



UDC 008:572:316.722

DOI: 10.63009/cac/1.2026.06

Pavlo Berest*

PhD in Cultural Studies, Associate Professor
Institute of Practical Cultural Studies and Art Management
National Academy of Culture and Arts Management
01015, 9 Lavrska Str., Kyiv, Ukraine
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5218-4812>

Features of the study of anthropology of art through the lens of interdisciplinary interaction between culturology and art history

Abstract. The relevance of the study is substantiated by the need to synthesise cultural and art-historical approaches in order to form a holistic paradigm of the anthropology of art and is driven by the crisis of classical formal-stylistic analysis, which may overlook the artist's subjectivity and the socio-political significance of the creative process. The aim of the study was to distinguish the anthropology of art from the general range of humanities disciplines and to analyse it within the context of interdisciplinary interaction between such important fields of science as cultural studies and art history. The methodological framework of the research consisted of a combination of the cultural-historical method, the systems approach, the comparative method, and the methods of analysis and synthesis. The findings indicated that the anthropology of art, within the interdisciplinary field of cultural studies and art history, functions not as an auxiliary discipline but as an independent analytical approach focused on the study of the human being as a subject of cultural meaning-making. It was determined that its theoretical and methodological potential ensures a shift in research focus from the formal-stylistic analysis of artistic forms to the interpretation of human experience embodied in symbols, images, and cultural archetypes. It was substantiated that the integration of cultural and art-historical approaches makes it possible to consider art as a form of socio-cultural communication and self-construction of both the individual and society. It was revealed that the anthropology of art serves as a theoretical foundation for understanding artistic practices in the context of the formation of value orientations, identity, and cultural space. It was also established that the interdisciplinary approach expands the possibilities for analysing art as a complex system of interaction between symbolic, social, and cultural factors. The results of the study can be used to develop new strategies for teaching the anthropology of art, where priority is given to an interdisciplinary approach, which will facilitate the further development of art studies beyond traditional frameworks towards meta-anthropology and meta-culturology.

Keywords: inter-studio relations; meta-culturology; meta-anthropology; cultural archetypes; sociocultural space; life-creation

INTRODUCTION

The study of the anthropology of art is essential due to its interdisciplinary nature, integrating insights from cultural anthropology, aesthetics, philosophy, cultural studies, and art history to provide a more comprehensive understanding of art. Traditional formal-stylistic

approaches often overlook the role of the human being as a creator of meanings and symbolic systems. In this context, the anthropology of art shifts the focus from analysing artworks as isolated objects to examining art as a form of human communication and a means of

Suggested Citation:

Berest, P. (2026). Features of the study of anthropology of art through the lens of interdisciplinary interaction between culturology and art history. *Culture and Contemporaneity*, 28(1), 6–13. doi: 10.63009/cac/1.2026.06.

*Corresponding author (berest@gmail.com)



interpreting the world. As an academic discipline, it plays a key role not only in the analysis of artistic practices but also in understanding the mechanisms through which individuals and societies construct cultural meanings and shape their sociocultural environment.

As S. Plattner (2003) noted, the anthropology of art can make a unique contribution to the study of the globalisation of art. It also provides an opportunity to deepen understanding of the general processes underlying the cultural interaction of different peoples and countries. Moreover, as I. Nechitailo *et al.* (2022) wrote, universities also measure the cultural capital accumulated during the educational process. Thus, informational cultural capital, in fact, tends to transform into academic success. In this context, the study of the anthropology of art also emerges as an important part of forming the individual cultural capital of every well-educated, successful professional. Having analysed the development of museum anthropology in the 21st century, Ph. Schorch (2023) concluded that its purpose is of paramount importance. Museum anthropology is identified as a specific set of knowledge practices imbued with significant methodological, epistemological, and ontological potential; this potential should be strategically harnessed for cross-disciplinary fertilisation across the academy and beyond the museum itself.

V. Karpov *et al.* (2020) underscored the importance of the interconnection between anthropology and contemporary art, as well as the significance of studying the role of art in anthropology and its impact on art history theory and artistic practice. Thus, the anthropology of art emerges as a theoretical foundation for artistic practices, viewing the artist as a socially significant phenomenon. H.M. Lyman (2023), investigating the specificities of the anthropology of art, noted that the anthropological dimension of art determines the study of the process of aesthetic reflection of human activity based on the canon of beauty as the essence of a human being and the embodiment of this inner need through artistic expression. At the core of the anthropological approach is the human being with their perceptions of the beauty of the world, society, and its relations with the individual, as well as the freedom of creativity and the expression of inner reflection and mental states. At the same time, as S. Rudenko (2025) noted, in many countries worldwide, the science of culture has acquired a euphemistic multifacetedness. Issues of culture have been directly examined by sociologists, cultural and social anthropologists, cultural historians, and researchers of collective memory, as well as within the frameworks of cultural and arts studies. Consequently, culture and art are shifting from the scientific sphere to the sector of social activism, remaining outside the theoretical-hypothetical field.

