

**THE METHODOLOGY OF CULTURAL STUDIES:  
NOMADOLOGY AND THE NON-LINEAR BEING OF MAN****METODOLOGIA STUDIILOR CULTURALE: NOMADOLOGIE ȘI FIINȚA  
NELINEARĂ A OMULUI****TETIANA UVAROVA<sup>1</sup>,**

PhD in Arts, lecturer,

International Humanitarian University, Odessa, Ukraine

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2628-7399>**OKSANA GOSTEVA<sup>2</sup>,**

postgraduate student,

International Humanitarian University, Odessa, Ukraine

<https://orcid.org/0009-0004-1048-0391>**SVITLANA POHASIY<sup>3</sup>,**

postgraduate student,

International Humanitarian University, Odessa, Ukraine

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8419-4399>

CZU 130.2

DOI <https://doi.org/10.55383/amtap.2023.1.19>

*This article updates the problem of cultural studies as a specific field of humanitarian knowledge. It has been stated that, with a certain similarity in the understanding of the ontology of culture (and in relation to the general boundaries of the problem field of humanitarian knowledge), the knowledge about various aspects of the cultural life of man and society is separated by the existing boundaries of the scientific competence of various social and human sciences, which contradicts the process of understanding the integrity of the cultural phenomenon itself. Cultural studies, learning culture as a whole, already by virtue of this circumstance cannot be a humanitarian science „among others”. This circumstance complicates the process of self-determination of cultural studies as an independent science (including the reflection of its method). Despite the fact that the emphasis on cultural studies as a specific area of theoretical knowledge is recognized by the Humanities, however, the problem of identifying the scientific method, which is associated with the final legitimization of this field of knowledge of culture, has not been sufficiently convincing yet. It is concluded that the Humanities are in dire need of rigor and improvement of their scientific status. With the exception of the descriptive part in these sciences, everything else remains the opinion of individual authors.*

**Keywords:** nomadology, cultural studies, art, methodology, method, methodology of cultural studies

*Acest articol actualizează problema culturologiei ca domeniu specific al cunoașterii umanitare. S-a constatat că, în cazul unei interpretări specifice a noțiunii de cultură ontologică (și în raport cu limitele generale ale câmpului problematic al cunoașterii umanitare), cunoștințele despre diversele aspecte ale vieții culturale a omului și a societății sunt separate prin limitele existente ale competenței științifice a diferitor științe sociale și umane, ceea ce contravine procesului de cunoaștere integră a fenomenului cultural în sine. Reieșind din aceste circumstanțe, culturologia, cunoașterea culturii în general, nu poate fi o știință umanitară „printre alte” științe. Acest lucru complică procesul de autodeterminare a culturologiei ca știință*

---

1 E-mail: [uvarovatajana71@gmail.com](mailto:uvarovatajana71@gmail.com)

2 E-mail: [okvanova@gmail.com](mailto:okvanova@gmail.com)

3 E-mail: [kidsmoviefest@gmail.com](mailto:kidsmoviefest@gmail.com)

*de sine stătătoare (inclusiv reflectarea sa metodică). În pofida faptului că accentul pus pe culturologie, ca domeniu specific al cunoașterii teoretice, este recunoscut de științele umanitare, problema identificării metodei științifice vizavi de legitimarea finală a acestei zone de cunoaștere culturală nu a beneficiat de suficientă atenție. Se concluzionează că științele umanitare au nevoie stringent de revigorare și îmbunătățire a statutului lor științific. Cu excepția părții introductive, punctele de vedere expuse în contextul acestor științe exprimă opiniile individuale ale autorilor.*

**Cuvinte-cheie:** nomadologie, culturologie, artă, metodologie, metodă, metodologia culturologiei

## Introduction

Various means of man and culture studies, those declared as a special humanitarian methodology, have blurred the frames of the traditional scientific interest, have limited significantly the belief in the omnipotence of scientific research. Now everyone is well aware that science is just one of the phenomena of culture, that it has not always been as significant as it has been in the last three centuries, and, perhaps, will not be so significant in the future either. The very fact is challenged of the leadership of science in culture. However, this methodology was noticeably inferior in efficiency to the methodology of natural science. The proposed means of humanitarian knowledge do not meet most of the other requirements that a scientific method must meet. The violation of the requirement of universality caused the most criticism: can experiences be the same for everyone? Do they meet the adequacy requirements? (in any case, in the sense of the divergence of these means?) The means of Humanities, as a rule, have the aim to obtain a negative result: how not to act, what is better not to hope for in the process of scientific research, how to destroy the existing models of reality. For the organization of positive research, it is better to research the relevant discourse. But if Descartes understood „discourse” as logically clear, evidence-based and testable reasoning” [1 c. 417], then in postmodernism it is a description of natural, psychologically and socially justified associative connections in the process of transition from one statement to another. Derrida spoke about the „need to interpret a sentence in the context of another sentence, where the first one takes on a new meaning” [2 c. 57]. However, how can we solve the problem of understanding? In general, the actual „methods” of such interpretation are citation, compilation, collage, well-chosen metaphor. It is interesting in itself, but one cannot make a scientific methodology out of it.

