

SOCIO-PHILOSOPHICAL CONTEXT OF THE HISTORY OF THE CULTURAL AND ANTHROPOLOGICAL PARADIGM

Violeta Demeshchenko

Ph.D. (theory and history of culture),
Associate Professor,
Institute for Cultural Research,
National Academy
of Arts of Ukraine, Kyiv,
vio150569@gmail.com

Демещенко

Віолета Валеріївна

кандидат історичних наук
(Ph.D., теорія та історія культури),
доцент, Інститут культурології
Національної академії
мистецтв України, м. Київ,
vio150569@gmail.com

Демещенко

Виолетта Валерьевна

кандидат исторических наук
(Ph.D., теория и история культуры),
доцент, Институт культурологии
Национальной академии
искусств Украины, г. Киев,
vio150569@gmail.com

Abstract. This article examines the state of such a science as anthropology in the modern scientific environment. It outlines a range of interesting issues regarding changes in general, as well as paradigm shifts that occur in modern anthropological knowledge. The article analyzes historical origins of the cultural-anthropological paradigm in the socio-philosophical context. The study notes new directions of anthropology development as a science; it points out that sociocultural reality and its dynamic characteristics are studied within the postmodernity since the aspects of human connections and their environment were not studied within classical anthropological models previously. Modern anthropology can be described as a general anthropology with the numerous branching. Such a modern direction focuses on those integration features that allow to present humanity as a whole. This new direction, developing at the junction of philosophy and anthropological science in general, has developed certain criteria for scientific synthesis. Today, anthropology seeks to synthesize philosophical and scientific knowledge about a man into a single cognitive picture of the world based on the general scientific methods considering comprehensive and systematic approaches.

Keywords: anthropology, history, philosophy, sociology, model, concept, paradigm, scientific synthesis, humanity.

Problem definition. Nowadays, anthropology has become a separate science that studies the origin and evolution of human at all levels, from the vital-biological to socio-cultural and cultural-civilizational, as well as technogenic.

Being a separate versatile science of the present, it is constantly evolving. The directions of its activity are constantly mutating and paradigms change depending on the historical development of the mankind in all its manifestations. The present of anthropology is characterized by the fact that its scientific interests are at the intersection of biological, humanities and technical sciences. It took a decisive step forward by asserting its scientific credo, its interests appeared to be significantly beyond the study of human biological origins, human physiology, the existence of the habitat of the homo sapiens population, the comparison of human species with primates, and the study of aboriginal life or archeological excavations.

The problem of human cognition permeates the entire history of philosophy and natural science. Many prominent scientists

have pondered the question "who is a human?" since for them knowing it was a necessary and paramount task of life. "Know thyself" taught the ancient Greek philosopher Socrates, this thesis of his is still relevant.

Among all the sciences, anthropology is the one that fully studies human, his/her past, the origin and evolution of physical organization and human races. It is also the science of the present, and to some extent of the future, it tries to look into the future without abandoning the diversity of human personalities, the dramatic changes that humanity has undergone during its evolution.

Realizing the modernity, trying to penetrate into the past and simultaneously looking into the future, anthropology is at the center of human knowledge which is its essence. Thus, in a broad sense, anthropology is the science of human (from Greek *anthrōpos* — human).

The research problem. Philosophy, which claims since its inception to a holistic knowledge of the system "human — the world", by virtue of its epistemological status tends predominantly to comprehend the issues of the general and existing in human, leaving essential aspects of human existence out of the sight. M. Berdyaev noted that it views a human not as a natural object, but as a supernatural subject (Бердяев, 1989, с. 298).

Socio-cultural anthropology and anthropology of culture are formed in the depths of philosophical anthropology. The focus of philosophical anthropology is questions about the origin, nature and essence of man, the modes of his existence, general connections with the world, nature and society. Its interest lies in the secrets of human existence — the problems of a soul and a body, the meaning of life and faith, death and immortality, love and happiness, and others. The main question of philosophical anthropology is the study of the nature and essence of man as a whole being.

Philosophical anthropology and its central part — the doctrine of the essential laws of (psycho-physically neutral) personality — can be established in turn only on the foundation of the science of essential forms of living existence and, therefore, must create its own conceptual apparatus for the whole sphere, for the whole surrounding in which a person occurs as a (psycho-physically neutral) person. This apparatus cannot be borrowed from any empirical science since it is a study of a complete, close to life reality but not a specifically objective, separate, hidden from view reality of individual sciences. Therefore, it is to take up what

the science has not approached yet, except for random attempts (Плеснер, 2004, с. 45).

Relevance. This study is to determine the historical origins of the cultural and anthropological paradigm in the socio-philosophical context as well as to identify new directions in the development of anthropology as a science, to describe the socio-cultural reality by noting its dynamic characteristics and compare the classical anthropological models with the models of modernity in which aspects of people's relationships with their environment are considered.

Latest research. The end of the 1960s is characterized by the appearance of the first signs of the intellectual current, which later became known as postmodern. Changes in cultural anthropology in relation to concepts occur under its influence. This time is associated with the names of such scientists having influenced the development of science in the intellectual sense as: J. Derrida, J. Lyotard (philosophy), M. Foucault, L. White (history), J. Lacan, G. Deleuze, R. Leng, N. Brown (psychoanalysis), H. Marcuse, J. Baudrillard, J. Habermas (political philosophy), T. Kuhn, P. Feyerabend (philosophy of science), R. Barthes, J. Kristeva, V. Shcher, U. Eco (literature theory), H. Garfinkel, J. Hoffman, A. Giddens (sociology in the context of cultural anthropology), C. Geertz, M. Gluckman, C. Castaneda, J. Clifford, O. Lewis, S. Tyler, V. Turner, R. Williams, R. Webber, M. Harris (cultural anthropology).

