

PHILOSOPHICAL SCIENCES

ФІЛОСОФСЬКІ НАУКИ

DOI: 10.15421/272201

UDC 1:930.19 (043.5)

S. Aytov

Ukrainian State University of science and technology, Dnipro, Ukraine

HISTORICAL ANTHROPOLOGY AS THE MODERN PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY AND SOCIAL ANTHROPOLOGY: INTERDISCIPLINARY DIALOGUE

E-mail: aytovspartak@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0001-9049-5865

Abstract. The article explores the complex issue of the influence of socio-cultural factors on the emergence of historical anthropology as a modern philosophy of history. The methodology of this work is based on the implementation of the principles of complementarity, structure, dialogicity. The following methods were involved in the study of this issue: philosophical hermeneutics, system-structural, interdisciplinary. Among the ontological categories of historical anthropology as a modern philosophy of history we note: reconstruction, historical explanation, intellectual intuition, microhistorical analysis, interdisciplinary dialogue. The epistemological psychological categories of historical anthropology as a modern philosophy of history include mentality, perception of space and time, worldview. The epistemological socio-cultural categories of historical anthropology as a modern philosophy of history include: socially significant behavior, everyday life, habitus. Among the axiological categories of historical anthropology are: «historical anthropocentrism», «psychological and cultural pluralism», democracy. anthropology is a special field of sociological knowledge. Social anthropology is one of the areas of study of society. Other social sciences are most closely related to it. This understanding corresponds to the name «social anthropology». The differences between the given interpretations of this science are insignificant. To take this factor into account, many researchers use the term «socio-cultural anthropology». In the French intellectual tradition, social anthropology actually coincides with ethnology. Mainly in the cognitive status of «others» were considered societies and cultural traditions, unlike the «Western», «industrial», type of socio-cultural relations. Social anthropology to a large extent and at the present stage of development focuses on this psychological and cultural division. It focuses research interest mainly on societies and cultures that are different from industrialized ones. However, in the modern world, the differentiation of societies according to the bipolar criterion is quite conditional. The scientific dialogue of historical anthropology as a modern philosophy of history with social anthropology gives this area of philosophical knowledge the possibility of further theoretical development. Among them are the following factors:

- coverage of a wide range of phenomena and processes of historical existence – in social, ethnic and cultural dimensions;
- integration into the problem field of historical anthropology of the study of culture, social organization and psychology of ethnic groups that are at the pre-state level of development;
- expansion of intercultural interactions of historical and anthropological studies with socio-humanitarian studies through the analysis of socio-anthropological issues;
- application of theoretical approaches to social anthropology in the study of ethnic, socio-cultural and mental aspects of the life of societies of the past;
- involvement of concepts and research experience of socio-anthropological studies in the analysis of the historical anthropology of the humanitarian horizon of the principles of modern socio-cultural dynamics.

Key words: philosophy of history, historical anthropology, social anthropology, interdisciplinary dialogue, humanities.

С. Айтів

Український державний університет науки і технологій, Дніпро, Україна

ІСТОРИЧНА АНТРОПОЛОГІЯ ЯК СУЧАСНА ФІЛОСОФІЯ ІСТОРІЇ ТА СОЦІАЛЬНА АНТРОПОЛОГІЯ: МІЖДИСЦИПЛІНАРНИЙ ДІАЛОГ

E-mail: aytovspartak@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0001-9049-5865