## Methodology evolution a special branch of philosophical knowledge

What has culminated the development of methodology as a special field of philosophical knowledge today? Let us summarize some (not final, of course) results of the evolution of methodology in short theses.

We have succeeded to make significant progress in the development of the logic and methodology of scientific research. The use of various general scientific methods has been rationally studied, the methods of obtaining and substantiating knowledge are described, the forms and boundaries of its development have been identified. The criterion of scientific character is formulated and, accordingly, the boundaries of scientific knowledge, in general, are indicated: no statement or system of statements can be considered scientific unless they are fundamentally subject to empirical confirmation (verification) or refutation (falsification).

Attempts a) to identify metaphysics with philosophy in general and b) to replace philosophy with scientific („positive”) methodology, begun by O. Conte [3 c.34], continued by empiriocriticism and logical positivism, and completed with post-positivism, but they have not succeeded. It turned out that the program of empiricism – the complete reduction of all terms and statements of scientific theories to statements about observations (to „elementary” empirical data) – is impossible. Theoretical terms are fundamentally irreducible from science, not to mention the fact that the very difference between theoretical and empirical terms is relative.

The program of rationalism is feasible, including the free promotion of coherent scientific ideas and hypotheses. However, if one accepts the criterion of scientific character, all the statements made are subject to empirical confirmation or refutation. This means that the rationalist program of liberation from metaphysics will meet the same difficulties that the program of empiricism has already faced.

It was not possible to limit the subject of methodology to the study of solely the language of science. The language itself cannot be completely reduced either to mathematics, or to any one logical calculus, or even to their combination. It is not possible to exclude completely the natural language with its polysemy from the language of science. This polysemy is determined, in the terminology of A. Wittgenstein, by „language games” – the real use (pragmatics) of language. The idea of Wittgenstein’s „language games” is better described in his work „Philosophical Investigations” [4].

By the end of the 20th century, most parties had almost agreed that metaphysics is not a part of science, but metaphysical prerequisites are always explicitly or implicitly present in scientific reasoning and in accepted theories and paradigms in the form of ultimate foundations (in the terminology of Aristotle – „first philosophy”). On the other hand, according to the principle of feedback, the methodology of science (like other areas of philosophical knowledge) is built according to the criteria of scientific rationality, no matter how the criteria are weakened over time. The only exception is the area of philosophical principles accepted on faith (ontological and epistemological ones), which play the role of prerequisites for both scientific and methodological modelling (and, therefore, systemic representation). After all, the importance of scientific advances is determined mainly by their metaphysical and methodological significance. Apparently, the opposite is also true: the importance of methodology and metaphysics is determined primarily by their scientific significance.

The attempts have failed to create a special methodology of humanitarian knowledge, just as the attempts to oppose it to the methodology of natural science. Human cognition is single. The Humanities, insofar as they are sciences, must meet the same criteria of rationality as scientific knowledge about nature. However, due to the formulation of the problem of a person, it became possible to separate two different goals of scientific activity – depending on the specifics of the object of research. Firstly, it is the formulation of general laws and regularities (nature, society, thinking, cultural evolution), and summarizing under them the data obtained (nomothetic work). Secondly, it is the description of the world from the point of view of individual or collective intentions and norms of life (ideographic work). For humanitarian knowledge, both types of tasks are relevant, although the predominance of the second type is characteristic. Humanitarian texts differ markedly from natural science works in their predominantly descriptive and narrative style of presentation.

Those philosophers that put the man in the centre of their picture of the world focused their efforts on analyzing the types of understanding according to its object – the text itself. The weak side of this philosophy was the methodological side, precisely – the answers to the question of how understanding is realized, and how to evaluate its results. It is worth mentioning, that scientists mainly focused their efforts on the analysis of the concepts of the system representation, but its structural side remained on the sideline.

