism, which implies a consistent solution of the following tasks: a) explication of the content of post-postmodernism in modern philosophical literature; b) identification of the ideological basis of metamodern anthropology; c) characteristics of the problem field of metamodern anthropology and the state of man in the modern era.

### Statement of basic materials

#### *Conceptual content of post-postmodernism*

The term "post-postmodernism" is rather unstable and not fully defined, but it still contains a hint of a new cultural paradigm. I cannot unequivocally agree that post-postmodernism, like the modern period, is distinguished by a fundamentally new understanding of the essence of human existence. It would be too presumptuous to claim post-postmodernism as an established and independent era. But, at the end of the 90s of the 20th century, postmodern theorists are increasingly beginning to talk about fatigue from infertility of postmodernism, which has lost a man in the tinsel of fruitless intellectual speculations. By the mid-1980s, Canadian authors Arthur Kroker and David Cook (1988) wrote about the next cultural stage after the postmodernism, calling it "hypermodernism" or "hypermodernity". Authors such as Scott Lash (1990), Jeffrey Alexander and Paul Colomy (1991), Perry Anderson (2006) are talking about the fact that postmodernism is losing ground and ending its implementation since the late 1990s. Zygmunt Bauman (1997), author of numerous works on the sociology of postmodernism, at the end of the 90s introduces the concept of "postmodernity", meaningfully different from postmodernism. In 2000, his book "Liquid Modernity" (Bauman, 2000) was published, in which the modern stage of cultural development is no longer called postmodernism.

In the early 2000s, postmodern fatigue reached a crisis, and many researchers are trying to substantiate modern culture in new terms. Canadian postmodern scholar Linda Hutcheon (2002), in her book "The Politics of Postmodernism", invites everyone to recognize the end of postmodernism and to support the term "post-postmodernism" that is appropriate for the modern era. Jeffrey Nealon (2012) in his book "Post-Postmodernism or, The Cultural Logic of Just-in-Time Capitalism" supported and conceptually developed this idea. The very concept of "post-postmodernism" is a general designation of new tendencies in the cultural space and includes many branches, the common place of which is legitimization of modernity and building a new state of culture on the toolkit of postmodernism. In a wide range of cultural realities of post-

## ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

postmodernism asserts the leadership of the metamodernism, which by 2010 is replacing the term "post-postmodern" from cultural-philosophical discourse. Metamodernism poses a problem of man in the era of digitalization as the main subject of its interpretation.

*Anthropological accentuation of the Metamodernism*

Metamodernism, stepping over postmodern relativism and conceptual plurality, seeks to fix and create a new description of anthropological reality. The fast-paced variability of the modern world leaves no time for static system developments that become obsolete before they mature. Obviously, this feature of the modern era, which began its countdown, conditionally from the new century, determined the specificity of metamodernism, which moves away from mono-determination, ideology and chooses dynamism and variability as its attribute. But what is behind this variability? Is metamodernism a new anthropological paradigm or just a new construction of "isms", the tendencies of which have no chance to develop into a mature cultural phenomenon? Time will tell, relying on the essential milestones of evolution hidden from man, but while being in today, let us try to figure out what the metamodernism is trying to express?

The paradox of the metamodernism genesis, which lies in the compatibility of incompatible binary oppositions of modernism and its criticism in the face of postmodernism, expresses the essence of metamodernism. At the same time, "meta" is understood not in the Aristotelian sense of "outside", "above" or "after", but in the Platonic sense of the Greek term *metaxis* – which denotes the interaction of polarities, essentially related to each other (meta – between). This interpretation fundamentally changes the understanding of the essence of man, who in the modern world is on the stretch between the actual and the real world, between the meaning and its situational objectification. At the same time, the Platonic meaning "meta" means hesitation between two opposites and the simultaneity of their participation. Metamodernists use the prefix "meta" (metaxic) in its most authentic meaning, as presented by Plato (2018) in the Symposium dialogue. Plato applies the concept of *metaxic* to the characterization of the Greek priestess Diotima in the meaning of "intermediate" or "medium level", using the concept of *metaxic* to express the relationship between a thing and idea, as something separating and simultaneously connecting the world of illusion and reality. If in Plato's ontology *Metaxis* appears in the meaning of the middle state, which includes both the world of ideas and the world of things, then in metamodernism this medial position brings novelty to the understanding of man as a dual entity, simultaneously manifested both as a meaning (idea) and as existence (the form).

