

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.20535/2026.17.343773>**Olga Ilchenko**

Dr.Sc. in Philology, prof., Head of Foreign Languages Department  
Research and Educational Centre of Foreign Languages, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine  
Kyiv, Ukraine  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5546-1408>  
[olgilch@hotmail.com](mailto:olgilch@hotmail.com)

**Natalie Kramar**

PhD in Philology, Senior Researcher,  
Research and Educational Centre of Foreign Languages, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine  
Kyiv, Ukraine  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5767-9200>  
[kra\\_nat@ukr.net](mailto:kra_nat@ukr.net)

**Nataliia Kravchenko**

PhD in Philology, Assistant Prof.,  
Research and Educational Centre of Foreign Languages, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine  
Kyiv, Ukraine  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8565-063X>  
[natkravgrig@ukr.net](mailto:natkragrig@ukr.net)

**Zinaida Shelkownikova**

PhD in Philology, Assistant Prof.,  
Research and Educational Centre of Foreign Languages, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine  
Kyiv, Ukraine  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1112-627X>  
[z.shelkownikova@gmail.com](mailto:z.shelkownikova@gmail.com)

**Yaroslava Bedrych**

PhD in Philology, Assistant Prof.,  
Research and Educational Centre of Foreign Languages, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine  
Kyiv, Ukraine  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8634-3124>  
[bedrych@ukr.net](mailto:bedrych@ukr.net)

*Dedicated to Professor Alla Kalyta on the occasion of her anniversary – in gratitude for her pioneering thought, which serves as an ethical compass for this study, and for a vision that transforms theory into a living call for a responsible “listening society.”*

## LINGUOPHILOSOPHICAL ASPECTS OF NOVEL SCIENTIFIC TERMS IN THE ERA OF METAMODERNISM

This article explores the phenomenon of metamodernism as a philosophical movement that emerged in response to the crisis of postmodernist skepticism, relativism, and deconstruction. It establishes that metamodernism, while aware of all the complexity and ambiguity of the previous era, strives for (co-)comprehension and progress towards a better and more perfect future. Based on a terminological analysis of key general scientific terms, such as “information,” “datafication,” “Anthropocene,” and “disruption”, the article outlines the linguophilosophical aspects of scientific cognition in the new era. Employing hermeneutic interpretation, definitional scrutiny, and conceptual modeling inspired

© Olga Ilchenko, Natalie Kramar, Nataliia Kravchenko, Zinaida Shelkownikova, Yaroslava Bedrych. 2026.  
Published by Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the licence CC BY 4.0

by Wittgenstein's language games and Derrida's *différance*, this approach uncovers how lexical structures encode metamodern tensions between sincerity and irony. Ukrainian equivalents of relevant terminological units are provided to localize the terminological units in question to culturally attune them in the era of sustainable disruption. It is argued that metamodern science is characterized by social orientation, an emphasis on informational ontology (J. Wheeler), and the necessity of ethical balancing between the disruptive nature of innovations (C. Christensen) vs. the idea of sustainable progress. Central to this is A. Kalyta et al.'s monistic-dialectical lens from manipulation in speech communication, which models psyche as a triune flux (conscious/preconscious/unconscious) of psychophysiological energy. This framework illuminates metamodern language's performative potential: countering post-truth manipulations through non-linear rhetorical safeguards, where verbal stimuli trigger existential reconfigurations, demanding "listening society" virtues (Freinacht) for emergent altruism and truth-seeking amid metamodernist oscillation and disruption. The research findings are of interest to specialists in the fields of linguistics, philosophy of language, and communication theory, particularly in fostering culturally attuned discourse for polycrisis navigation in Ukrainian and global scholarly contexts.

