



REVISTA INCLUSIONES

CENCIA EN TIEMPOS DE CAMBIOS

Revista de Humanidades y Ciencias Sociales

Volumen 7 . Número Especial

Julio / Septiembre

2020

ISSN 0719-4706

CUERPO DIRECTIVO

Directores

Dr. Juan Guillermo Mansilla Sepúlveda

Universidad Católica de Temuco, Chile

Dr. Francisco Ganga Contreras

Universidad de Tarapacá, Chile

Editor

Drdo. Juan Guillermo Estay Sepúlveda

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

Editor Científico

Dr. Luiz Alberto David Araujo

Pontificia Universidade Católica de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Editor Europa del Este

Dr. Aleksandar Ivanov Katrandzhiev

Universidad Suroeste "Neofit Rilski", Bulgaria

Cuerpo Asistente

Traductora: Inglés

Lic. Pauline Corthorn Escudero

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

Portada

Lic. Graciela Pantigoso de Los Santos

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

COMITÉ EDITORIAL

Dr. Jaime Bassa Mercado

Universidad de Valparaíso, Chile

Dra. Heloísa Bellotto

Universidad de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Dra. Nidia Burgos

Universidad Nacional del Sur, Argentina

Mg. María Eugenia Campos

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Francisco José Francisco Carrera

Universidad de Valladolid, España

Dr. Pablo Guadarrama González

Universidad Central de Las Villas, Cuba

Mg. Amelia Herrera Lavanchy

Universidad de La Serena, Chile

Dr. Claudio Llanos Reyes

Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso, Chile

Dr. Werner Mackenbach

Universidad de Potsdam, Alemania

Universidad de Costa Rica, Costa Rica

Mg. Rocío del Pilar Martínez Marín

Universidad de Santander, Colombia

Ph. D. Natalia Milanese

Universidad de Houston, Estados Unidos

Ph. D. Maritza Montero

Universidad Central de Venezuela, Venezuela

Dra. Eleonora Pencheva

Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria

Dra. Rosa María Regueiro Ferreira

Universidad de La Coruña, España

Dr. Andrés Saavedra Barahona

Universidad San Clemente de Ojrid de Sofía, Bulgaria

Dr. Efraín Sánchez Cabra

Academia Colombiana de Historia, Colombia

Dra. Mirka Seitz

Universidad del Salvador, Argentina

Ph. D. Stefan Todorov Kapralov

South West University, Bulgaria

COMITÉ CIENTÍFICO INTERNACIONAL

Comité Científico Internacional de Honor

Dr. Adolfo A. Abadía

Universidad ICESI, Colombia

Dr. Carlos Antonio Aguirre Rojas

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Martino Contu

Universidad de Sassari, Italia

Dr. Luiz Alberto David Araujo

Pontificia Universidad Católica de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Dra. Patricia Brogna

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

REVISTA INCLUSIONES

REVISTA DE HUMANIDADES
Y CIENCIAS SOCIALES

Dr. Horacio Capel Sáez

Universidad de Barcelona, España

Dr. Javier Carreón Guillén

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Lancelot Cowie

Universidad West Indies, Trinidad y Tobago

Dra. Isabel Cruz Ovalle de Amenabar

Universidad de Los Andes, Chile

Dr. Rodolfo Cruz Vadillo

*Universidad Popular Autónoma del Estado de Puebla,
México*

Dr. Adolfo Omar Cueto

Universidad Nacional de Cuyo, Argentina

Dr. Miguel Ángel de Marco

Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dra. Emma de Ramón Acevedo

Universidad de Chile, Chile

Dr. Gerardo Echeita Sarrionandía

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, España

Dr. Antonio Hermosa Andújar

Universidad de Sevilla, España

Dra. Patricia Galeana

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dra. Manuela Garau

Centro Studi Sea, Italia

Dr. Carlo Ginzburg Ginzburg

*Scuola Normale Superiore de Pisa, Italia
Universidad de California Los Ángeles, Estados Unidos*

Dr. Francisco Luis Girardo Gutiérrez

Instituto Tecnológico Metropolitano, Colombia

José Manuel González Freire

Universidad de Colima, México

Dra. Antonia Heredia Herrera

Universidad Internacional de Andalucía, España

Dr. Eduardo Gomes Onofre

Universidade Estadual da Paraíba, Brasil

CUADERNOS DE SOFÍA EDITORIAL

+ Dr. Miguel León-Portilla

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Miguel Ángel Mateo Saura

*Instituto de Estudios Albacetenses "Don Juan Manuel",
España*

Dr. Carlos Tulio da Silva Medeiros

Diálogos em MERCOSUR, Brasil

+ Dr. Álvaro Márquez-Fernández

Universidad del Zulia, Venezuela

Dr. Oscar Ortega Arango

Universidad Autónoma de Yucatán, México

Dr. Antonio-Carlos Pereira Menaut

Universidad Santiago de Compostela, España

Dr. José Sergio Puig Espinosa

Dilemas Contemporáneos, México

Dra. Francesca Randazzo

*Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Honduras,
Honduras*

Dra. Yolando Ricardo

Universidad de La Habana, Cuba

Dr. Manuel Alves da Rocha

Universidade Católica de Angola Angola

Mg. Arnaldo Rodríguez Espinoza

Universidad Estatal a Distancia, Costa Rica

Dr. Miguel Rojas Mix

*Coordinador la Cumbre de Rectores Universidades
Estatales América Latina y el Caribe*