The significance of the humanities: philosophy, culturology, art history, and anthropology as well as their constituents (cultural anthropology, the philosophy of creativity, the anthropology of art, etc.) in the development of contemporary digital society and cutting-edge

technologies should not be underestimated. They possess significant potential and remain a vital condition for the successful advancement of science as a whole. Investigating the “axiological heterogeneity of culture”, V. Sivers (2025) noted that this process involves the creation of a collective picture of reality by developing mechanisms to align an individual’s personal worldview with the communal one. Indeed, creativity serves as a form of transmitting value-based energy. As P. Just & J. Monaghan (2000) have observed, social and cultural anthropology examines more than merely “ancient customs”; rather, it investigates how people across diverse regions of the world continue, well into the 21st century, to endow their lives with meaning. Furthermore, these cultural rules, meanings, and social structures exert a direct influence on the behavior and existence of both the individual and society as a whole.

Analysing the various stages of the formation and development of the anthropology of art, M. Durand (2025) noted, that this field currently possesses broad interdisciplinary perspectives; if considered collectively, they are capable of re-evaluating fundamental questions and existing theories, thereby reaching new levels of scientific advancement. As E. Cassirer (2021) noted, a human being lives not merely in a physical universe, but in a symbolic universe. Language, myth, and art constitute the integral components of this social universe. Consequently, the study of not only art itself but specifically the anthropology of art emerges as a vital element in the advancement of the humanities.

All of the above determines the relevance of this research and the need for further detailed analysis of the interconnection and interpenetration of culturology (cultural studies), art history, and anthropology, along with the coordination of their scientific approaches to form a holistic paradigm for understanding the further development of the humanities. The purpose of this article was to distinguish the anthropology of art from the general list of humanities disciplines and to analyse its uniqueness, especially within the context of the interdisciplinary interaction between such vital scientific fields as culturology and art history. Thus, in accordance with the research objective, the main tasks of this study were: to analyse existing theoretical approaches to the interpretation of the anthropology of art; to determine the role of the anthropology of art in forming interdisciplinary links between culturology and art history; and to reveal the role of the anthropology of art in creating a new, modern, and competitive Ukrainian educational and sociocultural space.

The scientific novelty of the study lies in the analysis of the anthropology of art through the prism of the development and interaction of culturology and art history, comparing their scientific approaches to the analysis of the development of culture, art, and the sociocultural space as a whole. Furthermore, the study analyses the importance of rethinking the interdisciplinary interactions within the humanities, emphasising the blurring of distinctions between them and the increasing transition of research

objects across these disciplines, which facilitates the formation of a unified humanistic educational and scientific space of knowledge.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The research methodology employed a combination of interdisciplinary methods tailored to the study of the anthropology of art. The systemic approach was used to examine the interconnectedness of various artistic practices and their place within broader cultural systems. This method helped explore how avant-garde art interacted with social, political, and cultural processes, and how these elements formed a unified structure within the artistic process. The comparative method allowed for the examination of Ukrainian avant-garde art in relation to similar movements in Western Europe and Russia, revealing both universal trends and specific regional characteristics. By comparing these artistic phenomena, the study identified the key intersections and contrasts that shaped the development of Ukrainian avant-garde art in the first quarter of the 20th century.

Additionally, the semiotic method enabled the identification and interpretation of the visual codes and symbols embedded within the Ukrainian avant-garde works, providing insights into how these symbols functioned within the socio-cultural context of the time. The cultural-historical method facilitated an analysis of how artistic practices reflected the underlying values and ideologies of the periods in question, with particular focus on how these artworks served as cultural and social commentaries. By applying this method, the study was able to contextualise the evolution of avant-garde art in Ukraine and its interaction with global artistic trends.