Анотація. Стаття досліджує складну проблематику впливу соціально-культурних чинників на виникнення історичної антропології як сучасної філософії історії. Методологія цієї праці заснована на реалізації принципів комплементарності, структурності, діалогічності. У процесі студії зазначеної проблематики були залучені такі методи, як філософської герменевтики, системно-структурний, міждисциплінарний. Серед онтологічних категорій історичної антропології як сучасної філософії історії зазначимо реконструкцію, історичне пояснення, інтелектуальну інтуїцію, мікроісторичний аналіз, міждисциплінарний діалог. До складу гносеологічних психологічних категорій історичної антропології як сучасної філософії історії належать ментальність, сприймання простору і часу, бачення світу. До гносеологічних соціокультурних категорій історичної антропології як сучасної філософії історії належать суспільно значуща поведінка, повсякденне життя, габітус. Серед аксіологічних категорій історичної антропології виокремлюють «історичний антропоцентризм», «психологічно-культурний плюралізм», демократичність. Антропологія є особливою сферою соціологічного знання. Соціальна антропологія є одним із напрямів вивчення життя суспільства. Найбільш спорідненими з нею є інші соціальні науки. Такому розумінню відповідає назва «соціальна антропологія». Відмінності між наведеними інтерпретаціями цієї науки є незначними. Щоб врахувати цей чинник, багато дослідників застосовують термін «соціально-культурна антропологія». У французькій інтелектуальній традиції соціальна антропологія фактично збігається з етнологією. Науковий діалог історичної антропології як сучасної філософії історії із соціальною антропологією надає цьому напрямку філософського знання можливості подальшого теоретичного розвитку. Серед них слід вказати на такі чинники:

- охоплення широкого кола феноменів і процесів історичного буття – у суспільному, етнічному і культурному вимірах;
- інтеграція в проблемне поле історичної антропології вивчення культури, соціальної організації і психології етносів, котрі знаходяться на додержавному рівні розвитку;
- розширення міжкультурних взаємодій історично-антропологічних студій із соціогуманітаристикою завдяки аналізу соціально-антропологічної проблематики;
- застосування теоретичних підходів соціальної антропології у вивченні етнічних, соціокультурних і ментальних аспектів життєдіяльності суспільств минулого;
- залучення концепцій і дослідницького досвіду соціально-антропологічних студій в аналізі історичною антропологією гуманітарного горизонту засад сучасної соціокультурної динаміки.

Ключові слова: філософія історії, історична антропологія, соціальна антропологія, міждисциплінарний діалог, гуманітарні науки.

Introduction. The problem of interdisciplinary dialogue of historical anthropology as a modern philosophy of history and social anthropology is very briefly considered in the scientific literature. In this problem field we can note the study of individual problems, which are rather weakly correlated with each other and do not form a single cognitive system.

Thus, general information about the development of scientific links between historical anthropology and socio-anthropological studies are given in the work of R. Delege. It analyzes the theoretical similarity of research in these sciences, but hardly touches on the question of their scientific connections. He considers interdisciplinary contacts of historical and social anthropologies very briefly [5, p. 14–15], which follows from the orientation of the scientist's work to the study of mainly social anthropology.

Quite important information about the interdisciplinary interactions of historical and anthropological studies is contained in the works of an outstanding representative of this scientific field. A. Ya. Gurevich. In his work on the theoretical features of historical anthropology, the researcher points to the interdisciplinary nature of this science. He focused on understanding the interaction of historical and anthropological research with sociology and ethnology [4, p. 241–242]. However, A. Ya. Gurevich avoided studying her cognitive contacts with social anthropology.

In the work of Yu. Shlyupbom the analysis of the microhistorical slice of historical and anthropological experiments is given. He examines in detail the features of the «methodological tools» of microhistory, the originality of its research optics. Among the features of interdisciplinary contacts of microhistorical studies, the scientist notes the cognitive interactions of the latter with ethnology, culturology and sociology. [8, p. 25–26]. However, the scientific dialogue of historical anthropology with social anthropology remained outside the scope of this study.

The representative collection on the generation and development of «history of mentality» provides data on the interdisciplinary nature of historical and anthropological studies. The scientific connections of this discipline with the cluster of human sciences are indicated [6, p. 21–22]. Attention to the cognitive dialogue of historical and anthropological research with socio-anthropological research.

