ISSN: 2522-9699, 2616-5007

16. Bidney, D 1968, *Theoretical Anthropology*, N.Y., 528 p.
17. Ferrando, F 2018, 'Posthumanism, Transhumanism, Antihumanism, Metahumanism, and New Materialisms. Differences and Relations', *Existenz*. 2018. 8/2. P. 26-32.
18. Khamitov, N & Krylova, S 2011, 'Metaantropology as a philosophy of moral education in conditions of multicultural world', *Jinju*, p. 30–31.
19. Khamitov, NV & Dandekar, DD 2019, 'Gender strategies and political leadership', *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*. № 15. *Dnipro,* p. 40-48.
20. Khamitov, N 2023, *The War in Ukraine and the New Humanism: David versus Goliath. Meta-anthropology of history of 21st century,* Sofia: *Kibea*. 124 p.

Надійшло до видання / Received *02.03.2026*
Прийнято до друку / Accepted *01.04.2026*

DOI 10.33930/ed.2019.5007.58(3-4)-2
УДК 81-13:1:82.09

THE LINGUISTIC-PHILOSOPHICAL WORLDVIEW THROUGH THE PRISM OF FICTION

Olga Kyvliuk
Uliana Zhornokui

Abstract.

Relevance of the research. *The relevance of this study is driven by the need to comprehend the significance of the literary word in shaping human perception and awareness of values, meanings, and moral orientations. Fiction is not merely a reflection of reality, a means of aesthetic pleasure, or a factor in culture-building; it constitutes a distinct world model wherein linguistically articulated images, symbols, plot conflicts, and character traits represent deep-seated concepts of human nature, society, good, evil, love, justice, dignity, and freedom.*

Problem statement. *The study investigates how fiction represents a linguistic-philosophical worldview – specifically, how artistic images facilitate either the conceptualization or the distortion of fundamental categorical concepts, thereby shaping the value dimension of the individual. On the one hand, a literary work enables the disclosure of the profound meaning of human values by contextualizing them within specific life circumstances rather than presenting them abstractly. On the other hand, literature can romanticize contradictory or destructive behavioral patterns, generating flawed perceptions of love, happiness, freedom, pride, justice, or responsibility in the reader.*

Analysis of recent research and publications. *The interplay among language, imagination, thought, consciousness, and worldview has a long tradition of examination within philosophy, linguistics, and literary studies. Its theoretical foundations trace back to Wilhelm von Humboldt's concept of language as an activity of the spirit shaping the mode of perceiving reality, Ludwig Wittgenstein's thesis on the limits of language defining the limits of the subject's world, and Ernst Cassirer's definition of the human being as a symbolic animal. The hermeneutic dimension of the problem is explored in the works of Hans-Georg Gadamer, Martin Heidegger, and Paul Ricœur, who emphasized the historicity of understanding, the openness of textual meaning, and the dialogic nature of the literary word. Philosophical categories such as beauty, justice, equality, responsibility, love, and happiness have been analyzed since Plato and Aristotle, further developed by Immanuel Kant and John Rawls, and continue to be investigated by contemporary thinkers including Timo Airaksinen, Martha Nussbaum, Svitlana Krylova, Myroslav Popovych, and Lars Svendsen. Despite this substantial body of research, the issue of the permissible substitution of philosophical concepts in literature – where an aesthetically appealing image may construct inaccurate perceptions of love, freedom, dignity, happiness, and other categorical notions – requires further conceptualization.*

Research task. *We are to analyze the characteristics of representing the linguistic-*

ISSN: 2522-9699, 2616-5007

philosophical worldview in fiction through the prism of categorical concepts; to identify potential forms of conceptual substitution in literature and their influence on worldview formation via imagination and awareness; and to substantiate the significance of fiction as a space for philosophical reflection, moral interpretation, and the critical appraisal of human values.

Main material presentation. *The article examines the linguistic-philosophical worldview represented in fiction through categorical concepts such as love, happiness, friendship, trust, justice, dignity, and freedom. It establishes that literary works not only reflect a given system of values but also actively shape the imagination and its modes of understanding. In this context, fiction emerges as a domain of symbolic modeling for human behavior, emotional states, and lived experience, wherein philosophical categories acquire emotional-figurative, linguistic, and plot-role manifestations. Special attention is devoted to the potential substitution of concepts within literary discourse and the resulting formation of misconceptions regarding these fundamental categories.*

Conclusions. *The study demonstrates that fiction serves as a unique domain for representing the linguistic-philosophical worldview, reflecting a culture's value system while actively constructing modes of understanding basic categorical concepts. Literature constitutes a vital resource for humanistic thought, moral self-knowledge, and philosophical education. Its significance lies not only in its aesthetic impact, but also in its capacity to reveal the multifaceted nature of human existence, delineate the boundaries of concepts, distinguish authentic meanings from false ones, and foster a responsible attitude toward language, values, and the Other.*

Keywords: *linguistic-philosophical worldview, fiction, values, categorical concepts, artistic image, language, moral orientations.*

МОВНО-ФІЛОСОФСЬКА КАРТИНА СВІТУ ЧЕРЕЗ ПРИЗМУ ХУДОЖНЬОЇ ЛІТЕРАТУРИ

О.П. Кивлюк
У.В. Жорнокуй

Анотація.

