

ФИЛОСОФСКАЯ АНТРОПОЛОГИЯ, ФИЛОСОФИЯ КУЛЬТУРЫ

Научная статья / Article

UDC 168.522; 124.4

<https://doi.org/10.34130/2233-1277-2024-1-10>

Culture as a Wholeness in Research Programs of Russian Culturology

Audra-Kristina I. Zabulionite

A. I. Herzen Russian State Pedagogical University;
St. Petersburg State University, St. Petersburg, Russia,
k.zabulionite@holism-culture.org; zkristi@mail.ru

Abstract. *One of the fundamental problems of modern science of culture is the constitution of the unique wholeness of culture in conceptual form. The classical research programs of Russian culturology (mechanicism and organicism) offer different concepts and logical models of the wholeness. Of particular interest in the formation of culturological discourses of non-European cultures and civilizations is organicism, which is aimed at expressing the qualitative certainty of the phenomena being studied. However, its introduction into culturology is associated with considerable difficulties in developing a conceptual apparatus. Prospects for solving this problem are seen not only in turning to the philosophical phenomenology of E. Husserl and the idea of regional ontologies, but also in the formation of a third research program that involves rethinking the discipline of culturology and the algorithm of culturological cognition.*

Keywords: *typology of cultures, regional ontologies, phenomenology, disciplinary of culturology, research program*

For citation: Zabulionite A.-K. I. Culture as a Wholeness in Research Programs of Russian Culturology. *Chelovek. Kul'tura. Obrazovanie = Human. Culture. Education*. 2024; 1: 10–21. (In Russ.) <https://doi.org/10.34130/2233-1277-2024-1-10>

Культура как целостность в исследовательских программах российской культурологии

Аудра Кристина Иосифовна Забулионите

Российский государственный педагогический университет им. А. И. Герцена; Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет, Санкт-Петербург, Россия, k.zabulionite@holism-culture.org; zkristi@mail.ru

Аннотация. *В 2021 году прошла интересная и весьма напряженная полемика о состоянии дисциплинарности российской культурологии, полный текст которой был опубликован на страницах журнала «Человек. Культура. Образование» (2022, № 4 и 2023, № 1–3). В центре дискуссии был поставлен вопрос о том, как конституируется понятие «культура» — базовое понятие науки о культурах. Конституирование в понятийной форме уникальной целостности культуры является одной из фундаментальных проблем современной науки о культуре. Классические научно-исследовательские программы российской культурологии (механицизм и органицизм) исходят из разных онтологических постулатов: культура как системная целостность и культура как органическая целостность. Соответственно, они предлагают разные концепты и логические модели целостности. Как показала эта полемика, некоторые весьма основательные вопросы этих научно-исследовательских программ, а также вопрос их дополнительности и ныне остаются непроясненными. В статье раскрываются философские предпосылки этих двух научно-исследовательских программ, обсуждается их познавательный потенциал, выявляются рамки легитимации. Особый интерес в формировании культурологических дискурсов неевропейских культур и цивилизаций представляет научно-исследовательская программа органицизма, имеющая установку на выражение качественной определенности изучаемых явлений. Однако ее внедрение в культурологию связано с немалыми трудностями разработки понятийного аппарата. Перспектива решения этой проблемы видится не только в обращении к философской феноменологии Э. Гуссерля и идее региональных онтологий, но также в формировании третьей феноменологической научно-исследовательской программы, предполагающей переосмысление дисциплинарности культурологии и алгоритма культурологического познания. Феноменологическая научная программа, вводя идею региональных онтологий, открывает возможность формирования культурологических дискурсов уникальных цивили-*

лизаций: дискурсов китаеведения, арабистики, индологии, африканистики и других неевропейских культур и цивилизаций, в том числе и этнокультур.