The phenomenological reduction procedure developed by Husserl [5 c.12-21] concerns the systems theory. Indeed, the systemic representation of an object begins with the fixation of a certain concept, and then the certain structure of the thing of interest is selected. However, those who wanted to create a special methodology of humanitarian knowledge used phenomenology to define understanding as an almost exclusively subjective phenomenon associated with the search for various semantic, conceptual fields in which the text is placed, and not the ways of objects’ modelling. Understanding has been limited to a continuous and endless stream of possible interpretations (Heidegger’s idea of the „hermeneutic circle” as the last instance of knowledge) [6]. At the same time, the ontological side remained on the sidelines. By abandoning the desire for objectivity, anthropological philosophy states

the question of the very existence of scientific methodology and, accordingly, the practical significance of science.

The subjectivization and relativization of the phenomenon of understanding led postmodern philosophers to the definition of the principle of deconstruction – to the requirement to reject any preferential (primarily logical) grounds for understanding an object. The general acceptance of this principle of „negative methodology” would naturally mean the final „closure” of science. Nevertheless, the principle of deconstruction can also play a positive role in methodology – as a means of indicating the limitations of any interpretations and models, as a reminder that a model and an object are never identical, as a way to rid science of dogmatism and „blindness” of the researcher’s consciousness.

This primarily concerns culturology, which is established in the system of social and humanitarian sciences in the second half of the 20th century, and is largely determined not only by the nature of the era itself, but also by a new understanding of the role of culture in the life of a person and society.

### **Culturology and humanitarian knowledge**

Knowledge about various aspects of the cultural life of a person and society is divided by the established boundaries of the scientific competence of various social and humanitarian sciences, and this fact contradicts the process of cognizing the integrity of the culture phenomenon itself. Culturology, which studies culture as a whole, cannot be a humanitarian science „among others” by virtue of this circumstance. This circumstance complicates the process of self-determination of culturology as an independent science (including the reflection of its method). Despite the fact that the allocation of cultural studies as a specific area of theoretical knowledge is recognized by the humanitarians, however, the problem of identifying the scientific method, which is associated with the final legitimization of this area of knowledge about culture, has not yet been resolved convincingly.

The culturology paradigm is associated with a certain method of cognition the reality; it has integrated the resources of various sciences of the social and humanitarian cycle and formed a special area of subject ontology.

The difference between the scientific paradigm, on the one hand – from philosophical discourse, and on the other – from the methodology of private sciences, lies in the fact that here there is an organic integration of the results and methods of various areas of social and humanitarian knowledge around the actual problem field.

The paradigm method presupposes the involvement of not only the rational resources of the individual, but also the inclusion of other individuals’ energies, with the help of which a model of cultural reality is not only understood, but created. As a result of scientific reflection and interpretation of „cultural texts” (that is, knowledge gained in other sciences of the humanitarian profile), the culturology discourse not only analyzes, interprets and understands, but also „collects” the cultural reality „scattered” in the problem areas of the social and humanitarian knowledge, ontologizes culture as an integrity.

The need for interdisciplinary scientific integration was caused by several circumstances. Firstly, understanding the essence of individual cultural phenomena, even in every separate science, required an interdisciplinary methodology, and inevitably assumed an interdisciplinary character. Secondly, the reflection of culture as an integrity could not become the object of any single science – the object of knowledge with such a scale „eroded” its subject area. Thirdly, a list of problems appeared in the world, the „ontological scale” of which exceeded the epistemological capabilities of each science separately. The awareness has occurred of the limited possibilities and even the exhaustion of the classical sciences to solve a fundamentally new class of problems separately, including due to the analytical („abstract”) nature of traditional scientific disciplines. Foremost, in the formation of a culturology paradigm, an ontologization of the object of cognition took place – a certain class of phenomena and

facets of the existence of a person and society was united in the concept of „culture”. It was during this period that a culturology paradigm began to take shape, and its formation coincides with a new stage in the development of social and humanitarian knowledge – the stage of the formation of scientific paradigms: new areas of knowledge based on the natural and organic integration of the results and methods of various sciences (this trend, as it was already noted, is characteristic mainly for the sciences of the social and humanitarian profile).

The richness of the problematic and scientific spectra of culturology testifies not only about the variety of scientific forms in which the culturology thought can be formed, but also about the complementarity of its various aspects, which in their totality form a single complex discipline – culture knowledge as a multifaceted and multidimensional phenomenon. A systemic synthesis has taken place, the result of which is something more than the sum of the initial phenomenon.

