АНТРОПОЛОГІЧНА СПЕЦИФІКА УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ ФІЛОСОФІЇ В ПЕРСПЕКТИВІ КУЛЬТУРНО-ПРЕДИКАТИВНОГО АНАЛІЗУ

Ярослав ГНАТЮК
orcid.org/0000-0003-1340-1922
кандидат філософських наук, доцент кафедри філософії, соціології та релігієзнавства Прикарпатського національного університету імені Василя Стефаника

Анотація. Головною метою статті є аналіз твердження філософської україністики про антропологічну специфіку української філософської думки засобами історико-філософського культурно-предикативного аналізу. Методологію дослідження визначили передусім концепція культурного приписування і перекладу в діалозі мов історичних культур Познанської методологічної школи (Є. Топольський, В. Вжосек, Е. Доманська) та культурологічний підхід в історико-філософському українознавстві (В. Горський, С. Руденко). Твердження мови історико-філософського українознавства досліджується засобами історико-філософського культурно-предикативного аналізу. Останній є специфічною гуманітарно-науковою дослідницькою стратегією, котра пропонується нами в якості засобу вивчення комунікативної специфіки та синтаксичної коректності мови історико-філософської теорії. Вивчення комунікативної специфіки відбувається в перспективі модернізованих версій метафізичної, феноменологічної і діалектичної логік. Перша розуміється як логіка трансцендентної метафізики, друга – як логіка іманентної метафізики, а третя ж – як логіка процесуальної метафізики. Такий підхід забезпечує якісне і комплексне осмислення досліджуваних тверджень. Твердження мови історико-філософської теорії узагальнюються в її іменах, залежно від перспективи однієї з трьох версій логіки філософських міркувань. Пропонований історико-філософський культурно-предикативний аналіз комунікативної специфіки і синтаксичної коректності тверджень мови української історико-філософської теорії відкриває нові виміри для дослідження антропологічної специфіки української філософії.

Ключові слова: українська філософія; історія української філософії; антропологічність української філософії; український кордоцентризм; український персоналізм; історико-філософський культурно-предикативний аналіз.

ANTHROPOLOGICAL SPECIFICS OF UKRAINIAN PHILOSOPHY IN THE PERSPECTIVE OF CULTURAL-PREDICATIVE ANALYSIS

Yaroslav HNATIUK
Candidate of Philosophical Sciences, associate professor of the Department of Philosophy, Sociology, and Religious Studies at Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University

Annotation. The main purpose of the article is to analyze the statements of philosophical Ukrainian Studies about the anthropological specifics of Ukrainian philosophical thought by means of historical-philosophical cultural-predicative analysis. The research methodology was determined primarily by the concept of cultural attribution and translation in the dialogue of languages of historical cultures of the Poznań Methodological School (J. Topolski, W. Wrzosek, E. Domańska) and the culturological approach in historical-philosophical Ukrainian Studies (V. Horskyi, S. Rudenko). The statements of the language of historical and philosophical Ukrainian studies are analyzed by means of historical-philosophical cultural-predicative analysis. The latter is a specific humanities research strategy, which

we propose as a means of studying the communicative specifics and syntactic correctness of the language of historical-philosophical theory. The study of communicative specifics takes place from the perspective of modernized versions of metaphysical, phenomenological, and dialectical logic. The first is understood as the logic of transcendental metaphysics, the second as the logic of immanent metaphysics, and the third as the logic of procedural metaphysics. Such an approach provides a qualitative and comprehensive understanding of the analyzed statements. The statements of the language of the historical-philosophical theory are generalized in its names, depending on the perspective of one of the three versions of the logic of philosophical reasoning. The offered historical-philosophical cultural-predicative analysis of communicative specifics and the syntactic correctness of the Ukrainian historical-philosophical theory statements opens new dimensions in research of the anthropological specifics of Ukrainian philosophy.

__Key words:__ Ukrainian philosophy; history of Ukrainian philosophy; anthropological specificity of Ukrainian philosophy; Ukrainian cordocentrism; Ukrainian personalism; historical-philosophical cultural-predicative analysis.

The historical-philosophical literature on Ukrainian Studies substantiates the thesis about the anthropological specificity of Ukrainian philosophy. The latter can be fully understood only in the process of communicative interaction between the statements expressing it because, as the founder of the Poznań Methodological School, E. Topolski, points out, the logical and grammatical level of historical (including historical-philosophical) narrative plays a crucial role in its structure and development [19]. In fact, from these preconditions follows the necessity to analyze the communicative specifics of the language of historical-philosophical Ukrainian Studies in a historical-philosophical cultural-predicative way. The main principles of this analysis are cultural relativism and cultural constructivism, which, according to the accurate definition of the cultural theorist S. Kandulskyi, "are connected with the presupposition that knowledge about the world, together with cognitive forms, has its firm foundations not in the objective conditions related to the human organism, but rather within the social rationalization of one's experience and the ways of its formulation" [20, p. 44].

