3.6. LINGUISTIC PRACTICES AS ANTROPOTECHNIQUE IN THE CONTEXT OF INFORMATIVE MODERNITY

The last decades have been marked by intensive processes of transformation of all spheres of society's life. According to the researchers we are talking about the formation of an information society where the media fill the entire socio-cultural space. More often the scientists have turned to new paradigms among which a special place is occupied by the «communicative revolution», «communicative reality». It is about transformation of existing forms of communication and the transformation of reality which begins to act as a flow of information. This situation is accompanied by some changes in cultural values existing patterns of behavior as well as speech concepts. From now language has not only oral or written forms but now a transition happens to language in the context of mediareality as a media turn phenomenon. As emphasizes V. Savchuk (1)[1] in modern philosophy the researcher reveals various turns the number of which constantly grows: ontological, linguistic, iconic, medial, anthropological and others.

The text is the subject of the study of many sciences – linguistics, rhetoric, semiotics, logic, cultural studies, psychology and philosophy. The problem of the text in the conditions of the information society is considered in the writings of M. Castells, M. Webster, W. Eco, C. Lesch, E. Toffler, M. Ulbec, N. Nosov, C. Horuzhy, A. Carmin, D. Ivanov, B. Mironov, O. Astafyeva, A. Voyskunsky.

Modern scientific realities associated with the emergence of virtual reality, network society, the Internet and computer became the subject of philosophical and cultural analysis proving the medial turn. Back in the day according to R. Rorty a linguistic turn signaled its appearance in a collection under the same name in 1967. That analysis of conceptual matrices for decades has determined the refusal to understand reality from the standpoint of immobility («Everything is language») emphasizing that it is not only a way of describing the world but the world itself is revealed to a man as language (Lyotar).

Linguistic themes in the reflections of analytical philosophy for a long time remained the main thing. The latter focuses on language that not only speaks but also thinks itself.

In the context of the intensive development of communication technologies hypertext systems are widely used in the information space of modern society which has a significant influence on modern culture transformation. According to the researchers this influence is not unambiguous both positive and pessimistic views are expressed on the further development of society. There is a dilemma: an increase in the level of interaction between the intelligence of the man-machine complex (Steopin) or the absence of any significance of these systems for the «Gutenberg galaxy» (MacLuen).

In recent decades in the scientific thought mediation is understood as the process of information transfer at all stages of human development (from rock painting to the most advanced information and communication technologies, global information networks) (S. Lesh). However as V. Savchuk emphasizes in the modern information space media is no longer a technical intermediary but an environment itself a reality of experience and consciousness. It is a medial turn.

The formation of a modern information society is accompanied by a new attitude of man to the world, the development of new forms of rationality, improvement and the emergence of new means and forms of communication. For almost all generations of philosophers turned to their own language vision while expressing their questions in various perspectives. A careful look at the philosophical understanding and interpretation of language led to the appearance in a philosophical thought of a separate direction or section – the philosophy of language. Language is a historically evolving phenomenon. In the conditions of technologicalization of the society, technologicalization of language took place. M. Foucault defined this process as the emergence of «language machines». «Machines of speech» on his opinion are functional possibilities means of «conservation and

---

[1] Savchuk, V. V. (2013): Fenomen povorota v kul'ture XXIveka. Mezhdunarodnyy zhurnal issledovaniy kul'tury.

exchange of texts» (2)[1]. This is an instrumental language that exists along with writing, oral, natural and artificial.

Language according to research scientists performs in culture three functions: reproduction of culture (M. Gadamer), communicative action (Yu. Habermas), socialization (M. Mead). Modernity is characterized by new information technologies, ambiguity and pluralism of information, distribution of information for the benefit of society. In this situation one can not but agrees with the thoughts of the famous researcher S. Lesch (3)[2]. The latter highlights the following general features of the information society: firstly the uncontrolled dissemination of information flows. Secondly the assertion of the relevance of only the present which concentrates around communication as a result of which society becomes more mobile and loses a stable relationship. Thirdly there is the disorientation of a person which is associated with the loss of those ideological concepts that were provided by traditional notions. Fourthly the post-human post is formed. These features are directly embodied in hypertext in its modern configuration.

It should be emphasized that in the scientific literature there is a thought that hypertext appears in culture much earlier than the emergence of information society, information reality. And in this context hypertext includes books, reference books, encyclopedias, and even the Bible. This kind of hypertext U. Eco expresses as text hypertext (4)[3].

It is in this context that there is an urgent appeal to Skovoroda's speech practices. Note that the linguistic analysis of the heritage of G. Skovoroda is provided both in Ukrainian linguistics and in foreign publications. But it concerns morphology, vocabulary, phonetics, the style of word-formation, the use and borrowing of words from other languages etc. Linguists have comprehensively analyzed and are analyzing the G. Skovoroda's language but with regard to the philosophical context of language the researches are almost absent.

