



Published by the decision of the Scientific Council  
of Khachatur Abovian  
Armenian State Pedagogical University



Department of Philosophy and Logic  
named after Academician Georg Brutian



# W I S D O M

3(19), 2021



*WISDOM is covered in Clarivate Analytics' Emerging Sources  
Citation Index service*

YEREVAN – 2021

## LINGUISTIC PHILOSOPHY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL TURN OF CULTURE

### Abstract

The article considers the role of the ideas of linguistic philosophy in the context of the anthropological turn of culture that happened in the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Culture has constantly been developing on the horizon of man, and all its initiations have always met at the point of “life of man”, which is impossible without language as an essential anthropological attribute of man. The purports of linguistic philosophy (*ordinary language philosophy*) are relevant as never before. The study presented is based on the phenomenology of Nietzsche’s ideas of returning a new European thought to the origins of modern culture – the idea of a sovereign individual, which is determined by power over himself and his destiny, the ideas of the representatives and founders of linguistic philosophy, the slogan by I. Kant “*Sapere aude!*” (“Dare to think for yourself!”), on the historical excursus concerning the origin of the term “anthropological turn”. The anthropological turn in the culture of the 20<sup>th</sup> century together with the purports of linguistic philosophy brought back and developed further the main idea of new European culture – the idea of the self-worth of life, individuality, and freedom. These events gave a new value meaning to this idea.

*Keywords:* anthropological turn, anthropocentric, culture, individuality, linguistic philosophy (ordinary language philosophy), man.

### Introduction

Modern philosophical knowledge of man is determined by the need to systematize and conceptualize heterogeneous and diverse material. The development of new epistemological (gnoseological) guidelines for the given range of problems is a highly-priority scientific direction of the late 20<sup>th</sup> – early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries. Under the conditions of the current crisis of culture, the anthropocentric picture of the world is replacing the mythocentric, theocentric, and technocentric pictures. Anthropocentrism represents the fundamental scientific position of philosophy in general and linguistic philosophy in particular. It is a problem of man's essence and essential structure,

immersed in the linguistic and philosophical discourse, and it is becoming the main problem of anthropological knowledge. At the same time, the issue of the basic characteristics of man, capable of determining future trends in the socio-cultural and other development of humankind, is appearing. The current anthropo-philosophical situation is unfolding around the categories of human beings, human typologies, the principles of these typologies, forms of human self-determination, one of which is language (Svrydenko, Yatsenko, & Prudnikova, 2019; Donnikova, 2018; Koshelskaia, Muraveva, & Mareeva, 2018). The fact that language has been coming to the forefront in the anthropo-philosophical discussions for the last 50 years, where it has re-

placed both consciousnesses and being as their main subject, has become almost a common truth. However, as the mind in the classical period of the European thought or faith in God in the Medieval thought, it has not been so much the only or main subject of reasoning, but rather some defining concept, the paradigmatic core of modern thought (Balinchenko, 2019). Therefore, one can speak not so much about the philosophy of language as one of the leading philosophical directions, but about the development of philosophy in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, linguistic in essence, no matter what it is about, namely, and about the anthropocentricity of linguistic philosophy.

The originality of the authors' thought lies in interpreting the ideas and role of linguistic philosophy in the context of the anthropological turn in the culture at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup>–21<sup>st</sup> centuries. In the presented interpretation, the anthropological turn in culture returns and develops further the ideas of linguistic philosophy giving it a new value meaning, the main idea of which is the idea of the self-worth of life and ordinary language, individuality, and freedom. The anthropological turn reveals a curious peculiarity of the historical development of culture – general modern culture within the anthropological turn is able to return to its virgin origins to realize itself again and in different ways, and accordingly to implement the ideas of linguistic philosophy within culture and through culture.

#### Purpose

The manifestations of the linguistic paradigm of modern thought are infinitely diverse, which makes the issue of the reasons for its establishment and its development trends even more interesting – the issue of the foundations of this paradigm, which in itself becomes possible only within the framework of such a paradigm, because it is the question of the questions – the question about language, which is the main anthropocentric phenomenon. It is a set of specific questions that determines the life and thought of

a particular epoch and not a set of answers given to them. The “technique” of solving (or interpreting) a problem begins with its initial expression in the form of a question. The way the question is asked determines the direction in which the correct answers can be given (Langer, 1957, p. 9). Thus, the purpose of our article (our question) is to show that the anthropocentricity of philosophy and humanitarian knowledge of the 20<sup>th</sup> century due to the ideas of analytical and linguistic philosophy is caused by the anthropological turn of culture itself; to demonstrate the curious peculiarity of the linguistic-philosophical and historical development of culture within the framework of the anthropological turn, and also to determine the role of linguistic philosophy in the context of contemporary anthropological turn.