The main means of the proposed historical-philosophical cultural-predicative analysis is cultural attribution. In the view of W. Wrzosek – one of the authors of this concept – the peculiarity of the process of cultural attribution is that "the historian faithful to the principles of his profession imparts sense to the world which he investigates in the light of the meanings which, in his opinion, (and hence in the light of the received historical knowledge of those phenomena) could have been attributes of the time when they were taking place" [22, p. 138].

In this case, the historian of philosophy adopts a strategy contrary to naive empiricism in the methodology with its inherent notions of 'pure facts' and guidelines for citation and commentary on the sources. W. Wrzosek contrasts this approach with historical constructivism, ironically calling imperfect empiricism a methodology of 'scissors and glue' [23]. By preferring cultural constructivism to methodological empiricism and realism in our study, we will also adopt E. Domańska's thesis that modern humanities need a new metalanguage, which cannot be created without rethinking the concepts already embedded in tradition and firmly focusing on the creation of new ones [18].

Considering the above, the ***purpose*** of the article is to implement

historical-philosophical cultural-predicative analysis of the communicative specifics of the statements of the historical-philosophical theory about the anthropological specifics of Ukrainian philosophy. The realization of this purpose involves the solution of the following *tasks*: a) to transform the analyzed statement into a normal form; b) to analyze the syntactic structure of this statement by means of a modified subject-predicative syntax and to define its communicative states; c) to study the meanings of parts of the integral statement by means of the substitution semantics of logical terms and philosophical concepts; d) to conceive parts of the analyzed statement as studied and investigating methodological cultures in the context of historical-philosophical intercultural communication.

Empirical Aspect.
To the Problem of Definition
of Ukrainian Philosophy

Analyzing the statements of the language of historical-philosophical theory, we should first pay attention to the history of its syntactic construction and the historical semantics of the concept of 'Ukrainian anthropocentric philosophy'. It should be noted that, on the scale of cultural space, philosophy can acquire the status of global, regional, and national philosophy. The philosophy of the Ukrainian diaspora was centered on world philosophical thought, particularly Western European philosophy; regional philosophy, such as Slavic philosophy; and national, specifically Ukrainian philosophy. It is obvious that Ukrainian philosophy was a priority subject of the intellectual interest of thinkers of the Ukrainian diaspora. The views of these thinkers on the concept and specifics of Ukrainian philosophy prompted the philosophers

of independent Ukraine to popularize the concepts of 'national philosophy' and 'Ukrainian philosophy' within the Ukrainian national community.

The concept of 'national philosophy' in the context of national culture was studied in particular by V. Lisovyi and S. Rudenko. According to the first, national philosophy is a manifestation of the national worldview on the one hand, and philosophical ideas that are either created by people belonging to a particular nation, or have already become a fact of its intellectual life on the other [10]. Instead, in the opinion of the second, "there are no doubts that philosophy is a part of Ukrainian culture. Therefore, it reflects the main cultural practices of the Ukrainian people, or more precisely, their worldview. That is why studying national philosophy and its history is also a way of learning culture" [21, p. 86].

Some researchers of Ukrainian philosophical thought, in particular V. Horskyi, V. Shevchenko, V. Petrushenko, and O. Vusatiuk, developed the concept of national philosophy to the concept of Ukrainian philosophy. The relatively small number of definitions of Ukrainian philosophy is due to the fact that the problem of the national and cultural identity of Ukrainian philosophy has not yet been convincingly solved. In addition, P. Caussat noted that the concept of national philosophy is not a well-defined object. Firstly, because "this 'object' is first and foremost a 'subject', a center of invention carried out on the basis of radical contingency, a center of living, diverse, radical, and fundamental nature at the same time" [8, p. 76]. Secondly, because "this subject opens up both to the past, from which it breaks away in its sudden, incredible origin, and to a predetermined destiny, which does not have a clearly defined limit in the ocean

of possibilities, whose reliable calculation is impossible" [8, p. 76].

M. Symchych took the same position, noting that the concept of Ukrainian philosophy cannot be precisely defined because "no internal features have been found that serve its formation" [15, p. 90]. In turn, S. Yosypenko noted that instead of the concept of Ukrainian philosophy, it is better to use the concept of 'national philosophical tradition' [6, p. 58]. He also suggested using the term 'Ukrainian institutional philosophy' instead of the concept of Ukrainian philosophy, calling for "(…) switching to the level of institutions, without abolishing, of course, the cultural approach" [6, pp. 58–59]. However, it should be noted that in the case of applying the institutional approach, outside the so-called official philosophy are such prominent representatives of Ukrainian philosophical thought as H. Skovoroda, T. Shevchenko, P. Kulish, I. Franko, L. Ukrainka, and other figures, because their philosophical activity was on the margins of institutional forms of philosophy. Nowadays, such an approach implicitly deprives legitimacy of other possible forms of philosophizing, including journalism, essays, philosophical poetry and novels, consolidating the status of respectable philosophy only in the works of university professors and employees of research institutes.

