ISSN 2227-7242 (Print), ISSN 2304-9685 (Online)
Антропологічні виміри філософських досліджень, 2025, Вип. 28
Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research, 2025, NO. 28

THE MAN IN TECHNOSPHERE

UDC 130.2+304:004

O. M. PEREPELYTSIA[1*], E. V. KORDUMOV[2*]

[1*]V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University (Kharkiv, Ukraine), e-mail o.perepelytsia@karazin.ua,
ORCID 0000-0001-9825-7573
[2*]V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University (Kharkiv, Ukraine), e-mail kordumov.e.v@gmail.com,
ORCID 0009-0009-6775-8821

The Lifeworld of the Digital Age: Trans(in)dividual and Technosophistry

The purpose of this article is to comprehend the defining trend of recent years, namely the accelerated digitisation of human life, which leads to a rethinking of human self-determination. It is also necessary to analyse the main components of the new era of humanity, namely: a) the creation of a global communication platform – the Internet and a "digitised network structure of values"; b) a digital mode of exchange, leading to the transformation of the very form of the human being, which can be defined as a digital transhuman. According to the authors, the characteristics of the conceptualisation of this form in a certain (trans)anthropological perspective also deserve attention. **The theoretical basis** of the article is *subject-disoriented anthropology*, which is based on three topographical principles: disorientation, non-self-identity, and the multiplicity of the human being. **Originality.** Based on the three topographical principles of digitalisation (Network, Blockchain, Transformer), the transhuman is considered as a dividual or trans(in)dividual, and his or her life world and worldview are defined. Digitalisation, the rapid development of artificial intelligence technologies, the Internet, blockchain technology, ChatGPT, etc. have significantly changed the human Lifeworld. The Internet has introduced a networked mode of social interaction. The network is a rhizomatic multiplicity, all components of which are interdependent, unstable, and transformative. Blockchain technology implements decentralised data distribution and is a set in which all elements are interdependent, distributed, decentralised and interchangeable. A transformer, in particular ChatGPT, is a set in which all elements are transductive and generative. Thus, a person is sifted through digital technologies when everything (generic, common, individual) is subject to digital division. That is why the transhuman is already a dividual or trans(in)dividual – a transformative, inner-divided, multiple being. The dividual is characterised by decentralised subjectivity, fragmentation, embodied in a multitude of digital identities distributed in chains of network connections in virtual worlds. The multiple subject is not holistic, it is transgressive and deconstructive, its boundaries are blurred, it transgresses and deconstructs itself on the border between the real and the virtual, the biological and the technological. The achievements of AI developments distribute the thinking of individuals in networks that generate synthetic meanings created by algorithms that cannot be verified for truthfulness and are not considered in terms of truth. The existence of the trans(in)dividual determines his or her belonging to a particular network and the interdependence of the elements that comprise it. His or her worldview can be defined as technosophistic. **Conclusions.** An essential component of the technosophical worldview is that it does not proceed from the principle of truthfulness; its adherents are guided in life by emotions evoked by images produced by networks, which form the basis for unstable beliefs. For humans, the tasks of searching for objective knowledge and creating the preconditions for general social agreement are becoming increasingly important.

Keywords: human; transhuman; individual; dividual; technosophical worldview; digitalisation; network; blockchain; transformer

doi: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i28.349011

ISSN 2227-7242 (Print), ISSN 2304-9685 (Online)
Антропологічні виміри філософських досліджень, 2025, Вип. 28
Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research, 2025, NO. 28

Digital usually refers to something using discrete digits, often binary digits.
"Digital", 2025

From Old French discret, from Latin discrētus, past participle of discernō ("divide"), from dis- + cernō ("sift"). Doublet of discreet.
"discrete", 2025