Ключевые слова: типология культур, региональные онтологии, феноменология, дисциплинарность культурологии, научно-исследовательская программа

Для цитирования: Забулионите А. К. И. Культура как целостность в исследовательских программах российской культурологии // Человек. Культура. Образование. 2024. № 1. С. 10–21. <https://doi.org/10.34130/2233-1277-2024-1-10>

1. Concepts and logical models of cultural wholeness. In 2021, an interesting and very intense polemic took place on the state of disciplinarity in Russian culturology. This discussion was dedicated to the memory of Prof. Yu. N. Solonin, who initiated a debate on the systematicity and wholeness two decades ago, at the time of the formation of Russian culturology as an independent field of scientific research and university discipline. That is, the question was raised as to how the concept of “culture” — i. e. the basic concept of the science of cultures — is constituted. In this discussion on the material of culturology the competition of two research programs, known since the end of the 18th century, was updated. From the controversy of the 1990s to the present day, Russian culturology in its development is largely determined by the competition between these two scientific programs, which proceed from different ontological postulates: culture as a systemic wholeness and culture as an organic wholeness. However, the polemic of 2021 showed that some of the very fundamental issues of these research programs remain unclear. As a consequence, the issue of complementarity of competing programs was wrongly interpreted as a search for convergence, and judgments were made aimed to reduce competition [1, p. 178–181; 2, p. 170–176]. These kinds of attitudes expressed in the discussion served as an impetus to turn once again to the question of how a research program defines the conceptual apparatus of a particular concept, the architectonics of the disciplinarity of culturology and the very algorithm of culturological cognition.

There is no immediate reality in science. The way in which reality is incorporated into the scientific discourse is determined by the way the subject matter is constituted. According to these ontological postulates, different concepts and different logical models of theories of wholeness are being developed.

The systemic approach which was forming in the rationalist tradition has been widely applied in various fields of natural science for several centuries and today has a well-developed conceptual apparatus. It was very easily transferred to culturology and adapted to a new subject area. In the knowledge of cultures systemic (or systemic-synergistic) approach is based on the understanding of the general systemic organization of all cultures and civilizations: the basic concept of culturology — “culture” — is expressed as a systemic wholeness (type-system). This approach proposes a formational structuring of World History: history is divided into stages that all civilizations and cultures pass through in their historical development. However, adapted for cultural research, this approach also reveals its weaknesses: although at the postulate level, this approach asserts the uniqueness of cultures/civilizations, the conceptual apparatus of the systemic approach is not sensitive to the unique parameters of pictures of the world that are qualitatively different from each other. The logical model of wholeness, or the typological taxon of culture, built as a type-system and is a rationally constructed concept that is universal for all cultures. Its universality is based on the fundamental premise of the system approach: the mind is the same in all people and in all cultures a person acts as a reasonable being, therefore, culture has a rational organization. Such a universal type-system sets a rigid logical framework for reality and cognition. Insensitive to qualitative characteristics, to the uniqueness of cultures/civilizations, this approach in the 20th century was recognized as not working in the cognition of non-European cultures and civilizations. Oriental studies today abandon the formational structuring of the universum of cultures and give clear preference to the civilizational one, which was proposed in the scientific program of organicism.

With the beginning of the formation of Russian culturology in the 1990s, the necessity for the formation of cultural discourses of non-European cultures had been also realized. At the initiative of Yu. N. Solonin and E. A. Torchinov, one of the first in the country departments of philosophy and cultures of the East was opened at the Faculty of Philosophy of St. Petersburg University, which took a course on the formation of cultural discourses of Chinese studies, Indology and Arabic studies [3, p. 61]. Yu. N. Solonin associated the prospect of formation of cultural discourses of non-European cultures with the actualization of organicism, which he called the “Goethean line” in culturology. This scientific program focused on the expression of the uniqueness of each culture. This is evidently traced from the Herder’s idea of the intrinsic worth of all cultures to the life philosophy of O. Spengler, who introduced many proto-

types of cultures as independent principles. It should be noted that at the basis of human activity, the philosophy of life proceeded not from reason, but from the will, from the volitional impulse in human activity. Despite the fact that the ideas of classical organicism and philosophy of life had been attracting the attention of culturologists, however, the process of formation of culturological discourses of non-European cultures has not been completed yet. It should be noted that the difficulties in introducing organicism were observed not only in Oriental studies. If we talk about the introduction of the scientific program of organicism into the scientific practice of cultural research, then even nowadays in this area of knowledge it is significantly behind the systemic approaches.