The purpose of the article. This study aims to determine the historical origins of the cultural and anthropological paradigm and to outline its socio-philosophical context in the modern world considering the social dynamics that affect the change of the anthropological paradigm.

Before considering the stated concept, it should be noted that almost all natural science concepts can provide certain explanations only within their competence since they concern the facts of empirical reality being logically connected by means of worldview theoretical constructs, which, in fact, should be verified that is, to have a substantive content as a result. In turn the task of science is to give a materialistic explanation of phenomena as in the case of human, their culture to carry out a complex operation of ascent to the origins of human existence (Иерпов, 2010).

Paleontological and archaeological finds (remember the theory of paleo-contact of E. von Däniken and his wonderful documentaries *Chariots of the Gods*,

1970, and *Message from the gods*, 1976), the similarity of the biological structure of human and animals, the absolute materiality of the world, the idea of general connection and general conditionality of natural phenomena, the theory of progress leave natural science no other option than to recognize the animal origin of human. To start studying this issue by turning to the humanities, namely, starting with philosophy, seems to be necessary.

Philosophical anthropology arises in the late 1920s in Germany and then spreads to other countries, especially Austria and Switzerland. M. Scheler, H. Plessner and A. Gehlen are well-known classics in this field of knowledge. During this period, scientists wrote the following fundamental works: *The position of man in space* by M. Scheler (1928), *Levels of Organic Life and the Human* by H. Plessner (1928) and two treatises by A. Gehlen *Man: His Nature and Place in the World* (1940) and *Primitive man and late culture* (1956). P. Landsberg's research *Introduction to Philosophical Anthropology* (1934), L. Binswanger's *Formative Principles and Knowledge of Human Existence* (1942), K. Löwith's *From Hegel to Nietzsche* (1939), H. Lipps's *Human Nature* (1941), O. Bollnow's work *Meaning of Moods* (1941), E. Rothacker's *Problems of the Anthropology of Culture* (1942) and other works join the previously mentioned basic works.

Common to all these thinkers is the understanding of philosophical anthropology as a science, as well as a rejection of such traditional concepts of human philosophy as spirit and existence. Both idealism and existentialism hinder a correct understanding of the essence of human.

The most detailed typology of human comprehension in European philosophy belongs to M. Scheler. He stands at the origins of the anthropological turn in philosophy not only as the founder of modern philosophical anthropology: in a broader sense, he can be seen as the initiator of the reorientation of philosophy to the anthropological way of thinking. Within the field of phenomenology, he created a special direction — applied phenomenology (*angewandte Phanomenologie*), in which the phenomenological approach is applied to the analysis of value phenomena and phenomena of religious consciousness in terms of human development, involvement and transformation into "facts" of the human world. From these viewpoints, Scheler's sociology of knowledge unfolds putting the focus of the study on the factors of socio-anthropological conditionality

of cognitive activity. Scheler develops the theme of human in many aspects. Thus, in the essay *Die Idee des Menschen* the thinker wrote that in this case, all the central problems of philosophy can be reduced to the question of what is human and what metaphysical place and position one occupies in the totality of being, the world and Deity.

Scheler's philosophical work *The position of man in space* initiated anthropological themes in the philosophy of the XX century. The philosopher tries to give a definition of human, to find out one's difference from all other living beings, he tries to develop a new vision of the essence of human, to provide new experience for philosophical anthropology. In particular, he drew attention to:

- first, the (Jewish and Christian) interpretation of human;
- second, he focused on the ancient concept of "intelligent human" expressed by Anaxagoras, and which acquired the status of a philosophical category in Plato and Aristotle;
- third, the philosopher identifies naturalistic, positivist and pragmatic teachings that interpret man as *homo faber* ("Man the Maker");
- fourth, in his opinion, man is a crazy monkey obsessed with the "spirit";
- fifth, he says that human and his/her self-consciousness are overestimated and this is inherent in the philosophy of the 20th century (Шелер, 1988, с. 31–95).

In the evolution of Scheler's philosophical views, there are two periods: the classical (the period of creation of axiology) and the late period called the "anthropological turn." In the classical period, Scheler acted as an ideologue of neo-Catholicism, and at the center of his philosophical interests were the phenomenology of values and the phenomenology of acts of religious consciousness. In the late period marked by Scheler's the transition from theism to pantheistic positions, he acted as the founder of modern philosophical anthropology. The very problems of this period, based on the new theory of reality created by the philosopher and given in a different problematic and theoretical key, is likely to be unable to continue unfolding in the coordinates of a strictly phenomenological method of philosophizing. Moreover, at one time, M. Scheler in the work *Philosophical perspective* introduces the term of meta-anthropology.

In the first quarter of the twentieth century,

there was a special direction in philosophy to which M. Scheler, A. Gehlen, and H. Plessner belonged. These philosophers not only tried by the I. Kant to single out and present in some integrity the knowledge about man accumulated by philosophy, they directly addressed the problem of man as a cosmic being and contrasted this direction with other directions of contemporary philosophy. This point is considered the beginning of the classical period in the development of philosophical anthropology.

In the philosophical anthropology of the twentieth century, two main paradigms can be traced: the paradigm of life and the paradigm of existence. The first one belongs to F. Nietzsche, the second one belongs to S. Kierkegaard. The paradigm of life is associated with the fact that man is a vital being, that is, he is an integral part of the life process. Within this paradigm, quite different anthropological concepts develop: from the spiritualist vitalism of H. Bergson and the biological vitalism of L. Klages to the mechanistic evolutionism of H. Spencer and social Darwinism (based on Darwin's theory), from philosophically oriented biology of J. von Uexküll to biology oriented philosophy (vitalism) of H. Driesch.

