

## DIASPORA CULTURE: THE MAIN METHODOLOGICAL AND TERMINOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF CULTURE LOGICAL COMPREHENSION

**Iryna Haiuk**

Doctor of Cultural Studies, Associate Professor, Associate Professor at the Department of the Management of Arts, Lviv National Academy of Arts, Ukraine  
e-mail: irinahayuk@gmail.com, orcid.org/0000-0002-1296-0872

### Summary

The purpose of this article is to justify the necessity of the complex approach to study of the diasporian culture. It is shown that the culture of diaspora usually isn't considered as the original autonomous phenomenon, but only as a small separate marginal part of the native culture. This point of view is based on the outdated and inefficient paradigm of so-called "Island" anthropology. One of the most effective approaches to understanding the essence of culture is the theory of dissipative systems. The fact that the theory of dissipative systems not only explains but also proves the naturalness and regularity of the appearance of various branches/directions of any culture is one of its most important results. Study of the diaspora culture that has existed during the centuries in another country, it should include research on the entire material sphere of its life, all the artifacts created by its representatives. It is proved expedient to use iconological method, the approaches of the Actor-Network theory (ANT) and the "Philosophy from below" in this context. The ANT considers artifacts as active units/actors of social relations, which make up "sociality", as well as the principles of "Philosophy from below".

**Keywords:** "Alien", Armenian, artifact, Bakhtin M., colony, ethnos, diasporian community, dissipative system, Heidegger M.

DOI <https://doi.org/10.23856/5206>

### 1. Introduction

The culturelogical mode of comprehension of the phenomenon of diaspora culture brings the researcher into the sphere of conceptual uncertainty, since until today the phenomenon of diaspora has been studied mainly in the context of history, ethnology, sociology, political science, but not cultural studies. This approach has led to the formation of a number of stereotypes in views on diasporian culture, the dominant one among which is geographical and historical discourse and in fact, it excludes the existence of the phenomenon of Diaspora culture altogether. And although the investigation of the culture of the Armenian diaspora was taken as a basis, there are all reasons to say that similar problems and issues arise in the study of every diaspora culture. So within the framework of this approach, only the culture of the historical homeland/country of origin / Armenia and its historical fragments/artifacts that either originate from there or have typical features of the basic cultural matrix (language, stylistics, phenomenology of cultural practices) are considered Armenian. Such an an-system and an-ecological (E. Morin) approach to the phenomenon of diaspora represents the outdated inefficient paradigm of so-called "Island" anthropology, which was thoroughly criticized by the famous French philosopher, historian and sociologist Edgar Morin. In the work "The Lost

paradigm. Human nature” (1973) the researcher proves the need for a holistic approach to the study of Man and socio-cultural phenomena, taking into account the achievements of all natural, exact, and humanitarian disciplines, the discoveries of which shattered both the “island” concept of Man and the “island” concept of life (*Morin, 1995:47*). The main message of this work is the need to consider the world not as a mechanical combination of three separate “island”/isolated spheres “Man – Culture”, “Life – Nature”, “Physical – Chemical”, but as a complex integrative integrity, which is not inherent in external relations between “closed entities”, but ecosystem relations of open systems, each of which is a component of the other, and together they create a system integrity (*Morin, 1995: 12-13*). Subsequently, E. Morin develops this idea and proves, that ecological thinking is a necessary component of complex thinking, which does not isolate the subject under study, but considers it in relationships and self-regulating relations with the cultural, social, economic, political and natural environment (*Morin, 2011: 39*).

Today the content of the concept of "Diasporian culture" there are no clear boundaries and unambiguous definition for several reasons: blurring of the content field of concepts and phenomena “diaspora”, “ethnos” and “nation”; the difference between the concepts of “Diasporian culture” and “culture of Diaspora”. Since only consideration of the thesaurus of the above definitions may require a separate study, therefore in this article we will limit ourselves to certain established constants regarding these definitions in order to be able to pay sufficient attention to current approaches to understanding the phenomenon of Diasporian culture.

## 2. Terminological basis of the problem

Cultural understanding of the existence of the Armenian diaspora requires clarification of the general terminological base of research and justification of the main methodological foundations (the so-called ontology of a specific task). Taking into account the postmodern situation with the inherent fluidity and transformativeness of many terms, first of all it is necessary to determine the fundamental cultural issues: what is the phenomenon of culture, and, in particular, ethno-national culture and Diaspora culture, what are the criteria for their definition, what is ethnos ect.