#### Statement of Basic Material

Culture has always developed on the horizon of man; all its undertakings have always converged at the point of “life of man”. But only the culture of the Renaissance gives value to the very behaviour of a person, his/her desires and aspirations, but not to what he/she should be guided by (Order of Being, Justice, God, etc.). However, the culture of modernity, which grew out of the Renaissance's recognition of the importance of the interests and affections of man, has closed man with a screen of things, signs, and institutions. The society of modernity and the culture of modernity have subordinated man to the discipline of labour, language, and body (Foucault, 1969). Nietzsche's (1990) philosophy returns a new European thought to the origins of the culture of the Art Nouveau – to the idea of a sovereign individual, who is determined by power over himself/herself and his/her destiny. Here a new version of the Art Nouveau project begins to take shape. The anthropological turn in the culture of the 20<sup>th</sup> century brought back and developed further, giving it a new value meaning, the main idea of this new European culture – the

idea of the self-worth of life, individuality, and freedom, i.e. the idea of the anthropocentricity of the individual. The anthropocentric ideas of linguistic philosophy played a great role in this event as *linguistic philosophy (ordinary language philosophy)* (the authors' italics and refinement) is a philosophical direction that has set as its main task the analysis of natural language by strict methods. The analysis is undertaken to determine philosophically significant concepts (such as "good", "evil", "duty", "knowledge", "value", etc.) based on the contexts of using corresponding words in everyday speech. Another purpose of the analysis is to identify a special "logic" (rules, regulations, and conventions) of the functioning of language in everyday communication. The first circle of tasks is carried out by conceptual analysis, and the second one is fulfilled by the logical analysis of speech acts. As it is seen from this definition, *the nature of linguistic philosophy is anthropocentric in its essence since the subject of its study is ordinary language* (the authors' italics and refinement).

As a holistic direction, linguistic philosophy was formed in the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Its founder (along with G. Moore) is L. Wittgenstein. The most outstanding representatives are E. Anscombe, A. J. Ayer, J. L. Austin, P. Geach, R. W. Hare, M. Lazerowitz, P. H. Nowell-Smith, G. Ryle, P. F. Strawson, J. O. Urmson, F. Waismann, J. Wisdom. Such American philosophers as M. Black, L. Linsky, H. Malcolm, J. Searle, Z. Vendler, the Finnish logician G. H. von Wright, etc., join linguistic philosophy.

As for the term "anthropological turn", a slight historical digression is needed here that will explain the origin of this term and its relevance. At the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the Russian philosopher, S. L. Frank, developing the concept of total unity, rejects the idea of society as a simple set of different subjects. He claims that society is something supra-temporal, having an immaterial core – culture, traditions, history, language, etc., and he also notes the absence of any specific and recognized teaching "on the es-

sence of the human soul and the place of man and his spiritual life in the general system of things" (Frank, 1995, p. 421). Such a teaching, in his opinion, should be philosophical psychology, which he interprets as *philosophical anthropology* (Frank, 1995, p. 443). These statements anticipated the ideas of the report "Die Stellung des Menschen im Kosmos", published in 1928 by M. Scheler, the recognized founder of philosophical anthropology, which reveals the specifics of the philosophical view of man and his place in the system of being. A year earlier, M. Heidegger's treatise "Sein und Zeit" was published, who speaks not only about man, but about the ontological principle of his existence, not about man's position in space or his relation to other areas of being, but reveals the very secret of all the being, proceeding from a specific ability of man – the ability to be.

Thanks to intelligible and understandable provisions of the work by M. Scheler (1988), who claims that man is distinguished from all life by his inherent spirit (p. 53), and also thanks to, although not to everyone, and not immediately understandable, discussions about man as a particular being that "exists ontologically" – "*Dasein*" (Heidegger, 1997, p. 12) (Heidegger' italics and refinement), the anthropological range of problems captures philosophical and humanitarian thought. As Martin Heidegger called his doctrine of *Dasein*, fundamental ontology really turns out to be the foundation for understanding the human world, and from the concept of existence, so thoroughly analysed by M. Heidegger, existentialism and the existential tradition of analysing various manifestations of human life grows. Furthermore, with the light hand of philologists who published in 1996 the collection of articles entitled "The Anthropological Turn in Literary Studies", the phrase anthropological turn comes into widespread use. Moreover, now there exists not only that physical anthropology, which was once the only anthropology that studied the physical, bodily characteristics of man, not only philosophical anthropology, which was announced by