Along with the ontologization of the object of cognition, the question arose of identifying the scientific method of cultural studies. In the field of methodological reflection, the process of generating new means and tools for cognizing culture has revived. At the same time, the most important difference between the paradigmatic humanitarian knowledge is the dominance of a personality-oriented methodology – the appeal of the humanitarian community to topical issues of human existence in the world.

The scientific method is not only the knowledge about a person and the world received and ordered in a certain way, but also a system of rational methods and ideological principles of constructing truth. Conceptualization of the ways and methods of research, the conceptual apparatus, the principles of interpretation of the enquired material – all this largely determines and legitimizes (at first within the scientific community) this or that picture of the world.

The culturology paradigm begins to form based on the philosophical methodology. Moreover, it was the philosophical knowledge that the foundations of the culturological method were laid in, foremost in the works of E. Cassirer [7 c. 104-162]. The tendency for the formation of inter-scientific ties, as already noted, is determined by various factors. On the one hand, a class of complex social and humanitarian problems is being actualized, which cannot be solved fundamentally within the competence of individual sciences of a social science profile; on the other hand, the scientific community reflects on the limitations and even exhaustion of the methodology and methods of the social and humanitarian sciences.

The generation of culturology as a theoretical paradigm and as a field of scientific knowledge fits into the concept of a historical change in the paradigms of scientific knowledge proposed by T. Kuhn [8 c. 250].

The actualization of the problem field should be considered as the most important factor (and condition) for the birth of a culturology paradigm – the formation and correction of the scientific method, which, according to Kuhn’s concept, is always tied to the historical and cultural situation, and the method itself acts as a derivative of the activities of the scientific community.

The formation of a certain humanitarian community is taking place, united by a culturally centred discourse, within which the problematization and ontologization of a special reality takes place, fixed by the category of culture as „the material and spiritual habitat created by man” [9 c.84], as a form of creation and expression of human nature, as an existentially oriented „block” of methods and results of human activity.

The scientific paradigm acts simultaneously as a method of cognition, and as the methodology for interpreting „cultural texts”, and as a model of cultural reality, which is a kind of conceptual framework through which the scientific community sees its „picture of the world”. Of course, scientific knowledge fixes objective reality, but its truth is relative, it is legitimized within the framework of the corresponding paradigm.

Many well-known scientific paradigms have gone through a similar path of formation. Let us mention the synergetic paradigm of knowledge. Firstly, the scientific community reflects on the realm of reality, which cannot be explained with the classical scientific concepts. Then it is ontologized by means of a specific system of abstractions. Then the realities behind the abstractions are structured into new interpretational models, parts of which were previously included in the subject area of other sciences. These models ontologize a synergistic picture of self-organizing reality. The scientific method of synergy is based on the principles of integrity and complexity of self-developing systems, the concept of phase transitions of a system from one type of homeostasis to another through a different ratio of order and chaos, etc. The synergetic method reveals new patterns of dynamics of self-developing systems, including culture.

On the one hand, the specificity of the culturology method lies in a certain continuity of philosophical knowledge. As it was already noted, the methodology of the culturology paradigm as a kind of meta-science is based on the method developed in the realm of philosophy. However, there is a clear opposition here (foremost in relation to the positivist methodology), which absolutizes the role of a strictly rational discourse and outwardly recorded observations carried out in the field of experimental sciences. This opposition is natural – the possibilities of the intellect and rational knowledge are limited, as the 20th century showed. Its highest form of achievement is the understanding of the contradictoriness of being and the knowledge that reflects it. While resolving the next contradiction, the mind inevitably rests on the next, and so on ad infinitum. However, there are other forms and stages of spiritual cognition, when the synthesis of antinomies is possible. P. Florensky believed that the source of such knowledge is not the mind, but the heart. To cognize with the mind means „to recognize the contradiction”, to comprehend with the heart means „to understand completely”. The ability for holistic cognition appears because of the „transubstantiation of man” as a result of his real and holistic introduction to being, incarnation in being [10 c. 218 (T1. II)].

E. Cassirer, who made a significant contribution to the conceptualization of the culturology paradigm, pointed out that the human mind seeks to know and understand the universe as a kind of integrity [7 c.104-162]. He believed that the forms of culture cannot be described using conventional methods of logic. Culturology thought is holistic and syncretic, it goes beyond the „completed forms of pure scientificity” [11 c.412]. Cultural thought does not fit into strictly scientific approaches to culture (within general scientific or specialized methodologies): it includes both specialized forms of culture (art, philosophy, religion) and everyday forms of cultural identity; the scientific methods of cognition are organically combined with artistic and even religious and mystical reflections in it. Such a cultural synthesis is legitimate and productive in relation to the comprehension of culture.