The methods of analysis and synthesis were crucial in deconstructing the complex relationships between artistic forms and their social contexts. This process involved breaking down the artworks into their aesthetic, social, and psychological components, and then reintegrating these aspects to provide a holistic understanding of the art's significance. The analysis not only highlighted the formal qualities of the art but also examined the psychological and social dimensions that influenced the creative process. Finally, the generalisation method was employed to consolidate the findings from the various methods, synthesising them into a cohesive understanding of the development of Ukrainian avant-garde art and its place in the broader discourse of cultural and artistic.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Before proceeding to a direct analysis of the specificities of studying the anthropology of art through the lens of interdisciplinary interaction between culturology and art history, it is necessary to briefly outline the nature of this field and its connection to other humanities. The generally accepted definition posits that the anthropology of art is a branch of anthropology that examines how and why humans create art, the role art occupies within a culture, and

how art shapes the identity of both the individual and society. Consequently, the subject of research encompasses a broad spectrum of components, including the interconnectedness of the human being, culture, art, artistic works, cultural heritage, rituals, and traditions.

N. Khamitov (2024) defined cultural anthropology as a direction within anthropology and philosophical anthropology, the subject of which is the historical and structural characteristics of culture. In cultural anthropology, culture is understood as the most significant attribute of a human being – a universal result of activity in which the human essence is revealed. Thus, within cultural anthropology, the study of culture becomes the fundamental basis for investigating human existence. An essential component of anthropology is ethnic anthropology, which the Yu.I. Rymarenko (1996), defined as a scientific discipline situated at the intersection of various sciences. It studies the human being as a representative of an ethnic community (or ethnosocial group) and as a biosocial being from the perspective of morphophysiological characteristics and specific developmental traits of populations, their formation, and distribution. Consequently, ethnic anthropology emerges as a discipline capable of elucidating many aspects of the historiological life of peoples, providing an impetus for the development of new sciences and research fields. The analysis of the model of visual-anthropological research deserves separate attention. This model is still in its formative stage and may become the subject of further systematic and thorough research (Pecheranskyi *et al.*, 2023). Simultaneously, O. Pavlova (2022) pointed out that it is particularly important to understand the stages of the formation of visual anthropology and its basic elements in the context of the contemporary national transformation of various types of culturology. Researcher V. Limonchenko (2025) viewed art as an expansion of the empirical basis of philosophy. In this case, for him, art emerges as a practice of producing human meaning, fundamentally making a human being Human.

Furthermore, as noted by D. Androsova & O. Markova (2022), anthropology and culturology demonstrate a striking commonality in their scientific, methodological, and worldview-oriented frameworks. While anthropology typically relies on biological anthropology (the study of races and the physical-physiological indicators of the human being) and ethnology specifically “cultural” anthropology as semiotics, symbology, and philosophy (primarily the philosophy of culture) and related sciences the foundation of culturology is predominantly philosophy (mainly ethical and religious), art history, ethnology, folklore studies, and psychology, among others. Furthermore, according to I. Sumchenko (2025), interpretation in cultural anthropology is a multifaceted process, as every researcher brings unique experience, cultural background, and theoretical convictions to their work, which inevitably influences their understanding. Therefore, a constant critical reflection on one's own interpretations, the search

for alternative explanations, and the consideration of the polysemantic nature of various cultural phenomena are necessary. Moreover, as S. Lytvyn (2025) wrote, the application of interdisciplinary approaches – specifically anthropology, ethnology, and structuralism – has enabled the analysis of numerous examples of spiritual and material culture as a mechanism for constructing collective identity. This, in turn, has a significant impact on the development of the entire sociocultural space of any country.

Thus, the anthropology of art emerges as an interdisciplinary field that integrates knowledge from cultural anthropology, other anthropological subfields, aesthetics, philosophy, art history, ethnography, sociology, and other humanities and social sciences. The anthropology of art examines the human being as a creator, bearer, and consumer of art – and consequently, as a subject who constructs symbolic images to comprehend the surrounding world. Therefore, it is essential to recognise that the anthropology of art investigates not only artistic works but also the creator (the human being) as well as the meanings, messages, and ideas that individuals embed within these works. Analysing current issues in visual anthropology research, O. Pushonkova (2009) emphasised that it is important not only to understand the reasons for changes in sociocultural narratives and the methods of their visualisation but also to identify the conditions for the truthfulness of the human life experience, its integrity, and fullness, as well as the correct understanding of the polyphonic world and a person's place within it. Exploring the anthropology of collecting, T. Rozova & V. Kubko (2023) wrote that at the beginning of the 21st century, collecting creates communication channels through exhibitions, virtualisation, and digitalisation. This rendered it a unique, active source of timeless information that reflected cultural meanings and symbols of both cultural heritage and the contemporary human life-world.