S. L. Frank and M. Scheler but also social, sociocultural anthropology, religious, pedagogical, political, economic, historical, linguistic, visual, theatrical and many others. Both philosophy and culture have always been developed in the human horizon, and all the undertakings of culture in the direct or reverse perspective have always converged at the point of “human life”. Furthermore, as it should be in the laws of perspective, such a vanishing point, the point of view has been the same, otherwise, the perspective would simply “crumble”.

The development of the question, which was still considered by the ancient Greeks as the main one for philosophy and distinguishing it from the practical reasoning of the East – the question “What is Everything?” – successively passing through the stages of natural philosophy, metaphysics, finally, theology, led it to a radical change, probably by the end of The Middle Ages, by the time of the development of the nominalistic current. However, despite the great interest in the anthropological philosophy of language, the latter cannot be essentially called linguistic, since this interest in language in it was instead a special case of the emerging question of consciousness, just as interest in the language of sophists in antiquity was a special case of the question about being. M. Heidegger (1961) interprets this question wonderfully in “Europäischer Nihilismus”, considering the difference between the “metaphysical positions” of the sophist Protagoras, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, Descartes as one of the founders of the philosophy of consciousness in modern times. If, for Protagoras, according to Heidegger, the truth is the truth of being itself, and the “measure” in the famous saying “Man is the measure of all things” determines the limitations of man, which forces the latter to have only his point of view. At the same time, the whole truth turns out to be incomprehensible, then for Descartes, there is no longer any talk about human limitations. On the contrary, being itself falls into dependence on its cognitive ability.

The final reformulation of the question of the existence of being to the question of knowing things reaches, apparently, towards the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, when I. Kant boldly declares being an empty concept, reducing it to the status of a grammatical connective in a sentence, and openly affirms the impossibility and unnecessary of knowing anything beyond and without man’s cognitive abilities. In a sense, the crisis of the question of consciousness begins with I. Kant. When the beauty of an object becomes the result of an evaluation from the point of view of subjective pleasure arising as a result of a free, and therefore unpredictable, the play of cognitive abilities, at that moment, the generalizing power of the mind crashes. Kant’s aesthetic judgment is connected with a number of the paradoxical characteristics that, according to his definition, comprise its main distinguishing features: subjective universality, subjective necessity, expediency without purpose, expressed in a continuous “as if” mode. This subjectivity inexorably extends from Kant’s aesthetics to the entire subsequent philosophy of consciousness. As one of the main reasons for this process, one can point to the increasingly explicitly declared improbability of communication between two equal subjects, each of which is a thing in itself and an absolute source of goal-setting. The new terminology is required. Beauty becomes the value – this discovery belongs to the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and it is no coincidence that the neo-Kantians made the greatest contribution to the development of the concept of value. Following beauty, the value sphere extends to everything that depends on the consciousness directed at it. E. Cassirer, a neo-Kantian and, by the way, teacher of S. Langer, spoke about the value nature of knowledge in general and the totality of symbolization. In fact, values are a new way of generalizing in the absence of their ontological and rational foundations. Values are created by people and have their own source in the evaluation. However, as such, they are nevertheless objective and therefore provide general knowledge. It can be said that the

philosophy of values overcomes the Kantian “subjective universality” of aesthetic judgment, re-emphasizing the importance of parts of this phrase in the new terminology: value is basically random and individual. It expresses individual intention – even of humanity as a whole. However, where I. Kant tragically emphasizes the sharing power of this individual evaluation, and the new philosophy finds new forms of generality: instead of the “subjective universality”, we are most likely dealing with the “objective individuality”.

Already in neo-Kantianism, values are inextricably linked with symbols, which are the means of communication of this individual intention. Values exist in the form of symbols. Consciousness itself as hidden intentionality does not exist except through symbolization. The question of values in itself turns out to be the question of symbols. If it is no longer about what exists and not about how we cognize what exists, but about how we evaluate what exists, the only way to find out is to clarify what we are talking about it.