Despite a significant number of interpretations of the term “ethnos”, today there is no well-established generally accepted and exhaustive definition of this term. Most often, an ethnic group is defined as a group of people who speak the same language, recognize their common origin, and have a set of Customs and ways of life consecrated by tradition, which differs from the customs of other groups. However, in many cases this definition does not correspond to reality, and this primarily applies to ethnic groups whose fate has developed as the fate of the diaspora community.

The closest to understanding the fundamental characteristics of an ethnos were scientists who considered such recognition of a common origin and the presence of a collective historical memory (*Assman, 2004; Halbwachs, 2007*).

Unlike an ethnos, a nation is primarily a political phenomenon and it is connected with the relationship with power and the state. In this sense, the medieval delineation of these concepts is significant. An ethnos is primarily associated with the concept of “genus” (Lat.), in which the main one is genetic, blood relationship (genus, clan, tribe, people). Meanwhile, “nation” (lat.), although it could also indicate the origin, genus and ethnic group of a person, however, unlike “gens”, included social features in its semantic field and concerned not so much family ties as a social groups, associated with general jurisdiction, religion, political interests. In late

medieval Europe, "nation" was understood as a collection of subjects (population) of a certain ruler or representatives of a certain denomination (*Osipyan, b.d.*). This means that the content of the concept of "nation" was determined, first of all, by power, political factors, and then – by state factors.

Diaspora is a certain collective organism/community of emigrants, which is created in the host country/state in the presence of awareness/acceptance of its difference from the autochthonous population, common origin and common historical cultural memory, the desire to preserve its own ethno-cultural identity and adequately represent / assert itself in the conditions of a new stranger society. The representatives of the diaspora create the necessary organizational forms of representation-ethno-cultural / ethno-religious communities (in the historical context – colonies) with appropriate forms of cultural (in the broad sense of the word) activities and management and political ethno-national representation to realize the most effective ways to survive, adapt, and integrate into a new social environment.

Earlier the Armenian diaspora consisted mainly of colonies and satellite communities, but since the XIX century the cells of the diaspora organism have become not colonies, but communities. Colonies in the classical (administrative and organizational) sense of the term disappeared, they were replaced by ethno-national forms of life, associated with cultural, and more often – with religious and cultural societies (communities). The fundamental difference between communities/ societies and colonies is the lack of administrative autonomy and a compact place of settlement within a certain urban location. At the same time, the main factor/basis for enrolling any person in a particular ethno-national diaspora community is the individual's personal choice and own ethno-cultural identification. Therefore, it can be stated that for an adequate understanding of the phenomenon of diaspora identity, it is necessary to use both historical-situational and personality-oriented approaches.

The phenomenon of the diaspora can be described as a process rather than a structure, and like any process, it has a historical character. Therefore, when it comes to Diasporian culture or the culture of diaspora, it obviously makes sense to separate these concepts. It is clear that any diaspora has a certain culture. However, if we are talking about representatives of the 1-st generation of Diaspora, then their culture is a direct continuation of the culture of the country of origin, it's a kind of prolongation and spread their culture beyond the borders of the Homeland. While the next generation of descendants of emigrants have features that distinguish them from the compatriots of their parents. After a few generations, the differences become systemic and relate to different aspects of life, so we can already talk about the presence of a diasporian culture.

### 3. The System principle in the study of Diaspora culture

One of the most effective approaches to determining the essence of culture today is systemic, more precisely, in the context of I. Prigozhin's theory of dissipative systems (*Prigozhin, Stengers, 2003*). The question of the expediency of using the theories of natural sciences in the humanities remains quite acute. Leaving aside the influence of natural sciences on the formation of the main categories and principles of the humanities (objectivity, linearity, determinism), we note that it was the revolutionary discoveries in physics (the theory of relativity, the principle of complementarity, quantum mechanics, etc.) that led to noticeable shifts in the social sciences.