**Keywords:** metamodernism; oscillation; datafication; disruption; sustainable innovation; Anthropocene; linguophilosophical aspects; post-truth.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

**Problem statement.** This article explores the phenomenon of metamodernism as a linguistic and philosophical response to the crisis of postmodernist skepticism and deconstruction. The preceding era of postmodernism, with its emphasis on skepticism, relativism, decanonization, and the multiplicity of interpretations, radically questioned all grand narratives and ideas of objective truth. The inability of the postmodern vision to adequately respond to global challenges – such as the ecological crisis and rapid technological development – revealed the need for a new intellectual and ethical framework. Metamodernism emerged as a philosophical movement of the late 20th century, directly responding to this crisis. Unlike postmodernism, metamodernism, while aware of all the complexity and ambiguity of postmodernity, strives for (co-)comprehension and progress towards a better and more perfect future.

**Analysis of recent research and publications.** Jason Ananda Josephson Storm, one of the leading scholars of metamodernism, in his book *Metamodernism: The Future of Theory*, asserts that metamodernism is a new way of thinking that combines elements of modernism and postmodernism with its multiplicity, uncertainty, and irony (Storm, 2021). Another key contribution, by Greg Dember in *Say Hello to Metamodernism!*, emphasizes the emotional and social components, defining the cultural shift through concepts like "ironesty" (the surprisingly good combination of irony and earnestness), "felt experience," "empathic reflexivity" (Dember, 2024). In the Ukrainian scholarly tradition, Professor Alla Kalyta stands as a pivotal figure. Her collaborative work, *Manipulation in Speech Communication* (Kalyta et al., 2024), advances a monistic-dialectical framework (an orthodox-alternative synthesis that unifies phenomena under a single psychophysiological energy while resolving contradictions through dynamic polarities like instincts and feelings, enabling holistic modeling of cognitive shifts without eclecticism) for analyzing communicative phenomena, modeling how linguistic stimuli trigger non-linear shifts in the psyche's triune structure (consciousness, preconscious, unconscious). This approach resonates deeply with metamodernism's oscillation, offering tools to dissect ethical distortions in post-truth environments and foster responsible dialogue – hallmarks of progress beyond deconstructive irony. Digging a bit deeper, we argue that it was the distinguished Italian writer, Italo Calvino, with his work *Six Memos for the Next Millennium*, who could rightly be considered a forerunner of metamodernism. He noted the following characteristics of the future: lightness, quickness, exactitude, visibility, multiplicity, and consistency (Calvino, 1988). Resonating with such ideas, T. Vermeulen and R. van den Akker (2010) define the new sensibility as "oscillation," a dynamic movement between modernist enthusiasm and postmodernist mockery. This oscillation is a philosophical strategy for navigating the world's complexity that calls for a new precision of language. This new approach recognizes the complexity and ambiguity of the world and strives for constructive, analytical work, replacing criticism for the sake of criticism with the pursuit of progress. Hanzi Freinacht (a pen name for the Swedish political philosopher and sociologist Daniel Görtz and art theorist Emil Ejner Friis) (Severinova, 2025), a leading voice in

metamodern philosophy, has significantly advanced the discourse on ethics by integrating integral theory with metamodern sensibilities. In their work, Freinacht reframes ethics as a dynamic system that oscillates between modernist precision and postmodern complexity. Metamodern ethics, in Freinacht's view, emphasizes complementarity and interdependence, fostering a "listening society" where ethical decisions promote emergent virtues like altruism; Freinacht's ideas envision ethics as a tool for cultural evolution toward higher "metamodern" stages of development, with morality that honors truth, beauty, and goodness (Freinacht, 2017, 2022).

**The purpose of the article.** The goal of this research is to outline some current linguophilosophical aspects of science in the era of metamodernism through the prism of general scientific terms frequently used in scientific discourse to denote the specifics of scientific knowledge, which is of interest to specialists in practically all fields of knowledge. Our task is to identify and interpret these terminological units and integrate them into the metamodernist worldview, thereby demonstrating how new scientific language shapes and expresses a new scientific philosophy.

## 2 METHODS

This section details the methods, tools, and materials utilized during the research, with a focus on the necessary linguistic and philosophical integration.