However, it is curious that the triumph of linguistic philosophy begins with a protest against value propositions that took place at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The positivistic philosophy of science applied the subtlest logical analysis of language to preserve genuinely objective knowledge that was not coloured by evaluation. Indeed, individual evaluations are truly ineffable. The individual cannot enter the language, and L. Wittgenstein, in “*Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*”, brings everything value into the sphere of the “mystical”. Moreover, his argument was probably more profound than the logical justification of the rule of science required: the value for Wittgenstein (1973) directly addresses the question of the infinite, any evaluation of anything in the most everyday conversation includes a hidden question about the meaning of the world as a whole: the meaning, and consequently the value, eternally eludes, always being somewhere outside and slightly in front of a statement pointing to it.

A consistent logical analysis of language, which was aimed at linking language with value-neutral facts, revealed the value colouring of any facts in the final analysis. Our logical concept is already value, the fruit of interpretation, and as the American literary critic S. E. Fish aptly observes, no matter how deeply we can go in search of “reality”, we will not go beyond being interpreted. The inscription’s significance on a piece of paper is no more a result of evaluation than the evaluation of “this subject” as a sheet of paper, or as a set of molecules, or as a spatial extent. Any form is the fruit of interpretation. Nevertheless, although all objects are created by an interpretive strategy, for Fish, this is not the path to subjectivity since the strategies are social and conventional, and evaluations, finding their expression in the symbolic system of language, are never purely individual (Fish, 1980).

It is no coincidence that the late Wittgenstein turned to the theory of language games and the direction of analytical philosophy towards conventionalism: truth, in fact, is the result of a treaty made on the basis of a general evaluation. A convention replaces the requirement of absolute generality of truth. And even earlier, psychoanalysis announces: there is no norm, there is only a more or less generally accepted mode of behaviour, accidentally formed as a mechanism of protection and adaptation in a given situation. So, by the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, in the absence of access to being or consciousness, the question of language becomes the main one. Moreover, it seems that in this sceptical descent, it is impossible to move forward; it is impossible to go beyond language because we will be forced to talk about everything that we are faced with. It is no accident that Wittgenstein likens the boundaries of language to the boundaries of the world.

The state of culture, corresponding to the most comprehensiveness of the question of language, is what is called postmodernism. Its motto is “Everything is text”, its main direction is the development of any form of textuality. Its beginning in the art can be called the experiments of

the Dadaists, for example, the famous urinal brought to the museum by Duchamp or 4 minutes 33 seconds of silence in the famous “4.33” by John Cage. Its continuation is largely connected with the development of computer technologies and computer science, which was also addressed by the stubbornest of those logicians and mathematicians who talked about creating a language free of values at the beginning of the century. These are the Internet and hypertexts, this “infinitely delayed signified” by Jacques Derrida, a confusion of semantic paths, sung by Borges. Finally, it is a feeling of belatedness from the fact that where everything is text, everything is just reading, and irony that accompanies an eternal game with a variety of the read. This is a slight longing for an eternally escaping meaning and the following sensation of emptiness, absence, which controls the development and movement of everyone present.

Linguistic philosophy in the anthropological turn of culture, even though it substantially transformed all spheres of modern culture, nevertheless preserved and not only preserved but has strengthened and developed further, giving it a new value meaning, the main idea of this culture – the idea of the value of human life and human rights, the right to express thoughts freely. The modern era had ceased to be monologous when only one voice sounded in culture, and the truth was the same for all. Our era is the era of dialogue and pluralism. The paradox of the present time is that despite the growth of civilizational standardization, economic and information globalization, the culture affirms the priority of a chance, a game, situationality, and individualization. In our era, to think and to express oneself independently means to see and understand diversity, to understand the meaning of truth, which can be different from the same truth. The logic of meaning, which governs the sphere of personal application of the mind, is affirmed. Everything above mentioned has become possible thanks to the ideas of linguistic philosophy as well.