Thus, E. Morin worked fruitfully in the so-called "group of ten" (created in 1968 by Dr. J. Robin) to create a new anthropology, where there were mainly biologists and cybernetics;

he turned to the general theory of systems and the “logic of life” (Fr. Jacob), studied the theory of “Automata” and the theory of chaos (the emergence of order from disorder/chaos), or the principle of the “organizing” case by H. von Foerster (*Morin, 1995: 2-3*). A vivid example of changes in the interaction of natural sciences and humanities was the long-term work of a kind of international interdisciplinary intellectual Club/conference “Eranos”, founded in 1933 due to the active participation of C. G. Jung, who was a regular participant until his death. Every year the invited lecturers included not only historians, religious scholars, sociologists, philosophers, art historians, psychologists, but also specialists in biology, physics, chemistry or the history of science. Lectures were published in the Annual Collection “Eranos”, and their integrated approach to the study of Man, culture and society formed a new paradigm of a synergistic approach to the study of all phenomena of reality (*Progoff, 1966: 307-313*). Among its participants we see G. Bashlyar, M. Buber, G. Weil, J. Durand, M. Eliade, E. Nyman, R. Otto, A. Portman, Nobel Prize winners V. Pauli, I. Prigozhin and E. Schrodinger and others. Thus, the collaboration of C. Jung in the last years of his life with the physicist Wolfgang Pauli convinced both that the study of the depths of matter by physicists, and the study of the depths of the psychic by psychologists, are only different ways of understanding a single hidden reality. The result of this going beyond the narrow professional framework was the joint publication of an article on synchronicity in 1955 and the study of archetypes by V. Pauli in the works of J. Kepler (*Grof, 1993: 467*).

What does the use of the principles of dissipative systems theory in the development of cultures? I. Prigozhin proved, that instability (chaos) in open systems is the source of organization and order, and any event is the result of instability of chaos at all levels, including cosmological. Chaos theory proves, that within the same system (that is, with the same initial data), many different dissipative structures are naturally compatible, which is a consequence of the nonlinear nature of “strongly nonequilibrium” situations, and minor differences can lead to large-scale consequences (*Prigozhin, Stengers, 2003: 58*). The fact that the theory of dissipative systems not only explains but also proves the naturalness and regularity of the appearance of various branches/directions of any culture is one of its most important results. After all, even today a significant number of scientists, like most representatives of the modern Armenian diaspora in Ukraine and the world, consider only the culture of historical Armenia with a traditional set of basic ethnic characteristics (language, traditions, customs, confessional – Armenian Apostolic Church/AAC) to be Armenian. While the theory of dissipative chaos refutes the validity of such a view of any culture that is above a complex open dissipative system, and shows the regularity of the formation of autonomous, simultaneous functioning systems of culture in the process of its evolution.

The culture of the Armenian diaspora, derived from the native national, is an integral original phenomenon, that arises as a result of the interaction, organic synthesis of the culture of emigrants and the dominant culture of the country that gave them shelter, and develops as an autonomous and original phenomenon. Armenians create their own specific environment with more or less religious and administrative autonomy, develop traditional types of crafts, the products of which, under the influence of local traditions, acquire features that are not inherent on their native land. They have new laws, new customs, change life, language, names, form a modified/new ethno-cultural identity, after all, it is in Ukraine that a successful and stable Union of the AAC with Rome takes place, the duration of which is also a consequence of the changes that have occurred with the Armenian diaspora over the centuries of its existence on our territory.

The concept of "Event" of I. Prigozhin, by which he understands phenomena that can change the course of evolution, is also fruitful for understanding the regularities of the development of religious, ecclesiastical and cultural life of the Armenian diaspora. Evolution must be "unstable", that is means, it have mechanisms that can make certain events the starting point of a new development, a new interdependent order. And the study of the leading role of some persons, according to I. Prigozhin, allows to conclude namely Person is the "Event" that activates social mechanisms that change the course of evolution (*Prigozhin, Stengers, 2003: 47-48*). The historical dynamics of Armenian culture and the emergence of transcultural/glocal Diaspora components in the general world field of Armenian culture particularly clearly illustrates the role of the Person in the creation and specific reproduction of Armenian culture in the diaspora. If ethno-national self-identification in the native land is a process, that most often does not require personal choice, then in the diaspora, especially after an interval of several generations, this process always depends on the self-awareness and individual choice of each person. In Ukraine, the renaissance of Armenian culture, but in local refraction/reading, is due to outstanding, successful cultural persons of Armenian blood in their chosen fields of activity, whose ancestors moved to these lands centuries ago. Thanks to their activities, the common historical and cultural memory is updated and the sense of community of the ethno-mental and ethno-cultural field with Armenians living not only in their historical homeland, but also in different parts of the world is strengthened.