Exploring the components of culture, V. Sivers (2025) noted the culture possesses a holistic nature and, as such, must adhere to general natural laws, though these laws themselves may be further refined. Concurrently, the primary field of discourse should be grounded in the principles currently recognised by science as relevant within the humanities, particularly in culturology and art history. At the same time, cultural phenomena exert either a direct influence on contemporary events and the future development of humanity – where influence is formed through immediate interaction – or they operate through layers, which serve as imprints of the perception of the event itself. M. Kryshchtopa (2023) wrote that the anthropology of art is a branch of cultural (social) anthropology that focuses on the study of art within its socio-cultural context. It is designed to explain the formation of various art forms under specific conditions – namely, how and by what exactly these processes are determined. In general, humanitarian strategies in culture are influential factors that shape the conceptual vision of a state's cultural policy directions. Therefore, cultural and artistic development, along with

the mechanisms and tools for its implementation aimed at unlocking human creativity and forming human capital, represents an essential area that requires particular attention from scholars.

Accordingly, scientific research should focus not only on the artworks themselves, cultural heritage objects, and other material or spiritual monuments but also on the human being, their mode of thinking, and their perception of the world, particularly of culture and art. As O. Polishchuk (2026) states, aesthetic feelings, aesthetic activities, and aesthetic values, along with their roles in the life of the individual and society at large, merit rigorous scientific attention. Therefore, when formulating development plans or reforming higher education, disciplines such as culturology, art history, ethics, and others must be protected from attempts to reduce or remove them from academic curricula. Today, a situation is observed where even in the training of professionals in the fields of art and culture, students are effectively deprived of knowledge in the philosophy of art and remain unfamiliar with the achievements of philosophical and cultural anthropology. This raises the question of the importance of transcending the boundaries of any single subject or scientific field to reach an interdisciplinary level. Consequently, contemporary scholars are increasingly focusing on concepts such as meta-culturology studies and meta-anthropology. N. Khamitov (2024) defined meta-anthropology as the study of the boundaries of human existence, its existential dimensions, the conditions for communication within these dimensions, and the archetypal foundations of culture. Meta-anthropology becomes significant as a methodological strategy in modern philosophical anthropology, the philosophy of culture, ethics, aesthetics, and culturology. Furthermore, N. Khamitov defined cultural archetypes as: 1) worldview-existential foundations upon which the culturally significant creativity of any representative of a local culture is based, as well as its perception; 2) the worldview-existential foundations of culture as a global phenomenon. Cultural archetypes act as the deep-seated result of creativity and the spiritual communication of individuals within a given culture. Thus, culture is largely a process of identifying and modernising archetypes – not in an abstract or impersonal manner, but existentially and personally, through the creativity of specific individuals, groups, societies, and nations.

For his part, S. Rudenko (2025) defined meta-culturology studies as an interdisciplinary field within which an innovative habitus is formed. This habitus is necessary for synthesising theory, practice, and education on the path toward discovering tools for cultural transformation, particularly through logo-heuristics (the search for meanings). For clarity, the author proposes representing the meta-culturology habitus in the following form (Table 1), where the art history component of meta-culturology studies is highlighted as a vital direction for further research. It maintains genetic links with museology

and culturology (cultural studies). In the context of culturology, visual culture (fine arts) serves as a significant

embodiment of meanings and, therefore, a specific subject of scientific inquiry.

Table 1. The habitual structure of meta-culturology studies

Meta-culturology		
The science of culture	Museology	Art history
Curation, cultural and artistic expertise		

Source: developed by the author based on S. Rudenko (2025)

Thus, when considering the anthropology of art as a field of knowledge taught at the university level, it should be categorised within the block of philosophical and cultural disciplines. Its primary goal is to cultivate in undergraduate and postgraduate students the ability to perceive art as a phenomenon of human existence. Art should be viewed not merely as craftsmanship or aesthetic activity but as a cultural-anthropological form of communication between the author and other people, society, and the world. This approach studies the human being as a creator of artistic meanings: *Homo Creator*, *Homo Aestheticus*. As Ch. Giordano (2005) wrote, *Homo Creator* is capable of independently constructing their own identity, as humans possess the capacity for self-creation, adapting to new political and environmental circumstances. Meanwhile, *Homo Aestheticus* perceives the world through aesthetics (form, color, rhythm, harmony, etc.), which helps communities establish shared visual codes and emotional unity. Consequently, the human being is capable of creating social structures, politics, and new identities; thus, the human is a subject who changes the “rules of the game”. At the same time, the human is a being that requires harmony and visual meaning. Therefore, imbuing the world with beauty, rhythm, and emotional significance is one of the vital components of human activity. Ultimately, anthropology is a discipline that seeks to reveal the significance – often unsuspected or underestimated – of what the human being, as a social entity, creates every day.