Working on the problem field of other Humanities, culturology contextualizes the most pressing social and political problems, considering them both as a factor and as a result of diverse determinations. By interpreting problems within the boundaries of its method, culturology gives them depth and perspective of the solution. Cultural discourse, and this is very important, reinterprets (and restructures) the problems of other sciences, introducing their conceptual developments into a broader humanitarian context.

The specificity of the method of understanding and interpretation makes it possible to include various socio-cultural phenomena („cultural texts”) in the subject field, which are the object of analysis of other social and humanitarian sciences (for example, a literary text, which is an object of literary criticism, and linguistics, and psychology, and history).

Culturology also provides the specificity of its method with the constructive nature of research, which is not limited to the accumulation of facts and their interpretation. It implements the method through the embodiment of the opposite algorithm and logic of cognition existing in the exact sci-

ences: not from empirical facts or particular manifestations of culture to theoretical constructions, but through conceptual analysis of the „texts of culture” to recreate the phenomenon of culture in its ontological completeness and integrity.

When postmodern philosophers describe human behaviour and various shifts in the cultural evolution, they look for non-classical ways of representing them. Thus, the postmodern philosophers J. Deleuze and F. Guattari [12 c.152] invented the term „nomadology”. The authors of the concept of nomadology believe that human existence is nonlinear, subject to random deviations, resembles a „rhizome” – the rootstock of a plant or a tuber, similar to the potato one. In this „tuber-rhizome”, countless factors of human life are intertwined – from rational actions and language games to unconscious actions and communication with the help of facial expressions. This rhizome unfolds and deepens gradually, unpredictably, has a beginning, but seems to have no end. Its shape is not predetermined – there are not two identical tubers, and the stem of each of them can sprout in almost any direction. In this „labyrinth” (if you have read the detective novel of the famous philosopher U. Eco „The Name of the Rose” [13], then you will certainly remember his library, hidden in the labyrinth) of the unpredictability of the „a linear” rhizome, the possibility of self-organization and creativity lurks. And the process itself, as the authors believe, is more important than the result. This model is the „nomadism” of being, however, it seems to be „holistic”. Nevertheless, it is opposed to the „structure”, and this structure for some reason is understood (this is the tradition of using the term in French philosophy) in the form of only a centred, unidirectional, unambiguously linear system. For comparison, Deleuze and Guattari point to the differences between chess and the game of Go – the game of nomads. The possible development of events on the chessboard, although extremely diverse, is still fundamentally predictable. Let us remember computer chess programs that are able to compete on equal terms with international grandmasters. The same cannot yet be said about the game of Go, in which throws of equivalent pebbles on a 19x19 field (in an open space of sand), and their random arrangement each time give these figures a new situational meaning. Traditional deterministic prediction is becoming impracticable. This, the authors believe, is the vision of the world by nomads, and historians have never understood either their culture or their way of thinking.

From the philosophic point of view, the rhizome is contrasted with a straight tree-root or an arborescent structure that is associated with the classical way of thinking. A root has its central line and goes deep down, while a rhizome has no sense-bearing centre and it grows wider or broadens. From the point of view of ethnography the rhizome is nomadic culture whereas a root is a representation of traditional settled culture. In other words, the nomads are opposed to the state as they do not share the space, being in the strict frames, they get separated in the unlimited and endless space. According to Deleuze and Guattari, the rhizome is characterized by the following features or principles: the principle of heterogeneity and connection, the rhizome does not have either beginning or ending, so it can be interrupted, broken at any point and then connected to any other part of it; so the rhizome ceaselessly creates „connections between semiotic chains and organizations”; the principle of multiplicity (a unity which is multiple in itself): there is no unity which could become the kernel of the object and no subject that can be separated into clear identified structures; „the next principle was the principle of „a signifying rupture”: should the rhizome be broken at one or another point, it would start growing again on along one of its old lines or along a completely new line; another principle of rhizome philosophy was „cartography” and „decalcomania” instead of using „structural or generative models” which were still based on „a logic of tracing (calque)”, the authors propagated the use of a map. While traditional tree-like logic is mainly based on tracing and reproduction, the rhizome is absolutely incompatible with any kind of the genetic axis and profound structure; „the rhizome is altogether different, a *map and not a tracing*”, „the orchid does not reproduce the tracing of the wasp”; it forms a map with the wasp, in a rhizome. The map is open to alterations while the tracing always refers to the same.