Актуальність дослідження *зумовлена необхідністю осмислення значимості художнього слова на формування уявлення та усвідомлення людиною цінностей, смислів та моральних орієнтирів. Художня література – не є лише відображенням дійсності, способом естетичного задоволення, чинником культуротворення, –це є своєрідна модель світу, у якій мовно описані образи, символи, сюжетні конфлікти та характери персонажів репрезентують глибинні уявлення про людину, суспільство, добро, зло, любов, справедливість, гідність і свободу.*

Постановка проблеми. *Яким чином художня література репрезентує мовно-філософську картину світу, тобто як за допомогою художніх образів відбувається осмислення або деформація базових категоріальних понять та формування ціннісного виміру особистості. З одного боку, художній твір уможливлює розкриття глибинного сенсу людських цінностей, показуючи їх не абстрактно, а в конкретних життєвих обставинах, а з іншого боку, література може романтизувати суперечливі або деструктивні форми поведінки, створюючи у читача хибне уявлення про кохання, щастя, свободу, гордість, справедливість чи відповідальність.*

Аналіз останніх досліджень і публікацій. *Проблема взаємозв'язку мови, уяви, мислення, свідомості та світогляду має тривалу традицію осмислення у філософії, мовознавстві та літературознавстві. Її теоретичні засади пов'язані з ідеями В. фон Гумбольдта про мову як діяльність духу, що формує спосіб бачення світу, Л. Вітгенштайна – про межі мови як межі світу суб'єкта, Е. Кассірера – про людину як символічну істоту. Герменевтичний аспект проблеми розкрито у працях Г.-Г. Гадамера, М. Гайдеґґер, П. Рікера, які акцентували історичність розуміння, відкритість текстового смислу та діалогічну природу художнього слова. Філософські категорії краси, справедливості, рівності, відповідальності, любові, щастя тощо розглядалися у працях починаючи з Платона та Арістотеля, продовжувались І. Кантом, Дж. Ролзом, та досліджуються сучасними мислителями Т. Айраксиненом, М. Нуссбауном, С. Криловою, М. Поповичем, Л. Свендсеном тощо. Попри значний науковий доробок, подальшого осмислення потребує проблема допустимої підміни філософських понять у художній літературі, коли естетично привабливий образ може формувати не завжди коректне*

ISSN: 2522-9699, 2616-5007

уявлення про любов, свободу, гідність, щастя та інші категоріальні поняття.

***Постановка завдання**. Дослідити особливості репрезентації мовно-філософської картини світу в художній літературі крізь призму категоріальних понять. Виявити можливі форми підміни понять у художній літературі та їхній вплив на формування картини світу через уяву та усвідомлення. Обґрунтувати значення художньої літератури як простору філософської рефлексії, моральної інтерпретації та критичного осмислення людських цінностей.*

***Виклад основного матеріалу.** У статті досліджено мовно-філософську картину світу, репрезентовану в художній літературі через категоріальні поняття кохання, щастя, дружби, довіри, справедливості, гідності, свободи тощо. Обґрунтовано, що художні твори не лише відображають певну систему цінностей, а й активно формують уяву та модуси її розуміння. У цьому контексті художня література постає як простір символічного моделювання людської поведінки, емоційних станів, досвіду, де філософські категорії набувають емоційно-образного, мовного та сюжетно-рольового втілення. Особливу увагу приділено проблемі можливої підміни понять у художньому дискурсі та формуванню хибного уявлення про відповідні категоріальні поняття.*

***Висновки.** У результаті проведеного дослідження встановлено, що художня література є особливим простором репрезентації мовно-філософської картини світу, яка відображає систему цінностей певної культури та активно формує способи розуміння базових категоріальних понять Художня література є важливим ресурсом гуманітарного мислення, морального самопізнання й філософської освіти. Її значення полягає не лише в естетичному впливі, а й у здатності відкривати багатогранність людського буття, виявляти межі понять, розрізняти справжні й хибні смисли, формувати відповідальне ставлення до слова, цінності та іншої людини.*

***Ключові слова:** мовно-філософська картина світу, художня література, цінності, категоріальні поняття, художній образ, мова, моральні орієнтири.*

Relevance of the research. The relevance of studying the linguistic-philosophical worldview embodied in fiction is conditioned by the need to rethink and critically analyze how the literary word shapes human perceptions of core values, essential meanings, and moral orientations. Fiction is neither a mere instrument of aesthetic pleasure nor an objective mirror of empirical reality. The semantic content of descriptive images, their defining characteristics, narrative conflicts, and causal relationships within fiction constitute a distinct world model. In this model, the author's perceptions – shaped by personal experience, emotional state, and intellectual capacity – are represented with regard to humanity, society, good, evil, love, justice, dignity, and freedom.