Art, as a sociocultural phenomenon, shapes communication and preserves traditional, national, cultural, and civilisational memory. Simultaneously, the cultural context of art involves the interaction between symbols, rituals, and archetypes. Through the anthropology of art, one can form a comprehensive understanding of diverse eras and peoples, as well as interpret artistic representations of emotions, convictions, spiritual and religious beliefs, myths, legends, and archetypes. The scope of research in the anthropology of art encompasses a wide range of pivotal questions. These include: the origins of art; the reasons why art serves as a universal characteristic of humanity; the role of archetypes, symbols, and the language of imagery in the life of the individual and society; and the mechanisms through which material cultural heritage and artistic works influence human emotional, psychological, and intellectual development. Furthermore, it examines how objects created by humans emerge to express cultural and substantive meaning, and how artistic works impact the life-creation and viability of individuals and entire

societies. Consequently, the anthropology of art helps to reveal that art is not merely the result of creative activity but a fundamental mode of human existence within culture and the world. From a comprehensive perspective on contemporary academic art history, O. Klekovkin (2017) identified the following sub-disciplines: theoretical art history, which includes the general theory of art (the theory of artistic types, forms, and genres); historical art history, encompassing the history of art, the history of genres and forms, and the historiography of art, among others; and systemic art history. The latter includes the anthropology of art, the sociology of art, the psychology of art (including art therapy), artistic systems and organisations (incorporating law, management, etc.), as well as the analysis and criticism of artworks, documentation, and archiving.

Scholars D. Androsova & O. Markova (2022) noted that while culturology rely on art historical generalisations that balance rationalistic and extra-rational semantic frameworks, the anthropological perspective does not offer a direct path to artistic generalisations. Instead, it appeals primarily to a sociological lens, prioritising rationalistic and classical scientific dimensions of cognition. Accordingly, the field of the anthropology of art can be subdivided into more specialised components, such as the “anthropology of painting” or the “anthropology of music”. For her part, H.M. Lymar (2023) observes that while the anthropology of art traditionally leans toward the interpretation of prehistoric artefacts, it often fails to address how such art influences contemporary methods of creation and presentation. Thus, art and anthropology represent vital directions for seeking representative practices that open new dialogues between these two phenomena. Consequently, the anthropology of art emerges as a theoretical foundation for artistic practices, generating a complex reflection on socially significant processes. As V. Karpov *et al.* (2020) noted, the anthropology of art tends toward the interpretation of prehistoric artefacts. Thus, the anthropology of art can be regarded as a field that investigates the intercultural, universal human experience of creating and perceiving art. Furthermore, it functions as a discipline that explores the overarching life-creation of humanity.

When comparing the subject areas of anthropology, art history, and culturology, an analysis reveals distinct yet overlapping focuses. Anthropology examines the human being in their entirety: biological, social, cultural, and spiritual. Within the specific context of the anthropology of art, it analyses artistic practices as a mode of communication between the individual and the world, as well as

between the individual and the community. Art history investigates forms, styles, and means of artistic expression within historical and cultural dynamics. Its primary tasks include the description, analysis, and interpretation of artworks, as well as attribution and the determination of artistic value and stylistic specificities. Culturology examines culture as a whole – a system of meanings and symbols

created by humanity. The culturology approach emphasises that art is an integral part of culture's communication system, serving as a means of preserving and transmitting material cultural heritage and spiritual experience to future generations. Accordingly, the intersections and commonalities between anthropology, art history, and culturology (cultural studies) can be summarised as follows (Table 2).

Table 2. Intersections and commonalities between anthropology, art history, and culturology (cultural studies)

Field / Discipline	Intersections	Commonalities
Anthropology	Investigates art as a manifestation of human nature, experience, traditions, and rituals	Understanding art as an integral part of human life activity
Art history	Analyses specific artworks, styles, movements, and artistic schools	Interpreting the artistic experience of the human being as both creator and consumer of art
Culturology (Cultural studies)	Explains art as a form of cultural communication and a symbolic system	Identifying meanings, symbols, values, and archetypes within artistic expression

Source: developed by the author based on Ch. Giordano (2005), O. Klekovkin (2017), D. Androsova & O. Markova (2022)