The well-known fact is that sociocultural anthropology studies human within the culture of a particular community, and this is the direction that distinguishes it from other sciences that study man. The specificity of such an anthropological approach, first of all, is to reveal the generic essence of human as a socio-cultural subject of the world and a being who creates oneself, or rather builds. The main thesis of the anthropological turn in social knowledge was formulated by I. Kant who emphasized the free "self-construction" of human. He being the author of *Anthropologie in pragmatischer Hinsicht* has an important merit in substantiating such an approach. Kant believed that there is a fundamental difference between the physiological and pragmatic aspects of knowledge about human. "Physiological anthropology means the study of what nature makes of human, and pragmatic anthropology means the study of what human, as a free-acting being, makes, or can and should make self" (Кант, 1966, с.351).

Therefore, today, according to many scholars, the meaning of culture is that a person performs an act of self-creation, freely and consciously constructs himself in society and with the help of society. The main interest of anthropologists and their subject of scientific research is expressed in the following Marx's thesis —

to live in society and to be free from it is impossible.

The Dutch historian J. Huizinga proposed an interesting concept of the origin of culture, it is known that he entered the history of science as a theorist of the game nature of culture. In his opinion, in the history of self-development man initially imagined himself as *homo sapiens* (intelligent man), *homo faber* (creator man), *homo ludence* (human who plays). If to look at various human activities, according to Huizinga, it will be "no more than a game" in its genesis. Man plays and knows that he is playing, so he is more than just an intelligent being: "the existence of the game each time confirms, and in the highest sense, the supralogical nature of our state in the universe" (Хейзинга, 1992, с.13).

According to the scientist, the most important types of human activity involve the game. Considering the language by which a person raises objects to the sphere of the spirit from this perspective, one can see how the spirit that forms the language passes from the material level to the level of thought. Each expression of the abstract concept hides an image, a metaphor, and in each metaphor one can see a play on words. "Thus humankind again and again creates its own expression of being, next to the world of nature making its second fictional world" (Хейзинга, 1992, с.14).

Myth is the most ancient way of knowing the world, in which we can see that the root causes of human activity are in the divine, any bizarre mythological explanations of earthly phenomena are on the verge of jokes and seriousness. The same can be observed in the cult if we consider the primitive societies — the sacredness, sacraments, sacrifices, mysteries, sanctification — all that took place in the game in the broadest sense of the word. In the meantime, the driving forces of culture and life, such as religion, law, communication, craft, art, poetry, and science, are born and formed both in myth and in cult. "Culture is neither born as a game and nor from a game, but in a game" (Хейзинга, 1992, с.92). To paraphrase J. Huizinga, the game is a way of cultural existence.

So, J. Huizinga creates the concept of culture, which contains an anthropological basis. With the help of interdisciplinary synthesis, he, in fact, builds the structure of cultural anthropology. In his research on culture, the scientist relied on related disciplines such as ethnography, folklore, linguistics, historical psychology, mythology, sociology, and his historiographical method based on interdisciplinary research had an impact on the emergence of a new historical science

presented by *École des Annales* (M. Block, L. Febvre, F. Braudel), which re-considered the historical process. Proponents of the *École des Annales* insisted on replacing the classic "narrative history" on a "history problem" in an attempt to recreate a "total" history.

The self-consciousness of culture with the help of cultural philosophy opens a new, previously unknown world, when it comprehends itself in a sign, in a symbol or in a "symbolic form". The idea of culture as a system of symbols and signs endowed with a certain meaning developed the German philosopher and culturologist E. Cassirer (Петров, 2010, с. 64). He believed that the uniqueness of human culture and its anthropological foundations are in the problems of objective and emotional perception. In his opinion, all attempts to establish clear boundaries between the natural sciences and the sciences of culture by contrasting scientific methods (W. Windelband) or scientific concepts (H. Rickert) failed, neither reflections (H. Paul) on the principles of cultural sciences gave the expected result. Since he professed the ideas of an empirical approach to the study of cultural phenomena and could not overcome metaphysics in philosophy due to relying on the teachings of J. Herbart in psychology, Cassirer draws the following conclusion: it is necessary to turn to the phenomenology of sensations to establish a specific difference between the natural sciences and the cultural sciences. It is the analysis of sensations that is the Archimedean-type force to move the lever (Кассирэр, 1998, с. 51).

In this sense, we recall E. Husserl, who believed that consciousness transcends itself through intention, and intention expresses the fact that every act of consciousness is the awareness of something: any perception is the perception of the perceived object, any desire is the desire of the desired object, any judgment is the judgment about some "state of affairs" (*Sachverhalt*), about which we speak (Петров, 2010, с.45).

According to Cassirer's concept, culture has an anthropological basis manifested in its symbolic meanings and forms. Communicating with other people, being a spiritual person, a person gives the created subjects, objects and works art a certain meaning or significance, after which they acquire a special status and become symbols or signs (signs of language, myths and legends, religion, art, science). Such meanings a person discovers in oneself, and by virtue of social communication these certain meanings, being realized, acquire "intersubjective" status and become clear to society.

Human does not interact with nature, directly nature is replaced by "environment" or the world of culture: words and language forms, constructions of mythological thinking, rituals and dogmas of religion, artistic images of art. Culture as the production of symbols in relation to the world of nature is in another dimension, its existence takes place outside the physical world (Петров, 2010, с.70).

Not only anthropologists seek to study man in his multidimensionality — such search is inherent for other social scientists whose research is based on the methodology of complex analysis. Thus, according to the German scientist N. Luhmann, who shared the scientific views of neurobiologists F. Varela and H. Maturana on the nature of living and social systems and in his works applied the biological concept of autopoiesis, he believed that human is not a part of the social system completely. One is included in it only by a single facet — by one's personality which mediates person's interaction with the social environment. However, in this aspect human is a holistic correlation of the human and the social and naturally brings the human world into the social world.

For a long time, anthropological science has accumulated a sufficient cognitive arsenal to provide all the grounds for studying the complex nature of man. For this purpose, it has its own research methods as well as aspects. Anthropological view of socio-cultural activities is characterized by a holistic vision. In its research social anthropology considers human and culture as integral formations and interdependent parts of a single human-culture continuum. Moreover, the field of activity of cultural anthropologists is specified in the framework of their relationship with other branches of scientific knowledge — history, philosophy, sociology, psychology, ethnography and others.