In the philosophical tradition, categories such as beauty, truth, goodness, justice, happiness, and love possess an enduring history of conceptualization – ranging from the ancient philosophy of Plato and Aristotle to the German classical philosophy of Immanuel Kant, the hermeneutics of Paul Ricœur, John Rawls's theory of justice, and contemporary existential and phenomenological interpretations of human existence. For instance, in contemporary philosophical reference works, love is defined as an "existential of human being that delineates the deepest sense of the fullness of personal existence and the experience of wholeness in union with another personality and the world" [15, p. 348]; dignity is conceptualized as "a measure of affirming the personal principle, self-worth, and the capacity and need to be a moral agent within a human being" [15, p. 119]; and goodness is understood as "the primary positive category of morality, reflecting the aggregate content of the demands and values of moral consciousness" [15, p. 164].

However, the majority of individuals do not focus on theoretical definitions of these categories; rather, they objectify them through human experience as reflected in literary works. Consequently, in fiction, these and other categories appear not as abstract definitions, but as semantic structures represented through character traits, narrative logic, situational choices, internal conflicts, social preconditions, and moral-value orientations.

Thus, a literary work can either deepen the understanding of philosophical categories or induce their semantic deformation. Specifically, romantic love in literature may be portrayed as self-sacrifice, unconditional devotion, spiritual unity, or moral elevation; conversely, it may be depicted as possessiveness, dependency, obsession, jealousy, or self-destruction. Dignity may be distorted into hubris, freedom into license, justice into vengeance, and happiness into mere hedonistic pleasure. Therein lies not only the aesthetic, but also the worldview significance of

ISSN: 2522-9699, 2616-5007

literature.

This issue becomes particularly urgent in contemporary humanities education, where fiction is increasingly viewed as a resource for cultivating critical thinking, emotional intelligence, moral reflection, and the capacity to interpret complex human situations. Turning to the works of Jane Austen, Emily Brontë, Victor Hugo, Mykhailo Kotsiubynsky, Hryhorii Kvitka-Osnovianenko, and other authors allows us to trace how, across various cultural traditions, literary texts not only reproduce but also problematize the meanings of fundamental concepts of human existence.

The problem statement of this study consists in determining how fiction represents the linguistic-philosophical worldview and through what mechanisms artistic imagery leads to semantic shifts – and occasionally the substitution of meanings – concerning basic categorical concepts. On the one hand, a literary work is capable of revealing the profound meaning of human values by presenting them within concrete life circumstances rather than abstractly. On the other hand, literature can romanticize contradictory or destructive forms of behavior, fostering flawed perceptions of love, happiness, freedom, pride, and justice.

For example, Jane Austen's novel *Pride and Prejudice* (1813) demonstrates how social stereotypes, class expectations, and personal perceptual errors influence the understanding of love, marriage, dignity, and moral maturity [9]. In Emily Brontë's *Wuthering Heights* (1847), love appears not as a harmonious union, but as a destructive force of passion, resentment, and the desire for possession [16]. Mykhailo Kotsiubynsky's *Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors* (1911) presents a mythopoetic world of love within Hutsul culture, where human emotion is intertwined with nature, tradition, ancestral memory, and the tragedy of existence [7]. In Hryhorii Kvitka-Osnovianenko's *Marusia* (1834), the model of pure, sincere love is tied to the Christian notion of submission and fate [6]. In Victor Hugo's novel *The Man Who Laughs* (1869), the problem of beauty, ugliness, social inequality, and human dignity assumes a distinct socio-philosophical significance [19].

Hence, the question arises: does fiction merely replicate established meanings of philosophical categories, or does it actively participate in their reinterpretation, displacement, substitution, and worldview construction?

Research task. We are to investigate the characteristics of representing the linguistic-philosophical worldview in fiction through the lens of categorical concepts; to identify potential forms of conceptual substitution in literature and their impact on shaping the worldview through imagination and awareness; and to substantiate the value of fiction as a space for philosophical reflection, moral interpretation, and the critical appraisal of human values.