Despite methodological obstacles to defining the concept of Ukrainian philosophy, thanks to the efforts of a number of thinkers of the Ukrainian diaspora and philosophers of independent Ukraine, various versions of the concept of 'Ukrainian philosophy' have appeared in the Ukrainian philosophical discourse. Among them are the following: 'philosophy in Ukraine', 'philosophical thought of Ukraine', 'philosophy of Ukraine', etc. Usually, these concepts

are specified in more complex theoretical constructions, such as 'history of philosophy in Ukraine', 'history of philosophical thought of Ukraine', 'history of philosophy of Ukraine', 'development of philosophical thought in Ukraine', etc. One of the first attempts to conceptualize the concept of 'Ukrainian philosophy' in the context of a complex theoretical construction – 'History of Philosophy of Ukraine' – was made by V. Horskyi, who legitimized the concept of Ukrainian philosophy in the Ukrainian philosophical discourse in his work with the innovative title *History of Ukrainian Philosophy* [4]. According to V. Horskyi "the history of Ukrainian philosophy as a philosophical discipline studies the development of philosophical thought in Ukraine" [4, p. 8]. Based on this definition, the thinker touched upon the understanding of the concept of Ukrainian philosophy. From this point of view, Ukrainian philosophy is a self-consciousness of Ukrainian philosophical culture. It has a historical character: three historical stages of development of Ukrainian self-consciousness correspond to three historical types of Ukrainian philosophical culture: Greco-Slavic-Christian, Baroque, and Romanticism [4]. However, not all researchers agree with the proposal to generalize the concept of 'history of Ukrainian philosophy' in the concept of 'Ukrainian philosophy'. For example, V. Artiukh thinks that we should use the concept of the 'Ukrainian philosophical process'. He suggests understanding this concept as "the level of knowledge that arises as a result of the reflection of modern researchers on a set of philosophical texts organized into a whole (...) according to certain needs of modernity" [1, p. 308].

V. Shevchenko advanced even further than V. Horskyi on the way to developing

the concept of 'Ukrainian philosophy'. He was the first to separate the concept of 'Ukrainian philosophy' from the theoretical construction of the 'history of Ukrainian philosophy' and thus separated the historical and philosophical aspects in the brand new concept. According to V. Shevchenko, Ukrainian philosophy is "the doctrine of the principles of a wise way of life of Ukrainians in their own state among the peoples and nations of the world" [14, p. 10]. Besides going into detail describing his understanding of the concept of Ukrainian philosophy, as well as developing and accordingly complicating it, V. Shevchenko noted that "Ukrainian philosophy can be defined as a theoretical and methodological interpretation of the specific structure of the archetypes of world and life, which connects into a single system the features of reason, will, and emotional attitude to the world, as well as the organization of the Ukrainian community" [14, p. 73].

Later, V. Petrushenko proposed his own definition of Ukrainian philosophy. He noted that Ukrainian philosophy is "a set of philosophical and ideological ideas, views and concepts developed throughout the history of Ukraine by representatives of different peoples united by a common interest in the spiritual life, culture, and historical destiny of Ukraine" [13, p. 171]. In contrast to the above-mentioned definitions, O. Vusatiuk proposed his rather problematic definition of the concept of Ukrainian philosophy. In his opinion, Ukrainian philosophy is "a professional philosophical thought of the 18th – early 20th century, which existed on the basis of Ukrainian culture or functioned within the ethnic Ukrainian territory" [16, p. 831]. This definition reduces Ukrainian philosophy to the history of professional philosophy in Ukraine. However, the history of Ukrainian philosophy, as it was rightly emphasized by V. Horskyi, in addition to the history of professional philosophy, also includes the history of philosophical theory and the history of philosophical culture [4]. Therefore, reducing Ukrainian philosophy to only one of the directions of the history of Ukrainian philosophy, O. Vusatiuk limited the scope of this concept. Apart from that, he also reduced the existence of Ukrainian philosophy to the period from the 18th to the beginning of the 20th century, leaving out of its scope the philosophy of Kievan Rus, the philosophy of Renaissance humanism in Ukraine, the modern Ukrainian philosophy, and the philosophy of the Ukrainian diaspora. Moreover, in his opinion, the development of Ukrainian philosophy ended at the beginning of the 20th century. After that, apparently, according to O. Vusatiuk, Ukrainian philosophy lost its national specifics and fully merged with the world philosophy.

Within the given context, we should add that the national specificity of Ukrainian philosophy is not only the features of the Ukrainian worldview that are expressed in it but also the national and cultural expression of Ukrainian beingness. True Ukrainian philosophy is rooted in authentic Ukrainian beingness and expresses its essence in its philosophical concepts, bringing them from the depths to the surface of conceptual space. However, a significant part of Ukrainian philosophers is not rooted in Ukrainian life, thus indifferent and alien to it. For a number of reasons, these philosophers stay in the foreground of Ukrainian philosophical life; they are not immersed in the depths of Ukrainian beingness. Such thinkers are not able to express the essence of Ukrainian life in new, original philosophical concepts. And this is certainly the main task of

Ukrainian philosophy as a national-cultural phenomenon. Regarding the above, the concept of 'Ukrainian philosophy' logically leads to the concept of 'specifics of Ukrainian philosophy'.