One of the important qualities of the anthropological approach from the viewpoint of the methodology of studying human and their culture is the view from the perspective of the "other". First of all, this is, undoubtedly, observation and live contact with representatives of "natives" (aborigines of Melanesia, Polynesia, Australia), or with immigrants, scientists, representatives of culture and art of different countries, representatives of world industrial circles or national minorities, resulting in the context of life of those who are being studied and what it looks like from the viewpoint of the people who are being studied within their society. Therefore, the researcher anthropologist

has to become the "other", the one to understand the environment under study, to feel the "skin of the other" and carry out reflection from the viewpoint of this other. It is this view from the standpoint of another that involves a variety of research techniques.

According to the French scientist Lévi-Strauss who revolutionized anthropology and based it on culture making it independent of the natural sciences, anthropology in contrast to traditional science builds the science of society from the perspective of the observed. It expands the object of its research including the society of the researcher achieving, thus, a situation of reflexive reciprocal reflex of the researcher and the subject. Traditional social science, however, studies society and human from the standpoint of the observer. So, it represents the social world in the way it is seen by the researcher.

The development of anthropology as a science was not easy enough, there were constant discussions and debates among scientists due to the different scientific views on the subject of its study as well as conceptual differences inherent in this field. The American anthropologist Clifford Geertz (founder of interpretive anthropology) noted: "One of the advantages of anthropology as a scientific occupation is that no one including anthropologists themselves knows exactly what it is" (Geertz, 1985, p. 623).

American anthropologist R. Rappaport pointed out that there have been two trends in anthropology since its inception. One of them is focused on objectivity and finds inspiration in the biological sciences which seek to find an explanation and identify the cause and, on the part of the most ambitious researchers, even to discover general patterns. Another being influenced by philosophy, linguistics and the humanities and being more open to knowledge obtained in a subjective way makes attempts to interpret and tries to understand what has been obtained (Раррпорт, 1995, с. 18).

E. Wolf, the representative of American anthropology, the historian, noted that the early anthropology has achieved unity under the auspices of the concept of culture. It united this discipline around basic questions about the nature of the human species, their biological variability reflected in social forms, and how to evaluate similarities and differences (Wolf, 1982, p. 20).

We can conclude that the anthropological approach in the sense of the study of man and culture is aimed at identifying and holistic study of socio-cultural similarities and diversity of people manifested

in the "hidden" and "shadow" aspects of their daily lives. The phenomena of "otherness" together form a model of a person who is able to carry out purposeful activities and successfully interact in society.

In the field of natural human studies, special emphasis should be placed on physical (physical and somatic) and medical anthropology, including physiology, anatomy, embryology, as well as popular nowadays ethology, sociobiology, anthropogeography and ecology. Meanwhile, from the point of view of the socio-scientific field of studying human society, it will be represented by such sciences as archeology, ethnology, social and cultural anthropology sociology, cultural psychology, social linguistics, social demography and others.

Today, sociocultural anthropology is often spoken of as a science that includes cultural anthropology which studies culture as a holistic phenomenon, borders with sociology, fixing connections on a culture-society parallel, anthropology of psychology which studies culture-personality links, anthropology of ecology which studies the culture-nature relationship.

Cultural anthropology is a fairly large branch of socio-scientific knowledge based on the idea that culture is generated and reproduced by man as a result of active adaptation in a dynamic natural and social environment. The main purpose of this area of knowledge is considered to be the identification of similarities and differences between cultures through comparative analysis and explanation of their causes and consequences. The term *cultural anthropology* is used mainly in the United States, the same branch of scientific knowledge in Britain (and sometimes in the United States) is referred to as social anthropology, and in Germany and France it is called ethnology.

The American School of Anthropology is considered one of the leading national schools. Within this school, its own methodology and research methods were developed, as well as a number of areas that over the time have grown into independent schools: cultural and evolutionary (L. White, M. Sahlins, E. Servis, D. Stuart, and others.), historical (F. Boas, L. Kroeber, C. Wissler, R. Loewy), ethnopsychological (Abram Kardiner, R. Benedict, M. Mead, et al.) ones. In the American tradition, the indivisibility of knowledge about the study of human as a biological being and concurrently the study of human as a cultural subject is important. Therefore, by the middle of the twentieth century, disciplinary differentiation took place inwards

within American anthropology. So, the studying a man from an anthropological point of view in biology (biological anthropology: C. Loring Brace, J. Carter, R. Halloway, W. Howells, S. Washburn), scientists focus on the study of genetic comparisons, human biological evolution, the diversity of ethnicities and races, and the study of primates. Besides, in accordance with the American tradition, the direction of cultural anthropology includes primitive archeology, ethnology as a comparative historical analysis of cultures, ethnography, linguistics. In turn, social anthropology became widespread in Europe (Great Britain, France), and ethnology became widespread in Germany, while in the USSR only descriptive ethnography and physical anthropology became widespread.

American scientists are studying the cultural regions of different parts of the world, and their first field research aimed to study the culture of the Native American population. Later, Latin America, Africa, Oceania, and Asia fell into the scope of interests of scientists. A large amount of factual material was collected and systematized, and became the basis for museum collections and socio-cultural analysis.

In the mid-1970s, a group of followers of Clifford Geertz began to form forming the core of a field called interpretive anthropology. In the early 1980s, interpretive anthropology itself was already surrounded by a group of supporters whose work was important for the formation of scientific anthropology in the 1980s and 1990s.

American anthropology places great emphasis on theory, but as time goes on, "deskwork" is criticized, and anthropologists believe that field studies that allow for the collection of factual material are the most important.