The conceptual apparatus and methodology of this scientific program still remain less developed today compared to the quantitative-systemic one. Nevertheless, the scientific program of organicism, with its initial focus on qualitative certainty (qualitativity), is now attracting more and more interest in culturological discourses, focused on the study of the uniqueness of cultures and civilizations. The scientific program of organicism offers a civilizational approach and structuring of the universe of cultures and World History on the basis of a typological taxon, which is thought of as an indivisible monad, identical to itself during external changes in historical development and expressing the organic integrity and qualitative certainty of culture /civilization. In the program of organicism, it is important to emphasize that the type cannot be a general concept, because it has the intention to express the uniqueness of each culture/civilization, which develops according to its own internal logic.

Speaking of the development of the conceptual apparatus of organicism in relation to the knowledge of cultures, it is worth noting the idea of the German romantics of the cultural definiteness of being and the next important step made in the philosophy of life of O. Spengler, who introduces the idea of cultural pluralism and, turning to the Goethean idea of typology, offers meaningfully different prototypes of cultures (Apolonian soul, Faustian soul, etc.). The unique prefiguration of culture is exactly the type that expresses the existential metaphysical level of culture, the immaterial organization of its soul. The Orientalists call this level “the experience of the beyond, the experience of the transcendence”. However, Spengler’s prefigurations of cultures have not had a significant impact on the practice of culturalogical research. The reason why Spengler’s very productive idea of introducing pluralism — a multitude of unique prefigurations — was not used in the practice of culturalogical research, we see, first of all, in the fact that these unique “prefigurations” turned out

to be undeveloped. The lack of development of a substantive prefiguration of the soul of culture, which in this scientific program is a way of constructing the objectivity, i.e. the wholeness of a unique culture, has created difficulties for its implementation in the practice of culturalogical studies. Spengler also had another unresolved question: while postulating the cultural certainty of being (or a discontinuous metaphysical structure), he did not provide a philosophical justification for this idea.

2. Type of culture as a regional ontology. Therefore, we are faced with the question: on what basis can we assert a discontinuous metaphysical structure, or in other words, justify the ruptures and qualitative differences of being? It seems that we can find such a justification for a discontinuous metaphysical structure (the idea of the cultural certainty of being and the presence of multiple independent principles) in the philosophy of M. Heidegger, who rooted the source of being in Dasein (being-here), and proposed an existential concept of time and true historiography [4, p. 376]. Heidegger's concept of existential time, that proceeds from Dasein, or being-here, is fundamentally different from the concept of time in both the systemic approaches and their understanding of historicism and from O. Spengler's concept of time and historicism.

Discussing the prospects for further development of the metaphysics of culture, we have drawn attention to E. Husserl's theory of objectivity, which deals with the conceptual constitution of regional ontologies on the basis of quasi-region by introducing eidetic concepts [5]. Regional ontology allows to conceptually express the unique prefiguration of the soul of a culture, expressed by its own eidetic concepts. Metaphysical reconstructions of the beingness horizons of unique cultures in their own eidetic concepts — such a system of fundamental eidetic concepts describing the intangible dimension of culture (or the type of a given particular culture) serves as a semantic coordinate system for the interpretation of more specific events and phenomena of this particular culture in research. That is, by attracting the Husserl's theory of objectivity, we acquire a foundation on which it is possible to build research of any unique culture, including building culturological discourses of Oriental studies, African studies, and models of the world of ethnoculture. For in each case, the researcher will operate systems of concepts that correspond to the unique world pictures of specific civilizations/cultures.

However, by expressing eidetic concepts of metaphysical horizons of unique cultures (regional ontologies), their introduction into culturological research does not end. The involvement of philosophical ideas

of phenomenology and deep ontology entails the necessity of rethinking the disciplinarity of the science of culture.