Introduction

A human being is a creature that defines himself or herself. This definition is conveyed by one predicate or another. At least in the written history of humanity, there are quite a few such predicates. Some of them claim to be universal, while others claim to be epochal or stage-specific characteristics. Some are universally recognised, while others are more controversial conceptualisations. Recently, it seems that predicates alone are no longer sufficient, and prefixes such as *super*, *post*, or *trans* have been added. Their meaning lies in constituting the possibility of going beyond the purely/excessively human. Since the defining trend of recent years has been the accelerated digitization of almost all spheres of human life, people have become accustomed to defining humans as digital or digitised (see: Dzoban, 2021; Skinner, 2018). The usual context of this definition is related to the fact that, as Chris Skinner (2018) notes, "digitalisation of our planet is bringing about a major transformation", when "everyone on the planet will be included in the network and everyone on the planet will get the chance to talk, trade and transact with everyone else on the planet in real time", and "unlike the Industrial Revolution during which only a limited number of humans gained access to wealth and trade, this digital revolution will give everyone a chance" (p. 15). According to Skinner, the main features of this new era of humanity are the ability of everyone to be connected with others in a global world, connected to a single platform – the Internet as a "digitised network structure of values" that is timeless, global and interconnected, and access to which is almost free. This new structure is developing rapidly, building on old cultural and social structures. Skinner (2018) characterises it as a new (fourth) era, when anything can convey value instantly, almost at the speed of light (pp. 26-30). The digitisation of values reduces the role of banks, money and barter. As a result, humanity is transitioning to a different mode of exchange – digital. But does this not lead to a significant transformation of the nature/form of man? And should we not define the new form, which is emerging quite rapidly, as a digital transhuman? After all, the prefix *trans* indicates the passage through man of ever-increasing volumes of digitised, non-human (for example, generated by artificial intelligence (AI)), and the constant transgression of human boundaries, and a state of self-uncertainty, the inconsistency of all components of a decentralised subject, and a constant process of transformation, and a state of completely uncertain transition to something new/different that is about to appear.

Purpose

If so, then it is precisely this form of transhuman that should be considered and conceptualised, defining and marking out a specific (trans)anthropological perspective. In our opinion, this means that we should try to conduct research that (taking into account the trends of object-oriented ontology, which equates all objects and rejects the pathos of transcendental anthropocentrism) is based on the principles of a kind of *subject-disoriented anthropology* derived from the following topographical principles: humans are *disoriented* (therefore, all worldviews are

doi: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i28.349011

attempts to orient oneself in a world where the points of reference are certain orders of values, in Friedrich Nietzsche's version – quanta of power/authority), *without self-identity* (and therefore unstable, still in the process of becoming, transformative) beings, whose subjectivity is *a multiplicity* (and therefore manifests itself in different ways, constantly decentring itself in the process of interaction with others). Based on this, the determining factors in human development are mediations/mediums that constitute relationships, the nature of transformation, and value orientation.

There are at least three such media: sex, language, and money. All media were invented and formed at fairly early stages of human development as a species, but their influence and function were not the same in different periods of human development and in different historical forms of culture. Archaic humans first regulated sexual relations by establishing genealogical structures organised by myth. The topoi of the human world here are the family, the sanctuary, and the forest (or any natural environment). And man first and foremost identifies himself as a relative – that is, every person belongs to a family. Kinship practices are carried out through the exchange of gifts and potlatch rituals. Thus, mythology as an explanation of the world is corrected by potlatch as a means of communication and self-affirmation of man. At the next stage (especially with the development of writing), the medium of language is decisive, building an order formed by the word/book and shaping a religious/metaphysical worldview. The topoi of the human world here are the church, the university, and the field (any space cultivated and limited by humans). And a person identifies themselves with a certain community, as (according to the Greek etymology of the church) called to gather. Communication practices are carried out as sacrifices for the benefit of others, as rituals of offering. Therefore, religion as an explanation of the world is corrected by sacrifice as a condition for communication and self-affirmation of a person. The modern era transports people into a space of rational and, at the same time, market/monetary self-regulation, forming the basis for a scientific explanation of the world and a consumerist attitude towards it. The topoi of the human world here are the bank, the market and the factory (any space associated with extraction, production, invention). And people position themselves as individuals/personalities. Practices of individuation are carried out as the production and consumption of things/goods, as rituals of buying and selling. Therefore, science as an explanation of the world is adjusted to consumption, which constitutes the individual and human self-affirmation.

Digitalisation, in our opinion, does not introduce new media. It causes the mediation of all media in cyberspace according to three topographical principles: Network, Blockchain, Transformer. And a person, or more precisely, a transhuman, is a *trans(in)individual* here. Therefore, it is this form that we aim to define in this article. First, we will define (in mostly neutral, even complimentary tones) the general situation, the key trends of digitalisation and their impact on the human world, then we will characterise the form of transhuman subjectivity that corresponds to them, and finally we will try to define the horizons of the value/worldview revolution associated with this.

Statement of basic materials

Digitalisation, in particular the rapid development of artificial intelligence technologies, has already brought about changes in all spheres of human life, significantly altering the human world.