Melville Herskovits, a scientist-anthropologist, a representative of the American school who did not like office research, the founder of the theory of cultural relativism, one of the most relevant in cultural anthropology and culturology, is worth mentioning. The methodological and scientific approach created by the American scientist has prolonged in some way the assertion of multiculturalism as a theory and practice of intercultural communication in real life among many communities and individuals and has played a significant role in developing poststructuralist and post-modern discourse. He continued the line of research established by Franz Boas, a supporter of the principle of relativism. The scientist highlights the uniqueness

and originality of cultures, the relativity of social institutions, visions and values of the so-called Western or Eastern cultures. All the activity of Herskovits was focused on criticism of racism and ethnocentrism, geographical and economic determinism, approaches that prevent understanding of human and cultural diversity as a result of self-development of unique patterns and configurations attributed to other societies and cultures. According to Joseph Greenberg, M. Herskovits's achievements

"were impressive whether he conducted field research, published scientific articles and books, engaged in organizational activities or teaching students. His outstanding personal qualities were filled with almost boundless energy and enthusiasm, and every aspect of his various actions included a wide range of scientific and humanistic interests" (Greenberg, 1971, p. 65).

The concept of relativism was developed by M. Herskovits based on long scientific expeditions and the study of traditional cultures of Africa, Cuba, Brazil and other regions. The field of view of the scientist included a variety of forms and aspects of culture — household, religious and mythological, family and marriage, linguistic, and communicative. He refuted the thesis of the backwardness of the so-called primitive cultures through intensive cross-cultural research, paying attention, in particular, to acculturation processes. The result of his many years of prolific work was the book *Cultural Anthropology*, which sets out the main provisions of the relativistic strategy for the study and understanding of cultures and cultural development.

Increased interest in a more critical study from the standpoint of the theory of anthropology in the United States resulted in the appearance of a number of valuable scientific works, namely *The Social Organization of Ethnological Theory* by L. White, *The Rise of Anthropological Theory* and *Cultural Materialism: The Struggle for a Science of Culture* by M. Harris, *Theoretical Anthropology* by D. Bidney and others.

The stages of development of cultural anthropology as a social science began in the late 19th century and the first half of the 20th century. Thus, American anthropologists Adam and Jessica Kuper believe that the term *cultural anthropology* is mainly used in the

United States to refer to the branch of anthropology that studies human as a social being as well as acquired behaviors rather than those genetically transmitted (Kuper, 1995, p. 177).

From the very beginning, cultural anthropology was focused on scientific research concerning the study and comparison of races, cultures, languages, as well as identifying the origin, distribution and modification of individual elements of culture, on identifying forms of cultural dynamics in its local and global scales. American anthropologist D. Mandelbaum defines the main task of 'cultural anthropology', also focusing on the study of human behavior. According to Mandelbaum, this task

"... is to study the similarities and differences in the behavior of different groups of people, to describe the nature of certain cultures and their typical processes of reproduction, change and development" (Mandelbaum, 1968, p. 313).

Cultural anthropology grounds on the principle of evolutionism, which became a specific center making it possible to organize and synthesize large amounts of historiographical and ethnographic research and their fixation.

Henry Morgan, Edward Tylor, and James Frazer are considered the founders of cultural anthropology; their followers tried to develop the natural history of mankind on a regular basis and to identify the stages of cultural development. The research of the scientists was not strictly "office". Within their research, the scientists combined theoretical materials and systematizing of historical materials, ethnographic records, and field research data.

The ideas of the evolution of society from the middle of the nineteenth century to the beginning of the twentieth century were common in Britain, the USA, Germany, France, Austria, the Netherlands, Russia. From the very beginning, cultural anthropology was focused on scientific research concerning the study and comparison of races, cultures, languages, as well as identifying the origin, distribution and modification of individual elements of culture, on identifying forms of cultural dynamics in its local and global scales.

With the disappearance of illiterate societies in the late nineteenth century and during the twentieth century, representatives of cultural anthropology changed the main object of research. While in the first

half of the XX century the focus of the study was on small-numbered peoples, diasporas in megapolises, ghetto inhabitants, population of disadvantaged neighborhoods, then in the late XX — early XXI centuries, the emphasis shifted to the study of new differential socio-cultural units, such as religious sects, social movements, sexual minorities, gender groups. The field of research of modern cultural anthropology is rather large. Starting the middle of the XX century the relations between the person and one's cultural environment have been studied. The study of mental structures and symbolic systems for the reproduction and change of cultural reality, processes and mechanisms of interaction between existing cultures is becoming of importance.

In the late XX — early XXI century, the interest to the sign and symbolic aspects of culture, to communicative processes between people, the use of general and different cultural codes (the problem of "the other") intensifies, there is a transition, or rather reorientation from macro-historical to micro-dynamic processes occurring in society and culture today.

Cultural and anthropological generalizations are based on data derived from various sources: written historical documents, iconic, musical, material, subject-spatial artifacts, archeological and ethnographical data, results of field research. Currently, as materials for analysis are widely used the media messages and the data of the so-called new ethnography, a special way of organized observation.

Anthropology as a field of scientific knowledge developed in European culture in the XIX century and was finally formed in the last quarter of the XIX century and was associated with the task of comprehensive understanding of human and their history. Anthropology has widely used the acquired knowledge of the following sciences for its research:

- physical anthropology — embryology, biology, anatomy, human psychophysiology;
- paleoethnology — the early stages of human spread on Earth, its behavior and customs;
- linguistics — the formation and existence of languages, folklore;
- mythology — the emergence of myths, history and interaction of religions;
- social geography — the impact of climate and natural landscapes on human;
- demography — statistics on the composition and distribution of the human population;

- ethnography — a description of life and customs of different peoples;
- psychology — the study of the inner world of human in the context of culture.