Turning to the ideas of E. Husserl and M. Heidegger for the further development of the “Goethean line” in culturology, we will pay special attention to the fact that in the first third of the 20th century there was a turn in philosophical knowledge: it was thanks to the phenomenological school of E. Husserl, the works of M. Heidegger and other representatives of deep ontology that the first attempts to put the ontology and gnoseology of *human existence*, mainly in its existential-anthropological dimension at the center of philosophical constructions were presented. It is not just about the anthropological principle as a methodological approach, but about fundamental philosophical categories, about the possibility of a fundamentally different paradigm of philosophical knowledge. Yu.V. Perov presented this situation quite clearly back in the 1990s when he reflected on social philosophy. His arguments deserve to be cited *in extenso*: “The limits of today’s discussions on these topics (about the place of social philosophy within philosophical knowledge — A. K. Z.) are determined by our possibility (or rather: impossibility) to present another type of scientific knowledge, essentially different from the New European one, in which modern sociology is integrated, as well as other types and forms of philosophizing. Most philosophical doctrines from antiquity to the present day, in the constitution of their own ‘metaphysics’ and ‘ontology’, ‘gnoseology’ and ‘methodology’, in the treatment of reality and its cognition, proceeded from ‘nature’ as ‘reality par excellence’, ‘reality in preference’. The reality of society and social cognition were interpreted as a special case, as an optional ‘superstructure’. This was also the place of social philosophy in the classical (in this and only in this sense ‘naturalistic’) philosophical paradigm, in which the fundamental philosophical categories were oriented mainly to the ‘model’ of reality in the form of ‘nature’ and its cognition. It is important to see that we are talking about fundamental philosophical categories, and not only about the well-known natural science-oriented methodological ‘ideal of scientificity’. The dualism of ‘sciences of nature’ and ‘sciences of spirit’ formed in the last century turned out to be a temporary compromise primarily because of its obvious ‘methodology’” [6, p. 144]. The situation changed in the 20th century, when the first attempts were made to put the ontology and gnoseology of human existence at the center of philosophical constructions. This made possible the existence of a “sociocentric” and “historiocentric” philosophy, the basis of which is socio-historical reality, and nature is a special case. “In this approach, the primary and universal, and

partly 'only' 'ontological' reality is the process of social-historical life of mankind, and all other existing and possible 'realities': 'social', 'anthropological', 'cultural', 'psychological' (as it was once proposed by N. A. Berdyaev, although in a different context and with different purposes) and even 'natural' reality, as it appears in relation to the 'historical' one, are only analytically isolated and existing within it and on its basis" [6, p. 144].

Orientation to the philosophical paradigm, centered on the ontology and gnoseology of human existence, changes the whole situation in the science of culture. It not only creates a special methodological situation in the science of culture, but also affects the principles of disciplinary organization. It is important to emphasize: in cultural science the orientation to one or another paradigm of philosophical knowledge determines different principles of organization of the architectonics of disciplinarity of cultural science. Thus, it is not just a question of different methodological principles of cognition offered by alternative scientific programs, but precisely about the emergence of a new — phenomenological scientific program — as the third research program of cultural studies.

3. Alternative scientific programs: architectonics of disciplinarity and algorithms of cognition. Why do we have the right to talk about a new research program, in view of the fact that while turning to the ideas philosophical phenomenology we are developing the "Goethean line", that is, the ideas of organicism and philosophy of life? The fact is that both the concepts of the "Goethean line", and the mechanicism, with all their different attitudes in understanding reality, in cognition, proceed from pre-Kantian ontology. While the philosophical phenomenology of E. Husserl and its further development in the existentialism of M. Heidegger, in the philosophical hermeneutics of G. Gadamer, relate to the transcendental tradition of philosophy, which is reflected in the peculiarities in the formation of the architectonics of the disciplinary structure of culturology, built on "regional ontology".

If we pay attention to the architectonics of disciplinarity of culturology in the mechanistic scientific program — to the systemic (system-synergetic) approach in culturology, which in the most developed form was presented in the works of M. S. Kagan, then theoretical culturology is at the center of disciplinarity. The basic concept of culturology — the wholeness of culture — is constructed as a systemic wholeness. Moreover, the type-system is a logical model of wholeness, universal for all cultures, and serves as a basis for structuring the universum of cultures and World History as a stadial, formational, ascending development of