Dr. Luis Alberto Romero

CONICET / Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dra. Maura de la Caridad Salabarría Roig

Dilemas Contemporáneos, México

Dr. Adalberto Santana Hernández

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Juan Antonio Seda

Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dr. Saulo Cesar Paulino e Silva

Universidad de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Dr. Miguel Ángel Verdugo Alonso
Universidad de Salamanca, España

Dr. Josep Vives Rego
Universidad de Barcelona, España

Dr. Eugenio Raúl Zaffaroni
Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dra. Blanca Estela Zardel Jacobo
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Comité Científico Internacional

Dra. Elian Araujo
Universidad de Mackenzie, Brasil

Mg. Romyana Atanasova Popova
Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria

Dra. Ana Bénard da Costa
Instituto Universitario de Lisboa, Portugal
Centro de Estudios Africanos, Portugal

Dra. Noemí Brenta
Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Ph. D. Juan R. Coca
Universidad de Valladolid, España

Dr. Antonio Colomer Vialdel
Universidad Politécnica de Valencia, España

Dr. Christian Daniel Cwik
Universidad de Colonia, Alemania

Dr. Eric de Léséulec
INS HEA, Francia

Dr. Andrés Di Masso Tarditti
Universidad de Barcelona, España

Ph. D. Mauricio Dimant
Universidad Hebrea de Jerusalem, Israel

Dr. Jorge Enrique Elías Caro
Universidad de Magdalena, Colombia

Ph. D. Valentin Kitanov
Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria

Mg. Luis Oporto Ordóñez
Universidad Mayor San Andrés, Bolivia

Dr. Gino Ríos Patio
Universidad de San Martín de Porres, Perú

Dra. María Laura Salinas
Universidad Nacional del Nordeste, Argentina

Dra. Jaqueline Vassallo
Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Argentina

Dra. Maja Zawierzeniec
Universidad Wszechnica Polska, Polonia

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía
Santiago – Chile
Representante Legal
Juan Guillermo Estay Sepúlveda Editorial

Indización, Repositorios y Bases de Datos Académicas

Revista Inclusiones, se encuentra indizada en:





REX



UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN



Universidad de Concepción



BIBLIOTECA UNIVERSIDAD DE CONCEPCIÓN

**CREATIVITY AND INNOVATION IN CULTURE: AN EFFORT TOWARDS INTERPRETING
THE PHILOSOPHY AND CULTURAL STUDIES OF M. K. PETROV**

Dr. Viktor P. Rimskiy

Belgorod State Institute of Art and Culture, Russian Federation
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4373-5942>
viktorrimskiy@bk.ru

Dr. Sergey N. Borisov

Belgorod State Institute of Art and Culture, Russian Federation
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3292-266X>
sergeyborisov2020@bk.ru

Ph. D. Oksana S. Borisova

Belgorod State Institute of Art and Culture, Russian Federation
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6323-4379>
oksanaborisova2020@bk.ru

Fecha de Recepción: 13 de abril de 2020 – **Fecha Revisión:** 11 de mayo de 2020

Fecha de Aceptación: 23 de junio de 2020 – **Fecha de Publicación:** 01 de julio de 2020

Abstract

The topic of the study is relevant due to the fact that innovations in culture (social and technological, scientific and educational, works of art and literature ones) and emerging new technologies based on them are still not sufficiently explicated, although innovations determined the historical and cultural evolution of different societies in the past as well, and they still determine the economic and socio-cultural dynamics of mankind nowadays. Innovative changes had and have both positive, revolutionary, and sometimes negative, destructive effects. The main goal of the article is to give author's own interpretation of the ideas of Mikhail Petrov (1923-1987) - a front-line soldier, a remarkable Soviet writer and translator, an outstanding scientist and philosopher who laid the foundations of Russian cultural studies, the sociology of science and education, innovation and the systematic approach in regionalistics and science.

Keywords

B. Latour — Civilization — Creativity — Cultural and historical typology — Culture — Innovations

Para Citar este Artículo:

Rimskiy, Viktor P.; Borisov, Sergey N. y Borisova, Oksana S. Creativity and innovation in culture: an effort towards interpreting the philosophy and cultural studies of M. K. Petrov. Revista Inclusiones Vol: 7 num Especial (2020): 155-165.

Licencia Creative Commons Attribution Non-Comercial 3.0 Unported
(CC BY-NC 3.0)

Licencia Internacional



Introduction

M. K. Petrov is comparable with Martin Heidegger not only in the ontologization of the language, "language is the house of being"¹, but also in the desire to understand adequately the antiquity through a high accuracy of translation². However, if Petrov in his works, for example, considered the very paradoxical dialectic of the "eternal" and "temporal" in philosophy, regarding the part of the ancient Greek *nomos* and connected it with the specifics of the ancient Greek language and polis law, but not at all with the ontological dialectic of "divine being" and One, considering all the "fusional", ontological issues as marginal product of philosophical nomothetics, in contrast to Heidegger.