The emergence of the Internet has been decisive, creating conditions for interactive communication and rapid information transfer, and introducing a *networked mode of social interaction.*

doi: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i28.349011

Manuel Castells' (2001) definition has become classic: "the Internet is the technological basis for the organizational form of the Information Age: the network" (p. 1). The Internet has made communication total and continuous, introducing people to a multitude of social networks, decentralising the medium of language, i.e. creating conditions for a multitude of diverse communications and fragmented, disoriented identities. At the same time, it has satisfied people's desire for communication and consumer needs or whims, provided opportunities for the development of creative potential/talent, and responded to the demand for freedom, although at the same time it has, to a certain extent, become a platform for interpersonal alienation and (digital) inequality. However, the technology that enabled the transition to a "new form of society", i.e., a *networked society* and economy, is itself a technology of free communication (Castells, 2001, pp. 4-5). Castells links three key conditions for the rapid spread of the internet as a form of free communication to the dimension of openness:

> First, the networking architecture must be open-ended, decentralized, distributed, and multi-directional in its interactivity; secondly, all communication protocols and their implementations must be open, distributed, and susceptible of modification <…>; thirdly, the institutions of governance of the network must be built in accordance with the principles of openness and cooperation. (Castells, 2001, pp. 28-29)

This ultimately means that network *openness* is crucial. Even so-called "closed" social groups must identify themselves in the general network and ultimately attract/entice potential allies, even emphasising their "closed" nature. Therefore, all communities are defined in one way or another by "the value of horizontal, free communication", rejecting external censorship, and the value of "self-directed networking", which realises "the capacity for anyone to find his or her own destination on the Net, and, if not found, to create and post his or her own information, thus inducing a network" (Castells, 2001, pp. 54-55). It is on these principles that a "new dominant mode" of social connection is formed – what Castells (2001) calls tertiary relationships (which arise after families/communities and partnerships/associations), which, following Wellman, he calls "'personalized communities', embodied in me-centered networks" (p. 128). This model privatises communicability, which is primarily embodied in "the individualization of the relationship between capital and labor, between workers and the work process, in the network enterprise" (Castells, 2001, p. 128). Ultimately, Castells (2001) characterises this social model as *Networked Individualism*, based on which "individuals build their networks, on-line and off-line, on the basis of their interests, values, affinities, and projects" (p. 131). However, it should be added that this individual, so to speak, *is sifted* through the network and becomes partial, distributed, divided – in a word, a *dividual*.

A network is always a distribution of elements/roles/personalities that are constantly reconfigured in a transformative process of interaction. The essence of this process is well revealed by the Internet economy. Castells (2001) identifies four key characteristics when referring to networked business, in particular the "networked enterprise": "scalability, interactivity, management

doi: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i28.349011

of flexibility, branding, and customization in a networked business world" (p. 76). Ultimately, these characteristics apply not only to the successful operation of networked enterprises, but rather transform every Internet actor into something like such an enterprise, i.e., *part* of a network, which can be local and/or global, expand and/or contract, interact in real and/or selected time, combine management with decentralised, multidimensional interaction, focus on feedback from all components of the network, and adapt/adjust to any taste. Therefore, the way network actors are organised is rhizomatic.

Therefore, a network is always a multiplicity, all its elements/actors are interdependent and unstable, i.e. they are in a constant state of flux. And although a network is a *multiplicity of horizontal connections* or rhizomes, its elements/actors/users can acquire different levels/intensities of influence in the network, which, however, is also limited in time and space and is fleeting. Therefore, everything related to the network is infinitely decentralised, distributed and transformed, rapidly fading away; ultimately, the network itself is transformative.

Blockchain technology is a decentralised distributed database, and initially emerged as a means of facilitating the circulation of the cryptocurrency Bitcoin, i.e. primarily associated with electronic payments and transactions that can be carried out without any intermediation. However, this *decentralisation of the medium of money* is a model for creating decentralised, distributed methods of any kind of interpersonal interaction and communication without any restrictions in space and time (such as transnational DNS (domain name system)). In essence, as Melanie Swan (2015) writes, this is a new revolutionary organisational paradigm that is suitable for coordinating any kind of human activity (p. vii). Therefore, as Siraj Raval (2016) notes, blockchain technology "has enabled decentralised consensus for the first time in history" (p. 1). Bitcoin is a distributed system because the block chain is stored on many computers, and it is decentralised because if one node fails, the entire network can continue to operate. The system itself works thanks to the material (monetary profit) interest of the network actors.