In this interpretation, the term metamodernism appears for the first time in 1975 by the American writer Masud Zavarzadeh (1975). Alexandra Dumitrescu (2012) defines the metamodernism of the period 2005-2014 as a position of "modernist uprooting or postmodern shift". Moyo Okediji uses the term metamodern as a challenge to modernism and postmodernism (Harris & Okediji, 1999). Andre Furlani (2002) – to renew the aesthetics of modernity.

In the first decade of the 21st century, the term "metamodernism" receives active application and semantic content in the work of the Dutch authors Timotheus Vermeulen and Robin van den Akker. In 2010, in the "Journal of Aesthetics & Culture", they published "Notes on Metamodernism" (Vermeulen & Akker, 2010), in which they define metamodernism as a discourse of hesitation between the optimism of modernism and the mockery of postmodernism, as a neo-romantic turn to the problem of man, calling this the philosophical position as the "structure of feelings". Anthropology of metamodernism is based on a constant that escapes completion, as the dynamics "both – nobody". This medial position indicates anthropological demand between existence

## ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

and consciousness, which found expression in the work of Dutch authors in the form of "the double message of the modernist pursuit of meaning and postmodern doubt about the meaning of all this" (transl. by Y. S.) (Vermeulen & Akker, 2010). A man is positioned in metamodernism through performism, embodied in the modern aesthetics of hesitation, as a combination of enthusiasm and mockery, "hope and melancholy, swinging between awareness and naivety, empathy and apathy, integrity and splitting, clarity and ambiguity, ... in search of the truth, without expectations to discover it" (transl. by Y. S.) (Vermeulen & Akker, 2010). In search of the anthropological foundations of metamodernism, the authors substantiate the concept of neo-romanticism as an actualized return to subjective sensibility. Unlike romanticism, metamodern neo-romanticism, striving for ideals, never asserts them, partly relying on Schlegel (1975): "always in becoming, never in perfection" (transl. by Y. S.) (p. 175). Anthropological meaning of metamodernism is expressed in the form of "atopic metaxis", as "the middle outside the topos, hesitation outside the place". Following the "Notes on Metamodernism" in 2011 Luke Turner's "Manifesto of Metamodernism" emerges, which asserts hesitation as the basis of the cultural dominant of metamodernism based on "diametrically opposed ideas acting as pulsating polarities of a colossal electric machine that sets the world in motion" (transl. by Y. S.) (Turner, 2011).

Talking about the programmatic works of metamodern anthropology, one cannot ignore the work of the Swiss political philosopher and sociologist Hanzi Freinacht (2017) "The Listening Society: A Metamodern Guide to Politics, Book One". The author considers the combination of different-vector values in modern society to be the main issue of our time. "How can modern, postmodern and premodern people live productively together?" (transl. by Y. S.) (Freinacht, 2017).

Seth Abramson (2015) expresses his view of metamodernism in a peculiar way in his article "Ten Basic Principles of Metamodernism". With baseless optimism and postirony characteristic of metamodernism, he expresses these principles in the form of a tenfold repetition of It's all right (Abramson, 2015). At the same time, the work contains productive anthropological ideas, which Abramson expresses in the form of: collapse of distances, which in the era of digitalization and the Internet manifests itself in the simultaneous possibility of anonymity and false intimacy; recognition of a multitude of subjectivities as the ability to accept and share in virtual reality of Internet discourses; blurring the boundaries of familiar forms of identity; the formation of individual and collective identity based on semantic content; orientation towards cooperation in all social spheres, as an opportunity for individual self-expression. Optimism of justification of man is expressed in "basic trust in the world": "A metamodernist chooses life" 'as if' positive changes are possible, even if we are every day reminded that human culture is in a state of chaos and probably even decline" (transl. by Y. S.) (Abramson, 2015).

The worldview and value issues of metamodernism are actively studied by domestic researchers. In this regard, Ukrainian authors V. S. Miroshnychenko (2017), V. I. Drozdovskiy (2018), as well as Russian researchers such as A. Pavlov (2018), A. S. Markova and G. I. Mamukina (2019) should be named, who view metamodernism as a field of modern axiological discourse.