Analysis of recent research and publications. The relationship between language, thought, and worldview has a rich history in the humanities. The origins of understanding language as a framework for constructing the world are linked to Wilhelm von Humboldt, who viewed language not as a passive medium for transmitting thought, but as an activity of the spirit that shapes the mode of perceiving reality [20]. These ideas were further developed in Ludwig Wittgenstein's philosophy of language, for whom the limits of language correspond to the limits of the subject's world [3], as well as in the works of Ernst Cassirer, who defined the human being as a *animal symbolicum* living within systems of myth, language, art, religion, and science [17]. The hermeneutic dimension of the issue is represented in the works of Hans-Georg Gadamer [4], Martin Heidegger [18], and Paul Ricœur [12]. In philosophical aesthetics, social philosophy, and the philosophy of law, specific categories are examined in the works of Plato [10], Aristotle [2], Immanuel Kant [5], John Rawls [13], among others. Contemporary scholars addressing these themes include Timo Airaksinen [1], Martha Nussbaum [21], Svitlana Krylova [8], Myroslav Popovych [11], and Lars Svendsen [14].

Despite extensive research, the specific issue of the potential substitution of philosophical concepts in fiction requires further exploration – namely, scenarios where an aesthetically compelling image may reinforce an inaccurate understanding of love, freedom, dignity, happiness, or justice.

Main material presentation. The essence of the linguistic worldview implies that language does not merely name objects, phenomena, and states, but actively structures human experience. Through words, metaphors, symbols, evaluative constructs, and cultural codes, individuals perceive the world not as a chaotic collection of facts, but as an ordered semantic reality. Language dictates what is deemed significant, valuable, dangerous, beautiful, just, or ignoble.

The philosophical worldview, in turn, represents a system of generalized concepts regarding being, humanity, values, cognition, and moral choice. While the linguistic worldview

ISSN: 2522-9699, 2616-5007

reflects culturally embedded ways of naming and evaluating reality, the philosophical worldview strives for an objective-rational conceptualization of these modes, exposing their foundations, limits, and contradictions.

Fiction synthesizes the linguistic and philosophical worldviews. It does not offer a ready-made system of concepts like a philosophical treatise; instead, it constructs figurative situations in which these concepts are directly lived through by characters. The uniqueness of the literary text lies precisely in this capacity: rather than merely providing theoretical justifications for what constitutes love, happiness, or justice, it demonstrates how individuals misinterpret these categories, suffer due to misconceptions, evolve through experience, and reevaluate their convictions.

In this sense, fiction can be viewed as a unique mode of philosophizing that rarely articulates concepts directly, but instead creates a space for their interpretation. A literary text simultaneously clarifies and complicates the meaning of categories. Beauty can manifest not only as harmony, but also as temptation; love not merely as a positive emotion, but as a destructive force; pride not strictly as a moral flaw, but as a mechanism of self-defense; prejudice not simply as a cognitive error, but as a byproduct of social experience; and justice not solely as a norm of natural law, but as a problem of implementation within an imperfect society.

Consider the category of **beauty**, one of the oldest in philosophy. In the Platonic tradition, beauty possesses an ontological and spiritual dimension, serving as a marker of a higher order of being that directs the soul toward truth and goodness [10]. In the *Critique of Judgment*, Immanuel Kant connects beauty with disinterested aesthetic pleasure and the harmony of cognitive faculties, asserting a validity that transcends subjective perception to claim universal assent [5]. In the research of the Ukrainian philosopher Svitlana Krylova, human beauty is examined not merely as physical harmony, but as a synthesis of the beauty of one's worldview, actions, and interpersonal relationships. Here, the phenomenon of beauty is elevated beyond classical aesthetics into the domains of philosophical anthropology, metaanthropology, ethics, philosophy of culture, and social philosophy [8].

In fiction, beauty frequently appears as an ambivalent category that can signify inner harmony, yet can equally mask moral void, social injustice, or spiritual degradation. This tension is vividly illustrated in Victor Hugo's *The Man Who Laughs*. The figure of Gwynplaine – physically disfigured yet morally elevated – dismantles the reductionist identification of beauty with corporeal perfection, external elegance, and splendor [19]. Hugo executes a philosophical inversion regarding true beauty, shifting the focus from physical appearance to the realm of moral existence. In this context, the literary text exposes the substitution of the concept of beauty, wherein the beautiful is mistakenly conflated solely with the visible, attractive, and socially prestigious, thereby stripping it of its ethical dimension. Thus, literature demonstrates that beauty cannot be reduced to an aesthetic surface; its meaning is realized only through the unity of image, action, character, and moral substance. Substituting external appearance for beauty represents one of the most pervasive distortions of aesthetic consciousness.