The specifics of Ukrainian philosophy, the dominants and trends in its development have always been in the center of attention of specialists in philosophical Ukrainian Studies. Among the Ukrainian diaspora thinkers who initiated the analysis of the specifics of Ukrainian philosophical thought are the following: D. Chyzhevskyi, I. Mirchuk, D. Buchynskyi, O. Kulchytskyi, V. Yaniv, S. Yarmus, V. Oleksiuk, T. Zakydalskyi. Analytics of the specifics of the history of Ukrainian philosophy was continued by philosophers from the independent Ukraine V. Horskyi, V. Shevchenko, M. Horbach, V. Lisovyi, I. Bondarevych, H. Popadynets, I. Kozak, O. Chornyi, M. Tkachuk, I. Lysyi, and others. Characterizing the specific features of Ukrainian philosophy, these researchers mostly singled out either one expressive feature, for example, practicality, aphorisms, religiosity, anthropocentrism, cordocentrism, etc., or a number of similar features, such as antaeism, existentialism, cordocentrism, and others. In the first case, we are talking about the monophonic, and in the second – about the polyphonic specifics of Ukrainian philosophy. In the following narration, the main attention is paid to the monophonic specifics of Ukrainian philosophy, such its characteristic feature as anthropologism and related to it anthropocentrism.

From the perspective of the development of the Ukrainian historical-philosophical process, Ukrainian philosophy appears primarily as an anthropological philosophy built on the basis of anthropologism. On the one hand, the anthropologism of Ukrainian philosophy is its cornerstone philosophical principle, according to which the doctrine of human essence underlies this philosophy; on the other hand, anthropologism is the leading trend in Ukrainian philosophical thought, according to which the human problem is central to its history. The anthropologism of Ukrainian philosophy is related to anthropocentrism as one of its worldview principles, which proclaims man to be the center of the universe, its ultimate goal, and meaning.

O. Kulchytskyi's arguments give ground for asserting that the anthropologism of Ukrainian philosophy has passed through two main stages in its development: cordocentrism and personalism. In turn, the concept 'Ukrainian cordocentrism' was proposed in Ya. Hnatiuk's monograph *Ukrainian Cordocentrism in the Conflict of Mythologies and Interpretations* [2]. Nowadays, we can distinguish two approaches to solving the problem of describing the subject matter of Ukrainian cordocentrism: psychological and culturological; and accordingly, two schools of historical-philosophical Ukrainian Studies: psychological and culturological. The founders of the psychological school of historical and philosophical Ukrainian Studies, I. Mirchuk, V. Yaniv, O. Kulchytskyi, S. Yarmus understood Ukrainian cordocentrism as a manifestation of the Ukrainian worldview mentality. In the context of the psychological school of historical-philosophical Ukrainian Studies, Ukrainian cordocentrism was interpreted as the doctrine of a person divided into two opposite parts, the emotional and rational spheres, where the first part plays a leading role in relation to the second, and the second is completely subordinate to the first. In this perspective, the mind becomes weakened, unable to control emotions, receives an inferior status.

The founders of the culturological school of historical-philosophical Ukrainian Studies – V. Oleksiuk, T. Zakydalskyi, Ye. Kaliuzhnyi, V. Horskyi – interpreted Ukrainian cordocentrism as a manifestation of Ukrainian Orthodox culture, making its existence dependent on the prevailing religious beliefs. In the context of the culturological school of historical-philosophical Ukrainian Studies, Ukrainian cordocentrism was understood as the doctrine of a holistic man composed of body, soul and spirit, where the spirit plays a leading role, ensures the unity of body and soul, and the indivisibility of the human being.

Leading representatives of the academic direction of philosophy in the Ukrainian diaspora – D. Chyzhevskyi, I. Mirchuk – and a representative of the personalist direction O. Kulchytskyi proposed an explanatory scheme according to which the structure of the Ukrainian worldview determines the disciplinary structure of Ukrainian philosophy. In their opinion, the Ukrainian worldview mentality is characterized by the primacy of the emotional-sensory sphere over the rational-discursive one. This approach lays down the proper structure of Ukrainian philosophy, in which ethics prevails over logic and metaphysics, and practical philosophy over the theoretical. However, the philosopher from the Ukrainian diaspora, T. Zakydalskyi considered such an explanatory scheme undeveloped, insufficiently substantiated, and consequently problematic [17]. Subsequently, some representatives of the Kyiv worldview-anthropological school, in particular A. Bychko, I. Bychko, V. Tabachkovskyi, S. Krymskyi, M. Bulatov, and N. Khamitov, accepted the truth of insufficiently critically tested positions and conclusions of thinkers of the Ukrainian diaspora. The idea of the superiority of the emotional over the rational in Ukrainian philosophy is clearly traced in some works of these philosophers. For example, according to N. Khamitov, cordocentrism of Ukrainian philosophical thought means "(...) the dominant of the heart, the predominance of feeling over logical reasoning, and image over concept" [7, p. 193]. In our opinion, such statements have largely contributed to the spread in the Ukrainian cultural space of ideas about the Ukrainian worldview as excessive Ukrainian emotionality and Ukrainian cordocentrism as a doctrine of a divided human being, whose weakened mind is unable to control his emotions. According to this interpretation, the Ukrainian human is understood as an irrational being, not a holistic being or personality, and Ukrainian philosophy is interpreted as a philosophy of irrationalism rather than personalism. The outlined perspective shifts the emphasis from the theoretical nature of Ukrainian philosophy to its customary nature, reducing it to the so-called art of living. In fact, note that Ukrainian cordocentrism is a doctrine of a human personality, whose emotionality is firmly rooted in its holistic structure. This is the Ukrainian version of the philosophy of personalism, moreover, it is its original version, the prototype of the Western European analogue of personalism. It seems interesting that it arose much earlier than Western European personalism. The founder of Ukrainian cordocentrism as a personalistic philosophy was undoubtedly H. Skovoroda, who completed his doctrine of the heart as a whole person in 1794, while the concept of 'personalism' was proposed by F. Schleiermacher only in 1799.