In the semiotic aspect, it is possible to point out a lot of analogies with Michel Foucault - semantic and coincidental in the creation of texts ones³. The ideas of Petrov and Foucault are comparable not only in the time of their authors' lives and deaths, but also in coincidence of the main works, in drifting from structuralist-semiotic concepts to "subjectivity practices" and "mortal human"⁴, in turning to the history of philosophy precisely in the cultural context, in new point of view in understanding of antiquity. It would be interesting to compare the "discourse" of Foucault and the "thesaurus" of Petrov, as well as other ideas and concepts, not only discovering their convergence and coincidence, but also revealing the trajectory of divergence, a peculiar dialogue-dispute on the different sides of the Iron Curtain. They have a stylistic affinity and ease in writing "theoretical texts" in their native language, etc.

Bruno Latour in the same seventies / eighties of the last century also put forward equally nontrivial models of science virtually simultaneously with Petrov (even a little later)⁵, although Latour in France was not harassed by anyone for these ideas, and they are both

¹ M. Heidegger, Plato's doctrine of truth. Letter on humanism (Bern, 1947); M. K. Petrov, "Language and categorical structures", *Naukovedenie i istoriya kul'tury* (1973): 58-82 y M. K. Petrov, *Language, sign, culture* (Moscow: Nauka, 1991).

² M. Heidegger, *Heraclitus: The Inception of Occidental Thinking. Logic, Heraclitus' Teaching of the Logos* (Frankfurt on Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1979); M. Heidegger, *Parmenides* (Frankfurt on Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1982); M. K. Petrov, *Ancient culture* (Moscow: ROSSPEN, 1997); M. K. Petrov, *History of the European cultural tradition and its issues* (Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2004) y M. K. Petrov, *Issues of determinism in the ancient Greek philosophy of the classical period* (Rostov-on-Donu: YuFU, 2015).

³ M. Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (Paris: Gallimard, 1966); M. Foucault, *The Archeology of Knowledge* (Paris: Gallimard, 1969); M. Foucault, *Madness and civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason* (Paris: Gallimard, 1972); M. Foucault, *Dits et ecrits. 1954-1988. Vol. I-IV* (1994); M. K. Petrov, *History of the European cultural tradition and its issues* (Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2004) y M. K. Petrov, *Philosophical problems of the "science of science". Subject of sociology of science* (Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2006).

⁴ M. Foucault, *Dits et ecrits. 1954-1988. Vol. I-IV* (1994) y M. K. Petrov, *Language, sign, culture* (Moscow: Nauka, 1991).

⁵ B. Latour, *The pasteurization of France: War and peace of microbes-Irreductions* (Paris: A.-M. Metailie, 1984); B. Latour, "Les "vues" de l'esprit. Une introduction à l'anthropologie des sciences et des techniques", *Culture technique* num 14 (1985): 4-30; B. Latour, *Science in action How to follow scientists and engineers through society* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press., 1987); B. Latour, *Laboratory Life* (Paris: La Decouverte, 1988); M. K. Petrov, "Some issues of the Organization of Science in the Age of the Scientific and Technical Revolution", *Voprosy filosofii* num 10 (1968): 36-45; M. K. Petrov, *Self-awareness and Scientific Creativity* (Rostov-on-Don: Rostov University Press. 1992) y M. K. Petrov, *A systematic approach to the organization of a regional research center* (Rostov-on-Don: SKNTs VSh, 2009).

quite comparable in the perspective of the dialogue of ideas. M.K. Petrov made a parade of his "hypotheses" and "field studies," almost like P. Bourdieu⁶, constantly emphasizing that he was building his conceptualizations, including typological ones, using a hypothetical-deductive method based on "field research," which he considered as applicable for philosophy area, refuting the described empirical facts by bringing counterexamples.

People of such talent as M.K. Petrov was, never fit within the framework of "disciplinary" and, being the "founders of discursiveness"⁷, break out of the framework of any schools, trends, etc. Actually, this is the task of the philosopher: not to fit within the framework of "disciplinary" and diatribic (school), to be always free, first of all, in own thinking and life position.

We have some experience of a integral reading and reinterpretation of ideas and some concepts of Petrov's cultural studies and philosophy of science⁸, so let us try to rearrange some conceptual list that would enable to clarify Petrov's meanings of "creativity" and "innovation" in the modern context. We believe that it is worth, critically basing on M.K. Petrov's ideas, to relate the thematic line of innovation theory not only with the creativity, but also with more fundamental concepts of culture and civilization. After all, isn't 'creativity' just one of the modes of culture? Should the innovation theory deal only with creative innovations in the sphere of culture, or should we consider that innovations are also possible and necessary in the expanse of creative reproductions in their relationship with the development of civilizations? Isn't the creative reproduction the basis for our contemporary modernization leap in the transition to post-industrial civilization? How are the creativity and reproduction correlated with the cultural and civilizational typology? One can continue problematizing indefinitely. Obviously, this problematics in one way or another rests on methodological priorities and strategies.