Love in the philosophical tradition is conceptualized as one of the most complex modes of human existence. For Plato, love is an aspiration toward beauty, goodness, and the ultimate fullness of being [10]. For Aristotle, love and friendship are linked through moral reciprocity, wherein one wishes good upon another not for utility or pleasure, but for the intrinsic value of the other person [2]. In the Christian tradition, love assumes the meaning of self-sacrifice, mercy, and responsibility for one's neighbor. In 20th- and 21st-century philosophy, love is understood not merely as an emotional state or physical attraction, but as a mode of interpersonal relationship in which the other person is recognized as autonomous, unique, and intrinsically valuable. In personalist, dialogic, and ethical-hermeneutic traditions, love is bound to openness toward the Other, empathy, responsibility, care, and the moral recognition of their agency. Therefore, love cannot be reduced to possessiveness, idealization, or subordination, as its authentic meaning lies in accepting the Other as an independent center of lived experience, freedom, and dignity.

For instance, the central thesis of Martha Nussbaum's *Love's Knowledge: Essays on Philosophy and Literature* is that fiction is not merely an aesthetic form, but a distinct mode of moral cognition. Nussbaum demonstrates that literary texts are uniquely capable of revealing dimensions of human experience – such as the complexity of feelings, the role of emotions, the ambiguity of moral choice, and personal vulnerability – that abstract philosophical definitions often fail to convey [21].

ISSN: 2522-9699, 2616-5007

In literature, love often manifests as an ordeal rather than a source of immediate happiness, with its true essence frequently substituted by passion, infatuation, dependency, sacrificial self-abnegation, or the urge to possess another. In Austen's *Pride and Prejudice*, love unfolds as a process of moral discovery and the overcoming of bias, where love is not blind passion, but the capacity to perceive the Other holistically beyond initial social stereotypes and personal grievances [9].

Conversely, Brontë's *Wuthering Heights* presents a contrasting model, wherein an overwhelming emotion leads not to mutual moral growth or the expansion of freedom and responsibility, but to jealousy, resentment, revenge, social frustration, and self-destruction [16]. Here, the text highlights the danger of romanticizing obsession. When the intensity of feeling is uncritically equated with its truthfulness, the reader may mistake dependency, pain, and ruin for markers of "profound love".

In Kotsiubynsky's *Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors*, love serves as a mechanism integrating the individual into the cosmos of tradition, nature, and ancestral memory, bound to cosmic fatality where human emotion cannot entirely transcend the boundaries of death and destiny [7]. In Kvitka-Osnovianenko's *Marusia*, love and morality are expressed within a sentimental-Christian paradigm, where emotion is subordinated to notions of purity, virtue, meekness, familial harmony, and religious piety [6]. Here, love is conflated with resignation, suffering, and the renunciation of active struggle for personal happiness. While this model carries historical and cultural value, it requires critical appraisal from the standpoint of modern understandings of personal agency and autonomy.

Thus, fiction reveals a plurality of romantic models: love as moral cognition, love as destructive passion, love as mythopoetic unity, love as sentimental purity, and love as a social challenge. Consequently, the reader requires a philosophical culture of interpretation to avoid conflating emotional intensity with depth, self-sacrifice with self-destruction, fidelity with dependency, or passion with love.

The category of **happiness** has a complex history in philosophy. In antiquity, happiness was conceived not as fleeting pleasure, but as *eudaimonia*—the fullness of life lived in accordance with virtue [2]. In this sense, happiness is not reduced to emotional gratification or material prosperity; rather, it functions as cognitive activity, moral excellence, and the harmonization of the individual with the world. In *Happiness: A Frankly Modern Account*, Timo Airaksinen treats happiness not as a straightforward state of joy, pleasure, or comfort, but as a complex philosophical category linked to the human striving for existential completeness. Airaksinen emphasizes the paradoxical nature of happiness in human pursuit, noting that authentic happiness is frequently substituted by pleasure, desire, consumerism, social status, or external indicators of well-being. Happiness emerges not as a static outcome, but as a problematic framework for evaluating human actions, choices, desires, self-realization, and quality of life [1].

In literature, happiness is often presented as a desirable yet elusive goal. In their pursuits of love, marriage, social recognition, financial stability, freedom, or self-fulfillment, characters do not always realize what truly imparts genuine meaning to their lives. In *Pride and Prejudice*, happiness is tied to marriage, yet Austen critically delineates various marital choices: the socio-pragmatic, the romantically impulsive, and the model based on mutual moral respect [9]. The problem of happiness takes on a socio-philosophical dimension in Hugo's *The Man Who Laughs*, where happiness is shown to be unsustainable as a purely private endeavor if the surrounding social order systematically degrades human dignity [19].

Accordingly, fiction exposes several common substitutions for happiness—such as happiness as comfort, marital status, emotional euphoria, social success, or an escape from responsibility. A philosophical reading restores a deeper meaning to the concept, anchoring happiness in personal integrity, moral maturity, freedom, love, dignity, and harmony with the world.

The concept of **pride** exhibits an inherently ambivalent character. On the one hand, pride can function as a vice, a form of self-aggrandizement, arrogance, and an inability to acknowledge one's faults; on the other hand, it can approximate dignity, self-respect, and the refusal to demean oneself in the face of injustice. Thus, in literature, pride often becomes a locus of semantic tension.