It is important to understand that a cryptocurrency such as Bitcoin, since it is not tied to any of the world’s currencies, and its value is determined solely by supply and demand and is based on an algorithm that limits supply, simplifying transactions and freeing them from the control of governments and large banks at the basic level, so to speak, shows the way for decentralised communities and the decentralisation of society as a whole. Distributed decentralised systems and distributed registries are paving the way to overcoming the model of society based on centralised control, which includes institutions such as factories, private property, copyright, etc. Ultimately, blockchain shows how the principle of market self-regulation (the "invisible hand of the market") can be put into practice.

Therefore, blockchain is always a multiplicity of elements/actors that are interdependent, distributed, and decentralised, but also interchangeable. Subjectively, this means that none of them is autonomous, but *only functions as part* of a chain.

Finally, the next technological breakthrough is related to the transformer, embodied by ChatGPT – Generative Pre-trained Transformer. Specifically, it refers to a deep learning architecture of the transformer type for training large language models. As the authors of the software article "Attention Is All You Need" note, "Transformer is the first transduction model relying entirely on self-attention to compute representations of its input and output" (Vaswani et al., 2017, p. 2). It is important to note here the connection between transduction as a form of horizontal data transfer and self-attention as a vertically organised decision-making process. If the network and blockchain are intermediaries between humans, the transformer generates some-

doi: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i28.349011

thing that is already *additional to the human*. Here, humans enter into a relationship with a non-human entity (no matter how much we anthropomorphise artificial intelligence (Salles et al., 2020)). It is no coincidence that Human-AI Interaction is already being formulated as a separate problem area (or field of research), which includes a number of options: "human-AI collaboration, human-AI competition, human-AI conflict, and human-AI symbiosis" (Jiang et al., 2024).

Thus, a transformer is always a set, all elements/actors of which are transductive and generative, ultimately reflecting the meaning of technological singularity. But here we are no longer talking about truth (Bazaluk, 2024), which always reflects the human attitude to the world, but about the *combinatorics* and *composition* of different elements to generate new combinations and compositions of signs/images, the effectiveness, and even the monstrosity, of which will be more impressive and therefore effective/influential.

To a certain extent, this is about the embodiment of Nietzsche's worldview, according to which there is no truth, only a multitude of configurations of values as quanta of force that either strengthen their effect/influence on others or weaken. In order to have greater power/influence, and therefore authority, it is necessary to endlessly (and constantly accelerating) generate more effective, intense configurations of images, or, according to Vilém Flusser's (2002, p. 40) definition, techno-images.

It has already been noted that "accelerated image production", along with accelerated information dissemination and accelerated consumption, made possible by the latest technologies, lead people into "a kind of trance when s/he is almost unconsciously in a transformative flow of images/information, and in order to comply with it, s/he must constantly transform oneself", which constitutes the emergence of "the form of the *trans-human* (man-transformer), which in the flow of transforming one's own image constantly becomes a *post*-human" (Karpenko & Perepelytsia, 2023). Thus, the nomadic subject referred to by Rosi Braidotti (2013) constantly projects itself beyond its given nature, focusing not on preserving a certain (albeit imaginary) identity, but on transgression, transduction, and transmutation. Everything in a person, the person themselves, is sifted through digital spaces – the generic, the common, the individual are subject to digital division. And that is why the transhuman is already a dividual or, to be more precise, a trans(in)dividual – a trans-formative, inner-divided, that is, a multiple being. Presumably, only those who are divided within themselves are more likely to be divided among others.

The figure of the dividual is thoroughly examined by Michaela Ott, who first notes that "anthropos appears today as an entity that is possessed, administered and co-constituted by a variety of others", while the self-awareness of human beings is "inserted into the apparatuses proper to various orders of magnitude". Therefore, humans are fundamentally self-alienated not only because their survival depends on other people and the specificity of their mental reality is dependent on the speech acts and unconscious habits of others, but also "due to its insight into multi-scalar intertwinings" and "co-determination by non-human and technological others" (Ott, 2018, pp. 4-5). However, secondly, Ott (2018) notes that "the concept 'individual' has never been adequate for living beings, social structures or elements of the universe", since "basic, indivisible unit cannot be ascertained in the realm of physics, still less so in biology, sociology or art", therefore, the concept of dividual allows us to reveal transversality and ambiguity, when any practices "constitute themselves through division and participation" (p. 8), and finally defines several levels or spheres of individualisation: bio(techno)logical, socio(techno)logical and aesthetic/artistic.