In my opinion, the authors of the presented works express metamodern anthropology as a descriptive position of the modern cultural dominant of the digitalized era. Its feature is not a rational-theoretical position in philosophy, but a sensual experience of the aesthetic principle, which allows the subjective I to integrate new meanings. In this regard, the problem of man becomes the main content of metamodernism, striving for anthropological solutions to the eternal questions about meaning in a hesitant worldview perspective.

*Man in a state of metamodernism*

I think that the consistency of metamodernism will be proved by time, but even today we can talk about the tendencies of self-awakening of man – a holistic man. All extremes of the paradigmatic pendulum have been tested, from the rational assertion of the highest values (modernism) to their complete leveling (postmodernism), from hypostatizing the rational to extremely subjective immersion in the abyss of the irrational. Being is no longer represented as the identity of thinking, just as it is not a reflection of the transcendent. At the same time, the transcendent is realized in man through the attributes of beingness.

It was easier for a postmodern man, he had a wonderful predecessor. On the opposition to the anthropological values of modernism, a new paradigm of postmodern man was built. Metamodern man does not strive for destruction or opposition. In my opinion, the intuitions of our time suggest that the time has come to create, to "gather stones" scattered in different vectors of cultural paradigms. The process of creation takes into account all the achievements of the past, without discarding or taking anything away. Therefore, a man of metamodernism combines the uncombinable. He is contradictory and inconsistent, as it might seem at first glance: a priest is a rocker, a president is a comedian, a philosopher is a political strategist, a doctor is a businessman. In the combination of uncombinable, the way of the search for a man of metamodernism is found. Modernism sought the essence of man through metaphysical ideals. Postmodern rejected the search for the essence of man and any meanings. What to look for metamodernism after complete deconstruction? The goal of metamodernism is the *reconstruction of man*, multifaceted, true, deep. At the same time, the reconstruction of man is not accomplished in the affirmative way by means of substantiated declarations about what is due, like modern anthropology. Choice, search, acceptance of different and many things leads to the need for *self-reconstruction of man*.

Metamodern man experiences both the freedom of postmodernism and the framework of the value constraints of modernism. Everyone has the right to choose between opportunistic pragmatism and value self-determination of spiritual meanings. Any choice is correct for everyone who makes it and through this choice the formation of society, world politics, new cultural paradigm takes place. In this paradigm a Single man, who now makes decisions for the future is not forgotten, in contrast to non-classical subjectivism, where a man is immersed in self-flagellation, despair and loneliness.

At the same time, the solitude of the metamodern man is quite productive. Solitude becomes a necessity, fulfilling the saving function of self-determination of modern man in the multidimensionality of crowd strategies. Solitude, like collecting oneself in a mass agiotage of vain communications and imitations of crowd activity, is the way of self-restructuring of the inner man.

In the mainstream of metamodernism, individualization takes a different form, as a self-sufficient life in its own world of true reality, which does not conflict with external reality. Digitalization of the era as a process of the digital reality of our time has changed the perspectives of the life world of a metamodern man. Social networks contribute to the absence of a stereotype of behavior; norms go beyond the bounds of obligation, while the world order is not violated. One can get lost in the network, put on the desired mask, choose, expand or limit one's social circle. The pendulum of the digitalized metamodernism space fluctuates from the possibility of hiding, getting lost to the implementation of a public "crucifixion" or praise outside the spatial framework. Like or dislike have no national or state identity, remaining on the verge of impunity and the threat of public evaluation. Information of the network space is unpredictable in its further consequences.

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

---

After nihilism, irony and disappointment of postmodernism, respect, sincerity, openness, originality, uniqueness, which define the essence of man of metamodernism, in contrast to modern standardization (the principle of obligation in Kant's imperatives) or postmodern lack of principles, again in value.

Metamodernism is the integration of the individual I into the outer worlds. Individuality acts as a point of bifurcation, which can unpredictably change the turn of reality, the reorganization of the system based on unsystematic premises. The spontaneous manifestation of sincerity can confuse and motivate independent self-transformation.

It is no accident that art has become a sign of the cultural paradigm of metamodernism. Art, addressing the intuitive depth of man through the manifestation of a touching and naive simplicity, expresses hesitation as a defining feature of metamodernism. The dominant feature of metamodernism is ethics in its daily manifestation – the ethics of authenticity, open sincerity and innocence. Ethics, in which the universal is combined with the everyday, and the sincerity of the concrete gains superiority over the general, managing moral constructs not from above – the metaphysical ideal of universal obligation, but from below – existential meaning as a universal value, as a form of realization of being outside temporal linearity.