In conclusion, it can be asserted that these three disciplines interact within the “Human – Culture – Creativity” triad. Anthropology elucidates the origins of art, culturology address its semantic content, and art history focuses on its specific forms and manifestations. Consequently, the anthropology of art emerges as a cross-disciplinary dialogue centred on the human quest to understand both the self and the world. For the viewer, art acts as a vehicle for spiritual cognition and empathy, as seen in immersive digital installations where the audience becomes an active participant in the symbolic space, blurring the line between the observer and the observed. Furthermore, contemporary anthropology of art poses a fundamental ontological question: what does it mean to be a human being who creates symbols and meanings. In this context, art is examined in its broadest sense. It encompasses not only “high art” but also decorative arts, as well as modern urban phenomena like street art and digital performances. These practices, ranging from traditional folk rituals to globalised mass culture, reflect the diverse ways in which social structures and cultural rules directly influence individual and collective behaviour in the 21st century.

For instance, as G. Bakke & M. Peterson (2017) have observed, anthropologists may present their findings not only through textual media but also via sound installations or performances. Art itself constitutes a form of anthropological inquiry; when an artist engages with a specific community or theme, they perform a “thick description”. Concurrently, N. Bonvillain (2010) conceptualised culture not as a collection of random traditions, but as an integrated system. She analysed how economics, politics, religion, and art interact to shape a holistic human experience within a particular society. As U. Klein (2019) observed, the interdisciplinary interaction between anthropology and art facilitates a shift in focus from finalised cultural products to lived creative processes, thereby transforming the research method into an experimental space. Consequently, as T. Vlasovich (2022) noted, the knowledge of a person's spiritual life differs fundamentally from the study of nature, as the human world in general – and identity

in particular – cannot be described solely through external manifestations; rather, the spiritual realm is revealed through internal intuition and sensory perception.

Consequently, the anthropology of art must attend to internal intuition and sensory perception, particularly in cases where human identity and the spiritual world cannot be exhaustively described through external manifestations alone. Thus, examining the anthropology of art at the intersection of culturology and art history facilitates a transition from a purely descriptive strategy to one of phenomenological immersion. This approach ensures a comprehensive understanding of the human being as a creator of symbolic meanings, where the artistic process serves not only as an object of study but also as a unique method for cognising social and spiritual reality. The anthropology of art does not supersede art history or culturology; rather, it expands their horizons. Such a perspective on the anthropology of art invites scholars to further discuss the role of this subject both within university curricula and across the humanities at large. Indeed, it adds a critically important dimension of human agency, social context, and cultural function to the study of form (art history) and systems (culturology). This approach allows for an understanding of art as an indispensable part of the process of creating and sustaining human societies.

CONCLUSIONS

The study examines the specificities of the anthropology of art within the framework of interdisciplinary interaction between culturology and art history. The results of the research demonstrate that the anthropology of art emerges as a pivotal field that transcends traditional disciplinary boundaries, integrating knowledge from aesthetics, philosophy, sociology, and ethnography. It is established that this discipline shifts the focus from the purely formal analysis of artistic artefacts to the study of the human being as the primary agent of the creative process: *Homo Creator* and *Homo Aestheticus*. The anthropology of art, therefore, investigates not only the morphological features of art but also the existential and symbolic

meanings that individuals embed in the cultural space to comprehend the surrounding world.

It is substantiated that the interdisciplinary synthesis of culturology (cultural studies) and art history within the anthropological lens allows for a deeper understanding of “cultural archetypes” and the “value profile” of the artist. The research highlights that in the context of contemporary digital society, the humanities – specifically the anthropology of art – serve as a fundamental condition for the development of human capital and the preservation of national identity. The study proves that the formation of an “innovative habitus” and a meta-culturology approach in higher education is essential for protecting humanitarian disciplines from marginalisation. By treating art as a cultural-anthropological form of communication, the educational process can ensure a comprehensive development of creative potential, where the human being is viewed as a subject capable of constructing new identities and transforming social structures through visual and symbolic codes.

Prospects for further research lie in the detailed analysis of the “meta-culturology habitus” and its role in the systematic transformation of contemporary art education. At the same time, a significant area for future inquiry could be the study of visual-anthropological research models

and their application in the digital sociocultural space. Furthermore, the role of national cultural memory and the semiotics of artistic creativity in the context of modern global challenges merit rigorous scientific attention. Continuing research in this direction will facilitate the formation of a unified humanistic space of knowledge, where the anthropology of art acts as a bridge between theoretical philosophy and the practical reconstruction of the artistic process. In future research, it is essential to continue applying a comprehensive interdisciplinary approach so that subsequent studies may extend into the realms of meta-culturology and meta-anthropological discourse. Moreover, prospective scholarly inquiries may demonstrate that art exerts a profound influence on all constituents of human vital activity and the existential self-creation of both the individual and society as a whole.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

None.