The rhizome, seen by Deleuze and Guattari as the only reality and the new unity, resembles a mycelium which does not include the main root or the arborescent structure. It is a form in which the smaller root offshoots grow or disappear in any places in a really unpredictable way. Why is this process so unpredictable? Because, according to the writers, the rhizome is a lateral progression which consists of instant and random branching that may go in any direction. Thus, they reject any connections that lead from reasons/causes to results. The rhizome is flat, so all the events take place on the surface, without going into the depth. It does not involve any structures with the settled centres or connections. It only has the randomly appearing, starting anywhere and at any time quasi-structures which either disappear almost instantly or move continuously on the surface of the rhizome, along the evasion lines. However, the evasion lines are not the connecting skeleton of the rhizomorphic reality. Its unity is determined by the fact that the evasion lines can haphazardly connect any parts of the rhizome for a short moment. In this concern, the unity of the rhizome (as opposed to the classical vision of a structure) is structureless and causeless. At the same time, Deleuze and Guattari do not go as far as to completely deprive the rhizome of its causal logic and meaningfulness. They state that similar to synergy, where there may be some junctions where events are linked by causative relations, in the rhizomorphic world such zones might be found as well. As the rhizome extends, any multiplicity may be connected to other multiplicities by superficial stems forming a kind of structures called plateaus. On these plateaus on the surface of the rhizome the focuses of meaningfulness may appear. Thus, each plateau can be read starting anywhere and can be related to any other plateau, and all the person's knowledge can be seen as assemblage of heterogeneous texts (plateaus).

#### **Nomadologics and the dimension of culture and art**

From the beginning of the 21st century, the consequences of the ontological crisis and anthropological pessimism in culture began to arise more and more clearly. The nomadological model of the worldview of the art offers an adequate explanation for new trends in art in a cultural context. Nomadology (from nomad: nomad) is the concept of a new vision of the world. It is characterized by the rejection of the ideas of a rigid structure based on dual oppositions, as well as the ideas of strict predetermination. In the nomadological dimension, chaos is in the centre of the study, the essence of which is the rejection of the structural organization of being and the understanding of space formed by a multitude of semantic and axiological definite elements (points) linked by a discretely differentiated connection. The essence of these tendencies lies in the return to the sphere of private life, to the spiritual problems of artistic phenomena, in general to those certain fictitious forms of artistry. The main reasons for the change in artistic orientation are ideological disarmament, the decline of the Artist's image, exorbitant narcissism and cynicism. There is a prime of a multitude of the most diverse artistic associations and artistic modern „rites”, which one could call artistic only conventionally. This should include types of fundamentalism, interest in pagan rituals, esotericism, occultism, ecological movement, meditation, magic, spiritualism, etc., in a word – everything that was previously considered superstitious, commercial and primitive. Marginality as a condition of individuals has come to the surface of public consciousness. They are located on the borders between cultures that conflict with each other. Guattari and Deleuze called such groups „tribes” with their „tribal psychology. „Therefore, in the Western consciousness there is an interest to micro-groups, small tribes, interconnected by a network of socioeconomic and bio-cultural relations. Sociologists and specialists in culturology associate this emergence of a specific experimental art with attempts to obtain the so-called „group solidarity”. As Guattari has emphasized, the „tribe” in its social life tends to „transversality” – metaphysical „transverseness” relative to the generally accepted – to a plurality of rituals, to banal life, to general duality and ambiguity, to play, to carnivalism. The „new tribalism” of the century of tribes postulated by Guattari and Deleuze destroys, undermines the traditional con-



traditions and boundaries between magic, art and science, and allegedly contributes to the emergence of „Dionysian culturology” capable of investigating these phenomena of art as a complex of organic structures. These paradigms have changed the myth of the linear development of history of art (that is, the idea of historical progress) for the „polyphonic vitalism.” It is necessary to pay attention to the striking paradox of the artistic consciousness of the 2000s: the constant oscillation between the growing massification and the development of the ethical and aesthetic consciousness of small art groups.

The relativization of values takes place, a relativization of the idea of perfection. It is the time of the secondary ideal, the time of omnivorous and imperfection. A person in such a situation experiences disorientation.

(Let us note in parentheses that the interest to the differences between Western and Eastern thinking is by no means only of academic significance. For example, European and American political scientists, reproducing their ideas of rational expediency, ask themselves what the global strategic goals of modern rapidly developing China are. However, most likely the question is inappropriate: there may be simply no distant goals. The next tasks can be solved depending on how the „pebbles” are located at this stage of the game).