### 2.1 Research Material

The research material consisted of key general scientific and interdisciplinary terms, as well as neologisms (primarily English-language terms, as the source of global scientific communication), that function in contemporary scholarly discourse and serve as linguistic markers of changes in the paradigm of cognition. These units include: "metamodernism," "oscillation," "information," "datafication," "Anthropocene," "Chthulucene," and "disruptive innovation." The empirical base included dictionary definitions of English-language neologisms of the 21st century (Kramar, 2022), key theoretical works on the philosophy of science and science studies, fundamental works on information theory, theoretical texts defining the essence of metamodernism, recent research on communication and knowledge manipulation (Schumpeter, 1942; Wiener, 1948; Wittgenstein, 1953; Derrida, 1976; Calvino, 1988; Wheeler, 1989; Dobrov, 1989; Crutzen and Stormer, 2000; Vermeulen & van den Akker, 2010; Kuhn, 2015; Christensen, 2016; Haraway, 2016; Latour, 2017; Freinacht, 2017; 2022; Glattfelder, 2019; Storm, 2021; Dember, 2024; Kalyta et al., 2024).

### 2.2 Research Methods

To achieve the objective, we selected a complex of general scientific and specific methods that involves the following research techniques and approaches. First, we utilized hermeneutic-philosophical method (used to interpret key philosophical concepts of metamodernism, specifically, "oscillation", "post-skeptical sincerity") and their relationship with the epistemological ideas of T. Kuhn and G. Dobrov. We have also employed terminological and definitional analysis to clearly define the meanings of selected general scientific terms, namely: "Anthropocene," "disruption," "datafication" and their functional load within the context of the new paradigm. This analysis focuses on how the lexical structure of these terms reflects the underlying philosophical shift. Another technique we made use of was conceptual analysis that allowed for the identification of the worldview and value foundations underlying each term (e.g., the link between "disruption" and the ethical imperative of "sustainable progress") to reveal the philosophical content encoded in the language. Last but not least, the selected methodology included systemic approach to ensure the consideration of scientific knowledge as a holistic, socially determined system in constant development, and the establishment of connections between the philosophical, linguistic, and ecological aspects of modern science. The latter was employed in conjunction with linguophilosophical modeling that was used to demonstrate how language (neologisms, terms) actively constructs a new scientific and social reality, rather than merely passively reflects it, through the prism of linguistic turn in philosophy, specifically, in light of L. Wittgenstein's "language games" (with meanings as emergent from contextual use within social "forms of life" rather than inherent essences) (Wittgenstein, 1953), and Jacques

Derrida's ((Derrida, 1976, original work published in 1967) extension of this through "différance," a neologism blending "difference" and "deferral," which deconstructs binary oppositions, rendering language inherently unstable.

### 3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### 3.1 Philosophical Foundations of Metamodernism: Oscillation and "The Future of Theory"

Postmodernism completed its cycle when deconstruction became an end in itself and irony the only possible tonality, leading to the exhaustion of narratives and linguistic stagnation. The sight of this wreckage – the inevitable decay of monumental, modernist ambition – is perfectly captured by P. B. Shelley's (1818) distant allusion in the poem "Ozymandias", where the "colossal wreck" of former sovereign power is left stranded in the vast, empty desert of skepticism. Metamodernism suggests a new sensibility, defined by T. Vermeulen and R. van den Akker (2010) as "oscillation" between modernist enthusiasm and postmodernist mockery. Geometrically, this oscillation could be conceived as a Möbius strip, a non-orientable surface with only one side.



The strip serves as a powerful metaphor for the metamodern condition, representing the continuous, non-binary plane upon which the poles of enthusiasm and mockery are fundamentally the same, inseparable experience.

J. A. J. Storm (Storm, 2021) provides a theoretical framework by proposing a "Process Social Ontology" that views social categories as "dynamic clusters of powers." This concept allows researchers to recognize that social categories (like "scientific knowledge") are constructed, yet are real in their consequences, thus offering tools for constructive, analytical work that is simultaneously rigorous and meaningful – a process inherently dependent on precise philosophical terminology.