In Austen's *Pride and Prejudice*, this category is explicitly foregrounded. The philosophical core of the novel suggests that both pride and prejudice are overcome through self-knowledge and moral transformation. The work demonstrates that genuine dignity is not equivalent to pride, just

ISSN: 2522-9699, 2616-5007

as critical judgment is not equivalent to premature bias [9].

Prejudice in literature is frequently depicted as a socio-linguistic mechanism. It is constructed through rumor, stereotypes, class codes, familial expectations, fixed phrases, and societal appraisals. The individual perceives the Other not as they are, but as the community has labeled them. Therefore, overcoming prejudice is not merely a psychological challenge, but a linguistic-philosophical one. In *The Man Who Laughs*, prejudice is tied to physical appearance and social standing; society transforms a physical defect into a justification for humiliation, turning it into a form of symbolic violence [19].

Thus, fiction helps distinguish between pride as moral blindness and dignity as self-respect. Substituting these concepts is dangerous, as hubris may masquerade as strength of character, while dignity may be misconstrued as stubbornness. Only philosophical interpretation allows one to discern where self-respect safeguards the individual and where pride isolates them from truth.

Justice in classical philosophy is tied to the concept of a rightful order through the prism of equality and freedom, as its absence is most starkly felt in conditions of social degradation, dependency, discrimination, or restricted choice. Inequality reveals a rupture in the balance between the individual and society, whereas freedom provides the possibility of mending this disruption through the recognition of dignity, agency, and moral autonomy. In contemporary philosophy, justice is increasingly linked to rights, liberty, equality of opportunity, and social institutions. John Rawls's theory of "justice as fairness" emphasizes that a just society must be built upon equal basic liberties and principles of fair cooperation among free citizens [13].

In contemporary Ukrainian philosophical thought, Myroslav Popovych (*The Philosophy of Freedom*) conceptualizes freedom as a socio-cultural and civic value – the capacity for independent critical thinking, moral choice, and the prerequisite for an authentic, responsible existence grounded in spiritual independence [11]. Lars Svendsen similarly emphasizes freedom as a philosophical problem involving choice, autonomy, determinism, responsibility, and meaning, arguing that freedom is necessary not merely to "have choices", but to act as the author of one's own life [14].

Literature frequently exposes injustice not through abstract theory, but through specific human destinies, making the literary image potentially more impactful than normative definitions. In Hugo's work, justice and equality are central socio-philosophical categories. The aristocratic world in *The Man Who Laughs* is portrayed not merely as privileged, but as a morally distorted system where inequality is institutionalized, and human dignity is dictated by birth, title, and appearance [19]. The issue of equality also permeates *Pride and Prejudice*, which addresses constraints related to class, gender, and the limited agency of women in early 19th-century English society [9]. In *Marusia*, justice is conceived as alignment with a divine and moral order rather than socio-political equality [6]. In *Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors*, the individual cannot always secure worldly justice, but can preserve the inner truth of feeling, memory, and devotion [7].

A common conceptual substitution in literature occurs when justice is conflated with **revenge**. This is prominently illustrated in *Wuthering Heights*, where personal tragedy is weaponized into a strategy for destroying others [16]. However, justice requires proportionality, recognition of the Other, and the restoration of a damaged order, whereas revenge merely compounds harm.

Conclusions. The analysis demonstrates that fiction serves as a specialized domain for representing the linguistic-philosophical worldview, which not only reflects the value system of a given culture but actively constructs modes of understanding basic categorical concepts – such as beauty, love, happiness, pride, prejudice, justice, equality, dignity, and freedom.

Philosophical categories in literary texts exist not as abstract formulations, but as lived meanings embodied in imagery, plot lines, conflicts, character dialogue, and moments of moral choice. Furthermore, the linguistic-philosophical worldview in literature encompasses both universal human dimensions and national-cultural specifics. While categories of love, beauty, and justice are universal, each literary tradition endows them with distinct linguistic and symbolic forms.

It is established that fiction can clarify as well as deform categorical concepts. The most prevalent substitutions include equating love with obsession or dependency, dignity with pride, beauty with physical appearance, happiness with social status, justice with revenge, and freedom with license. Such conceptual shifts do not necessarily constitute artistic flaws, as they generate the

ISSN: 2522-9699, 2616-5007

required tension for critical interpretation. However, without a philosophical framework for reading, they risk reinforcing flawed assumptions regarding human values.

Ultimately, literature confirms that philosophical categories do not exist in isolation from language and culture, necessitating an integrated approach combining philosophy, linguistics, cultural studies, and literary theory. Fiction must be recognized as a vital resource for humanistic inquiry, moral self-knowledge, and philosophical education. Its value resides not merely in aesthetic appeal, but in its ability to illuminate the complexity of human existence, map the boundaries of concepts, distinguish genuine meanings from false ones, and cultivate a responsible attitude toward language, values, and the Other.