Metamodernism is the time of searching for the extra-spatial-temporal topos of man, where I feels "at home", outside social roles, but socially realizing at the same time. The pendulum swings between the desired and the unrealizable, but at the same time intuitively precisely felt. A kind of "straight-knowledge" allows one to stay "at home" going on social wanderings, to keep oneself true in social standardization. A society of individuals is being formed. Not personalities, with a hypertrophied standard of social demand, but Individualities, equally manifested in the implementation of the universal, eternal, at the same time vitally tangible. Simply put – a space in which everyone can be right and wrong at the same time, and everyone has the right to any position, while maintaining focus and involvement in the life process, in evolutionary formation, in the realization of the universal goal – to Be!

A metamodern person may be attracted to the multi-vector and dispersion postmodernism and, at the same time, to individual certainty and focus on the generic characteristics of man. Individuality in the era of metamodernism surpasses personality, internal uniqueness surpasses external standardization, but at the same time, individuality is not a chaotic scattering of fragmentary manifestations. Individuality reconstructs a genuine, internal, essential person without regard to public opinion and standardized masks of society, while keeping the time shrinkage to the search for eternal, enduring meanings about man – true, the approximation to whom is the main task of metamodernism.

Metamodern anthropology is characterized by a dynamic balance between the spiritual and the material, which are not opposed, but are a simultaneous manifestation of objective reality. Metamodern man is dual, spiritually material. Neglect, as well as exaggeration of the significance of one of the modes, is fraught with ontological distortion.

Duality of the metamodern man is expressed, in the so-called new sincerity, which allows direct acceptance of everything and at the same time does not finally assert anything – hesitation as unconditional optimism, unconditioned enthusiasm. If Schopenhauer's will to live is presented as a metaphysical ontological principle, then in metamodernism objective beingness is the basic cosmological principle of eternal fulfillment, in which everything is accepted. This is the basis for metamodernism optimism. Not "Everything will be fine" as an ideal or utopia, but "Everything is already and always fine", because the world exists and existence is a constant. And the

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

---

state, fact, event that exists now is a justified reality as the most successful for each person in its own way. Simply put, every decision made, state experienced, action performed is ideally correct for a given man.

Metamodernism realizes that truth is unattainable, because the only true is the ultimate objective reality, which is not given to us in its completeness. We will never be able to reach this reality; abstractly (mentally or spiritually) we fall into delusions, since we do not have a verification tool. Everything is always subjective. The subject of cognition has limitations due to its conditionality by the form of being. Therefore, the spiritual always slips away, but at the same time expands the material.

That is, everything that a man can create – judgments, theories, ideologies, worldviews, scientific approaches, works of art – are all models of realities behind which there are key ideas that invariably accompany an individual search.

Each model has its own boundaries, corresponding tools, conditions of implementation. A perfectly accurate model is reality itself, in all its absolute completeness. It will always be unattainable, since man is only a part of it. Therefore, any model is only a fragment of an integral reality, a part of it; therefore, as an element of the structure, it will generate an anti-model that will take into account what the previous model did not take into account. Thus, a man of metamodernism, is in a state of hesitation between the axiological model (modernism) and its rejection (postmodernism), defining the meaning of his existence as a way of replenishing the completeness of reality. A path that will never be completed, hence the truth will always slip away until it becomes absolute reality. Metamodernism on this path is a tactic of accepting the entire completeness of reality through hesitations between possible extremes worked out by previous eras. A man of premodernism and modernism made sense. Premodernism is the golden age of humanity, striving for eternal values. Modernism is an attempt to transform the world through rationality. Postmodernism loses its meaning, hence deconstruction, criticism, nihilism. A man of metamodernism, yearning for meaning, strives to recreate the purposefulness of the universe and a man in it. But at the same time he hesitates.

It is in the quickened trajectory of this evolutionary hesitation that the potential for deep reconstruction of a man arises – holistic, true, living his accomplishment in the complementarity of the spiritual-material, metaphysical-existential, rational-irrational, esoteric-exoteric, universal-concrete at a new qualitative level of acquiring meanings. The pendulum between modernism and postmodernism in its hesitation shakes up reality forming a reconstruction of the Holistic man of metamodernism. Perhaps the entire previous path of a man strove to this time point of collecting worked-out meanings and their negation.