The fact that new scientific approaches, in particular, based on the theory of dissipative systems, are fruitful in the study of cultural phenomena, is evidenced by Nelly Kornienko's deep, scientifically balanced study of theatrical culture "Invitation to chaos. Theater (art culture) and synergetics. Attempts at non-linearity" (2008). The researcher believes, that the traditional scientific paradigm with its linear logic and requirements of certainty, objectivity, and isolation is not suitable for "creative study of open viable self-developing systems" (*Kornienko, 2008: 11*), which include culture, religion, and, ultimately, any society as a whole. Especially effective to the studying, first of all, Diaspora cultures, is the original definition of H. Kornienko one of the two basic qualities of any system – integrity, which is "associated with the constant restoration of constancy, stability of the system, ensuring balance along the line of three components: Energy, Information and matter", and one of the "fixed circumstances" of transition is that "the center and marginal zones tend to be interchanged, which fixes the need for a new configuration of energies, their new trajectories and the special role of marginal models; at this stage, it is the marginal systems that assume the role of a kind of locomotive, the leader of the process – after all, they kept the zone of experiment, search, and risk in the asset" (*Kornienko, 2008: 19*).

The study of the transformation of "marginal { Diaspora cultures into such a "kind of locomotive { for the development of Armenian culture in the world is beyond the scope of our work, but even a cursory look at the development of the culture of Armenian diasporas not only in Ukraine, but in different parts of the world confirms this statement of the researcher.

So, how legitimate is it to enroll in Armenian culture and its representatives people who were citizens of Poland, Russia, Moldova, Ukraine, felt, recognized themselves as such, spoke the languages of these countries and played a significant role in their political, cultural and religious life? It is still a common point of view in the scientific and museum environment, that people, who have been living outside their ancestral homeland for several generations, communicate in the language of another country, live according to its laws, accept its traditions and Customs, cannot be considered Armenians, because they are too different from Armenians living in Armenia.

However, is it scientifically correct to consider the comparison of Armenians of the historical diaspora with Armenians living in their native land today? If the first large wave of emigrants from Armenia to Ukrainian lands took place in the XI century, then over the centuries changes have occurred not only with Armenian emigrants, but also with autochthons, and changes are no less. In addition, significant waves of Armenian immigrants came to our lands from the Crimea (and to the Crimea – from the banks of the Volga, where the capital of the Golden Horde was Ak-Sarai), later – from Wallachia, Crimea, Moldova, Persia, Turkey. Therefore, the criteria for comparison can give only signs that were inherent in Armenians of the XI century, when the formation of new branches of the Armenian ethnic group began.

Emigration of people, especially mass emigration, always disrupts the balance of the ethnic system of both their own autochthonous ethnos and the society in which these emigrants form a diaspora; it changes not only those, who left their homeland, but also those, who stayed there. For emigrants, a sharp change in living conditions destroys established social ties. Armenians enter into the sphere of “highly unbalanced { relations (according to I. Prigozhin) (*Prigozhin, Stengers, 2003: 59*), because in the first period of life in a new conditions, they do not determine the character of new social connections, but the new society sets the main parameters for logging in to the system. However, the crisis situation becomes an impulse and a condition for accelerated self-organization of the Armenians of the diaspora in two main directions: it strengthens internal ties, binds the ethnic group, ensures its cohesion, mobility and self-preservation, and at the same time forces it to be intensively incorporated into a new social system as an autonomous component of this system. A new system and a new self-organization change the role and content of connections. The Armenians who emigrated to our lands are changing, the Armenians who stayed in their native territories are changing as a result of each wave of emigration, and the society that accepted Armenian emigrants is changing too. Armenians, while maintaining their original ethno-cultural identity, simultaneously become Ukrainian, Polish, and Russian Armenians.

The next reason, why comparing the cultural characteristics of Armenians of the historical diaspora with the modern population of Armenia is incorrect from a scientific point of view, because the Armenian culture is a complex open dissipative system, the development of which is wrong to reduce only to the culture of Indigenous Armenia, since historically the Armenians developed primarily in the form of diaspora communities/ethno-national minorities in many countries.