FUNDING

None.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

None.

REFERENCES

- [1] Androsova, D., & Markova, O. (2022). [Anthropology and culturology: Methodological intersection and antitheses](#). *National Academy of Managerial Staff of Culture and Arts Herald*, 2, 3–8.
- [2] Bakke, G., & Peterson, M. (Eds.). (2017). [Between matter and method: Encounters in anthropology and art](#). London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- [3] Bonvillain, N. (2010). [Cultural anthropology](#). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- [4] Cassirer, E. (2021). [An essay on man: An introduction to a philosophy of human culture](#). New Haven: Yale University Press.
- [5] Durand, M. (2025). Anthropology of art. *Anthropen*. doi: 10.47854/a36t1776.
- [6] Giordano, Ch. (2005). Homo creator. The Conception of man in social anthropology. *Finance & Bien Commun*, 22, 25–31. doi: 10.3917/fbc.022.0025.
- [7] Just, P., & Monaghan, J. (2000). [Social and cultural anthropology: A very short introduction](#). New York: Oxford University Press.
- [8] Karpov, V., Bondyk, O., Lyamar, A., & Naumov, O. (2020). Art and anthropology in the discourse of European studies. *Culture and Modernity*, 1, 110–117. doi: 10.32461/2226–0285.1.2020.221352.
- [9] Khamitov, N. (Eds.). (2024). [Philosophy of science and culture: Dictionary](#). Kyiv: KNT.
- [10] Klein, U. (2019) Between matter and method: encounters in anthropology and art. *Visual Studies*, 35(2–3), 305–306. doi: 10.1080/1472586X.2019.1672957.
- [11] Klekovkin, O. (2017). [Art: Research methodology](#). Kyiv: Phoenix.
- [12] Kryshchop, M. (2023). Anthropology of art as a methodological approach to the study of Ukrainian painting. *Ethnic History of the Peoples of Europe*, 71, 71–77. doi: 10.17721/2518–1270.2023.71.10.
- [13] Limonchenko, V.V. (2025). [Philosophy of art as anthropology](#). In *Philosophy in the modern world: Proceedings of the 6th international scientific and practical conference* (pp. 25–27). Kharkiv: National Technical University “Kharkiv Polytechnic Institute”.
- [14] Lyamar, H.M. (2023). [Anthropology of art of the Ukrainian avant-garde of the first third of the 20th century](#). (Doctoral dissertation, National Academy of Culture and Arts Management, Kyiv, Ukraine).
- [15] Lytvyn, S. (Eds.). (2025). [Ukrainian folklore in the global cultural space](#). In *Ukrainian contemporary humanities: Challenges and development strategies* (pp. 181–211). Kyiv: NAKKKiM. 181–211.
- [16] Lytvyn, S.Kh., & Dobrovol'ska, V.V. (2022). [Preparation of a research project and presentation of scientific research results](#). Kyiv: Lira-K Publishing House.
- [17] Nechitailo, I., Nazarkin, P., Biriukova, M., Stadnik, O., Boriushkina, O., & Rozova, O. (2022). [Opportunities and some results of measuring cultural capital in sociological research practice](#). *Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*, 2022, 159–166.
- [18] Pavlova, O. (2022). Visual anthropology: Formation stages and basic elements of analysis. *NaUKMA Research Papers History and Theory of Culture*, 5, 47–53. doi: 10.18523/2617–8907.2022.5.47–53.