The modernity project today is innovation. It is creativity, that is, not only man’s motivation for the initiative, activity but the effectiveness of this activity. Therefore, the modern era is no longer utilitarian, although it establishes a consumer society, perhaps because a consumer society has established itself in it. In the economy of a consumer society, it is no longer the exchange value of this or that kind of goods, but its use value determines the economic status of a thing or service. The very value of use as an objective need exists only in and through the willing man, only in desires and aspirations, in intentions; that is, it is directly connected with the development of either human sensuality or the spirit of man. The economy and consumer society are oriented towards developing an extensive range of things and services when a whole range of things or services is created to satisfy the same need (benefit). Diversity, the difference becomes a significant factor in production. And this is not only an economic factor but also a cultural phenomenon, a value moment that cultivates the ability of preference, the ability of difference. So in the very foundation of a creative economy, a fundamental form of producing differences in human life is created. Difference, not identity, is becoming the new word in the culture of modernity. This is where the ideas of linguistic philosophy come to the rescue. Therefore, philosophy builds a new understanding of difference, giving it a categorical meaning – the ability to see new aspects of being expressing its peculiarities by means of language. Linguistic philosophy contributes to developing the individuality of expression. Individuality is bursting into life: each person seeks to cultivate it in himself/herself, even when this cult becomes fashion, everyone tries to arrange his/her life in his/her own way, even when it is built from standard things, and often it happens with the help of language. And the essence is that individuality becomes a value and gets the opportunity to express itself in the cultural space thanks to language. Due to the latest means of communication and presentation, any individual

beginning can receive its announcement, becoming the public domain. Be it a work of art that, thanks to technical reproduction, acquires an exceptional existence, or be it any event that, through television, through video and networks on the Internet, becomes the property of not only its participants but everyone. Each person can put himself/herself in front of the whole world, and the world itself in any manifestation can appear before each of us. The screen of a computer connected to the world's network becomes not just a window into the world or a door through which one enters the world, and it is a point of confluence of the world and man; it is a voltaic arc that gives rise to a particular state of human being, in which, like in plasma, there is no differentiation on private and public (Yakushik, 2018).

This is the turn of culture to man, to *every* man. This is its anthropological turn. The anthropological turn taken place in the culture not only draws the attention of culture to the difference, and thereby to the diversity of life in its sensual and visual manifestations, but also opens the entrance to the culture of the "ordinary" person, the person of everyday life, to the ordinary language. A popular culture that evokes scornful assessments of "intellectuals" is actually the membrane that connects/separates culture and everyday life, providing an exchange of meanings and preferences between culture and the realities of life. The ideas of linguistic philosophy behave in the anthropological turn in two ways. The extension of the concept of language and information to all spheres of what is happening makes their boundaries so vague that, in the end, their very status as language and information is lost. It is about the transition of modern linguistic culture to emotional visual, and sound forms. Some researchers note in the modern world a growing thirst for the presence of a culture of signs and culture of presence, and if the former has been dominant in Europe in recent centuries, then the requirement of the latter is clearly manifested in the modern world. An event of direct presence is in all respects valued more than a

mark. The sign is aesthetic in the Kantian sense: it is a pure form of representation without interest in real existence. The main thing in the event is its being here and now given in all respects and for all sensations (and not just for distant sight and hearing, easily replaced by imagination) (Wittgenstein, 1973).

However, the question is in the fact of whether it is achieved and whether the presence is possible in the context of linguistic scepticism. Longing for the presence in this context turns into longing for signs of presence. The mass media and the ideological propaganda of the modern consumer society are doing everything in their power to provide people with this lost presence in the forms of advertising, fashion, in all kinds of entertainment, in the liberalization of pleasures, the spread of the cult of bodily beauty, a healthy lifestyle, the liberation of the natural (as well as unnatural) sexuality, and develop amusement technologies. In this, they meet the demand of the mass consciousness rather than impose anything from outside, that is why, in fact, no matter how dangerous this state of things may seem to the cultural elite brought up in the old, iconic system, it does not make sense to blame any ideological forces. On the contrary, the ability of the ideological apparatus to understand that there is no better way to manage people successfully than to contribute to their maximum satisfaction is an amazing achievement of modern liberalism, and no one would welcome any form of suppression, infringement, and restriction, although, in fact, from the beginning of the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. They were the last and only thing that stimulated the modernist rebellion to the development of culture and art. However, all these attempts to recreate the presence so far recreate rather only the presence of the sign, or the presence of the sign of presence, a simulacrum of presence: a sign of pleasure instead of real pleasure is caused by a sign of presence instead of real presence. The linguistic analysis carried out during the 20<sup>th</sup> century has already sufficiently destroyed the illusions regarding



penetration to reality, and the popularization of scientific achievements, liberalization of society, widespread use address to psychological schools have brought to the ordinary consciousness, or, more likely, the subconscious, the idea of its inaccessibility and ambiguity. It is difficult to say whether such an option for the development of problems is possible and whether it will lead to a total collapse of culture, and accordingly to the collapse of the culture of using language. Axiological thinking and linguistic philosophy associated with it have for the first time learned to raise the question of foundations – the foundations of any paradigm of thought, including one's own. Even at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Wittgenstein said, "We feel that if there were an answer to all possible scientific questions, the problems of life would not even be affected. Then, of course, no more questions remain; that is the answer" (Wittgenstein, 1973, § 6.53).