The next stage in the development of anthropologism as a specific feature of Ukrainian philosophy is the anthropological turn to Ukrainian personalism, initiated by the

Ukrainian diaspora thinker O. Kulchytskyi. This turn generalizes Ukrainian cordocentrism and outlines the transition from Ukrainian cordocentrism to Ukrainian personcentrism. Ukrainian personalism focuses on the heart of the personality, the indivisibility of the whole human being. In this definition, the heart is understood as the integrative beginning of the human being, and on the other hand, the whole human being is interpreted as a personality. In this approach, the heart and personality coincide, becoming one and the same. The heart, the spirit, the human born of the spirit is a real and true person. Hence the understanding of Ukrainian personalism as cordocentric [9]. Now it can be seen that the affinity of Ukrainian cordocentrism with Ukrainian cordocentric personalism becomes more obvious.

Thus, Ukrainian philosophy, as follows from the results of its empirical analysis, is an anthropological philosophy, a theoretical system of Ukrainian philosophical humanities. The axiological version of anthropocentrism is a kind of problem center of Ukrainian philosophy, and the leading trend in the development of Ukrainian philosophical thought is its anthropologism as an existential-humanistic direction. This tendency is specified in two genetically related forms: Ukrainian cordocentrism as a doctrine of the human heart and Ukrainian personalism as a doctrine of the heart as an integrative center of personality.

Theoretical Aspect.
Cultural-Predicative Analysis
of the Statements
of Historical-Philosophical
Ukrainian Studies

The above outlined empirical analysis of anthropologism as a leading trend in Ukrainian philosophy should be supplemented by a theoretical analysis of the language of the historical-philosophical theory of this trend. Such an analysis will make it possible to determine the correctness and quality level of the structure of this theory from lower to higher. Among other things, the theoretical analysis of the anthropologism of Ukrainian philosophy can be carried out using historical-philosophical cultural-predicative analysis as a special research method in the humanities. A more detailed historical-philosophical cultural-predicative analysis of the communicative specifics of the statements of historical-philosophical theory is substantiated in Ya. Hnatiuk's monograph *Communicative Potential of Cultural Predication* [3].

The historical-philosophical cultural-predicative analysis should be understood as a study of communicative specificity and syntactic correctness of historical-philosophical theory with the logic of philosophical reasoning and methodology of historical-philosophical intercultural communication, which aims to build an integrative communicative theory of the history of philosophy. According to this definition, the logic of philosophical reasoning (philosophical logic in the traditional sense) – which we develop on the basis of functional analysis in logical theory – is the calculus of definitive specifications in the language structure of philosophical logical theory. The calculation of definitive specifications should be understood as the interpretation of a *definiendum* by means of a *definiens* and, at the same time, its transformation from one into another. All this is due to the methodology of historical and philosophical intercultural communication, which is understood as the informational interaction between the investigating and studied

methodological cultures and correlates with the typology of the historical-philosophical process, combining the communicative principle with the typological principle. In this sense, each subsequent historical type of philosophy is an investigating philosophical culture in relation to the prior, studied philosophical culture.

The branches of the philosophical reasoning logic are modernized models of metaphysical, phenomenological, and dialectical logic. In these logics, the basic subject-predicate syntax of traditional models of metaphysical and phenomenological logics and a conversive definitive-specific syntax of the traditional model of dialectical logic are replaced by a modified subject-predicate syntax of philosophical reasoning. In turn, its simple subjects and predicates are converted into complex ones. The modernized model of metaphysical logic is a metaphysical language of philosophical logic of modified subject-predicate discourse. In a syntactic aspect, this model is built as a calculus of general names, where these names function in the status of language equivalents of the traditional metaphysics categories such as a 'substance', 'quality', 'quantity'. Accordingly, we will consider the modernized model of phenomenological logic as the phenomenological language of philosophical logic of a modified subject-predicate discourse, which is syntactically constructed as a calculus of general and singular names, where these names function in the status of language equivalents of such categories of transcendental phenomenology as 'intension', 'phenomenon', and 'eidos'. Finally, the modernized model of dialectical logic is the dialectic language of the philosophical logic of modified subject-predicate discourse. In the syntactic aspect, it is constructed as the calculus of general,

partial, and singular names, in which general, partial and singular names function in the status of language equivalents of such processual dialectics categories as 'general', 'special', 'singular'.