A metamodern man understands the meaninglessness of the world, the insignificance of himself and the problems surrounding him, but instead of seeing the uselessness of his capabilities, he can act, for a man realizes his imperfection and the need to move along this path. Despite the fact that a man has already been disassembled into fragments by postmodernism and the modern world knows very well what parts our brain, psyche or soul consists of, what affects our behavior, what hormones are responsible for happiness and what mechanisms are involved in manipulative technologies, we do not know who we. Having studied a man thoroughly, we have not found ways for him to become qualitatively, globally better. The ideal recedes and the world moves away from well-being and harmonious existence. The balance is hard to find. And the metamodernism naturally comes to hesitation as a process of finding a path, as a state of realization of everything.

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

---

It is not by chance that postirony is characteristic of metamodernism, the essence of which can be expressed: the thinner the line, the truer. The intangibility of the extremes of seriousness and joke. The meaning of metamodernism is in the absence of objective value, leading into either intangible distances or speculative delusions. The thinner the line between the extremes, the closer a man is to comprehending his essence. Comprehending, not knowledge. Uncertainty is embedded in the anthropology of metamodernism as a path of subjective-objective duality. And this uncertainty is as changeable as the tangibility of the line between irony and sincerity, seriousness and frivolity, sanity and madness, deep and superficial views on the acquisition of meaning. It is this uncertainty that protects a metamodern man from dangerous categoricity and paradigmatic certainty.

### Originality

It has been substantiated that metamodernism as a descriptive position of the modern cultural dominant of the digitalized era is characterized by a state of fluctuation between the values of modernism and postmodernism. The anthropology of metamodernism manifests itself in the form of the reconstruction of the holistic man and the self-reconstruction of the inner man. The peculiarities of a metamodern man are recognized as the mutual determinability of the individual and the mass, which is realized through postirony, naive sincerity, and optimistic openness to the world.

### Conclusions

The last decade of the development of modern culture has qualitatively changed the content of the anthropological paradigm. For the first time, the definition of the socio-cultural context is expressed in hesitant state that absorbs all the modes of previous eras, while not unambiguously affirming the semantic dominant of time. Metamodernism forms a new level of manifestation of freedom, not limited by any of the ideologies of the past, while being called upon to preserve and expand to evolutionary meanings all worked out ideological attitudes. The thin line between the values of the Modernism and the Postmodernism determines the subtle characteristic of the metamodern man, whose evolutionary vocation lies in a qualitatively new level of world attitude. The simultaneous acceptance of the highest values and their leveling with an unambiguous assertion makes it possible to formulate the peculiarity of time as a reconstruction of the Holistic Man, impartial to the dominant worldview attitudes of a social nature. In this regard, the anthropology of metamodernism manifests such features as baseless optimism, individualization of the sociocultural space through postirony, naive sincerity, openness and penetration in the dual complementarity of the I with the mass nature of modern society. The expression of the anthropological space of metamodernism becomes mutual complementarity of the spiritually-material, metaphysical-existential, rational-irrational, religious-scientific, esoteric-exoteric, universal-concrete at a new qualitative level of living of the meanings of the Holistic Man, who reconstructs himself at all anthropological levels. An era without an unambiguously expressed moral guideline is based on the ethics of all-acceptance, the only justification for which is the existence of a universal right to beingness. Digitalization as a process of digital transformation of society creates conditions for the value realization of the free choice of a man of metamodernism, through which the Holistic man is accomplished. Metamodernism is more likely not a solution to a problem, but its posing in a new perspective of the question of a man – what to be and how to survive between the extremes of semantic poles without losing dignity and unique intrinsic value. On this basis, the fate of a metamodern man is determined in pursuit of the endlessly receding horizons of the anthropology of incompleteness.



## ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

## REFERENCES

- Abramson, S. (2015). Ten Basic Principles of Metamodernism. *Huffpost*. Retrieved from [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/seth-abramson/ten-keyprinciples-in-met\\_b\\_7143202.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/seth-abramson/ten-keyprinciples-in-met_b_7143202.html) (in English)
- Alexander, J., & Colomy, P. (Eds.). (1991). *Differentiation Theory and Social Change: Comparative and Historical Perspectives*. New York: Columbia University Press. (in English)
- Anderson, P. (2006). *Spectrum: From Right to Left in the World of Ideas*. London: Verso. (in English)
- Barthes, R. (1994). Smert avtora. S. N. Zenkin, Trans. In *Izbrannye raboty. Semiotika. Poetika* (pp. 384-391). Moscow: Progress. (in Russian)
- Bauman, Z. (1997). *Postmodernity and its discontents*. New York: NYU Press. (in English)
- Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press. (in English)
- Drozдовskiy, D. I. (2018). Discussion on Metamodernism in the Aspect of Post-Postmodernistic Theory. *Naukovi zapysky Kharkivskoho natsionalnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu imeni H. S. Skovorody. Literaturoznavstvo*, 3-4(89-90), 58-71. (in Ukrainian)
- Dumitrescu, A. (2012). *Interconnections in Blakean and Metamodern Space*. Retrieved from [https://web.archive.org/web/20120323035251/http://www.doubledialogues.com/archive/issue\\_seven/dumitrescu.html](https://web.archive.org/web/20120323035251/http://www.doubledialogues.com/archive/issue_seven/dumitrescu.html) (in English)
- Foucault, M. (1994). *Slova i veshchi. Arkheologiya gumanitarnykh nauk*. St. Petersburg: A-cad. (in Russian)
- Freinacht, H. (2017). *The Listening Society: A Metamodern Guide to Politics. Book One*. Metamoderna ApS. (in English)
- Fukuyama, F. (2009). *The End of History and the Last Man*. Moscow: OOO «Izdatelstvo ACT: ZAO NPP "Yermak"». (in Russian)
- Furlani, A. (2002). Postmodern and After: Guy Davenport. *Contemporary Literature*, 43(4), 709-735. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/1209039> (in English)
- Harris, M. D., & Okediji, M. B. (1999). *Transatlantic Dialogue: Contemporary Art In and Out of Africa*. University of North Carolina. (in English)
- Hutcheon, L. (2002). *The Politics of Postmodernism*. London, New York: Routledge. (in English)
- Kroker, A., & Cook, D. (1988). *The Postmodern Scene: Excremental Culture and Hyper-Aesthetics*. London: Macmillan. (in English)
- Lash, S. (1990). *Sociology of Postmodernism (International library of sociology)*. London: Routledge. (in English)
- Markova, A. S., & Mamukina, G. I. (2019). Metamodernism: Overcoming discreteness and individualism. *Bulletin of Moscow Region State University*, 1, 89-98. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18384/2310-7278-2019-1-89-98> (in Russian)
- Miroshnychenko, V. S. (2017). Metamodernism, oscillation, interpellation. *Culture of Ukraine*, 55, 109-117. (in Ukrainian)
- Nealon, J. (2012). *Post-Postmodernism: or, The Cultural Logic of Just-in-Time Capitalism*. Stanford: Stanford University Press. (in English)
- Pavlov, A. (2018). Images of modernity in the twenty-first century: Metamodernism. *Logos*, 28(6), 1-19. (in Russian)
- Plato. (2018). *Benket*. U. Holovach, Trans. Lviv: Vydavnytstvo UKU. (in Ukrainian)
- Schlegel, F. (1975). Athenaeum Fragments. In *Lucinde and the Fragments* (pp. 150-182). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. (in English)
- Turner, L. (2011). *Metamodernist // Manifesto*. Retrieved from <http://www.metamodernism.org> (in English)
- Vermeulen, T., & Akker, R. van den. (2010). Notes on metamodernism. *Journal of Aesthetics & Culture*, 2(1), 5677. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3402/jac.v2i0.5677> (in English)
- Zavarzadeh, M. (1975). The Apocalyptic Fact and the Eclipse of Fiction in Recent American Prose Narratives. *Journal of American Studies*, 9(1), 69-83. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/s002187580001015x> (in English)

## LIST OF REFERENCE LINKS

- Abramson S. Ten Basic Principles of Metamodernism. *Huffpost*. 2015. URL: [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/seth-abramson/ten-keyprinciples-in-met\\_b\\_7143202.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/seth-abramson/ten-keyprinciples-in-met_b_7143202.html)
- Differentiation theory and social change: Comparative and Historical Perspectives* / eds. by J. Alexander, P. Colomy. New York : Columbia University Press, 1991. 510 p.
- Anderson P. *Spectrum: From Right to Left in the World of Ideas*. London : Verso, 2006. 398 p.

## ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

- Барт Р. Смерть автора / пер. С. Н. Зенкина. *Избранные работы. Семиотика. Поэтика*. Москва : Прогресс, 1994. С. 384–391.
- Bauman Z. *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge : Polity Press, 2000. 240 p.
- Bauman Z. *Postmodernity and its discontents*. New York : NYU Press, 1997. 232 p.
- Дроздовський Д. І. Дискусійність метамодернізму в аспекті теорії постпостмодернізму. *Наукові записки Харківського національного педагогічного університету імені Г. С. Сковороди. Літературознавство*. 2018. Вип. 3–4 (89–90). С. 58–71.
- Dumitrescu A. *Interconnections in Blakean and Metamodern Space*. 2012. URL: [https://web.archive.org/web/20120323035251/http://www.doubledialogues.com/archive/issue\\_seven/dumitrescu.html](https://web.archive.org/web/20120323035251/http://www.doubledialogues.com/archive/issue_seven/dumitrescu.html)
- Фуко М. *Слова и вещи. Археология гуманитарных наук*. Санкт-Петербург : А-сэд, 1994. 408 с.
- Freinacht H. *The Listening Society: A Metamodern Guide to Politics, Book One*. Metamoderna ApS, 2017. 414 p.
- Фукуяма Ф. *Конец истории и последний человек*. Москва : ООО «Издательство АСТ: ЗАО НПП «Ермак»», 2009. 588 с.
- Furlani A. Postmodern and after: Guy Davenport. *Contemporary Literature*. 2002. Vol. 43. No. 4. P. 709–735. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/1209039>
- Harris M. D., Okediji M. B. *Transatlantic Dialogue: Contemporary Art In and Out of Africa*. University of North Carolina, 1999. 80 p.
- Hutcheon L. *The politics of postmodernism*. London-New York : Routledge, 2002. 232 p.
- Kroker A., Cook D. *The Postmodern Scene: Excremental Culture and Hyper-Aesthetics*. Macmillan Education, 1988. 320 p.
- Lash S. *Sociology of Postmodernism (International library of sociology)*. London : Routledge, 1990. 316 p.
- Маркова А. С., Мамукина Г. И. Метамодернизм: преодоление дискретности и индивидуализма. *Вестник Московского государственного областного университета*. 2019. № 1. С. 89–98. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18384/2310-7278-2019-1-89-98>
- Мірошніченко В. С. Метамодернізм, осциляція, інтерпеляція. *Культура України*. 2017. Вип. 55. С. 109–117.
- Nealon J. *Post-Postmodernism: or, The Cultural Logic of Just-in-Time Capitalism*. Stanford : Stanford University Press, 2012. 241 p.
- Павлов А. Образы современности в XXI веке: метамодернизм. *Логос*. 2018. Т. 28. № 6. С. 1–19.
- Платон. *Бенкет* / пер. У. Головач. Львів : Видавництво УКУ, 2018. 220 с.
- Schlegel F. *Athenaeum Fragments. Lucinde and the Fragments*. Minneapolis : University of Minnesota Press, 1975. P. 150–182.
- Turner L. *Metamodernist // Manifesto*. 2011. URL: <http://www.metamodernism.org>
- Vermeulen T., van den Akker R. Notes on metamodernism. *Journal of Aesthetics & Culture*. 2010. Vol. 2. Iss. 1. 14 p. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3402/jac.v2i0.5677>
- Zavarzadeh M. The Apocalyptic Fact and the Eclipse of Fiction in Recent American Prose Narratives. *Journal of American Studies*. 1975. Vol. 9. Iss. 1. P. 69–83. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/s002187580001015x>

Ю. О. ШАБАНОВА<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1\*</sup>Національний технічний університет "Дніпровська політехніка" (Дніпро, Україна), ел. пошта [jshabanova@ukr.net](mailto:jshabanova@ukr.net), ORCID 0000-0001-5876-4140