In the context of our study, it is worth paying attention to some characteristic features of the understanding of the dividual. We will do this, disregarding the chronologically important differ-

doi: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i28.349011

ISSN 2227-7242 (Print), ISSN 2304-9685 (Online)
Антропологічні виміри філософських досліджень, 2025, Вип. 28
Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research, 2025, NO. 28

ence between its postmodern and metamodern understanding, which is summarised in the publications of O. Maniukov (2022a, 2022b). To begin with, let us quote Karl Smith's generalisation, which shows how the concepts of the individual and the dividual differ:

> The dividual is considered to be divisible, comprising a complex of separable – interrelated but essentially independent – dimensions or aspects. The individual is thus monadic, while the dividual is fractal; the individual is atomistic, while the dividual is always socially embedded; the individual is an autonomous social actor, the author of his or her own actions, while the dividual is a heteronomous actor performing a culturally written script; the individual is a free-agent, while the dividual is determined by cultural structures; the individual is egocentric, and the dividual is sociocentric. (Smith, 2012, p. 53)

The first defining feature is the divisibility/separability of the dividual, which rejects claims to integrity or selfhood. Therefore, the dividual can be defined as "a digital footprint, a set of traces that an individual leaves behind in the network flows of their economic, social and political life, as well as in leisure practices", that is, fundamentally, dividuals are determined not by their own body or soul, but by "electronic accounts and records" (Maniukov, 2022b, p. 29), thus "representing data flows emitted by virtually everyone in digital culture" and dispersed by "the technical means used by humans" (authors' transl.) (Maniukov, 2022a, p. 35). This external component of the transhuman as a dividual, who constantly stimulates him-/herself into streams of information, along with which he or she constantly transforms, also influences the process of self-understanding and self-awareness, which consists in the realisation of "one's inner divisibility" and "the multi-layered nature of one's 'Self'" (Maniukov, 2022b, p. 29).

Originality

Thus, the dividual is characterised by decentralised subjectivity; moreover, it is a split subject, and this split is embodied primarily in a multitude of digital avatars/identities that are distributed in chains of network connections formed in virtual worlds. The multiple subject is not a holistic self that perceives itself in terms of dialectics; it is transgressive and deconstructive, its boundaries are blurred, it transgresses and deconstructs itself on the border between the real and the virtual, the biological and the technological. It is neither corporeal nor thinking, but rather interface-based. The achievements of AI developments, in particular technologies such as ChatGPT and Gemini, distribute the thinking of individuals in networks that generate synthetic meanings created by algorithms as plausible but unverifiable, and ultimately not considered in terms of truth. These are more like sets of plausible combinations formed using a cut-up method, which Tristan Tzara and William Burroughs once manifested to create artistic/poetic texts. Lan-

doi: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i28.349011

ISSN 2227-7242 (Print), ISSN 2304-9685 (Online)
Антропологічні виміри філософських досліджень, 2025, Вип. 28
Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research, 2025, NO. 28

guage here acts in a non-subjective way, like an algorithmic generator or a combinatorial transformer, leaving the utterance in the mode of "what is said" outside the mode of "who says it". It acts in the mode of order/command, and the success of the response is verified only by the satisfaction of the customer. Therefore, in this situation, there is no place for truth, however we interpret it: according to the criterion of scientific objectivity or eventfulness in the spirit of Alain Badiou. Any message acts in a distributed environment as a simulacrum-equivalent to a particular request, as a functional simulation of the satisfaction of desire. And requests are also generated by the flow of the trans(in)dividual's changing desires.

Ultimately, we find ourselves in a schizoid (in Gilles Deleuze's sense) world. That is, a trans(in)dividual/transhuman is a state of split existence in a situation of oneworldedness, as defined by Ana Teixeira Pinto. Split, distributed subjects interact in a network where "everything is connected". She rightly notes, continuing Felix Stalder's thought,

> Systems of networked governance rely on informal rather than formal structures: unlike laws, protocols come into force through voluntary adoption. Enforcement is decentralized and ubiquitous but, once adopted, protocols became conditions upon which economic or social agents are constituted, upheld by the interactions they afford as well as by the interdependencies they engender. (Teixeira Pinto, 2018)

These interactions and interdependencies are fundamental, because only in this way can a network, a chain, a transformer exist, and only in this way can they stitch together a torn, decentralised, multiple dividual.