Y. Sherekh (Y. Shevelov) the world-famous linguist noted that G. Skovoroda fulfilled a linguistic revolution. His literary heritage has absorbed elements of such languages as Church Slavonic, Ukrainian, Normative Russian, Latin, Greek, and other languages of the East and West (5)[4]. The talk is about the multilingualism of G. Skovoroda and his speech polylinguism. This situation provides the opportunity for its multilingualism in the context of innovations regarding to the current language situation. This is due to the fact that modernity requires new theoretical and methodological means of language analysis in philosophical discourse. This analysis is not possible in the context of the domination of some ideology.

A new aspect of G. Skovoroda's analysis of language is seen in its interpretation as an activity and as an action. Such studies are based on new philosophical concepts: speech actions, speech practices, speech games, speech consciousness, speech reality, speech strategies, communicative action, etc.

Understanding the language and the word as «action» opened up new aspects of language analysis. The key concept of the theory of D. Austin appears as a matrix of application in the philosophy of language of the concept of «speech practices». Language is interpreted as what people do with words in specific socio-cultural contexts. And in this sense it is very important to think of L. Wittgenstein about the diversity of types of speech activity and the variety of functions that can perform the same word. D. Austin and L. Wittgenstein introduce new concepts in the philosophy of language which are dominant: «speech games», «speech actions».

M. Heidegger continuing their thoughts argues that language itself is not a product but an activity. He primarily focuses on the special features of language which relate to the inner activity of spirit. Such in this is seen the «treasure» of Skovoroda's speech practices: the inner activity of the spirit.

According to the analysts of language the interrelation of language and action its use for the analysis of speech processes is a significant progress. And it is impossible to disagree with this.

[1]Mishel', F. (1994): Slova i veshchiPerevodchiki
[2] Lash, S. (2002): Critique of information.
[3]Eko, U. Ot Interneta k Guttenbergu: tekst i gipertekst.
[4] Sherekh, YU. (2012): Porohy i zaporizhzhya, s.404.

Language acts as a present in conversations, listening, correspondence, translations, writing of various works, messages and appeals. Language is the action coordinator.

In language reviews the use and appeal to the concept of speech practice which has a varied manifestation is becoming increasingly commonplace. To them researchers in the philosophy of language include speech games, hybrid speech practices, informational, written and spoken. This list can be extended which indicates the transformation of both language and speech practices. The linguistic space of the modern era is changing. Speech practices as an action have not yet been investigated sufficiently broadly although of course they also play an important role in the communication process both at the individual and in society life. Linguistic practices realize our goals, thoughts, desires and directions (6)[1].

Let's also pay attention to the understanding of speech practice as anthropological technique. It is about the ability to communicate, share experiences, feelings, store and transmit information, promote socio-historical development, means of world perception. Linguistic practice is an integral part of human life / being. Coincidentally M. Heidegger defined his position as follows: «Language is the home of my being». The change of life / being is embodied in speech practices. This trend in philosophical studies is only gaining momentum because the modern era has become a kind of challenge to the past. Linguistic practices as anthropological techniques prove that the type of person is determined by civilization and «technologies» of socialization (7)[2].

Linguistic practices reproduce not only linguistic reality. Man from his birth is in language and social space. Since his birth a person uses speech practices as a means of communication and action. These practices encourage different kinds of activities provide the opportunity to construct or reconstruct reality in its varieties. Analysts of the philosophy of language offer a somewhat unconventional understanding of both language and speech practice: these phenomena have a non-linguistic component which include mental and physical processes and events as well as technological ones. We are talking about the transformation of the classical linguistic paradigm which was aimed at analyzing how we talk about the world and how we are thinking about the very reasoning.

M. Foucault put forward the thesis that different states of human life are connected and reproduced in language practices. The philosopher analyzing friendship as a way of life understands it as a way to escape the power of the Symbolic. The direct leader of such escape from power in his opinion is language as a special language practiced in friendship. Here we have a phenomenon and language game. This very concept of language game – parrhesia – gives the opportunity to understand in general the «phenomenon of Foucault» (B. Markov) and his philosophical thought.

In order to analyze Skovoroda's speech practices the letters of the philosopher to his pupil and friend M Kovalinsky which were issued separately in 2012. The letters were published by National Literary and Memorial Museum. The editor was Professor L. Ushkalov. The letters were written by G. Skovoroda from 1762 to 1794 in Latin. The most intense correspondence occurred in 1762–1764 when M. Kovalinsky was sent 72 letters. L. Ushkalov describes correspondence as a «spiritual novel» that lasted several decades (8)[3].