N. Yakovenko studies a wide range of issues of mental and cultural horizon of the historical existence of the Zaporozhian Cossacks. However, N. Yakovenko does not consider the possibility of applying the methods of anthropological disciplines, in particular social anthropology in the study of their own issues.

In accordance with the analysis of the range of theoretical issues, the aim of this work is to compare socio-historical and anthropological studies, isolate and analyze the interdisciplinary dialogue of historical anthropology as a modern philosophy of history and social anthropology.

Research methods. The methodology of this work is based on principles, complementarity, structure, dialogicity and is based on factual, conceptual and critical material contained in the works of modern domestic and foreign experts in historical anthropology and social anthropology, social. The comparison of historical-anthropological and socio-anthropological studies and the study of their interdisciplinary dialogue was carried out on the basis of a number of research methods. These include, in particular, methods: philosophical hermeneutics, system-structural, interdisciplinary. The application of these scientific methods in this article was aimed at achieving a number of cognitive objectives.

The implementation of the principle of complementarity and the method of philosophical hermeneutics is aimed at understanding the relationship between the conceptual approaches of social anthropology and historical-anthropological research as a modern philosophy of history by clarifying their essence.

The implementation of the system principle and system-structural method aims to study the theoretical interaction of scientific approaches to socio-anthropological concepts and historical anthropology as a modern philosophy of history, which contributed to the formation and development of the problem field and «methodological tools» of the latter.

Research results. Historical anthropology as a modern philosophy of history is a complex and innovative discipline [1, p. 329]. Its theoretical foundations form ontological, epistemological (psychological and sociocultural) and axiological categories. Among the ontological we note: reconstruction, historical explanation, intellectual intuition, microhistorical analysis, interdisciplinary dialogue. The category of reconstruction is the mental reproduction of the content and important features of the mentality and cultural dimensions of life of individuals and societies of the past. Historical explanation is revealed as a category that aims to understand the psychological and socio-cultural causes and components of the existence of individuals and communities of the past.

Intellectual intuition is the understanding of the essence of multifaceted mental and socio-cultural components of historical processes through intuition, which is based on detailed studies

of objects of the past. The content of the category of microhistorical analysis is This category in historical and anthropological studies is embodied in the study of the life path of individuals of the past who held various social statuses, including nobility [10, p. 45–46]. Interdisciplinary dialogue is realized as a category of historical anthropology, which establishes extensive scientific interactions with the conceptual approaches of philosophical, socio-humanitarian and natural sciences. The composition of epistemological psychological categories of historical anthropology as a modern philosophy of history include: mentality, perception of space and time, worldview. Mentality is understood as a set of peculiar conscious and unconscious ideas that have formed in people and societies of different historical epochs. Perception of space and time is a cognitive basis understanding of spatial (architectural, topographical, geographical) and temporal (daily, calendar, historical) dimensions of individuals and various communities of past eras. The category of worldview reflects the understanding of people and societies of past epochs of the natural environment and various aspects of socio-cultural reality.

The epistemological socio-cultural categories of historical anthropology as a modern philosophy of history include: socially significant behavior, everyday life, habit. Socially significant behavior is a set of moral, ethical and cultural norms and rules (formal and informal) that regulate and guide the trajectory of life of people and societies of the past. Everyday life is material. material and mental-cultural conditions of various aspects of the existence of people and societies of the past. Habitus is understood as a set of styles and ways of life of individuals and communities of different historical epochs.

Among the axiological categories of historical anthropology are: «historical anthropocentrism», «psychological and cultural pluralism», democracy. «Historical anthropocentrism» is manifested in the understanding of human life in the past in the context of the historical era as the main object of historical and anthropological studies. It should be noted that the understanding of man as the main subject of historical and anthropological research has been formulated by the founders of this science [2, p. 73–74]. The category of «psychological and cultural pluralism» is realized in the understanding of the self-worth and equal significance of the mentality and socio-cultural characteristics of people and societies of different historical epochs. The category of democracy is embodied in historical and anthropological studies by studying the peculiarities of the mentality and socio-cultural phenomena of predominantly diverse social communities, rather than elite groups of the past.