Список використаних джерел:

1. Айраксинен, Т 2017, *Щастя. Відверте і чітке бачення щастя і того, чому у нас його немає*, Ніка-центр, Київ, 208 с.
2. Арістотель 2002, *Нікомахова етика*, пер. з давньогр. В. Ставнюка, Аквілон-Плюс, Київ, 480 с.
3. Вітгенштайн, Л 2025, *Логіко-філософський трактат*, Арій, Київ, 128 с.
4. Гадамер, Г-Г 2000, *Істина і метод. Основи філософської герменевтики*, Юніверс, Київ, 464 с.
5. Кант, І 2022, *Критика сили судження*, Темпора, Київ, 702 с.
6. Квітка-Основ'яненко, Г 2025, *Конотопська відьма. Маруся*, Кондор, Київ, 248 с.
7. Коцюбинський, М 2023, *Тіні забутих предків*, Дискурсус, Івано-Франківськ, 136 с.
8. Крилова, СА 2019, *Краса людини в життєвих практиках культури. Досвід соціальної та культурної метаантропології і андрогін-аналізу: монографія*, 2-ге вид., перероб. і допов., КНТ, Київ, 563 с.
9. Остін, Дж 2025, *Гордість та упередження*, пер. з англ. І. Бондарєвої, Клуб Сімейного Дозвілля, Харків, 432 с.
10. Платон 2022, *Діалоги*, Фоліо, Харків, 349 с.
11. Попович, МВ 2018, *Філософія свободи*, Фоліо, Харків, 524 с.
12. Рікер, П 2002, *Сам як інший*, пер. з фр. В. Андрушко, Дух і літера, Київ, 458 с.
13. Ролз, Дж 2001, *Теорія справедливості*, пер. з англ. О. Мокровольський, Вид-во Соломії Павличко «Основи», Київ, 822 с.
14. Свендсен, Л 2016, *Філософія свободи*, Ніка-центр, Київ, 336 с.
15. Шинкарук, ВІ (ред.) 2002, *Філософський енциклопедичний словник*, Абрис, Київ, 742 с.
16. Brontë, E 2002, *Wuthering Heights*, ed. P Nestor, pref. L Miller, Penguin Classics, London, 416 p.
17. Cassirer, E 1965, *The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms*, vol. 1: Language, trans. R Manheim, pref. and introd. CW Hendel, Yale University Press, New Haven, 342 p.
18. Heidegger, M 1971, *Poetry, Language, Thought*, trans. A Hofstadter, Harper & Row, New York, 229 p.
19. Hugo, V 2022, *The Man Who Laughs*, Mint Editions, Vancouver, 608 p.
20. Humboldt, W von 1988, *On Language: The Diversity of Human Language-Structure and its Influence on the Mental Development of Mankind*, trans. P Heath, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 368 p.
21. Nussbaum, MC 1990, *Love's Knowledge: Essays on Philosophy and Literature*, Oxford University Press, New York, 403 p.

References:

1. Airaksinen, T 2017, *Shchastia. Vidverte i chitke bachennia shchastia i toho, chomu u nas yoho nemaie [Happiness. A frank and clear vision of happiness and why we don't have it],* Nika-tsentr, Kyiv, 208 p. [in Ukrainian].
2. Aristotle 2002, *Nikomakhova etyka [Nicomachean Ethics],* transl. by V. Stavniuk, Akvilon-Plius, Kyiv, 480 p. [in Ukrainian].
3. Wittgenstein, L 2025, *Lohiko-filosofskyi traktat [Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus]***,** Arii, Kyiv, 128 p. [in Ukrainian].
4. Gadamer, H-H 2000, *Istyna i metod. Osnovy filosofskoi hermenevtyky [Truth and Method: Foundations of Philosophical Hermeneutics]*, Yunivers, Kyiv, 464 p. [in Ukrainian].
5. Kant, I 2022, *Krytyka syly sudzhennia [Critique of the Power of Judgment]*, Tempora, Kyiv, 702 p. [in Ukrainian].
6. Kvitka-Osnovianenko, H 2025, *Konotopska vidma. Marusia [The Konotop Witch. Marusia]*, Kondor, Kyiv, 248 p. [in Ukrainian].
7. Kotsiubynskyi, M 2023, *Tini zabutykh predkiv [Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors]*, Dyskursus, Ivano-Frankivsk, 136 p. [in Ukrainian].
8. Krylova, SA 2019, *Krasa liudyny v zhyttievykh praktykakh kultury. Dosvid sotsialnoi ta kulturnoi metaantropolohii i androhin-analizu: monohrafiia [The Beauty of a Person in the Life Practices of Culture. The Experience of Social and Cultural Meta-anthropology and Androgyne-analysis: a monograph]*, 2nd edn, rev. and enl., KNT, Kyiv, 563 p. [in Ukrainian].