- [19] Pecheranskyi, I., Denysiyuk, Z., Humeniuk, T., Diachuk, V., & Kosinova, O. (2023). "Objective realism", ethnographic cinema, and the classical model of visual-anthropological research. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities*, 4(3), 395–409. [doi: 10.58256/rjah.v4i3.1153](https://doi.org/10.58256/rjah.v4i3.1153).
- [20] Plattner, S. (2003). Anthropology of art. In R. Towse (Ed.), *A handbook of cultural economics*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing. [doi: 10.4337/9781781008003.00007](https://doi.org/10.4337/9781781008003.00007).
- [21] Polishchuk, O. (2026). Aesthetic and artistic foundations of modern design: A theoretical, methodological and cultural discussion. In *Architectonics of socialisation: Human in the landscape of culture* (pp. 65–78). Warsaw: East European Association of Scientists. [doi: 10.5281/zenodo.18406488](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18406488).
- [22] Pushonkova, O. (2009). [Current issues in visual anthropology research](https://doi.org/10.1080/00137580903338815). *Contemporary Art*, 6, 300–305.
- [23] Rozova, T., & Kubko, V. (2023). Anthropology of collecting. *Culturological Almanac*, 1, 202–212. [doi: 10.31392/cult.alm.2023.1.27](https://doi.org/10.31392/cult.alm.2023.1.27).
- [24] Rudenko, S. (2025). Metaculturology: Converging the science of culture and museology. *National Academy of Managerial Staff of Culture and Arts Herald*, 2, 25–35. [doi: 10.32461/2226-3209.2.2025.338815](https://doi.org/10.32461/2226-3209.2.2025.338815).
- [25] Rymarenko, Yu. I. (Eds.). (1996). *Concise encyclopedia of ethnostate studies*. Kyiv: Dovira; Heneza.
- [26] Schorch, Ph. (2023). What can museum anthropology do in the twenty-first century? *Museum and Society*, 21(3), 96–111. [doi: 10.29311/mas.v21i3.4388](https://doi.org/10.29311/mas.v21i3.4388).
- [27] Silvers, V.A. (2025). [Axiological heterogeneity of culture](https://doi.org/10.31392/cult.alm.2023.1.27). In *Ukrainian contemporary humanities: Challenges and development strategies* (pp. 55–81). Kyiv: NAKKKiM.
- [28] Sumchenko, I. (2025). [The problem of interpretation in the context of cultural anthropology and philosophy of culture](https://doi.org/10.31392/cult.alm.2023.1.27). In *13th Uymovsky readings: Materials of scientific readings in memory of Avenir Uymovsky* (pp. 116–119). Odesa: Odesa I.I. Mechnikov National University.
- [29] Vlasovich, T. (2022). Spiritual foundations of human identity: Philosophical and cultural dimension. *Bulletin of Lviv University. Philosophical and Political Studies*, 41, 7–13. [doi: 10.30970/PPS.2022.41.1](https://doi.org/10.30970/PPS.2022.41.1).

Павло Берест

Доктор філософії з культурології, доцент

Навчально-науковий інститут практичної культурології та артменеджменту

Національної академії керівних кадрів культури і мистецтв

01015, вул. Лаврська, 9, м.Київ, Україна

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5218-4812>

Особливості студіювання антропології мистецтва у світлі міждисциплінарної взаємодії культурології та мистецтвознавства

Анотація. Актуальність дослідження обґрунтовується необхідністю синтезу культурологічного та мистецтвознавчого підходів для формування цілісної парадигми антропології мистецтва та зумовлена кризою класичного формально-стилістичного аналізу, який може ігнорувати суб'єктність митця та суспільно-політичне значення творчого процесу. Метою роботи було виділити з загального переліку гуманітарних дисциплін антропологію мистецтва, проаналізувати її в контексті міждисциплінарної взаємодії таких важливих галузей науки як культурологія та мистецтвознавство. Методологічну базу дослідження становили поєднання культурно-історичного методу, системного підходу, порівняльного методу, методів аналізу та синтезу. У результаті дослідження встановлено, що антропологія мистецтва у міждисциплінарному полі культурології та мистецтвознавства функціонує не як допоміжна галузь, а як самостійний аналітичний підхід, орієнтований на дослідження людини як суб'єкта творення культурних смислів. Визначено, що її теоретико-методологічний потенціал забезпечує зміщення дослідницького фокусу з формально-стилістичного аналізу художніх форм на інтерпретацію людського досвіду, втіленого у символах, образах та культурних архетипах. Обґрунтовано, що інтеграція культурологічного та мистецтвознавчого підходів дозволяє розглядати мистецтво як форму соціокультурної комунікації та самоконструювання індивіда і суспільства. Виявлено, що антропологія мистецтва виступає теоретичною основою для осмислення мистецьких практик у контексті формування ціннісних орієнтацій, ідентичності та культурного простору. Також встановлено, що міждисциплінарний підхід розширює можливості аналізу мистецтва як складної системи взаємодії символічних, соціальних і культурних чинників. Результати роботи можуть бути використані для розробки нових стратегій розвитку викладання антропології мистецтва, де пріоритетом стає міждисциплінарний підхід, що дозволить розвивати подальші студії мистецтва, як такі, що виходять за межі традиційних підходів в сферу метаантропології та метакультурології

Ключові слова: міждисциплінарні зв'язки; метакультурологія; метаантропологія; культурні архетипи; соціокультурний простір; життєтворчість