## ЛЮДИНА МЕТАМОДЕРНУ В СВІТОГЛЯДНОМУ ВИМІРІ НОВОЇ КУЛЬТУРНОЇ ПАРАДИГМИ

**Мета.** В основі представленого дослідження лежить осмислення антропологічних тенденцій метамодерну, що передбачає послідовне вирішення наступних завдань: а) експлікація змісту постпостмодерну в сучасній філософській літературі; б) виявлення світоглядної основи антропології метамодерну; в) характеристика проблемного поля метамодерної антропології та стану людини в сучасну епоху. **Теоретичний базис.** Антропологія метамодерна вперше визначає соціокультурний контекст через коливальний стан між цінностями модерну та їх запереченням постмодерном, що дозволяє сформулювати особливість часу як прагнення до реконструкції людини-цілісної, незаангажованої домінуючими світоглядними настановами соціального характеру. Антропологія метамодерну представлена як індивідуалізація соціокультурного простору у вигляді

## ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

самореконструкції людини на всіх антропорівнях. Епоха без однозначно вираженого морального орієнтиру спирається на етику загальноприйнятого, єдиним виправданням якої є наявність універсального права на буттєвість. Діджиталізація як процес цифрової трансформації суспільства формує умови для ціннісного здійснення вільного вибору людини метамодерну, через який і самоздійснюється цілісна людина. **Наукова новизна.** Обґрунтовано, що метамодерн як описова позиція сучасної культурної доміанти діджиталізованої епохи, характеризується станом коливання між цінностями модерну і постмодерну. Антропологія метамодерну маніфестує себе у вигляді реконструкції людини-цілісної і самореконструкції людини-внутрішньої. Особливостями людини метамодерну визнані взаємодовизначеність індивідуального і масового. **Висновки.** Метамодерн – це постановка проблеми людини в новому ракурсі: яким бути і як вижити між крайнощами смислових полюсів, не втративши гідності та унікальної самоцінності. Виходячи з цього, доля людини метамодерну визначається в переслідуванні нескінченно відступаючих горизонтів антропології незавершеності, що здійснюється через постіронію, наївну щирість, оптимістичну відкритість до світу.

*Ключові слова:* метамодерн; людина-цілісна; коливання; модерн; постмодерн; антропологічна реконструкція

Ю. А. ШАБАНОВА<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1\*</sup>Национальный технический университет "Днепровская политехника" (Днепр, Украина), эл. почта jshabanova@ukr.net, ORCID 0000-0001-5876-4140

## ЧЕЛОВЕК МЕТАМОДЕРНА В МИРОВОЗЗРЕНЧЕСКОМ ИЗМЕРЕНИИ НОВОЙ КУЛЬТУРНОЙ ПАРАДИГМЫ

**Цель.** В основе представленного исследование лежит осмысление антропологических тенденций метамодерна, что предполагает последовательное решение следующих задач: а) экспликация содержания пост-постмодерна в современной философской литературе; б) выявление мировоззренческой основы антропологии метамодерна; в) характеристика проблемного поля метамодерной антропологии и состояния человека в современную эпоху. **Теоретический базис.** Антропология метамодерна впервые определяет социокультурный контекст через колебательное состояние между ценностями модерна и их отрицание постмодерном, что позволяет сформулировать особенность времени как стремление к реконструкции Человека-Целостного, незаангажированного доминирующими мировоззренческими установками социального характера. Антропология метамодерна представлена как индивидуализация социокультурного пространства в виде самореконструкции человека на всех антропоуровнях. Эпоха без однозначно выраженного нравственного ориентира опирается на этику всепринятия, единственным оправданием которой является наличие универсального права на бытийственность. Диджитализация как процесс цифровой трансформации общества формирует условия для ценностного осуществления свободного выбора человека метамодерна, через который и свершается Целостный человек. **Научная новизна.** Обосновано, что метамодерн как описательная позиция современной культурной доминанты диджитализированной эпохи, характеризуется состоянием колебания между ценностями модерна и постмодерна. Антропология метамодерна манифестирует себя в виде реконструкции человека-целостного и самореконструкции человека-внутреннего. Особенности человека метамодерна признаны взаимодоопределяемость индивидуального и массового. **Выводы.** Метамодерн – постановка проблемы человека в новом ракурсе – каким быть и как выжить между крайностями смисловых полюсов, не утратив достоинства и уникальной самоценности. Исходя из этого, судьба человека метамодерна определяется в преследовании бесконечно отступающих горизонтов антропологии незавершённости, которая осуществляется через постіронію, наївну іскренність, оптимістическую відкритість к миру.

*Ключевые слова:* метамодерн; человек-целостный; колебание; модерн; постмодерн; антропологическая реконструкция

Received: 19.10.2019

Accepted: 17.11.2020