Materials and Methods

First of all, we have to agree with those authors⁹ who states that the cultural (civilizational) methodology, which has replaced the formational paradigm over the last twenty years, has not eliminated its main 'sin' – that of historical materialism (dogmatism). Many Russian authors, applying the concepts of 'culture' and 'civilization' to the

⁶ P. Bourdieu, *Choses dites* (Paris: Minuit, 1987) y M. K. Petrov, *Historical and philosophical studies* (Moscow: ROSSPEN, 1996).

⁷ M. Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (Paris: Gallimard, 1966); M. Foucault, *The Archeology of Knowledge* (Paris: Gallimard, 1969); M. Foucault, *Madness and civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason* (Paris: Gallimard, 1972); M. Foucault, *Dits et ecrits. 1954-1988. Vol. I-IV* (1994) y V. P. Rimskiy, *The establishing discourse of Mikhail Petrov: an intellectual in the interior of cultural capital* (Moscow: Kanon+ ROOI «Reabilitatsiya», 2017), 6-25.

⁸ V. P. Rimsky, *Demons at Crossroads: Cultural and Historical Image of Totalitarianism* (Belgorod: BelGU, 2007); V. P. Rimsky, *Totalitarian Cosmos and a Person* (Belgorod: BelGU, 2008); V. P. Rimskiy, "The concept of 'innovation' in the philosophy of culture", in *Problemy filosofii kultury*, eds S.A. Nikolskiy (Moscow: IF RAN, 2012), 138–152; V.P. Rimskiy, and V.S. Ignatova, "The problem of 'tradition - innovation' and genesis of scientific and innovative subcultures (cultural and civilizational context)", *Nauka. Kultura, Iskusstvo* num 1 (2012): 34-57; V. P. Rimskiy, and V.S. Ignatova, "Genesis of Science, Innovation and Science University (to the ninetieth birthday of MK Petrova)", *Nauka. Kultura. Iskusstvo* num 2 (2013): 61–75 y V. P. Rimskiy, *The establishing discourse of Mikhail Petrov: an intellectual in the interior of cultural capital* (Moscow: Kanon+ ROOI «Reabilitatsiya», 2017), 6-25.

⁹ V.P. Makarenko, "Socio-cultural Background for the Studies by M.K. Petrov: the Problem of Exploration and Development" In *Mikhail Konstantinovich Petrov*, eds Neretina, S.S., (Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2010).

interpretation of specific historical facts, seriously believe that their own texts truly reflect the cultural and historical ontology. However, we can only discuss *ideal types*, as defined by Max Weber, that help us to identify some cultural and civilizational types and to construct certain concepts only on the basis of *systemic analogies*, *systemic patterns*, which are to some extent indifferent to the substantive (and ideological!) characteristics of empirical, specific historical systems that are studied by special sciences (history, historical psychology, ethnography, historical anthropology, sociology of culture, historical semiotics, etc.). Such division between the formal, systemic patterns and the substantial ones, in our opinion, allows avoiding that sin of historicism, of which K. Popper blamed almost all theories of the cultural-historical process.

When attempting to build a particular classification of cultural and civilizational ideal types, we are, first of all, interested in the applied, instrumental and methodological aspects. The definition of a particular socio-cultural entity and its placement as a unique phenomenon in the cultural and civilizational continuum helps us to overcome those ‘historicist’ (historical-materialist) schemes which continue dominating the contemporary Russian cultural studies and philosophy.

In this respect, the concept by M.K. Petrov is quite indicative in the part where he describes the difference between the traditional and the European modernist cultures: If we determine the level of development only by the date of birth, and everything that occurs later is bound to be more developed, then the European universal-conceptual type undoubtedly was and is still more developed. If the development is defined by other criteria – for example, by the society's ability to store and transfer a certain amount of knowledge and skills through a chain of generations – we have a totally different situation: up to the XVII–XVIII centuries, i.e. before the start of technological applications of science, countries with traditional cultures had been the most developed countries in the world¹⁰.

M.K Petrov generally believed that the European cultural-civilizational type was *anomalous* ‘dislocation’, – a deviation from the normal traditional, natural development of mankind.

The paragraph ‘We through the lens of a tradition’ in ‘*Yazyk. Znak. Kultura [Language. Sign. Culture]*’, his only book completely prepared for printing is the most representative for this idea of him.