#### 3.2 Linguophilosophical Aspects and the Social Context of Science

Metamodernism continues the traditions of postmodernism in the sense of recognizing the existence of multiple, pluralistic perspectives and interpretations of the world. At the same time, metamodernism is more open to new ideas and ways of thinking, which is also reflected in the multiplicity of interpretations in scientific terminology. Metamodernism is also more oriented towards practical activity and the involvement of as many people as possible in a broad dialogue for the purpose of resolving social problems. From this perspective, metamodernism is the embodiment of Thomas Kuhn's idea that dated back to 1962, expressed in his book "The Structure of Scientific Revolutions," that it is impossible to understand the essence of scientific knowledge outside the social context of science (Kuhn, 2015). The renowned Ukrainian science studies scholar Hennadiy Dobrov (1989) also emphasized the social nature of science. Since it is not isolated from society, it depends on social, economic, and political factors. Metamodernism embraces this lesson, recognizing that scientific truth is reliant on communal linguistic consensus. This reliance on language and communal consensus in defining scientific truth necessitates an acute awareness of rhetorical dynamics. In the contemporary context, particularly considering the widespread issue of the so called "post-truth" (this word is currently being used predominantly as noun, even though it was originally introduced as an adjective when declared by Oxford Dictionaries Word of the Year 2016, specifically, as used in the phrase "*post-truth politics*" (Oxford Languages, 2016), it becomes crucial to address the potential for manipulation in communication. Well-known Ukrainian scholars, namely, A. Kalyta, O. Klymeniyk, and L. Taranenko, elaborate on this by framing speech manipulation as a "communicative

phenomenon” that operates across the triune structure of the human psyche – consciousness, preconscious, and unconscious – leading to “sharp changes in the listener’s behavior or thoughts” through targeted verbal stimuli (Kalyta et al., 2024, p. 13). They argue that this process is inherently non-linear and multilevel: linguistic inputs trigger dialectical interactions within the recipient’s mental (preconscious) and existential (unconscious) spheres, often bypassing rational filters to reshape perceptions and actions. For instance, manipulative discourse – encompassing persuasion, suggestion, and neuro-linguistic programming – functions as a “process of targeted, involuntary, or hidden psycho-communication” that exploits cognitive vulnerabilities, such as emotional priming or ideational imposition, to alter structural equilibria in the interlocutor’s worldview (Ibid., p. 38-39, 48). The metamodern ethos, therefore, must include a commitment to rhetorical responsibility to counteract communicative distortion and ensure the integrity of the linguistic consensus. So language, particularly scientific terminology, becomes a creative tool for constructing a new reality.

Contemporary neologisms, such as “IT-agnostic” (a term for a person or company that is impartial and open-minded about the technological platforms and programs they use), embody the metamodern oscillation and pragmatism. Philosophically, the term rejects dogmatism about a “single correct technology” (skepticism) while sincerely striving for effective progress (modernist impulse).

### 3.3 Metamodern Ontology: Centrality of Information and Datafication

One of the most important terms in modern science is “information.” The metamodern ontology is built around this concept and “data,” representing a philosophical re-evaluation of fundamental existence articulated through new language. It was Hennadiy Dobrov (1989) who was one of the first scientists to propose viewing science from the perspective that science is a process of collecting, processing, and utilizing information. Such an approach gains particular significance specifically in the context of “post-truth.” The Swiss philosopher James Glattfelder (2019) in his monograph notes that a revolutionary understanding of information and its role came from physicist John Wheeler’s (1989) phrase “it from bit” to describe the idea that information is fundamental to the Universe. This idea is based on the probabilistic nature of quantum mechanics, where outcomes can be interpreted as information, and that the Universe is a vast quantum information system. Recently, the following related terms have emerged:

- **“Homo digitalis” / “Homo technicus” / “Homo virtualis”** (stemming from “digital”, by analogy with “homo sapiens”, “homo videns”) a new subjectivation of humanity formed under the influence of the practices and technologies of the digital age (first used around 2015);
- **“IT-agnostic,” “tech-agnostic” / “technology-agnostic”** – the terms for a person or company that is impartial and open-minded about the technological platforms and programs they use in their work, employing various options depending on specific needs (first used between 2005 and 2010);
- **“Datafication”** (from the English word “data”, a Latin borrowing) to denote the practice of transforming various aspects of life into data that can be tracked and analyzed (first used in 2013) (Kramar, 2022).