The analogy of humanitarian and social objects with the subjects of non-classical natural science is obvious, and the authors of the synergetic paradigm, for example I. Prigozhin, have repeatedly drawn their attention to this fact [14 c. 312]. However, what are the implications of this analogy? Do you doubt the methodological suitability of this philosophy for the Humanities (and at the same time, perhaps, for the analysis of various dissipative – „scattering” – structures that are interesting to modern natural science)?

Let us pay attention to the differences. When synergetic examines super-complex systems, it does not forget its „kinship” with the classical science, which it grew from. Therefore, non-equilibrium thermodynamics does not abandon quantitative characteristics – albeit gigantic (nearly  $1 \times 10^{25}$ ), but still quantitative. Experiments and research methods for synergetics are quite „benign” from a scientific point of view. In other words, synergetics does not „cover” classical science and its linear methodology, but only indicates their insufficiency and boundaries. The ontological question is also open – about the relationship between linear and nonlinear ways of organizing of being. At the same time, attempts continue to limit the uncertainty of the appearance of bifurcation points in the time and place as much as possible (of course, statistically). Synergetics reminds us that science is just knowledge and, like any knowledge, it has its limits, in particular, when we are unable to foresee millions of accidents and weak disturbances and predict the behaviour of an object. Thus, when „order out of chaos” nonetheless arises, then the classical ideas regain their rights. Nobody calls for the deconstruction of existing knowledge, for the abandonment of mathematics, logic, rationality and the transition exclusively to descriptions in the language of metaphors and epithets, which are characteristic of art.

### **Conclusion**

It seems to us that the claims to the methodology of the new Humanities, as well as the claims to a complete rejection of scientific methodology, would seem justified if humanitarian knowledge had passed a part of its path towards natural science. However, this has not yet been done. The Humanities are in dire need of rigor and enhancement of their scientific status. Except for the descriptive part in these sciences, everything else remains the opinions of individual authors, even if these opinions are combined into concepts that are accepted as paradigms. The evidence base and the predictive part are almost completely absent. Until we begin to apply scientific methods in humanitarian knowledge in the very sense abovementioned, until scientific theories, organized according to the classical canons, appear, there is no point in talking about the inappropriateness of scientific methodology. At the same

time, references to the particular complexity of objects in the Humanities cannot be accepted. In natural science, there are as many equally complex things as you like – from the universe as a whole to the description of the phenomenon of life.

Should the Humanities follow the path of natural science? Apparently not! Natural science is unthinkable without quantitative measurements and mathematics. However, this is just of little interest to the Humanities. Hard determinism with its unambiguous predictability of results is not very interesting either. We should seek for other possibilities.

Apparently, the main methodological question that remained unresolved by the Humanities is precisely the question of the adequacy of their methods, i.e. the question of the conceptual relevance of the means used. It seems to us that the systemic method, in particular, in the form of parameters of the systems theory, meets both of these requirements. Despite the fact that the postmodern philosophers proclaimed the rejection of the systemic method (this method, in their opinion, „drives” creative thought into the narrow framework of the separate deterministic concept), they still did not manage to get rid of the systematic presentation of their subject. For example, „integrity” (in the case of „rhizome”) is often used. Nevertheless, „integrity” is just one of the system parameters. Humanitarian knowledge, indeed, refers to the subjectivity of understanding an object through experiences, through ascribing values to objects, through indicating goals and through intentional relations, which a person uses to „refer” to the world in a certain way. And humanitarian knowledge does it much more often than natural science. Here it would be most natural to turn to the second (relational, which is dual to the attributive) definition of the system. In this case, the systems seem to be the arbitrary things, and some of their features correspond to the relevant attitude. The structure here is not the relations (natural science seeks to represent them in the form of properties), but a certain (not rigidly defined) set of the features of an object. At the same time, it remains possible to formulate systematic patterns. There is no need to call the „integrity” of the rhizome „structural”, and its linearity is not necessary. However... the discussion is not over. Perhaps you are using a different way to preserve the unity of knowledge and a single methodology. Nevertheless, you see, there is something to think about here, especially, for the Humanities.

### **Findings**

The article actualizes the problem of the methodology of humanitarian knowledge, in particular the methods of cognition of culture. The authors draw the attention to the fact that, on the one hand, it is difficult to single out a special methodology of humanitarian knowledge, since human cognition is one, and on the other hand, the difficulty lies in the fact that the subject of the methodology of science that studies culture as an integrity is not clear.