Comparing us, for example, with primeval societies living according to the norms of personal-nominal coding and accounting for a great role of situations of a collective action (industry) in our life and a relatively small role of typified situations of an individual action, which lie in the basis of hereditary professionalism, a tradition from its own view of superiority would define us as something ‘halfway’ between tribal and traditional sociality, as ‘developed barbarity’ or ‘developed savagery’. Besides, it would use our own evidence — utopias, anti-utopias, studies devoted to derivation of philosophy from traditional sign systems of Egypt and Middle East — and easily prove to itself that we only dreamed of the transition to a developed collective state throughout our life where a human is not a slave of a group and group business, but business packed according to the measure of individual forces and possibilities is subjected to an individual and does not imply strict limitations by place and time on it: all that can be done tomorrow, can be done today, and all that can be done today

¹⁰ M. K. Petrov, *Self-awareness and Scientific Creativity* (Rostov-on-Don: Rostov University Press. 1992).

can be done tomorrow without destroying the system of interfamily contacts. Only a set of various unfortunate circumstances prevented Europe from entering this development and retarded its development to a tradition as the highest achievement of humankind... We assume that there is no such a sharp and current topic today as the issue of a dialogue between typologically different cultures, the issue of mutual understanding with possibly less risk of mistakes and smashing effects of mutual misunderstanding¹¹

Unfortunately, M.K. Petrov himself, in his works, using a semiotic criterion (personal-nominal, professional-nominal and universal-conceptual sociocodes) for the construction of his cultural typology, reproduced a trivial scheme 'archaism – traditionalism – modernization'. We could critically discuss the culturological constructs by M.K. Petrov. There is only one thing we'd like to point out: M.K. Petrov was well aware that he not only introduced new terms but also created *his own concepts* – partially formalized notions loaded with existential and metaphorical meanings by virtue of their speech (discourse) component and polemical orientation against parascientific dogmatism.

Discussion

However, not less fruitful (after certain modifications), for the development of a cultural-civilizational typology and identification of the role of cultural creativity and innovations in the history of mankind, besides the semiotic criterion of sociocodes, can be M.K. Petrov's ideas about more stable foundation for the cross-cultural typology: One foundation is more or less obvious – it is the foundation of wholeness. In other words, under all conditions, the culture, whatever type it be, is built as a set of social institutions and *relationships that form the pattern of successive existence of many* or at least several *generations of people*. This functional and stabilising aspect of culture – its, so to say, inertial component, an established *ritual* (italics ours – authors) – is precisely the 'relation of all things', 'a universal' of certain culture, which does not necessarily have to be realized through the exchange of goods (material relationship) but can also use other types of relationship and communication... The ritual – the bond of wholeness as such – looks like a *natural and universal relation*, which is present in our consciousness as a universal category¹².

While studying works by M.K. Petrov as a whole, one could notice, that he developed and used the methodology of the studying of diversity of cultures, based on identification of the inertial, functional-stabilising aspect of culture – a *ritual* as a universal holistic factor; a *sociocode* of culture as a storage medium of social memory and an informational and cultural key; and the *institution of renovation* associated with the function of *accumulation and transformation of innovations* and new information into a socio-cultural system¹³. There is also a methodology of intergenerational dynamics here, which has begun to concern the minds of humanitarian scientists and sociologists only recently.

¹¹ M. K. Petrov, *Language, sign, culture* (Moscow: Nauka, 1991).

¹² M. K. Petrov, *Self-awareness and Scientific Creativity* (Rostov-on-Don: Rostov University Press, 1992).

¹³ V. P. Rimskiy, "The concept of 'innovation' in the philosophy of culture", in *Problemy filosofii kultury*, eds S.A. Nikol'skiy (Moscow: IF RAN, 2012), 138–152; V. P. Rimskiy, and V.S. Ignatova, "The problem of 'tradition - innovation' and genesis of scientific and innovative subcultures (cultural and civilizational context)", *Nauka. Kultura, Iskusstvo* num 1 (2012): 34-57 y V. P. Rimskiy, and V.S. Ignatova, "Genesis of Science, Innovation and Science University (to the ninetieth birthday of MK Petrova)", *Nauka. Kultura. Iskusstvo* num 2 (2013): 61–75.

The ritual, sociocode and the institution of renovation are embodied in the specific *semiotic systems* (matrix texts) that ensure involvement of a person into the ritual, 'switch on' specific forms of activity and *types of technology*, 'dominant in this culture and bound into a system of socially necessary practical attitudes to the world'¹⁴. In our opinion, *the system* (ritual, sociocode, institution of renovation, semiotic forms, and technologies) identified by M.K. Petrov as a formative foundation for different types of culture corresponds more to the notion of *civilization* used in the contemporary scientific context.

A civilization can be defined as a holistic formation based on the universal foundation of specific historical types of social technologies as generally valid reproductive methods of activity, which are embodied in semiotic systems and sociocodes (semiotic and symbolic storage medium of socially significant information), institutions of renovation and translation of innovations, social memory (information matrices), forms of rationality (the knowledge and applied technologies of its use) and specific mental-anthropological structures that determine human behaviour in daily activities and social life.

The different modes of production demonstrate combinations of technologies that both preserve the legacy of past civilizations and include new *unstable formations* of technological *innovations* heralding the future modes of production (so inventions of the Chinese civilizational genius were incorporated into the fabric of European culture through *imitation* and later formed the basis of the applied, experimental European science as an innovative regulator of fundamentally new industrial technologies). The social technologies encoded in the semiotic systems become storage medium of specific *types of rationality* that can be used in different types of culture as *formal-ideal* structures, providing a *civilizational mechanism of succession, reproduction* and communication between cultural-civilizational worlds and a way of integrating a human being in certain rituals as universal bonds of civilization wholeness. Thus, we get an opportunity to distinguish more accurately between the categories in arrays 'civilization – formation' and 'social technologies – modes of production'.