humanity. M. S. Kagan, proceeding from the ontological postulate of the systemic organization of culture, believed that the theoretical construct — the system of culture — is a certain internally differentiated wholeness, which he was building by the hypothetico-deductive method. The condition of hypothesis verifiability is connected with another condition — with the possibility to unfold deductively the hypothesis to empirically verifiable statements being compared with observed facts and phenomena. Therefore, in his article “Classification and Systematization” M. S. Kagan emphasized that the work of a systematician should be complemented by the work of a classifier, who deals with the immediate empirical reality and uses the method of induction in cognition [7, p. 10]. M. S. Kagan consistently adheres to this logic in his subsequent works. In “Introduction to the History of World Culture” the scholar not only continues to develop his theoretical construct, but also shows how it works in the cultural material. He models history as an ascending development of parallel cultures. All cultures are based on the same regularities. United into one whole, they form a “system”, which in the most general form is a basic concept, a logical model expressing the wholeness of culture (type-system). It is the basis of different cultural-historical types. Turning to individual cultures, M. S. Kagan demonstrates how historical material illustrates the truth of his theoretical construct, how the “system” works in a concrete material. The principle of correlation between the empirical and theoretical levels of knowledge is already defined in the “Philosophy of Culture” as an illustration of a rationally constructed construct with the help of facts [8, p. 330]. The principle of correlation between empirical and theoretical levels of cognition is already defined in the “Philosophy of Culture” as an illustration of a rationally constructed construct by facts [8, p. 330]. The same motive is carried out in the “Introduction to the History of World Culture”, where “the author refers to the specific material of history of culture only insofar as it is necessary to prove the heuristic value of the justified concept” [9, p. 8]. In M. S. Kagan’s works, the systemic approach received not only a detailed representation, but also a well-considered, well-founded disciplinarity, which is based on a theoretical construct.

The scientific research program of organicism, the “Goethean line”, with all the differences in the construction of the basic concept — culture, also thought that the basis of disciplinarity should be theoretical culturalology. Of course, the basic concept (culture is an organic wholeness) in the qualitative scientific program is constituted in a fundamentally different way than in the systemic approaches developed in the rationalist

tradition and oriented on the model of physics. Classical organicism was formed on the natural philosophy of J. W. Goethe. In his philosophy of life, O. Spengler's understanding of the being of culture proceeded not from reason: Spengler turned to the will, to the impulse of life. However, his philosophy of culture retained many biological analogies, which are evident, for example, in his concept of historicism. Both classical organicism and O. Spengler's philosophy belonged to the pre-Kantian tradition of philosophy.

As opposed to the "Goethean line," the phenomenological tradition of philosophy represented a variation of the transcendental tradition of philosophy. At the center of this paradigm of philosophy are the constructions of ontology and gnoseology of *human existence*. The rationale for the discontinuous metaphysical structure in this program is based on Dasein and the existential concept of time. In the phenomenological research program of culturology, not only the entire system of concepts is rethought, but also the structure of disciplinarity, which is based not on theoretical culturology (as in the case of the two classical ones), but on the metaphysics of culture. Regional ontology expressing in eidetic concepts the metaphysical (being) horizon of a unique culture is not an abstract theoretical construct. Thus, the unique, individualized and characteristic only for this civilization system of eidetic notions acts as an individualized common denominator in the research of those or other phenomena of this particular culture. And the control of all hermeneutic procedures in cultural research is carried out from the metaphysical level. It is the point of account for revealing meanings in specific studies: events, artifacts, phenomena, fragments of this culture. That is, cognition is a hermeneutic comprehension of the meaning of a fragment of culture in the semantic horizon of the wholeness of culture. In addition, the procedure of hermeneutic interpretation of the fragment from the perspective of the wholeness of the metaphysical horizon of a particular culture ensures the verifiability and justification of specific scientific research in this scientific program.

The phenomenological scientific program, while introducing the idea of regional ontologies, opens the possibility of forming culturological discourses of unique civilizations: discourses of Chinese studies, Arabistics, Indology, African studies and other non-European cultures and civilizations. However, the introduction of the idea of regional ontologies raises the question of the unity of the science of cultures. Consequently, a phenomenological scientific program in culturology is required to clarify the question of the unity of the science of cultures. This question, which

at first glance may seem rather tricky, is not really a serious problem. In his theory of objectivity, E. Husserl provides a clear explanation of how regional ontologies and quasi-region relate. E. Husserl explains: the quasi-region is initially empty and as such it does not reflect the ontological organization of a unique culture/civilization. Regional ontologies are not inferred from formal ontology [10, p. 61–62]. The individualization of the quasi-region implies the creation of a unique system of eidetic concepts that express the world picture of a particular unique culture. Thus, the quasi-region is thought of as a certain common logic of construction of the subject sphere of science, in our case, culturalogical discourse. Or in other words, the science of culture combines the culturalogical discourses of unique cultures, built according to the unified logic of objectivity formation.