The main research object of historical-philosophical cultural-predicative analysis is the communicative specifics of the statements of historical-philosophical theory. It is manifested as a result of studying the informational interaction between the parts of the statements of the language of historical-philosophical theory as spheres of the unknown and the known, and the explanation of the unknown on the basis of the known. In the philosophical reasoning logic, the unknown is localized in the subject, definition, term, singular, special or general, etc.; and the known – in the predicate, definition, predicator, singular, special or general, etc. The methodology of historical-philosophical intercultural communication assumes that the unknown is located in the sphere of the studied philosophical culture, and the known is located in the sphere of the investigating philosophical culture.

Now we will analyze the possibilities of historical-philosophical cultural-predicative analysis in the field of study of the communicative specificity of the language of historical-philosophical theory. This will help to clarify the features of applying the philosophical reasoning logic and the historical-philosophical intercultural communication methodology to the study of the Ukrainian historical-philosophical theory language statements that express the specifics of Ukrainian philosophy. For example, according to S. Yarmus, "the philosophy of Ukrainian thinkers is cordocentric, and in a broader sense, it is anthropocentric" [5, p. 402]. Let us convert this paradigmatic statement to the normal form of

philosophical logic and analyze it by means of the latter. At the same time, we should also keep on the table the issues of the article. As a result, we get the statement of the modified subject-predicative structure: 'Ukrainian philosophy is anthropocentric'. Let us consider it by the analysis of all three branches of the philosophical reasoning logic, which are modernized models of metaphysical, phenomenological, and dialectical logics. Let us write it in the language of the modified subject-predicative syntax. In the modernized metaphysical version, it takes the form of 'Ukrainian philosophy (S(r)) is anthropocentric (P(a))', where S(r) is a complex subjective term formed from a function as a simple subject (S) and an argument as an individual thing (r), and P(a) is a complex predicate term formed from the function as a simple predicate (P) and an argument as quality (a). In terms of the modified subject-predicate syntax of the modernized model of metaphysical logic, the analyzed statement will be called a material-qualitative statement.

The next step should be a semantic interpretation of the complex subject and complex predicate terms of the analyzed statement. A complex subject term appears as a logical subject with the function of a simple subject and an argument of an individual thing, and a complex predicate term appears as a logical predicate with the function of a simple predicate and an argument of quality. In the context of the substitutive semantics of logical terms and philosophical concepts of the modernized model of metaphysical logic, function and argument as general names are language equivalents of the metaphysical categories 'substance' and 'quality'. Substance or the 'first substance' is understood as an individual thing, and quality – as a distinctive feature of the

thing. In the analyzed statement, the concept of Ukrainian philosophy corresponds to the modified subject-predicate structure of the category of substance, and the category of quality corresponds to such a specific feature of Ukrainian philosophy as anthropocentrism. In the context of the methodology of historical-philosophical intercultural communication, the scope of a complex subject term is identified with the world of the studied philosophical culture and localized within its sphere. Accordingly, the scope of the complex predicate term coincides with the world of investigating philosophical culture and is also localized in its field. The scope of a complex subject term (the world of the studied philosophical culture) is considered to be the sphere of the unknown, and the scope of the complex predicate term (the world of the investigating philosophical culture) is considered to be the sphere of the known. In the case of the analyzed statement, Ukrainian philosophy as the unknown is explained through anthropocentrism as the known. This is the essence of logical-methodological communication as information interaction in the context of the assertion of a modernized version of metaphysical logic, which is studied using the historical-philosophical cultural-predicative analysis.

In turn, in the modernized phenomenological version, the analyzed statement takes the form 'Ukrainian philosophy (S(f)) is anthropocentric (P(e))', where S(f) is a complex subjective term formed from a function as a simple subject (S) and argument as a phenomenon (f); P(e) is a complex predicate term formed from the function as a simple predicate (P) and argument as eidos (e). In terms of the modified subject-predicate syntax of the modernized model of phenomenological logic, the

studied statement of the modified subject-predicative structure appears to be a finite statement. According to this statement, a complex subject term is compared to a finite set of complex predicate terms.

Now let us make a semantic interpretation of the complex subject and complex predicate terms of the analyzed statement. A complex subject term appears as a logical subject with a function of a simple subject and an argument of a phenomenon, and a complex predicate term appears as a logical predicate with a function of a simple predicate and an argument of eidos. From the point of view of the substitutive semantics of logical terms and philosophical concepts of the modernized model of phenomenological logic, the function and argument of a complex subject term are expressed by singular names, and the function and argument of a complex predicate term are expressed by general names. A singular name is the language equivalent of such a phenomenological category as a phenomenon, and a general name is the language equivalent of eidos as a phenomenological category. A phenomenon is a *phenomenon in itself*, not a phenomenon as a manifestation of something, but a unique phenomenon observed by the subject of cognition. It is synonymous with fact. In turn, eidos is synonymous with essence and is opposed to fact. In the context of the methodology of historical-philosophical intercultural communication, the scope of a complex subject term is identified with the world of the studied philosophical culture and localized in its sphere. Accordingly, the scope of its complex predicate term coincides with the world of investigating philosophical culture and is localized in the field of a complex predicate term. The scope of a complex subject term as the world of the studied philosophical

culture is the sphere of the phenomenon as the unknown, and the scope of the complex predicate term as the world of the investigating philosophical culture is the sphere of eidos as the known. In the process of communicative interaction between the studied and investigating philosophical cultures, a definitive specification of the phenomenon as the unknown is built on the basis of eidos as the known. In the context of the analyzed statement, Ukrainian philosophy as an unknown phenomenon becomes known due to anthropocentrism as its essential characteristics, or eidos. This is the result of information interaction within the studied statement of the modernized version of phenomenological logic.