This approach also allows *distinguishing between the categories of 'civilization' and 'culture'*: the civilization as a social and cultural entity is a *universal formative and reproductive foundation* for distinct *unique cultures* with diverse spatio-temporal and ethno-cultural characteristics, which are the media for the realization of *creativity* (creative innovation) with unique individuality and relevance (here and now), later solidifying in the universality and validity of *creative reproduction* (social technologies-innovations). M.K. Petrov rightly observes that complicated and cyclical professional technologies were very effective means of stabilization and *stable and dynamic development* of primary civilizational entities, the existence of which lasted for millenniums (Assyria, Babylon, Sumer, the Hittite state, Egypt, India and China "Pre-Axial Age time", ancient Judea, Mycenaean culture, the empire of the Incas and Mayans, and many others)¹⁵. The professional-nominal civilizations demonstrated certain plasticity, sometimes creating particular cultural-civilizational mutations and transitional systems. Therefore, not only the cultural heritage of ancient civilizations is still relevant for us – the mode of professional-personal technologies itself still defines the forms of modern human life, especially on that level of everyday life. However, here we have to specify these ideas of M.K. Petrov.

¹⁴ M. K. Petrov, *Self-awareness and Scientific Creativity* (Rostov-on-Don: Rostov University Press. 1992).

¹⁵ M. K. Petrov, *Language, sign, culture* (Moscow: Nauka, 1991) y M. K. Petrov, *Self-awareness and Scientific Creativity* (Rostov-on-Don: Rostov University Press. 1992).

In contemporary cultural and science studies, there is a viewpoint that we share, which identifies two types of rational cognition: contemplative-theoretical, or philosophical, and proper scientific-theoretical, which is characteristic, first of all, of the new European cultural tradition.

S.S. Averintsev¹⁶ paid attention to it in due time, and we justified it in some of our publications¹⁷. However, earlier, O.M. Freidenberg, an oldest Russian antiquity researcher, did not refer primary forms of rationality to entirely 'scientific' in her works, though she did not deny them in 'notionality' and specific rationality. She wrote:

“A mythological image and a notion are different means for cognizing the world; however, at a known historical stage they mutually conditioned each other. The antiquity was an epoch, in which notions appeared, were created and grew. However, we do not see there “extirpated”, pure abstract notions that would inherit dead sensual images...Antiquity shows how the content of old mythological images turned to the facture of fledging notions. The fact that an image did not disappear, but remained inside a notion formally untouched with specificity that was not fully taken off shows that early ancient notions were indeed the images that just had changed their basic function¹⁸”.

O.M. Freidenberg called this type of thinking 'imagery-notional' and 'narrative-notional'.

V.A. Shkuratov expressed similar ideas and introduced the notion of 'narradygm':

“I use the word 'narradygm' to define the type of thinking, which is hidden between an artistic expression clouded by images and a Scientist speech lost in formalisms... A narradygm gives an example of a grammatical structure turning into a mental image. A conceptual thought is implemented in this core of language by its notionality, which is slightly underformalized¹⁹”.

Narrativity and narradygmality is kind of alloy of the rational and the imagery, the rational and the irrational, the natural and the supernatural, the scientific and the parascientific, the habitual and the festive etc.

From this perspective, it is also possible to identify a *specific code* for the third civilizational type of social technologies and define it as *narrative-conceptual* (O.M. Freidenberg) or *narradigm* (V.A. Shkuratov). The narradigm sociocode implies not only existence of a written language but also a high level of literacy, if not among the entire population then at least among the ruling elite and the dominant 'middle class', that it is not peculiar to one European antiquity or the Middle Ages, but also other cultural and civilizational system. Speculative-theoretical technologies – updated and justified as aesthetic, ideological and religious models in the works of sages, philosophers and

¹⁶ S. S. Averintsev, “Two of birth of European rationalism”, Voprosy filosofii num 3 (1989): 67–79 y S. S. Averintsev, “Two of birth of European rationalism and the simplest realities of literature”, in Chelovek v sisteme nauk eds I.T. Frolov (Moscow: Nauka, 1989), 332-342.

¹⁷ V. P. Rimskiy, and V.S. Ignatova, “Genesis of Science, Innovation and Science University (to the ninetieth birthday of MK Petrova)”, Nauka. Kultura. Iskusstvo num 2 (2013): 61–75.

¹⁸ O. M. Freydenberg, Myth and literature of antiquity (Moscow: Vostochnaya literature RAN Publ, 1998).

¹⁹ V. A. Shkuratov, Historical psychology (Moscow: KREDO, 1997).

theologians are aimed primarily at regulating the society, which is always quite mobile, conflicting and sufficiently dynamic in the considered civilizations, and there may be very different reasons for it. They can be external (a threat of conquest, geographic location or the elements of nature) and internal (demographic overproduction, class conflicts, multi-ethnicity, marginal social and ethno-cultural groups, etc.).