In the history of anthropology as a branch of scientific knowledge of society and culture the following periods are usually distinguished: ethnographic (1800–1860), evolutionist (1860–1895), and historical (1895–1925). At that time there was an accumulation of knowledge, the formation of ideas about the subject within the cultural (social) anthropology, ethnology (initially — ethnography), the crystallization of foundations and categories.

As early as in 1936, Thomas Penniman created the following scheme, he divided the history of anthropological science into four periods: 1) the formation of science (from antiquity to 1835), 2) convergence (1835–1859), resulting in a single science of human, 3) the constructive period (1859–1900) when the classical concepts of human were created, and 4) the critical period (1900–1935), the time of revision of old concepts, the most important thing is the inability to cover numerous research materials about a person by one researcher. As a result, a new trend is emerging that leads to the disintegration of a single "anthropology" into its constituent parts and the weakening of contacts between them. This period lasted quite a long time from 1935 to 1960 (Васильев, 2002, с. 50).

The American researcher R. Borofsky believed that the history of anthropology can be divided into three periods: 1) the period of formation, 2) the period of "heroic mentors", 3) the period of expansion. The formation period began with the creation of this discipline in the nineteenth century and lasted until the end of the first decades of the twentieth century. During this period, anthropological societies were founded, the first publications appeared, and the teaching of the discipline began in universities. Scientists such as Morgan, Tylor, and Frazer proposed general schemes of progressive development that demonstrated how the primitive "rest" of the world developed following the way of the modern Western countries. The "heroic mentors" of anthropology, Boas, Malinowski, Radcliffe-Brown, and Durkheim, were the founders of modern anthropology. Each of these scientists at the beginning of the century created their own personal "schools" (Борофски, 1995, с. 9).

The paradigm shift of anthropology in the twentieth century was seriously influenced by political fac-

tors. The era of colonialism was over, global processes began, which determined the world situation in the second half of the XX century. New relations began to form between developed and politically independent developing countries. This, in turn, necessitated changes in the context of international relations; there is an awareness of the need to build new relations between countries, respectively, expanded the scope of knowledge concerning cultural diversity and dynamism of countries, regions and ethnic groups.

"The values that were once considered the foundation, which determined how specific people conduct their relationships with each other and with the environment are now situational, time-related, rather than those eternal truths that can be used to predict behavior in time and in all circumstances" (Colson, 1984, p. 7).

In addition, important economic and technological changes around the world and the rapid development of progress are important factors for anthropologists to consider. If before the Second World War anthropologists believed that small nations far from the centers of European culture were isolated cultural groups being free, or (relatively free) from external influences, today it is impossible to believe in this anymore.

Awareness of this fact has influenced anthropology in various aspects. It questioned its basic claims about the nature of culture. In his work *Europe and the People Without History* Eric Wolf says that

"as soon as we place the reality of society in the context of historically changing, inaccurately defined, complex and structured and branched social ties, the idea of a fixed and homogeneous culture with clearly defined parameters should give way to the idea of mobility and permeability of cultural systems" (Wolf, 1982, p. 387).

Anthropology was also influenced by the circumstances that the nationalist movement intensified, interregional, interethnic and interfaith conflicts exacerbated, international manifestations of terrorism and organized crime intensified, occurrence of local wars increased, it has stimulated anthropological research in the field of political relations, wars, psychology (aggressive and deviant behavior).

Socio-economic factors also became an important

lever. After the Second World War, the transition from industrialism to post-industrialism began in developed countries, and modernization processes in developing countries intensified. As a result, the processes of formation of international and transnational corporations, international political and economic communities in the study of culture accelerated, it influenced the allocation of political, organizational, legal anthropology in independent branches of this science. The dynamics of urbanization processes has also increased, in particular in developing countries, due to the migration of large groups of the population, mainly the poor and the uneducated, to cities. Such processes have allowed the formation of urban anthropology, which includes the study of cultural problems of urban communities.

Changes in the world economy have created a number of new socio-cultural issues associated with rising unemployment, an overall increase in leisure time, changes in the content of the social division of labor. Accordingly, the interest in the topic of differences in people's lifestyles, the problems of young people and the "third age", the changes in gender relations and roles, as well as the active development of the leisure industry has increased.

Ideological factors, again, influence the transformation of anthropological knowledge. The second half of the XX — beginning of the XXI century are characterized by the fact that socio-cultural life has become much more complicated on a global scale. There is a breakdown of traditional normative structures, anomic processes are spreading, the relativization of cultural values is intensifying — all of this has led to a crisis of cultural personal identity on a large scale. This intensified research in the field of psychological anthropology: socialization and enculturation of identity, study of deviant behavior.

The emergence of mass culture and its global expansion has created a space of unified behavior models that do not include the diversity of manifestations of complex modern culture, including the dynamic experiences of people, causing tense relations between supporters and opponents of mass culture. Cultural anthropology is beginning to actively study mass culture and its connections in a broader cultural context.

During this period, major changes in the field of philosophical and scientific knowledge were occurring, having influenced cultural anthropology as well. Around the mid-1960s, there was a discussion on changing the set of principles of theoretical knowledge,

which T. Kuhn called a paradigm, and M. Foucault named an episteme. Reflection on numerous scientific theories and methodologies on the knowledge of man, society, culture, has led to the realization of the inadequacy of some of them regarding the need to solve the problems accumulated in cultural anthropology. Thus, theories of historical orientation proved to be questionable in explaining of macro-dynamic processes, and the principle of the total interrelation of the integrity of society and culture has exhausted its heuristic potential. It had to be recognized that autonomy, discreteness, multidimensionality and diversity were also significant parameters of socio-cultural life of people.

The scientist E. Wolf notes that in anthropology we constantly abandon existing paradigms just to see how they come back to life, as if they were discovered for the first time. Since each of the others puts down one's ax on their predecessors, anthropology begins to resemble a project for the destruction of the "intellectual" forest. The first generations of anthropologists spoke of the same trend. The American anthropologist A. L. Kroeber believed that anthropology is subject to "fashion influences", and the British anthropologist A. Wallace noted that anthropology has a "slash-and-burn" nature (Борофски, 1995, с. 12).