Published letters is a substantial contribution to the «Skovorodiniada». As a metaphor it means competent and artistic and literary works, video works, sculptures, museums dedicated to the famous philosopher and poet, teacher and theologian, «the Ukrainian national genius» according to Tabakowska. «Skovorodiniada» based in Kharkov with the advent of the cultural life of Slobozhanshchina («Ukrainian Bulletin» in 1816). In the April issue of the journal appeared the recognition of G. Skovoroda in the cultural life by V.Maslovich. The last called the Ukrainian thinker and Kharkiv philosopher as Stoic Diogenes (9)[4].

Why V. Maslovich characterized Grigory Skovoroda as a «stoic philosopher»? Because of his life credo coincided with the life principles of the Stoics. The Stoics believed that the meaning of life was a harmonious unity of the world of nature and man. In their opinion such unity promotes harmony and peace of the spirit. These principles G. Skovoroda followed all his life.

[1] Linhvopravova kartyna svitu: suchasni problemy linhvistyky ta inshomovnoyi dydaktyky : monohrafiya.

[2] Markov, B. V (208): Filosofskaya antropologiya: ucheb. posobiye dlya vuzov, s. 147.

[3] Ushkalov, L. (2012): Istoriya odniyeyi druzhby. Skovoroda H. Lysty do Mykhayla Kovalyns'koho, s. 3.

[4] Ukrainskiy vestnik na 1816 god. Chast' vtoraya. Mesyats aprel'. Ukrainian Bulletin for 1816. Part two.

Dmitry Chizhevsky a historian of Ukrainian philosophy noted that from that time the Kharkiv and the Ukrainian «Skovorodiniada» started. Continuing the idea of the famous historian of philosophy we note that in our time «Skovorodiniada» acquired international and intercultural values.

One of the areas of «Skovorodiniada» is an appeal to linguistic features of creativity of the philosopher.

The analysis of Skovoroda's speech practices in the philosophical context is almost absent and therefore requires careful study. The letters show the richness of speech practices since G. Skovoroda and M. Kovalinsky freely owned several languages. Both of them knew Latin and Greek, language of the Holy Scripture as evidenced by the correspondence but also emphasize «acted» in these languages. These languages became communicative actions, means of communication, reproductions of that era, a certain environment and historical conditions. The letters reveal the mental activity of G. Skovoroda and M. Kovalinsky (10)[1]. The conversation of the soul with the soul is a feature of Skovoroda's speech practice proceeding from its position on the second «inner nature» of man. Knowing a number of foreign languages the philosopher used a variety of speech practices, speech actions but in the correspondence he preferred the use of Latin speech practice (10)[2].

The letters of the philosopher represent us a special inner world of his life first of all spiritual inner, existential. Using a variety of speech practices he defined his existential states: friendship, anguish, love, amount, joy, respect, sorrow, etc. Note that G. Skovoroda's speeches give his inner nature.

Conversation and correspondence are the main language of the speech. This was repeatedly highlighted in the letters. «Conversation with a Missing Friend» is a feature of speech practice. It was compared by G. Skovoroda «with listening of more pleasant musical instrument». The philosopher aspires to Kovalinsky's «nice conversation».

He sent poems to M. Kovalinsky by Latin, made translations, interpreted texts. That's why the letters had frequent references to the works of famous scientists, philosophers, writers and Rome artists. They were presented as expressions, poems, epigrams, provision of works and Latin authors. G. Skovoroda in letters to M. Kovalinsky used the works of Horace, Ovid, Cicero, Plutarch, Virgil, etc.. Especially frequently in his letters he referred to the works of Plutarch as a sample of classical Latin literary language from the point of view of today's philosophy of language they are the written speech practices.

In the comments to the letters that made by L. Ushkalov it is highlighted the wide use of the speech practices of Latin language. Note that it is not just about knowledge of language and how language is used and as language becomes an action and an action becomes it in conversations, in correspondence, in essays, in translations. It is in this sense refers to the practice of speech or verbal action on the practical meaning of language.

In early correspondence (July 1762) G. Skovoroda sent to M. Kovalinsky a notation in Greek which provided the following tips:

1) «The best guide in old age is wisdom»;
2) «Sacred love of virtue»;
3) «Having friends, consider that you own a treasure»;
4) «Lovely is difficult»;
5) «The short path to evil» (10)[3].

It is believed that he filed a brief moral code to be observed and performed by every person. These sentiments he translated from Greek into Latin and used the intersection and speech practices. In letter No. 29 he recalled the statements of Aristotle from the «Big ethics» (book 2). In the letter No. 43 provided with translation of the Greek poem in Latin it was translated from the «State» of Plato. There is a link with works of the sophists Diogenes, Zeno, Menander, Socrates. The thinker believed that his pupil should be aware of these Greek classics.