It was at that time that, almost simultaneously, in Jewish and Greek cultural areas there appeared a phenomenon which M.K. Peter called 'miniaturization' of the social ritual and social structures 'to such an extent that it was possible to exercise personal control over all objects of the ritual and personally manage these objects'²⁰. What is especially interesting is a new *cultural archetype of 'primacy' of the word over the act* discovered by M.K. Petrov:

"This is a new type of communication, communication 'through the word' when the word objectifies a program of activity and the activity – 'act' – is conceived as subordinate to the word, more or less successfully copying the word... At the same time the word as an initiator and determinant of the act looks more independent, while the act, losing the professional specialization properties – those of certainty and formedness, turns to a simple willingness to take the form specified by the word, becoming, so to say, an 'executive' essence – the wax, 'sort of disorderly cause', 'pure possibility', 'matter' of the ancient peoples. The separation of the word from the act with the formation of two functionally independent areas with different subjects, in one of which there is a concentration of initiators-determinants (area of the word), and in the other – implementers-performers (area of the act), led, in fact, to the emergence of ancient slavery (we can also add: any other form of *personal dependence* – V.R.) in that fundamentally new functional opposition of freedom and slavery which is described, for example, by Aristotle²¹".

However, we have previously shown that it is hardly necessary to link the formation of the *new type of man*, already possessing the distinct personal being, only with the activities of a pirate-king, as M.K. Petrov did²².

Our comments and clarifications, first of all, refer to the understanding of the ancient cultural and civilizational type as a 'European' one. We insist on the approach that considers certain typological similarity of antiquity and its 'parental' significance for the fate the European culture as only a *systemic similarity* of the ancient traditional marginal (secondary) civilization and the medieval traditional marginal (tertiary) civilization that existed in two global forms – Orthodox and Catholic. The systemic similarity of these cultural and civilizational entities, unrelated directly in the historical evolution and continuity, is rooted in their position of 'crossroads of cultures and civilizations', their high *mobility* and secondary, artificial (mutational) nature, as well as their *openness* to the action of *anti-systemic* factors and entities, which intensified in periods of crises or social unrest and during transitional period.

²⁰ M. K. Petrov, *Self-awareness and Scientific Creativity* (Rostov-on-Don: Rostov University Press. 1992).

²¹ M. K. Petrov, *Self-awareness and Scientific Creativity...*

²² V. P. Rimskiy and Yu.M. Melnik, "Time of Moses and time of Odysseus", *Chelovek* num 2 (2013): 48–63 y V. P. Rimskiy, and Yu. M. Melnik. *Time to live and time to contemplate... Existential meaning and philosophical understanding of time in the classical European culture* (Saint-Petersburg: Aletyya, 2014).

So, on this typological basis we can identify at least two more cultural-civilizational types, apart from the world of Hellenism and the East. First of all, *these are non-classical cultural-civilizational tertiary systems of 'Axial Time'*, resulting from the artificial formation processes. Their centripetal, marginal, cosmopolitan and polyethnic character led to the spatial openness and incompleteness in combination with local sacred centres and tidal-wave rhythms of life, which was reflected in the *specific syncretic chronotope*, with all previous models of the world included into the transcendental-hierarchical spatio-temporal continuum, completing the deployment of the basic polisodicy as a *theodicy*. The pre-schism 'Christian world', including the Byzantine and the Old Russian civilizations, and the early 'Islamic world' both belong to this type.

The second type is represented by *super civilizations of the Middle Ages* created as a result of centripetal tendencies, located on vast territories and characterised by *dynamically stable rhythms of life* with a great sense of historicism. The complex, unstable and open nature of these cultural-civilizational systems and *organic syncretism of cultural archetypes* led to the emergence, in the depths of super-civilizations of the Middle Ages, of various anti-systemic structures (ethno-religious diasporas, Gnostic-Manichaeic sects, secret orders, etc.) with destructive tendencies. In our opinion, this typological series encompasses the Western Catholic civilization, including the Renaissance with its *anthropodicy* as an attempt of organic transformation of theodicy, the Byzantine Empire, the Ottoman Empire, the Russian and Japanese Far East civilizations, medieval China and India.

Conclusion

Thus, the proposed working, instrumental methodology of cultural and civilizational typology, based on the development of some ideas by M.K. Petrov, helps us not only to discover new problem fields in the cultural and historical past and present, but also to outline some of the contours of a possible future, already controlling us. We can see that the *principle of innovation*, creative- innovative and creative-reproductive human activity, inherent in the mechanisms of coupling 'culture' with 'civilization', existed throughout the entire cultural history of the mankind. But it is in our mobile world that innovations become existential prerequisites for the preservation of mankind.