So what kind of world does the trans(in)dividual live in, what is their worldview? Of course, they do not stem from the kinship of the magical/mythological tribal worldview, nor do they stem from the commonality of the social/sacred precepts of the religious/metaphysical worldview, and they are no longer limited to their own interests, like an individual with a consumerist/aesthetic worldview. Their existence is determined by their belonging to a certain network/chain and the interdependence of the elements/units that comprise it. This worldview is based on the possibilities offered by technology, primarily digital technology today. Therefore, it is technological. But this technological, digitised world is the measure of all things, existing or non-existing, effective/influential or ineffective/invisible. In this sense, this worldview is sophistical. Therefore, it should be defined as a *technosophical worldview*.

The technosophical worldview, decentralising and splitting all previous worldviews, contaminates them in the virtuality of digital cyberspace, yet detaching them from their environment: 1) we observe how new mythological images are born, which today are combined with AI applications, we observe how actively people exchange various content, which sometimes resembles potlatch practices, but networks must expand, completing the process of destroying family ties (note that it accelerated with the emergence of so-called world religions), and services such as TikTok make it possible to constantly consume entertainment content, erasing from consciousness or the subconscious any need for places of worship and natural environments; 2) we are

doi: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i28.349011

witnessing a kind of inversion of religiosity, where large language models are replacing the old gods (after all, was not the Christian god originally a word, i.e. a large language model!), and people rely on beliefs in the so-called post-truth world, but even such overly human sacrifice is entirely possible, after all, so-called donations are the driving force behind new media projects and the solution to certain problems, but online communities do not need a church, which provides an opportunity to confess and unite in a community of believers, or a university, which provides an opportunity to gain knowledge and unite in a community of scholars, or a field, the cultivation of which unites people in cooperation; 3) of course, science is fundamental to the development of technology, although it is valued more as technoscience – it is its development that creates the conditions for comprehensive consumption, but now, beyond banks, markets and factories that relied on individual accounts, interest and labour, trans(in)dividuals are dealing with one-off transactions, disoriented interest and distributed labour.

Conclusions

In conclusion, let us note that the point is not whether the technosophical worldview is better or worse than others. In fact, it is generated by the nature of technological development and models of interpersonal relationships, which are being mastered and used in the new technological world. Surely, we still have a way not to get lost (although the cost of this is not clear) in this world. This way is still connected with the miracle invented by the ancient Greeks – philosophy. Is technosophistry more illusory or threatening to autonomous thinking beings, such as humans, than mythology or religion? An essential component of this worldview is that, unlike the rest, it does not proceed from the principle of truth; moreover, its proponents refute the very necessity of truth, directing their lives by emotions evoked by spectacular (techno)images produced by networks. They create conditions for unstable, flexible beliefs and irrational trust, which can be quite effective in orienting oneself in the world, at least until they are rejected and replaced by others. In this sense, the technosophical worldview is still the embodiment of a fetishistic perception of the world. So it seems that it is enough to ask questions about truth, or to form a perspective of general agreement or objectivity of knowledge, to refute the alienation, fetishism and bias of technosophistry. But truth, social consensus, and scientific objectivity require a different way of perceiving time – not acceleration, but slowness; not a disoriented rush of rapidly changing images, but focused, unhurried dialogue; not the generation of new combinations of signs, but exploratory creativity and the creation of meaning.

REFERENCES

Braidotti, R. (2013). *The Posthuman*. Cambridge: Polity Press. (in English)

Bazaluk, O. (2024). Aletheia vs. Truth: Socratic Logos for a Modern Understanding of the Universe. *Philosophy and Cosmology, 32*, 117-126. DOI: https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/32/9 (in English)

Castells, M. (2001). *The Internet Galaxy: Reflections on the Internet, Business, and Society*. Oxford University Press. (in English)

Digital. (2025, May 26). In *Wikipedia*. Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Digital (in English)

discrete. (2025, June 19). In *Wikipedia*. Retrieved from https://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/discrete (in English)

Dzoban, O. P. (2021). Tsyfrova liudyna yak filosofska problema. *Informatsiia i pravo,* (2), 9-19. DOI: https://doi.org/10.37750/2616-6798.2021.2(37).238330 (in Ukrainian)

Flusser, V. (2002). The Codified World. In A. Ströhl (Ed.), *Writings* (E. Eisel, Trans., pp. 35-41). University of Minnesota Press. (in English)

Jiang, T., Sun, Z., Fu, S., & Lv, Y. (2024). Human-AI interaction research agenda: A user-centered perspective. *Data and Information Management, 8*(4). DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dim.2024.100078 (in English)

doi: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i28.349011

Karpenko, I. V., & Perepelytsia, O. M. (2023). Philosophy in the (Post) Humanitarian Mission of the University. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, (23), 5-13. DOI: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i23.283579 (in English)