Thus, information – in this broad sense – can be considered a specific entelechy (a philosophical concept coined by Aristotle describing the purpose-driven transition from a state of potential existence to actual existence, essentially the force that makes something become what it is), or the realization of potential of modern existence.

### 3.4 Ecological and Social Challenge: the Anthropocene Context

Metamodernism involves an awareness of the boundary conditions of human existence, notably the ecological dimension. The term “Anthropocene” (from Greek *ἄνθρωπος* – human and *καινός* – new) is an informal term in geochronology. The authors of the term are the authoritative Dutch atmospheric chemist and Nobel Laureate in Chemistry Paul Crutzen and American ecologist Eugene Stoermer (2000). The term denotes the current geological epoch in which human activity plays a significant role in the Earth’s ecosystem. This term is a logical continuation of the terms “biosphere” and “noosphere” proposed by the outstanding Ukrainian scientist Volodymyr Vernadsky. Unlike the modernist, optimistic project of the “noosphere,” the Anthropocene is a post-skeptical term. It records

not only the influence of reason but also the catastrophic consequences of uncontrolled human activity, demanding a philosophical response. Philosophers like Bruno Latour (2017) and Donna Haraway (2016) call for a radical re-thinking of the separation between nature and society. Haraway's alternative term, "Chthulucene," emphasizes the need for "staying with the trouble." This embodies the metamodern ethos: the ethical and responsible co-existence with the environment, oscillating between technological advancement and ecological responsibility, and articulated through new, relational language.

### 3.5 Disruption and Innovative Progress in the Metamodern Economy

The economic sphere is framed by the concept of "disruption." The term "disruptive innovation" (cutting-edge technologies that cause an upheaval in the market) was proposed by the famous American management theorist Clayton Christensen in 1997. The term "disrupt," on the one hand, means: to destroy, to damage, to violate, or to destabilize; and, on the other hand, to revolutionize, to radically transform, or to qualitatively change something. This concept seems to be rooted in Joseph Schumpeter's (1942) idea of "creative destruction". The linguistic adoption of "disruption" highlights a core philosophical tension in metamodernism. The metamodern ethos requires science to constantly oscillate, questioning whether disruption is merely destruction or genuine progress. Recently, a number of related terms have emerged for innovation, including: "disruptive innovations," "breakthrough innovations," and "sustaining innovations"/ "transformative innovations". The goal is to ensure that breakthrough innovations do not undermine but rather sustain human and planetary well-being. We suggest several Ukrainian equivalents for these newly-coined terms within the domain of related words and phrases, taking into account critical distinctions between "disruptive innovation" and "breakthrough innovation." Disruptive innovation is focused on disrupting existing markets to target new or previously underserved markets by introducing new products, services, or business models that challenge the status quo. They often involve a new technology or a different business model, to say nothing of simpler, more affordable, or more accessible solutions. On the other hand, breakthrough innovation is about developing new products, services, or processes that create a significant impact on the market and change the way things are done, but without causing actual market disruption. Breakthrough innovations focus on existing markets and established customers, such innovations build upon existing technologies and paradigms although they offer significant improvements in performance, features, or functionality. As such, our translation suggestions revolve around the above-mentioned criteria:

- "sustaining innovations" / "transformative innovations" підтримуючі інновації;
- "breakthrough innovations" проривні інновації;
- "disruptive innovations" дизруптивні інновації, передові технології, що спричиняють переворот на ринку; дизруптивні інновації, підривні інновації (Ilchenko et al., p. 82).

These translations not only bridge linguistic gaps in Ukrainian scientific discourse but also embody metamodernism's dialectical tension, preserving the nuanced ethical imperative to harness innovation for collective flourishing rather than unchecked upheaval. By localizing such terms, we empower metamodern scholarship to engage global paradigms with culturally resonant precision, fostering inclusive progress in an era of linguistic and technological flux.

## 4 CONCLUSIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH

The analysis of the philosophical foundations and key terminological units of modern science confirms that we are at a stage of transition to a metamodern paradigm. This transition is characterized by moving beyond postmodern inertia and stagnation through the acceptance of oscillation – a dynamic balancing act between the sincere striving for truth and progress (modernism) and the awareness of multiplicity and contextuality (postmodernism).