ISSN: 2522-9699, 2616-5007

9. Austen, J 2025, *Hordist ta uperedzhennia [Pride and Prejudice]*, transl. by I. Bondarieva, Klub Simeinoho Dozvillia, Kharkiv, 432 p. [in Ukrainian].
10. Plato 2022, *Dialohy [Dialogues]*, Folio, Kharkiv, 349 p. [in Ukrainian].
11. Popovych, MV 2018, *Filosofiia svobody [Philosophy of Freedom]*, Folio, Kharkiv, 524 p. [in Ukrainian].
12. Ricoeur, P 2002, *Sam yak inshyi [Oneself as Another]*, transl. by V. Andrushko, Dukh i Litera, Kyiv, 458 p. [in Ukrainian].
13. Rawls, J 2001, *Teoriia spravedlyvosti [A Theory of Justice]*, transl. by O. Mokrovolskyi, Solomiia Pavlychko Publishing House "Osnovy", Kyiv, 822 p. [in Ukrainian].
14. Svendsen, L 2016, *Filosofiia svobody [Philosophy of Freedom]*, Nika-tsentr, Kyiv, 336 p. [in Ukrainian].
15. Shynkaruk, VI (ed.) 2002, *Filosofskyi entsyklopedychnyi slovnyk [Philosophical Encyclopedic Dictionary]*, Abrys, Kyiv, 742 p. [in Ukrainian].
16. Brontë, E 2002, *Wuthering Heights*, ed. P Nestor, pref. L Miller, Penguin Classics, London, 416 p.
17. Cassirer, E 1965, *The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms*, vol. 1: Language, trans. R Manheim, pref. and introd. CW Hendel, Yale University Press, New Haven, 342 p.
18. Heidegger, M 1971, *Poetry, Language, Thought*, trans. A Hofstadter, Harper & Row, New York, 229 p.
19. Hugo, V 2022, *The Man Who Laughs*, Mint Editions, Vancouver, 608 p.
20. Humboldt, W von 1988, *On Language: The Diversity of Human Language-Structure and its Influence on the Mental Development of Mankind*, trans. P Heath, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 368 p.
21. Nussbaum, MC 1990, *Love's Knowledge: Essays on Philosophy and Literature*, Oxford University Press, New York, 403 p.

Надійшло до видання / Received *28.01.2026*
Прийнято до друку / Accepted *04.03.2026*

DOI 10.33930/ed.2019.5007.58(3-4)-3
УДК 130.2:141.32:316.722:398.47

МУЛЬТИМОДАЛЬНІСТЬ РЕПРЕЗЕНТАЦІЙ ФЕНОМЕНУ ЖАХЛИВОГО В СЕМІОСФЕРІ УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ ДОМОДЕРНОЇ ТА РАННЬОМОДЕРНОЇ КУЛЬТУРИ: ФІЛОСОФСЬКО-АНТРОПОЛОГІЧНИЙ АНАЛІЗ

Н. В. Радіонова

Анотація.

Актуальність теми дослідження. *Попри безпрецедентний розвиток науки, технологій та інформаційних систем, сучасна людина продовжує стикатися з явищами, які виходять за межі раціонального пояснення та актуалізують екзистенційні переживання страху, що зумовлює актуальність дослідження феномену жахливого.*

Постановка проблеми. *Необхідність дослідження даного феномену посилюється потребою з'ясування того, чому образи та сюжети жахливого, сформовані в межах архаїчної міфологічної свідомості в домодерній та ранньомодерній культурі, зберігають свою актуальність у сучасному українському суспільстві та продовжують впливати на способи осмислення людиною власного буття.*

Аналіз останніх досліджень і публікацій. *У сучасному українському філософському дискурсі жахливе набуло свого вивчення через дослідження досвіду війни, страху, травми – В. Агеєва, О. Забужко, О. Панич, Т. Лютий, а також у ракурсі досліджень феномена зла та антифобіальних практик – О. Вовк, К. Богун, М. Столяр, О. Приходченко та ін.*

Постановка завдання. *Здійснити філософсько-антропологічну інтерпретацію мультимодальних форм репрезентації феномену жахливого у фольклорно-містичному дискурсі української культури як цілісного семіотичного й культурного комплексу, а також простежити взаємозв'язок між архаїчними формами світосприйняття та сучасними культурними практиками репрезентації страху.*

Виклад основного матеріалу. *Феномен жахливого належить до тих культурних універсалій, які формують смислові конфігурації семіосфери культури та визначають способи символічного структурування досвіду людського існування. Попри*