«Methodological tools» of historical anthropology as a modern philosophy of history includes methods of general science, private science and metatheoretical, determined by the nature of the acquired knowledge. The first group includes methods: scientific description, generalization, classification, interpretation, explanation, idealization, theoretical, scientific prediction. Among the private-scientific methods that are integrated into the «methodological tools» of historical anthropology as a modern philosophy of history, we can distinguish: genetic, historical, hermeneutic, semiotic, reconstruction and interdisciplinary. In accordance with the characteristics of the content of knowledge in historical and anthropological studies used metatheoretical methods. These include the method of analysis in historical and anthropological concepts of their philosophical foundations.

In the early stages of scientific dynamics, anthropology (in the broadest sense) was understood as a universal field of knowledge about man. This interpretation dominated the intellectual space until the middle of the XIX century. Since then, this discipline began to acquire clearer scientific boundaries and, mainly, began to be interpreted as a field of knowledge that focuses on the study of peoples whose way of life and cultural characteristics differed significantly from industrial, «Western» societies. from which came anthropologists [2, p. 28–29]. The object of study of this classical social anthropology were the so-called «primitive» peoples, who in most cases had no literacy, were not familiar with the circulation of money and other important socio-economic institutions of Western European countries.

Mostly social anthropologists chose for their studies communities that lived in geographical locations away from Western societies. Scientists analyzed the essential features

of their social structure, features of the economic mechanism, the system of religious ideas, everyday life, kinship relations, ritual and symbolic horizon of social life and. etc.

The main element of the first stages of development of socio-anthropological studies, according to the level of organization of the societies studied, was the tribe. The application of this concept in the study of human communities indicates a significant qualitative difference between the context of socio-anthropological studies from the object of their exploration; the difference between Western cultures and traditional societies. The object of scientific studies of social anthropology is society and man in the multifaceted space of social ties and relations [7, p. 32–33]. At the same time, the relevant issues are studied in a number of disciplines, in particular: social philosophy, sociology, social psychology, demography, history. Each of them analyzes a certain sphere of society. Of the social science disciplines that study and comprehend sociocultural dynamics, the most theoretically close to social anthropology is often called sociology.

Mainly in the cognitive status of «others» were considered societies and cultural traditions, unlike the «Western», «industrial», type of socio-cultural relations. Social anthropology to a large extent and at the present stage of development focuses on this psychological and cultural division. It directs research interest mainly to societies and cultures that are different from industrialized. However, in the modern world, the differentiation of societies by bipolar criterion is quite conditional.

Today's world order is extremely diverse and socially and culturally diverse. There are now a large number of states on the planet. Each of them differs in the features of the political system, has an original demographic, ethnic and social structure, is characterized by different levels of internal heterogeneity. This structure integrates a complex of different social systems and subsystems, cultural traditions and subcultures. The latter are of considerable interest to studies in this problem field. At the present stage of scientific dynamics, social anthropology is a very specialized and multifaceted field of socio-humanitarian knowledge with its own problem field and research methods.

Some ambiguity in the understanding of the subject originality of social anthropology determines that, in fact, this discipline combines three meanings – «cultural anthropology» in the United States and «social anthropology» and ethnology in Europe.

According to this theoretical approach, in the American intellectual tradition (which is founded primarily with the studies of F. Boas), this science came to be called cultural anthropology and understood as part of a holistic anthropological knowledge. It includes, within this interpretation, four main disciplines – physical anthropology, archeology, linguistic anthropology and purely cultural anthropology. The research interests of the latter lie in the study of cultural components of public life.

According to another interpretation, which was formed in the space of the British tradition, anthropology is a special field of sociological knowledge, one of the areas of study of society. Other social sciences are most closely related to it. This understanding corresponds to the name «social anthropology». The differences between these interpretations are insignificant. To emphasize this, many researchers use the term «socio-cultural anthropology». In the French intellectual tradition, social anthropology actually coincides with ethnology.