As an epistemological model, metamodernism embraces the social context of scientific knowledge (Kuhn, Dobrov) and offers tools for building new theories (Storm) based on post-skeptical

sincerity. From the linguophilosophical perspective, recent terms and neologisms actively construct a new scientific reality, acting as cognitive frames, and embodying the metamodern oscillation between skepticism and pragmatism, as in “IT-agnostic”. The scientific ontology shifts toward information as a fundamental essence (Wheeler’s “it from bit”), giving rise to terms like “datafication” and “homo digitalis.” Ecologically, the term “Anthropocene” captures the depth of human impact, replacing the modernist optimism of Vernadsky with an ethical commitment to co-existence and a realization of the need to oscillate between technological advancement and ecological responsibility. Last, but not least, science must balance disruptive innovations that destroy old structures with the ethical imperative of sustaining innovations that ensure stable, socially oriented progress, using a language of balance and sustainability.

The findings of the analysis of several current terms in scientific research demonstrate the possibility and importance of multiple interpretations, dialogue, and openness to different perspectives and viewpoints, and also testify to the rapid, dynamic, and innovative nature of scientific activity in the information society. As such, metamodernism provides the necessary theoretical and ethical lens for navigating the rapidly changing contemporary world, offering not a final answer, but a dynamic, constantly updated process of searching for truth in the era of multiplicity of interpretations. The global entanglement of multiple systemic crises (polycrisis) is the pressure that forces us to adopt a mindset of hopeful action despite postmodern skepticism, which inevitably defines the metamodern condition.

## REFERENCES

- Calvino, I. (1988). *Six memos for the next millennium*. Harvard University Press.
- Christensen, C. M. (2016). *The innovator's dilemma: When new technologies cause great firms to fail* (Reprint ed.). Harvard Business Review Press.
- Crutzen, P. J., & Stoermer, E. F. (2000). The “Anthropocene”. *Global Change Newsletter*, 41, 17–18.
- Dember, G. (2024). *Say hello to metamodernism!: Understanding today's culture of ironesty, felt experience, and empathic reflexivity*. Exact Rush Multimedia Publishing.
- Derrida, J. (1976). *Of grammatology* (G. C. Spivak, Trans.). Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Dobrov, G. M. (1989). *Nauka o nauke. Vvedenie v obshchee naukovedenie* [Science of science. Introduction to general science studies]. Naukova Dumka.
- Freinacht, H. (2017). *The listening society: A metamodern guide to politics, Book one*. Huli.
- Freinacht, H. (2022, August 31). A four-dimensional fractal approach to ethics. *Metamoderna*. <https://metamoderna.org/a-four-dimensional-fractal-approach-to-ethics/>
- Glattfelder, J. B. (2019). *Information—Consciousness—Reality: How a new understanding of the universe can help answer age-old questions of existence*. Springer. (The Frontiers Collection)
- Haraway, D. (2016). *Staying with the trouble: Making kin in the Chthulucene*. Duke University Press.
- Ilchenko, O., Kramar, N., Shelkovnikova, Z., & Bedrych, Ya. (2024). *Akademichna anhliiska: Oporni konspekty do zaniat. Academic English: Class takeaways* (3rd ed.). TOV “Vydavnyche Pidpriemstvo “EDELVEIS”. [https://langcenter.kiev.ua/documents/2025/Academic%20English\\_Class%20Takeaways\\_3rd\\_ed\\_Ilchenko\\_Kramar%20et%20al.pdf](https://langcenter.kiev.ua/documents/2025/Academic%20English_Class%20Takeaways_3rd_ed_Ilchenko_Kramar%20et%20al.pdf)
- Kalyta, A. A., Klymeniyk, O. V., & Taranenka, L. I. (2024). *Manipulyatsiia v movlennivii komunikatsii: Monohrafiia* [Manipulation in speech communication: Monograph]. Tropea.
- Kramar, N. (2022). *Slovnnyk anhliys'komovnykh neolohizmiv XXI stolittia: Dictionary of English neologisms of the 21st century*. TOV “NVP “Interservice”.
- Kuhn, T. S. (2015). *The structure of scientific revolutions* (50th anniversary ed.). University of Chicago Press.
- Latour, B. (2017). *Facing Gaia: Eight lectures on the new climatic regime*. Polity Press.
- Oxford Languages. (2016). Oxford word of the year 2016. <https://languages.oup.com/word-of-the-year/2016/>
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1942). *Capitalism, socialism and democracy*. Harper & Brothers.
- Severynova, M., Kharchenko, P., Chibalashvili, A., Bezuhla, R., & Putiatytska, O. (2025). Transformations of the contemporary art practices in the context of metamodern sensibility. *Open Cultural Studies*, 9(1), Article 20250053. <https://doi.org/10.1515/culture-2025-0053>
- Shelley, P. B. (1818). Ozymandias. Poetry Foundation. <https://www.poetryfoundation.org/poems/46565/ozymandias>
- Storm, J. A. J. (2021). *Metamodernism: The future of theory*. University of Chicago Press.
- Vermeulen, T., & van den Akker, R. (2010). Notes on metamodernism. *Journal of Aesthetics & Culture*, 2(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.3402/jac.v2i0.5677>
- Wheeler, J. A. (1989). Information, physics, quantum: The search for links. In H. Ezawa & Y. Murayama (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 3rd International Symposium on Foundations of Quantum Mechanics in the light of new technology* (pp. 354–368). Physical Society of Japan.