R. Borofsky noted that anthropological theories and models, at least at first glance at superficial observation, have a relatively short "period of intellectual half-life." Anthropologists often strive for something new, although they give way to the old, "killing" it, throwing it aside or simply ignoring it. Thoughts seem newer if the author ignores his predecessors. According to the scientist, this is especially true nowadays, when looking for work in a limited space of the labor market and status in the expanding boundaries of the discipline, a new generation of anthropologists considers it more profitable (financially and intellectually) to create new niches, belittling and ignoring predecessors' behavior.

In this context, to cite as an example the opinion of an American professor at the University of California, anthropologist E. Colson seems appropriate. She believes that rapid population growth and geographical spread (within the discipline) are associated with the emergence of a large number of intellectual schools, each of which emphasizes its uniqueness and superiority, as well as the need for the entire socio-cultural community to recognize its leadership. This never happens though. Moreover, even the most successful of formu-

las rarely dominates for more than a decade, at the very moment when it seems to be triumphing, young anthropologists seeking to put a personal brand on the profession declare it the out of fashion orthodoxy. There is a therapeutic effect in declaring the obsolescence of all existing literature that has a large enough array for a beginner to overcome. However, old ideas continue to be put forward under new headings. The history of anthropology is a great example of what John Barnes once called structural amnesia, the creation of convenient myths that respect a minimum number of predecessors. Selective forgetting does not contribute to the continuity of ideas (Резник, 2012, с. 51).

Cognitive paradigms are changing, characterized by a shift in the focus of research attention on other concepts compared to the previous period. This is how the pluralism of human life (the opposition of mechanism and dualism), the heterogeneity of sociocultural space (its variability and the processes of deconstruction of social systems), the multilayered symbolic objects (the existence of several types of reality with which man interacts), the decentralization of personality are studied. The subject belongs to both cultural and symbolic worlds (each is not homogeneous), there is an internal bifurcation of personality, ambiguous attitude to moral imperatives (none, even the generally accepted moral code, does not provide a basis for the existence of social solidarity).

Sociocultural reality and its dynamic characteristics are studied within the framework of postmodernism; previously, the aspects of human relations with their environment were not studied in classical cultural and anthropological models.

Conclusions. Modern anthropology having emerged as a separate science does not remain where it was. Rather, it can be described as a general anthropology that has a lot of ramifications. Such a modern direction of it focuses on those integration features allowing to present humanity as a whole. This new direction, developing at the junction of philosophy and anthropological science in general, has developed some criteria for scientific synthesis. Today, anthropology seeks to synthesize philosophical and scientific knowledge about man in a single cognitive picture of the world on the basis of general scientific methods, taking into account comprehensive and systematic approaches.

During the period of its scientific formation for more than a century, anthropology has developed its methodology and categorical apparatus. As a science that provoked wide discussions and debates, it repeatedly changed scientific theories, concepts, and visions. The dynamics of this process seems to continue, because humanity is not standing still, new history will bring new concepts, ideas, scientific discoveries and, consequently, cultural paradigms.

References:

- Berdjaev, N. A. (1989). *Filosofija svobody. Smysl tvorchestva [Philosophy of freedom. The meaning of creativity]*. Moscow: Pravda. (In Russian)
- Borofsky, R. (1995). Vvedenie k knige: «Osmyslivaja kulturnuju antropologiju» [Introduction to the Assessing Cultural Anthropology]. *Jetnograficheskoe obozrenie*. № 1. P. 3–18. (In Russian)
- Cassirer, E. (1998). Logika nauk o kulture. *Izbrannoe. Opyt o cheloveke [Favorites. Experience about a person]*. Moscow: Gardarika. (In Russian)
- Colson, E. (1984). The Reordering of Experience: Anthropological Involvement in Time. *Journal of Anthropological Research*. № 40. P. 7. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1086/jar.40.1.3629686>
- Geertz, C. (1985). Wadding. *Times Literary Supplement*. № 4288 (June 7). P. 623.
- Greenberg, J. (1971). *Melville Jean Herskovits 1895–1963. A Biographical Memoir by Joseph C. Greenberg*. Washington: National Academy of Sciences.
- Huizinga, J. (1992). *Homo ludens. V teni zavtreshnego dnja [Homo ludens. In the shadow of tomorrow]*. Moscow: Progress, Progress-Academy. (In Russian)

- Kant, I. (1966). *Soch.: V 6 t. [Works in 6 volumes]*. Vol. 6. Moscow. (In Russian)
- Kuper, A. & Kuper, J. (Eds.). (1995). *The Social Science Encyclopedia*. Boston. P.177.
- Mandelbaum, D. (1969). Cultural Anthropology. In D. Sills (Ed.). *Anthropology. Encyclopedia of Social Science*. N.Y.
- Petrov, Ju. V. (2010). *Filosofija kultury: Trudy Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta [Philosophy of Culture: Proceedings of Tomsk State University]*. Vol. 272. Ser. kulturologicheskaja. Tomsk: Izd-vo Tom. un-ta. (In Russian)
- Plessner, H. (2004). Stupeni organicheskogo i chelovek. *Vvedenie v filosofskuju antropologiju [Introduction to Philosophical Anthropology]*. Moscow: Rossijskaja politicheskaja jenciklopedija (ROSSPJeN). (In Russian)
- Rappaport, R. (1995). Jevoljucija chelovechestva i budushhee antropologii [Evolution of humanity and the future of anthropology]. *Jetnograficheskoe obozrenie*. № 6. P. 18–30. (In Russian)
- Reznik, Ju. M. (red). (2012). Sociokulturnaja antropologija: Istorija, teorija i metodologija [Sociocultural Anthropology: History, Theory and Methodology]. *Jenciklopedicheskij slovar*. Moscow: Akademicheskij Proekt, Kultura; Kirov: Konstanta. (In Russian)
- Scheler, M. (1988). Polozhenie cheloveka v Kosmose [The position of man in space]. Filippov, A. (Translation). *Problema cheloveka v zapadnoj filosofii [The problem of man in Western philosophy]*. Yu. N. Popova (ed.). Moscow: Progress. P. 31–95. (In Russian)
- Vasilev, M. I. (2002). *Vvedenie v kulturnuju antropologiju [Introduction to Cultural Anthropology]*. Uchebnoe posobie. Velikij Novgorod: NovGU im. Jaroslava Mudrogo. (In Russian)
- Wolf, E. (1982). *Europe and the People Without History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Література:

- Бердяев, Н. А. (1989). *Философия свободы. Смысл творчества*. Москва: Правда.
- Борофски, Р. (1995). Введение к книге: «Осмысливая культурную антропологию». *Этнографическое обозрение*. № 1. С. 3–18.
- Васильев, М. И. (2002). *Введение в культурную антропологию*. Учебное пособие. Великий Новгород: НовГУ им. Ярослава Мудрого.
- Кант, И. (1966). *Соч.: В 6 т.* Т. 6. Москва.
- Кассирэр, Э. (1998). Логика наук о культуре. *Избранное. Опыт о человеке*. Москва: Гардарика.
- Петров, Ю. В. (2010). *Философия культуры: Труды Томского государственного университета*. Т. 272. Сер. культурологическая. Томск: Изд-во Том. ун-та.
- Плеснер, Х. (2004). Ступени органического и человек. *Введение в философскую антропологию*. Москва: Российская политическая энциклопедия (РОССПЭН).
- Рappapорт, Р. А. (1995). Эволюция человечества и будущее антропологии. *Этнографическое обозрение*. № 6. С. 18–30.
- Резник, Ю. М. (ред). (2012). Социокультурная антропология: История, теория и методология. *Энциклопедический словарь*. Москва: Академический Проект, Культура; Киров: Константа.
- Хейзинга, Й. (1992). *Ното ludens. В тени заветрешнего дня*. Москва: Прогресс, Прогресс-Академия.
- Шелер, М. (1988). Положение человека в Космосе. Филиппов, А. (Перевод). *Проблема человека в западной философии*. Ю. Н. Попова (ред.). Москва: Прогресс. С. 31–95.
- Colson, E. (1984). The Reordering of Experience: Anthropological Involvement in Time. *Journal of Anthropological Research*. № 40. P.7. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1086/jar.40.1.3629686>
- Geertz, C. (1985). Wadding. *Times Literary Supplement*. № 4288 (June 7). P. 623.
- Greenberg, J. (1971). *Melville Jean Herskovits 1895-1963. A Biographical Memoir by Joseph C. Greenberg*. Washington: National Academy of Sciences.

- Kuper, A. & Kuper, J. (Eds.). (1995). *The Social Science Encyclopedia*. Boston. P.177.
- Mandelbaum, D. (1969). Cultural Anthropology. In D. Sills (Ed.). *Anthropology. Encyclopedia of Social Science*. N.Y.
- Wolf, E. (1982). *Europe and the People Without History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Демещенко Віолета Валеріївна

Соціально-філософський контекст історії культурно-антропологічної парадигми

Анотація. У дослідженні розглядається питання щодо стану такої науки, як антропологія в сучасному науковому середовищі. У статті окреслено низку цікавих питань щодо змін у цілому, а також трансформації парадигм, що відбуваються в сучасних антропологічних знаннях. Проаналізовано історичні витoki культурно-антропологічної парадигми в соціально-філософському контексті. Зазначено нові напрями розвитку антропології як науки, а також відзначено, що в межах постмодерну вивчається соціокультурна реальність та її динамічні характеристики, оскільки до цього в класичних антропологічних моделях не вивчалися аспекти зв'язків людей з їхнім оточенням. Сучасну антропологію можна охарактеризувати як загальну антропологію, що має масу розгалужень. Такий новітній її напрям концентрує увагу на тих інтеграційних рисах, які дозволяють показати людство як єдине ціле. Цей новий напрям розвиваючись на стику філософії та антропологічної науки в цілому, виробив деякі критерії наукового синтезу. Сьогодні антропологія прагне синтезувати філософське й наукове знання про людину в єдину пізнавальну картину світу на основі загальнонаукових методів, враховуючи комплексні й системні підходи.

Ключові слова: антропологія, історія, філософія, соціологія, модель, концепція, парадигма, науковий синтез, людство.

Демещенко Виолетта Валеріївна

Социально-философский контекст истории культурно-антропологической парадигмы

Аннотация. Это исследование рассматривает вопрос места такой науки, как антропология в современной научной среде. В статье очерчен круг интересных вопросов относительно изменений в целом, а также трансформации парадигм, которые изменяются в современных антропологических знаниях. Проанализированы исторические истоки культурно-антропологической парадигмы в социально-философском контексте. Указаны новые направления развития антропологии как науки, а также отмечено, что в рамках постмодерна изучается социокультурная реальность и ее динамические характеристики, поскольку до этого в классических антропологических моделях не изучались аспекты связей людей с их окружением. Современную антропологию можно охарактеризовать как общую антропологию, имеющий массу ответвлений. Такое ее новейшее направление концентрирует внимание на тех интеграционных чертах, которые позволяют представить человечество, как единое целое. Это направление, развиваясь на стыке философии и антропологической науки в целом, выработало некоторые критерии научного синтеза. Сегодня антропология стремится синтезировать философское и научное знание о человеке в единую познавательную картину мира на основе общенаучных методов, учитывая комплексные и системные подходы.

Ключевые слова: антропология, история, философия, социология, модель, концепция, парадигма, научный синтез, человечество.