4. Conclusion. There is no immediate reality in science. In order to reach understanding how reality is included in the culturological discourse, it is necessary to see that alternative research programs are oriented to different paradigms of philosophy, which set different contents of fundamental concepts (time, space, motion, causality, etc.), perceived by scientific programs and theoretical knowledge in a ready-made form. From their point of view, not only the objectivity of culturology is fundamentally differently constituted, but the architectonics of disciplinarity and the algorithm of culturological cognition are constructed in a fundamentally different way.

References

1. Relevance of Yu. N. Solonin and M. S. Kagan Polemics. Fundamentals of Russian Culturology (dedicated to the 80th Anniversary of Professor Yu. N. Solonin). The Roundtable Discussion Proceedings in the Framework of the Third Saint Petersburg International Culture-Studies Symposium (November 20, 2021). Part 1 / A. K. I. Zabulionite (academic ed.), I. B. Ardashkin, V. N. Badmaev and others. *Human. Culture. Education*. 2022. No 4. Pp. 145–183. <https://doi.org/10.34130/2233-1277-2022-4-145>. (In Russ.)
2. Relevance of Yu. N. Solonin and M. S. Kagan Polemics. Fundamentals of Russian Culturology (dedicated to the 80th Anniversary of Professor Yu. N. Solonin). The Roundtable Discussion Proceedings in the Framework of the Third Saint Petersburg International Culture-Studies Symposium (November 20, 2021). Part 3. A. K. I. Zabulionite (academic ed.), I. B. Ardashkin, V. N. Badmaev and others. *Human. Culture. Education*. 2023. No 2. Pp. 152–188. <https://doi.org/10.34130/2233-1277-2023-2-152>. (In Russ.)

3. Solonin, K. Yu., Tumanyan, T. G. Traditions of studying the philosophy and cultures of the East at St. Petersburg University. *Etnosotsium*. 2015. No 7 (85). P. 61.
4. Heidegger M. *Being and Time*. Translated from German. St. Petersburg, 2002. 451 p. [s. n.].
5. Zabulionite A. K. I. Typological Systematics in the Science of Culture: Foundations and Prospects. *Bulletin of Tomsk State University. Culturology and Art history*. 2021. No 43. Pp. 40–54. DOI: 10.17223/22220836/43/3. (In Russ.)
6. Perov Yu. V. *Historicity and Historical Reality*. St. Petersburg, 2000. 144 p.
7. *Types in Culture. Methodological Problems of Classification, Systematization and Typology in Socio-Historical and Anthropological Sciences* / Kleyn L. S. (ed.). Leningrad: Leningrad State University, 1979.
8. Kagan M. S. *Philosophy of Culture*. St. Petersburg: Petropolis, 1996. 415 p.
9. Kagan M. S. *Introduction to the History of World Culture*. St. Petersburg: Petropolis, 2003. Vol. 1. 383 p.
10. Husserl E. *Ideas for Pure Phenomenology and Phenomenological Philosophy. Book One: General Introduction to Pure Phenomenology*. Moscow, 2009. 498 p.

Сведения об авторе

Забулионите Аудра Кристина Иосифовна, доктор философских наук, профессор Российского государственного педагогического университета им. А. И. Герцена (191186, Россия, Санкт-Петербург, Набережная реки Мойки, д. 48); доцент Санкт-Петербургского государственного университета (199034, Россия, Санкт-Петербург, Университетская набережная, 7–9)

Information about author

Audra-Kristina I. Zabulionite, Doctor of Philosophy, Professor of the A. I. Herzen Russian State Pedagogical University (48, Moika River embankment, St. Petersburg, 91186, Russia); Associate Professor at St. Petersburg State University (7–9, Universitetskaya embankment, St. Petersburg, 199034, Russia)

Статья поступила в редакцию / The article was submitted	17.01.2024
Одобрена после рецензирования / Approved after reviewing	02.02.2024
Принята к публикации / Accepted for publication	12.02.2024