Finally, in the modernized dialectical version, the studied statement takes the form 'Ukrainian philosophy (S(x)) is anthropocentric (P(z))', while S(f) is a complex subject term formed from a function as a simple subject (S) and an argument as the singular (x); P (z) is a complex predicate term formed from the function as a simple predicate (P) and an argument as the general (z). In the proposed terms, the analyzed statement has the status of a singular-general. It clarifies the relationship between a complex subject term as a singular and a complex predicate term as a general. Let us make a semantic interpretation of the complex subject and complex predicate terms. From the perspective of the substitutive semantics of logical terms and philosophical concepts of modernized dialectical logic, the function is a simple subject as a singular name and a simple predicate as a general name, and the argument of a simple subject as a singular name and the argument of a simple predicate as a general name serve as language equivalents of dialectics categories of the singular and general. The singular is

an element or an individual as an expression of the basis, and the general is a whole or a genus as an expression of identity. In the analyzed statement, Ukrainian philosophy corresponds to the singular, and anthropocentrism to the general.

The scope of a complex subject term in the methodology of historical-philosophical intercultural communication is identified with the world of the studied philosophical culture, which is localized within its scope. The complex predicate term in this methodology is compared with the world of investigating philosophical culture, which is localized in its field. The scope of a complex subject term as the world of the studied philosophical culture is considered to be the sphere of the singular as the unknown on the basis of the general as the known. In the context of the analyzed statement of the modernized version of dialectical logic, Ukrainian philosophy as the unknown and unique is clarified and comprehended by comparing it with the anthropocentrism as the known and general, and thus acquires the status of the unproblematic expression Therefore, from the perspective of modernized models of the philosophical reasoning logic, the statement 'Ukrainian philosophy is anthropocentric' contains two parts: the known and the unknown. The unknown part is the scope of a complex subject term, and the known part is the scope of a complex predicate term. A complex subject term in the context of the substitutive semantics of logical terms and philosophical concepts of the logic of philosophical reasoning can acquire the status of a single thing, phenomenon, or individual, and a complex predicate term – the status of quality, eidos, or general.

In the methodology of historical-philosophical intercultural communication,
which appears as a superstructure over the philosophical reasoning logic as its basis, the scope of a complex subject term acquires the status of the world of investigated philosophical culture, and the scope of a complex predicate term acquires the status of the world of investigative philosophical culture. There is a communicative interaction between the worlds of the studied and investigating philosophical cultures. As a result of this interaction, the world of the studied philosophical culture as the unknown part is clarified on the basis of the world of investigating philosophical culture as the known part. In this way, the meanings of the first are included in the world of the second, enriching it and expanding its scope.

Historical-philosophical cultural-predicative analysis of historical-philosophical theory makes it possible to identify the communicative specificity to check the correctness of the syntactic construction of the language of this theory, multiply its expressive capabilities, and improve the quality of its construction. It also enables the clarification of the unknown part of the statement belonging to the language of historical-philosophical theory on the basis of the known in the process of their communicative interaction. In this interaction, Ukrainian philosophy is defined as the unknown through anthropologism as the known. From the above considerations follows the importance of studying the communicative specifics of the statements of the language of historical-philosophical theory about the anthropologism of Ukrainian philosophy by means of historical-philosophical cultural-predicative analysis.

Conclusions

According to the historical-philosophical cultural-predicative analysis, the

communicative specifics of the language of historical-philosophical theory about the anthropologism of Ukrainian philosophical thought can be formulated by using metaphysical, phenomenological, and dialectical languages of philosophical reasoning logic based on three separate ontologies. In the ontology of metaphysical categories, by means of categories of substance (first substance) and accident (quality), in the ontology of phenomenological categories by means of categories of phenomenon and eidos, and in the ontology of dialectical categories by means of categories of the singular and general. This is made possible by the translation of the studied statements into concepts from the relevant branches of the philosophical reasoning logic (metaphysical, phenomenological, or dialectical), as well as the transition from one ontology of categories to another.

It goes without saying that the examples of historical-philosophical cultural-predicative analysis of the communicative specificity of the statements belonging to the language of historical-philosophical theory given above do not fully reveal all its methodological possibilities. However, they provide a holistical view of its application possibilities in the study of the language of Ukrainian historical-philosophical theory. These patterns can also be included in outlining further prospects for the development of the modern Ukrainian philosophical language, as they are able to offer new heuristically fruitful philosophical concepts for further development.