Maniukov, O. Y. (2022a). Postmodern Dividual and Its/His/Herhabitats. *The Journal of V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University. Series "Theory of Culture and Philosophy of Science"*, (65), 32-38. DOI: https://doi.org/10.26565/2306-6687-2022-65-04 (in Ukrainian)

Maniukov, O. Y. (2022b). Understanding of Human Dividuality in Political Metamodernism. *The Journal of V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, Series Philosophy. Philosophical Peripeteias*, (66), 27-37. DOI: https://doi.org/10.26565/2226-0994-2022-66-3 (in Ukrainian)

Ott, M. (2018). *Dividuations: Theories of Participation*. Palgrave Macmillan. (in English)

Raval, S. (2016). *Decentralized Applications: Harnessing Bitcoin's Blockchain Technology*. O'Reilly. (in English)

Salles, A., Evers, K., & Farisco, M. (2020). Anthropomorphism in AI. *AJOB Neuroscience*, *11*(2), 88-95. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/21507740.2020.1740350 (in English)

Skinner, C. (2018). *Digital Human: The Fourth Revolution of Humanity Includes Everyone*. Wiley. (in English)

Smith, K. (2012). From dividual and individual selves to porous subjects. *The Australian Journal of Anthropology*, *23*(1), 50-64. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1757-6547.2012.00167.x (in English)

Swan, M. (2015). *Blockchain: Blueprint for a New Economy*. O'Reilly. (in English)

Teixeira Pinto, A. (2018, February 12). *The Psychology of Paranoid Irony*. Transmediale. Retrieved from https://transmediale.de/en/journal/the-psychology-of-paranoid-irony (in English)

Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A. N., Kaiser, Ł., & Polosukhin, I. (2017). Attention is All you Need. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30*. Retrieved from https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2017/file/3f5ee243547dee91fbd053c1c4a845aa-Paper.pdf (in English)

LIST OF REFERENCE LINKS

Braidotti R. *The Posthuman*. Cambridge : Polity Press, 2013. 229 p.

Bazaluk O. Aletheia vs. Truth: Socratic Logos for a Modern Understanding of the Universe. *Philosophy and Cosmology*. 2024. Vol. 32. P. 117–126. DOI: https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/32/9

Castells M. *The Internet Galaxy: Reflections on the Internet, Business, and Society*. Oxford University Press, 2001. xi, 292 p.

Digital. *Wikipedia*. 2025, May 26. URL: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Digital

discrete. *Wikipedia*. 2025, June 19. URL: https://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/discrete

Дзьобань О. П. Цифрова людина як філософська проблема. *Інформація і право*. 2021. № 2(37). С. 9–19. DOI: https://doi.org/10.37750/2616-6798.2021.2(37).238330

Flusser V. The Codified World. *Writings* / ed. by A. Ströhl ; trans. by E. Eisel. University of Minnesota Press, 2002. P. 35–41.

Jiang T., Sun Z., Fu S., Lv Y. Human-AI interaction research agenda: A user-centered perspective. *Data and Information Management*. 2024. Vol. 8, Iss. 4. 10 p. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dim.2024.100078

Karpenko I. V., Perepelytsia O. M. Philosophy in the (Post) Humanitarian Mission of the University. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*. 2023. No. 23. P. 5–13. DOI: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i23.283579

Манюков О. Ю. Постмодерний дивід(уум) та його ареали. *Вісник Харківського національного університету імені В. Н. Каразіна. Серія "Теорія культури і філософія науки"*. 2022. № 65. С. 32–38. DOI: https://doi.org/10.26565/2306-6687-2022-65-04

Манюков О. Розуміння людської дивідуальності в політичному метамодернізмі. *Вісник Харківського національного університету імені В. Н. Каразіна. Серія "Філософія. Філософські перипетії"*. 2022. № 66. С. 27–37. DOI: https://doi.org/10.26565/2226-0994-2022-66-3

Ott M. *Dividuations: Theories of Participation*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2018. 254 p.

Raval S. *Decentralized Applications: Harnessing Bitcoin's Blockchain Technology*. O'Reilly, 2016. 103 p.

Salles A., Evers K., Farisco M. Anthropomorphism in AI. *AJOB Neuroscience*. 2020. Vol. 11, Iss. 2. P. 88–95. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/21507740.2020.1740350

Skinner C. *Digital Human: The Fourth Revolution of Humanity Includes Everyone*. Wiley, 2018. 325 p.