Wiener, N. (1948). *Cybernetics: Or control and communication in the animal and the machine*. MIT Press.

Wittgenstein, L. (1953). *Philosophical investigations* (G. E. M. Anscombe, Trans.). Blackwell.

**Ольга Ільченко, Наталія Крамар, Наталія Кравченко, Зінаїда Шелковнікова, Ярослава Бедрич.** Лінгвофілософські аспекти новітньої наукової лексики в епоху метамодернізму. У цій статті досліджено феномен метамодернізму як філософського руху, що виник у відповідь на кризу постмодерністського скептицизму, релятивізму та деконструкції. Доведено, що метамодернізм, усвідомлюючи всю складність і неоднозначність попередньої ери, прагне до (спів-)усвідомлення та прогресу до кращого й досконалішого майбутнього. На основі термінологічного аналізу ключових загальнонаукових термінів, таких як «інформація», «датафікація», «Антропоцен» та «дизрупція», стаття окреслює лінгвофілософські аспекти наукового пізнання в новій епосі. Застосовуючи герменевтичну інтерпретацію, дефініційний аналіз та концептуальне моделювання, натхненне «мовними іграми» Л. Вітгенштейна та «диферансом» Ж. Дерріда, цей підхід розкриває, як лексичні структури кодують метамодерні напруження між щирістю та іронією. Надано українські еквіваленти відповідних термінологічних одиниць з метою їхньої культурної адаптації. Встановлено, що метамодерністська наука характеризується соціальною орієнтацією, акцентом на інформаційній онтології (Дж. Вілер) та необхідністю етичного балансування між деструктивною природою інновацій (К. Крістенсен) та ідеєю сталого прогресу. Центральним у цьому є моноістично-діалектична концепція А. Калити та ін., яка моделює психіку як тріадний потік (свідоме/підсвідоме/несвідоме) психофізіологічної енергії. Ця модель висвітлює перформативний потенціал метамодерністської мови: протидію постправдивим маніпуляціям через нелінійні риторичні механізми захисту, коли вербальні стимули запускають екзистенційні реконфігурації задля збереження чеснот «суспільства слухання» (Фрайнахт) через емерджентний альтруїзм та пошук істини серед метамодерністської осциляції та дизрупції. Результати дослідження становлять інтерес для фахівців у галузі лінгвістики, філософії мови та теорії комунікації, особливо у сенсі сприяння культурно адаптованому дискурсу для подолання полікризи в українських та глобальних наукових контекстах.

**Ключові слова:** метамодернізм; осциляція; датафікація; дизрупція; сталі інновації; Антропоцен; лінгвофілософські аспекти; постправа.

*Received: November 17, 2025*

*Accepted: April 27, 2026*