---

[1] Skovoroda, H. S. (2012: Lysty do Mykhayla Kovalyns'koho, s.6
[2] Skovoroda, H. S. (2012): Lysty do Mykhayla Kovalyns'koho, s.104
[3] Skovoroda, H. S. (2012): Lysty do Mykhayla Kovalyns'koho, s. 21.

The linguistic practices presented in the letters have a philosophical and anthropological orientation they are combined in one semantic whole: a respectful attitude towards his student, to their new friendship, to friendly feeling of love for each other: «Because friendship is so divine such a pleasant thing that it seems as if it is the sun of life», «friendship accompanying life not only adds pleasure and charm to its bright sides but also eases suffering» (10)[1].

L. Ushkalov well-known in Ukraine and abroad researcher of the works of G. Skovoroda, wrote: « The philosopher in his advisory and encouraging letters to M. Kovalinsky was able to fill not only with numerous colorful images, quotations from Greek and Roman classics, wise teachings, philosophical reflections, sparkles of irony, refined verses but true, alive, trembling and friendly feelings» (8)[2].

Using of various linguistic practices in the legacy of G. Skovoroda proposed in the article is debatable and invites for analysis in the context of contemporary achievements of the philosophy of language. The linguistic practice in the letters to M. Kovalinsky has a very personal relationship between two friends, a relationship that should not be known to others. This is the world of two personalities meeting for whom their friendship became their life. Researchers of language practices point out that they determine the «sincerity» of language. In each letter there is «sincerity». The correspondence of G. Skovoroda and M. Kovalinsky is a unique example of the philosophical vision of the interaction «I/the Other» where the language practice reveals the ambiguity of states and relations, feelings. The letters show tips for mastering your inner person. They reveal the «inner world» of G. Skovoroda. That's why he used Latin and Greek language practices to convey» his attitude, his feelings to M. Kovalinsky. Moreover the speech practices of G. Skovoroda prove his intentional states: faith, hope, desire, love, sorrow, sympathy, misunderstanding, friendship, respect, confusion, revealing the wealth of his «second nature», overcoming the tragedy of spirit.

The phenomenon of linguistic turn («linguistic turn») at the turn of the twentieth centuries is gaining ground. The questions arise not only about the subsequent existence of a person in the situation of transition from the present to the postmodern in the conditions of media reality but also the perception of the personality of the transition from the text to the hypertext. The latter most effectively manifests itself in the realm of creative activity. What is evidenced by the legacy of the famous Ukrainian philosopher G. Skovoroda.

References:
1. Savchuk, V. V. (2013): Fenomen povorota v kul'ture XXIveka. Mezhdunarodnyy zhurnal issledovaniy kul'tury. 2013. No 1 (10). S. 93–108.
2. Mishel', F. (1994): Slova i veshchiPerevodchiki; per. V. P. Vizgin, N. S. Avtonomova. Sankt-Peterburg, A-cad, 408 s.
3. LASH, S. (2002): Critique of information. London: Thousand Oaks (Ca); Sage Publications. XII, 234 p.
4. Eko, U. Ot Interneta k Guttenbergu: tekst i gipertekst. [online]. [Cited 15.07.2019]. Available online: hppp://www.pseudology.org/websmaster/UmberEco.htm.
5. Sherekh, Yu. (2012): Porohy i zaporizhzhya. KHarkiv, 410 s.
6. Linhvopravova kartyna svitu: suchasni problemy linhvistyky ta inshomovnoyi dydaktyky : monohrafiya. [online]. [Cited 15.07.2019]. Available online:https://docplayer.net/67009639-Lingvopravova-kartina-svitu-suchasni-problemi-lingvistiki-ta-inshomovnoyi-didaktiki.html.
7. Markov, B. V. (2008): Filosofskaya antropologiya: ucheb. posobiye dlya vuzov. Piter, 349 s.
8. Ushkalov, L. (2012): Istoriya odniyeyi druzhby. Skovoroda H. Lysty do Mykhayla Kovalyns'koho. KHarkiv,182 s.
9. Ukrainskiy vestnik na 1816 god. Chast' vtoraya. Mesyats aprel'. Ukrainian Bulletin for 1816. Part two. [online]. [Cited 15.07.2019]. Available online: http://dspace.univer.kharkov.ua/handle/123456789/10714
10. Skovoroda, H. S. (2012): Lysty do Mykhayla Kovalyns'koho. KHarkiv, 184 s.

---

[1] Skovoroda, H. S. (2012): Lysty do Mykhayla Kovalyns'koho, s.40.
[2] Ushkalov, L. (2012): Istoriya odniyeyi druzhby. *Skovoroda H. Lysty do Mykhayla Kovalyns'koho*, s. 7.