Smith K. From dividual and individual selves to porous subjects. *The Australian Journal of Anthropology*. 2012. Vol. 23, Iss. 1. P. 50–64. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1757-6547.2012.00167.x

Swan M. *Blockchain: Blueprint for a New Economy*. O'Reilly, 2015. 152 p.

doi: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i28.349011

Teixeira Pinto A. The Psychology of Paranoid Irony. *Transmediale*. 2018. February 12. URL: https://transmediale.de/en/journal/the-psychology-of-paranoid-irony

Vaswani A., Shazeer N., Parmar N., Uszkoreit J., Jones L., Gomez A. N., Kaiser Ł., Polosukhin I. Attention is All you Need. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30*. 2017. URL: https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2017/file/3f5ee243547dee91fbd053c1c4a845aa-Paper.pdf

О. М. ПЕРЕПЕЛИЦЯ[1*], Є. В. КОРДЮМОВ[2*]

[1*]Харківський національний університет імені В. Н. Каразіна (Харків, Україна), ел. пошта o.perepelytsia@karazin.ua, ORCID 0000-0001-9825-7573
[2*]Харківський національний університет імені В. Н. Каразіна (Харків, Україна), ел. пошта kordumov.e.v@gmail.com, ORCID 0009-0009-6775-8821

Життєвий світ цифрової епохи: транс(ін)дивід і технософістика

Мета статті – осмислення визначальної тенденції останніх років, а саме – пришвидшена диджиталізація (digitization) людського життя, що призводить до переосмислення самовизначення людини. Також потребує аналізу головна складова нової епохи людства, а саме – а) створення глобальної комунікативної платформи – інтернету і "оцифрованої мережевої структури цінностей", б) цифровий режим обмінів, що призводить до трансформації самої форми людини, яка може бути визначена як дигітальна транслюдина. На думку авторів, також заслуговують на увагу визначення особливостей концептуалізації цієї форми в певній (транс)антропологічній перспективі. **Теоретичний базис** статті становить *суб'єктно-дезорієнтована антропологія*, що виходить з трьох топографічних принципів: дезорієнтованість, несамототожність, множинність людської істоти. **Наукова новизна.** Виходячи з трьох топографічних принципів диджиталізації (Network, Blockchain, Transformer), транслюдина розглядається як дивід чи транс(ін)дивід і визначається його життєвий світ і світогляд. Диджиталізація, швидкий розвиток технологій штучного інтелекту, інтернет, технологія blockchain, ChatGPT тощо суттєво змінили життєвий світ людини. Інтернет впровадив мережевий спосіб соціальної взаємодії. Мережа є ризоматичною множиною, всі складники котрої є взаємозалежними, нестабільними, трансформативними. Технологія blockchain впроваджує децентралізований розподіл даних, є множиною, всі елементи якої взаємозалежні, розподілені й децентровані, взаємозамінні. Трансформер, зокрема ChatGPT, є множиною, всі елементи якої трансдуктивні та генеративні. Отже людина просіюється цифровими технологіями, коли все (родове, спільне, індивідуальне) піддається цифровому розділенню. Саме тому транслюдина вже є дивідом чи транс(ін)дивідом – трансформативною, поділеною в собі, множинною істотою. Дивіда характеризує децентрована суб'єктивність, розщепленість, що втілюється у множині цифрових ідентичностей, які розподіляються в ланцюгах мережевих зв'язків у віртуальних світах. Множинний суб'єкт не є цілісним, він є тренсгресивним і деконструктивним, його кордони розмиті, він трансгресує і деконструюється на межі реального і віртуального, біологічного і технологічного. Досягнення розробок ШІ розподіляють мислення окремих індивідів в мережах, що генерують синтетичні сенси, створені алгоритмами, що не підлягають перевірці на істинність, не розглядаються в категоріях істини. Буття транс(ін)дивіда визначає належність до певної мережі і взаємозалежність елементів, що її складають. Його світогляд можна визначити як технософістичний. **Висновки.** Суттєвою складовою технософістичного світогляду є те, що він не виходить з принципу істинності, його носії скеровують життя афектами, які викликаються образами, що продукуються мережами і є підгрунтям для нестійких вірувань. Для людини все більш важливими є задачі пошуку об'єктивних знань та створення передумов для загальної суспільної домовленості.

Ключові слова: людина; транслюдина; індивід; дивід; технософістичний світогляд; диджиталізація; мережа; блокчейн; трансформер

Received: 22.07.2025
Accepted: 16.12.2025

doi: https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i28.349011