### Conclusion

Culture has always been oriented towards maintaining and developing human behaviour that is decent and acceptable to society and the environment, but until Modern times, the focus of culture was not the man himself, but what he should be guided by (Order of Being, Justice, God). Furthermore, only in the Modern Age the purpose, function, and destination of culture – the act of man – becomes the centre of culture. The Renaissance introduces the interests of the man himself into the culture as its dominant value. And from now on, culture is unlikely to change its central idea. Of course, the interests and aspirations of man will be understood in different ways. The Enlightenment understands them this way, and modern culture in a different way. But it will always be precisely the interests of the man himself. "Sapere Aude" – "Have the courage to think for yourself!" Kant proclaimed, but, what to think and how to think – the time will give hints.

Thus, the project of modern culture can be

transformed, modified, varied in different ways, but in the centre of it always, we hope, the statement of the interests and aspirations of the man himself, and language as the most outstanding and the most anthropological feature of man will be preserved. And this historical feature of culture is discovered by the anthropological turn of European culture with the help of the ideas of linguistic philosophy at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup>-21<sup>st</sup> centuries.

In general, linguistic philosophy and associated with it the conceptual analysis of everyday consciousness are promising areas of human knowledge in which remarkable discoveries have already been made in linguistic semantics, anthropological philosophy, communication theory, social psychology, realistic concepts in the theory of ethics. Thanks to linguistic philosophy, many new logics have been created that reflect a certain form of life and culture and are based on natural language. It is worth noting that the philosophy of everyday language (linguistic philosophy) has influenced approaches in philosophy, linguistics, anthropology, and sociology that emphasize the importance of everyday language and conversation. The anthropological turn of culture and linguistic philosophy, which took place in the past and is taking place in the current century, has drawn attention to another critical circumstance for culture – how culture is developing.

### References

- Balinchenko, S. (2019). Mythologeme-related crisis of identity: Reality and fictional markers of alienation. *Future Human Image, 11*, 5-13. <https://doi.org/10.29202/fhi/11/1>
- Donnikova, I. A. (2018). Moral search in multicultural communication. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research, 14*, 30-41. <https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i14.150545>
- Fish, S. (1980). How to recognize a poem when you see one. In *Is there a text in this*

- class? The authority of interpretive communities* (pp. 322-337). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Foucault, P.-M. (1969). *L'archeologie du savoir* (Archeology of knowledge, in French). Paris: Gallimard.
- Frank, S. L. (1995). *Dusha cheloveka. Opyt vvedeniia v filosofskuyu psikhologiyu* (Human soul. Experience of introduction to philosophical psychology, in Russian). Saint-Petersburg: Nauka.
- Heidegger, M. (1997). *Bytie i vremya* (Being and time, in Russian). Moscow: Ad marginem.
- Heidegger, M. (1961). *Nietzsche* (Nietzsche, in German). Pfullingen: Neske.
- Koshelskaia, T. V., Muraveva, O. I., & Mareeva, L. V. (2018). *Kommunikatsiya kak tsestral'nyi fenomen sovremennykh antropologicheskikh kontseptsii* (Communication as a central phenomenon of modern anthropological concepts, in Russian). *Sibirskii psikhologicheskii zhurnal* (Siberian psychological journal, in Russian), 67, 77-88. <https://doi.org/10.17223/17267080/67/6>
- Langer, S. K. (1957). *Philosophy in a new key: A study in the symbolism of reason, rite, and art*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- Nietzsche, F. (1990). *Sochineniya v 2 tomakh* (Collection of works in 2 volumes, in Russian). (Vol. 1). Moscow: Mysl.
- Scheler, M. (1988). *Problema cheloveka v zapadnoi filosofii: Perevody* (Problem of man in western philosophy: Translations, in Russian). Moscow: Progress.
- Svyrydenko, D. B., Yatsenko, O. D., & Prudnikova, O. V. (2019). Organicity of the Phenomenon of Culture as an Explication of Vitality. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, 16, 7-23. <https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i16.188227>
- Wittgenstein, L. (1973). *Logisch-philosophische Abhandlung* (Logical-philosophical treatise, in German). Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- Yakushik, V. (2018). The timeless value of a pluralistic world. *Future Human Image*, 10, 123-135. <https://doi.org/10.29202/fhi/10/13>