The article comprehends the methods of cognition of culture in the context of the formation of a culturology paradigm. The opinion is expressed that culturology, which has been established in the system of social and humanitarian sciences not so long ago, is not yet convincingly legitimized, the problem of identifying its scientific method is still not convincingly resolved. Traditionally, the science of culture integrates the results and methods of various fields of social and humanitarian knowledge around the actual problem field. In cultural studies, scientific cognition usually becomes possible through the study of the corresponding discourse.

The culturology discourse not only analyses, interprets and understands, but also „collects” cultural reality, „scattered” in the problem areas of social and humanitarian knowledge, ontologizes culture as a whole. Namely, the culturology discourse reinterprets (and restructures) the problems of other sciences, introducing their conceptual developments into a broader humanitarian context. A systemic synthesis takes place, the result of which is something more than the sum of the initial phenomena.

In the course of scientific reflections, we have emphasized that a certain class of phenomena and facets of human and society's existence is united in the concept of „culture”, and a special place in the

knowledge of culture belongs to topical issues of human existence in the world as a multifaceted and multidimensional phenomenon. Accordingly, culturology, in contrast to natural science, needs to turn to the subjectivity of understanding an object through experience, through assigning values to objects, through indicating goals and other intentional relations through which a person „refers” to the world in a certain way.

Therefore, the authors of the article propose a systemic method as a solution to the main methodological issue – the adequacy of methods of cognition of culture in its integrity. In particular, the method is proposed in the form of a parametric theory of systems, in which „integrity” is just one of the system parameters. Based on the nonlinearity of human being, susceptibility to many accidents and unpredictability, variability of self-organization and creativity („rhizome”), the authors of the article propose a nomadological concept as an instrument of cognition, taking into account that „nomadism” is revealed as „integrity.”

Focusing on some important issues of the methodology of culturology knowledge, which is still in the process of its formation, can contribute to further research in this area. The findings and the proposed methodological approaches, perhaps, will contribute to the further understanding of the nonlinearity of human life, as well as to building of the „order” out of „chaos” in the study of contemporary culture and art.

### Bibliographical References

1. ДЕКАРТ, Р. *Сочинения*. Т. 1. Москва: Мысль, 1989. ISBN 5-244-00022-5.
2. DERRIDA, J. *Die Struktur, das Zeichen und das Spiel im Diskurs der Wissenschaften von Menschen*. Postmoderne und Dekonstruktion. Stuttgart, 1993.
3. КОНТ, О. *Дух позитивной философии: Слово о положительном мышлении*. Предисл. М.М. Ковалевского. Санкт-Петербург: Вестник знания, 1910.
4. ВИТГЕНШТЕЙН, Л. *Философские исследования* [online]. Кембридж, 1945 [accesat 21 noiembrie, 2023]. Disponibil: <http://filosof.historic.ru/books/item/f00/s00/z0000273/index.shtml>
5. ГУССЕРЛЬ, Э. Феноменология. В: *Логос*. 1991, № 1, с. 19–21. ISSN 0869-5377.
6. ХАЙДЕГГЕР, М. *Бытие и время*. Москва: Ад Маргинем, 1997. ISBN 5-88059-021-6.
7. КАССИРЕР, Э. Лекции по философии и культуре. В: *Культурология: XX век*. Москва: Юрист, 1995, с. 104–162. ISBN 5-7357-0044-8.
8. КУН, Т. *Структура научных революций*. Москва: АСТ, 2020. ISBN 978-5-17-122824-8.
9. КАГАН, М.С. *Философия культуры*. Санкт-Петербург: Петрополис, 1996. ISBN 5-86708-073-0.
10. ФЛОРЕНСКИЙ, П. *Столы и утверждение истины*. Москва: Правда, 1990.
11. КОНДАКОВ, И.В., СОКОЛОВ, К.Б., ХРЕНОВ, Н.А. *Цивилизационная идентичность в переходную эпоху: культурологический, социологический и искусствоведческий аспекты*. Москва: Прогресс-Традиция, 2011. ISBN 978-5-89826-370-6.
12. ДЕЛЁЗ, Ж., ГВАТТАРИ, Ф. *Что такое философия?* Москва: Институт экспериментальной социологии, 1998.
13. ЭКО, У. *Имя розы: Роман*. В: *Иностранная литература*. 1988, № 8/10.
14. ПРИГОЖИН, И., СТЕНГЕРС, И. *Порядок из хаоса: Новый диалог человека с природой*. Москва: Прогресс, 1986.