References

- Akhiezer, A. S. Russia: historical experience of the critic (socio-cultural dynamics of Russia) Vol. I. From the past to the future. Novosibirsk: Sibirskiy chronograph. 1997
- Averintsev, S. S. "Two of birth of European rationalism and the simplest realities of literature". In *Chelovek v sisteme nauk* eds I.T. Frolov. Moscow: Nauka. 1989. 332-342.
- Averintsev, S. S. "Two of birth of European rationalism". *Voprosy filosofii* num 3 (1989): 67–79.
- Bourdieu, P. *Choses dites*. Paris: Minuit. 1987.
- Foucault, M. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. Paris: Gallimard. 1966.
- Foucault, M. *The Archeology of Knowledge*. Paris: Gallimard. 1969.

Foucault, M. Madness and civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason. Paris: Gallimard. 1972.

Foucault, M. Dits et écrits. 1954-1988. Vol. I-IV. 1994.

Freydenberg, O. M. Myth and literature of antiquity. Moscow: Vostochnaya literature RAN Publ. 1998.

Heidegger, M. Plato's doctrine of truth. Letter on humanism. Bern. 1947.

Heidegger, M. Heraclitus: The Inception of Occidental Thinking. Logic. Heraclitus' Teaching of the Logos. Frankfurt on Main: Vittorio Klostermann. 1979.

Heidegger, M. Parmenides. Frankfurt on Main: Vittorio Klostermann. 1982.

Latour, B. Laboratory Life . Paris: La Decouverte. 1988.

Latour, B. "Les „vues“ de l'esprit. Une introduction à l'anthropologie des sciences et des techniques". Culture technique num 14 (1985): 4-30.

Latour, B. Science in action How to follow scientists and engineers through society. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press. 1987.

Latour, B. The pasteurization of France: War and peace of microbes-Irreductions. Paris: A.-M. Metailie. 1984.

Makarenko, V. P. "Socio-cultural Background for the Studies by M.K. Petrov: the Problem of Exploration and Development". In Mikhail Konstantinovich Petrov, eds Neretina, S.S., Moscow: ROSSPEN. 2010. 146

Petrov, M. K. Ancient culture. Moscow: ROSSPEN. 1997.

Petrov, M. K. A systematic approach to the organization of a regional research center. Rostov-on-Don: SKNTs VSh. 2009.

Petrov, M. K. Historical and philosophical studies. Moscow: ROSSPEN. 1996.

Petrov, M. K. History of the European cultural tradition and its issues. Moscow: ROSSPEN. 2004.

Petrov, M. K. Issues of determinism in the ancient Greek philosophy of the classical period. Rostov-on-Donu: YuFU. 2015.

Petrov, M. K. "Language and categorical structures". Naukovedenie i istoriya kultury (1973): 58-82.

Petrov, M. K. Language, sign, culture. Moscow: Nauka. 1991.

Petrov, M. K. Philosophical problems of the "science of science". Subject of sociology of science. Moscow: ROSSPEN. 2006.

Creativity and innovation in culture: an effort towards interpreting the philosophy and cultural studies of M. K. Petrov pág. 165

Petrov, M. K. Self-awareness and Scientific Creativity. Rostov-on-Don: Rostov University Press. 1992.

Petrov, M. K. "Some issues of the Organization of Science in the Age of the Scientific and Technical Revolution". Voprosy filosofii num 10 (1968): 36-45.

Rimsky, V. P. Demons at Crossroads: Cultural and Historical Image of Totalitarianism. Belgorod: BelGU. 2007.

Rimskiy, V. P. "The concept of 'innovation' in the philosophy of culture". in Problemy filosofii kultury, eds S.A. Nikolskiy. Moscow: IF RAN. 2012. 138–152.

Rimskiy, V. P. The establishing discourse of Mikhail Petrov: an intellectual in the interior of cultural capital. Moscow: Kanon+ ROOI «Reabilitatsiya». 2017.

Rimsky, V. P. Totalitarian Cosmos and a Person. Belgorod: BelGU. 2008.

Rimskiy, V. P. and V. S. Ignatova. "The problem of 'tradition - innovation' and genesis of scientific and innovative subcultures (cultural and civilizational context)". Nauka. Kultura. Iskusstvo num 1 (2012): 34-57.

Rimskiy, V. P. and V. S. Ignatova. "Genesis of Science, Innovation and Science University (to the ninetieth birthday of MK Petrova)". Nauka. Kultura. Iskusstvo num 2 (2013): 61–75.

Rimskiy, V. P. and Yu. M. Melnik. Time to live and time to contemplate... Existential meaning and philosophical understanding of time in the classical European culture. Saint-Petersburg: Aleteyya. 2014.

Rimskiy, V. P. and Yu. M. Melnik. "Time of Moses and time of Odysseus". Chelovek num 2 (2013): 48–63.

Shkuratov, V. A. Historical psychology. Moscow: KREDO. 1997.

CUADERNOS DE SOFÍA EDITORIAL

Las opiniones, análisis y conclusiones del autor son de su responsabilidad y no necesariamente reflejan el pensamiento de **Revista Inclusiones**.

La reproducción parcial y/o total de este artículo
Puede hacerse sin permiso de **Revista Inclusiones, citando la fuente**.