REFERENCES

1. ARTIUKH, V. (2014). How Did the Ukrainian Philosophical Process Become Possible? *Istoriia filosofsko-osvitnoi dumky* (History of Philosophical and Educational Thought), (1), pp. 296–310. [in Ukr.]

2. HNATIUK, Ya. (2010). *Ukrainian Cordocentrism in the Conflict of Mythologies and Interpretations.* Ivano-Frankivsk: Symfoniia-forte, 184 p. [in Ukr.]

3. HNATIUK, Ya. (2019). *Communicative Potential of the Cultural Predication* Ivano-Frankivsk: Lileia-NV, 304 p. [in Ukr.]

4. HORSKYI, V., KYSLIUK, K. (2004). *History of Ukrainian Philosophy*: A Study Guide. Kyiv: Lybid, 488 p. [in Ukr.]

5. YARMUS, S. (1988–1989). Cordocentrism as the Basis of Ukrainian Spirituality and Philosophy. In: V. YANIV, ed., *Yuvileinyi zbirnyk prats naukovoho konhresu u 1000-littia khreshhennia Rusy-Ukrainy* (Anniversary Collection of Works of the Scientific Congress Devoted to the 1000th Anniversary of The Baptism of Rus-Ukraine). Munich: Ukrainian Free University Press, pp. 402–415. [in Ukr.]

6. YOSYPENKO, S. (2014). National Philosophic Traditions as an Object of Reflection in The Field of The History of Philosophy. *Sententiae*, (30), pp. 52–61. [in Ukr.]

7. KHAMITOV, N., GARMASH, L., KRYLOVA, S. (2000). *History of Philosophy: The Problem of Man and His Limits:* A Study Guide. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 271 p. [in Ukr.]

8. CAUSSAT, P. (2014). „Could 'National Philosophy' Be a Strictly Defined Research Object?" Ebb and Flow Between the Unit (Common) and Multiple (Differential). *Sententiae*, (30), pp. 62–79. [in Ukr.]

9. KULCHYTSKYI, O. (1995). *Fundamentals of Philosophy and Philosophical Sciences.* Munich-Lviv: Ukrainian Free University, 164 p. [in Ukr.]

10. LISOVYI, V. (1994). Ukrainian Philosophy in the Context of National Culture. In: M. TYMOSHYK, ed., *The History of Philosophy of Ukraine:* A Study Guide. Kyiv: Lybid. [in Ukr.]

11. LYSYI, I. (2004). *Philosophical and Artistic Culture.* Kyiv: Kyiv-Mohyla Academy Press, 368 p. [in Ukr.]

12. LYSYI, I. (2013). *National and Cultural Identity of Philosophy: Seven Approximations to The Topic.* Kyiv: Kyiv-Mohyla Academy Press, 180 p. [in Ukr.]

13. PETRUSHENKO, V. (2009). *Explanatory Dictionary of Basic Philosophical Concepts.* Lviv: Lviv Polytechnic National University Press. [in Ukr.]

14. SHEVCHENKO, V. (2008). *Ukrainian Philosophy in the System of Ukrainian Studies.* Kyiv: Personal Publishing, 240 p. [in Ukr.]

15. SYMCHYCH, M. (2012). „Ukrainian Philosophy": Historical-Philosophical Canon or Research Project? *Humanitarni studii* (Humanities Studies), (12), pp. 87–92. [in Ukr.]

16. VUSATYUK, O. (2006). Ukrainian Philosophy. In: I. ANDRUSHCHENKO, O. VUSATYUK, S. LYNETSKIY, A. SHUBA, *The Philosophical Dictionary.* Kyiv: A.S.K., 1056 p. [in Rus.]

17. ZAKYDALSKYI, T. (1991). The Concept of The Heart in Ukrainian Philosophical Thought. *Filosofska i sotsiolohichna dumka* (Philosophical and Sociological Thought), (8), pp. 127–138. [in Ukr.]

18. DOMAŃSKA, E. (2010). What Methodology Does Contemporary Humanities Need? *Tektsty Drugie*, (12), pp. 45-55. [in Pol.]

19. TOPOLSKI, J. (2016). *Theoretical Problems of The Historical Knowledge. An Anthology of Texts.* Poznań: Wydawnictwo Nauka i Innowacje, 346 p. [in Pol.]

20. KANDULSKI, S. (2014). Defining History of Mentalities. In: A. BEŁKOT, S. KANDULSKI, M. KOSIŃSKA, *Cultural Theory and History: The Change and Everyday Life.* Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Wydziału Nauk Społecznych Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza, 112 p. [in Eng.]

21. RUDENKO, S. (2018). History of Ukrainian Philosophy: Teaching and Evaluation Methodology. *Future Human Image*, (10), pp. 85-91. [in Eng.]

22. WRZOSEK, W. (1994). The Problem of Cultural Imputation in History. *Poznań Studies in the Philosophy of the Sciences and the Humanities*, (41), pp. 135–144. [in Eng.]

23. WRZOSEK, W. (2014). Dogmatic „Methodist" against The Methodology of History. *Kwartalnik Historyczny Rocznik CXXI* (The Historical Quarterly Yearbook CXXI), (2), pp. 379–405. [in Eng.]