The subject of social anthropology is man in the unity of all its socio-cultural manifestations, determined by the historical conditions of society. The subject of this discipline determines the methods of its research. They form a system of levels of analysis and knowledge of the unity of human life and society. They include:

1. Empirical: methods of observation, description, analysis, classification.
2. Historical: methods of comparison, synthesis, systematization.
3. Structural and functional level: methods of theoretical abstraction and modeling.

Conclusions. Scientific dialogical historical anthropology as a modern philosophy of history with social anthropology gives this area of philosophical knowledge the possibility of further theoretical development. Among them are the following factors:

– coverage of a wide range of phenomena and processes of historical existence – in social, ethnic and cultural dimensions;

- integration into the problem field of historical anthropology of the study of culture, social organization and psychology of ethnic groups that are at the pre-state level of development;
- expansion of intercultural interactions of historical and anthropological studies with socio-humanitarian studies through the analysis of socio-anthropological issues;
- application of theoretical approaches to social anthropology in the study of ethnic, socio-cultural and mental aspects of the life of societies of the past;
- involvement of concepts and research experience of socio-anthropological studies in the analysis of historical anthropology of the humanitarian horizon of the principles of modern socio-cultural dynamics.

REFERENCES

1. *Aytov, S. Sh.* (2018). Suchasna filosofiya istorii: istorychno-antrpologichnyy gorizont [Modern philosophy of history: historical-anthropological horizon]. Dnipro: LIRA, 368 s. (in Ukrainian).
2. *Bloc, M.* (1973). Apologiya istorii. Feodal'noe obshchestvo [Apology of the history. Feudal society]. Moscow: Nauka, 307 s. (in Russian).
3. *Borysova, O. V.* (2017). Social'na antropologiya [Social anthropology]. Kyiv: Kondor, 412 s. (in Ukrainian).
4. *Gurevich, A. Ya.* (2005). Istoricheskaya nauka i istoricheskaya antropologiya [Historical science and historical anthropology] / Gurevich A. Ya. Istoriya – neskonchaemyy spor [History – unlimited argument]. Moskva: RGGU, s. 236–260 (in Russian).
5. *Del'ezh, R.* (2008). Narysy z istorii antropologii: shkoly, teorii, avtory [Essays in anthropological history: schools, theories, authors]. Kyiv: Kyivo-Mogylyans'ka Akademiya, 287 s. (in Ukrainian).
6. *Istoriya evropeys'koi mental'nosti* (2004). [European mentality history]. L'viv: Litopys, 720 s. (in Ukrainian).
7. *Mel'nik, V. M.* (2015). Narysy z teorii sociokul'turnoi antropologii [Essays in sociocultural anthropology]. Vinnytsya: Vinnyts'ka mis'ka drukarnya, 551 s. (in Ukrainian).
8. *Shlupbom, U.* (2003). Mikroistoriya: bol'shye voprosy v malom masshtabe [Microhistory: big problems in the small scale] / Shlupbom U. and others / Proshloe – krupnym planom. Sovremennye issledovaniya po mikroistorii [Past – large plan. Modern studies in microhistory]. Sankt-Petersburg: Aleyteya, s. 7–78 (in Russian).
9. *Yakovenko, N. Ya.* (2002). Paralel'nyy svit. Doslidzhennya z istorii uyavlen' ta idey v Ukraini XVI–XVII st. [Parallel world. Studies in history of presentations and ideas in Ukraine XVI–XVII st.]. Kyiv: Krytyka, 416 s. (in Ukrainian).
10. *Swinfen, D.* (2015). Moncrif: the life and career of James Wichwood Moncrif, 1811–1895. Brought Ferry: Shakenoak Press, 297 p.

Received 23.02.22

Accepted 25.03.00.22