So, for a full-fledged study of Diaspora culture, an interdisciplinary integration approach is necessary using basic scientific principles and methods of cultural studies, philosophy, sociology, art history, namely: the principle of integrity and consistency – the culture of the Armenian diaspora is considered as an open dissipative socio-cultural system; the method of comparative analysis and synthesis is necessary for the study and comparison of cultures in order to identify Armenian artifacts, determine the mutual influence of Armenian and autochthonous Ukrainian cultures, as well as to recreate a complete picture of the formation and development of the culture of the Armenian diaspora on Ukrainian lands; the method of scientific reconstruction is necessary for the reproduction of cultural life based on the items base of museum depositories and archival materials; a historical and cultural method allows us to find out the historical context and identify the reasons that led to the specifics of development and changes in the culture of the Armenian diaspora; the method of historical analogy, which makes it possible to recreate individual episodes of the cultural existence of Armenians in the absence of sufficient exhibit-archival material, and the method of iconological analysis is necessary for interpreting works of art in the context of a certain era, environment and life and psychological realities of a

particular person. Also, one of the main methods is historical and biographical, since it provides factual material for concluding the inclusion of a particular person in the communicative space of the Armenian cultural environment.

Understanding the historical existence of Diaspora culture was based on Heidegger's phenomenology of being and the ontology of M. Bahtin's involvement. M. Heidegger in his phenomenology of being (fundamental/social ontology) was based on the so called phenomenological maxim: a phenomenon is self-sufficient and carries all the content in relation to the subject (both the phenomenon and the essence), while the being is everything that can be thought. The M. Bahtin's philosophical approach V. Mahlin aptly described as "the ontology of being – co-existence/Events" (Mahlin, 2018: 286) or the ontology of participation (Mahlin, 2018: 284). In the context of the history of European philosophical and cultural thought, M. Bahtin's philosophical concept is organically included in the content horizon of "social ontology" – a term that was introduced and justified in his work "Other" (1965) by the famous German historian of philosophy Mikael Toinissen (1933-2015) (Mahlin, 2018: 275). Moreover, M. Bahtin's philosophy combined both "transcendental" (E. Husserl – M. Heidegger – P. Sartre) and "dialogic" (M. Buber, M. Scheler, K. Jaspers, R. Guardini, etc.) vectors of social ontology development. M. Bahtin denies the monologue nature of cognition and justifies the need of dialogic activity of the knower (Bahtin, 1986: 383). In fact, the content of the concept of "ecological thinking" by E. Morin largely coincides with Bahtin's dialogicism. Social ontology justified the primacy of concrete-historical, "actual "thinking over the" monologue structure of modern science, scientific theory" (Gadamer, 1999: 88); as well as the introduction to philosophy of "relatively new categorical character – "Other", so that being from a certain "essence" turned into an open, incomplete event, which was determined by the correlation "I" – "Other" (Mahlin, 2018: 275).

#### 4. The conceptual base of understanding the mechanisms of being material things

Study of the diaspora culture that has been existed during the centuries in another country, it should include research on the entire material sphere of its life, all the artifacts created by its representatives. This, in turn, requires defining the conceptual foundations for understanding the mechanisms of being of material things.

If the being is all that can be thought (M. Heidegger), then things are different forms of the being that open up to us in many of their manifestations/individual entities. One of the most fruitful methods of cultural understanding of artifacts is iconological analysis of art items. Back in the early twentieth century Max Dvorzhak (1874–1921) wrote the work "The history of art as the history of the Spirit" (2001), and later his ideas were developed by Erwin Panofsky (1892–1968). He created an iconological method that reveals the historically determined figurative and symbolic content of artefacts and try to discover essential worldview attitudes in them, to reveal the "cultural symptoms" of the era (Panofskij, 1999, 2009). Also the approaches of the so-called Actor-network theory (ANT), formed at the end of the 20th century, are fruitful in this context. The ANT considers artifacts as active units/actors of social relations, which make up "sociality" (Latour, 2006), as well as the principles of "Philosophy from below". The concept of "Philosophy from below" in European philosophical discourse appeared at the beginning of the twentieth century and determined the return "to the things themselves", first of all, to the "small things" of everyday human life (Makhlina, 2018: 277), which marked a decisive event in the development of twentieth-century philosophy, which G. Gadamer defined

it as “the transition from the world of science to the world of life” in scientific and philosophical thinking and cognition itself (*Gadamer, 1991: 7*).

M. Heidegger considered things to be different forms of being, which opens up in the set of its individual entities, and so on. According to B. Latour, in the modern era, things/objects “became disembodied/immaterial for the humanities precisely when they became “objective” for the Exact Sciences” (*Latour, 2006: 90*). Whereas, according to ANT, co-created by the aforementioned Bruno Latour, artifacts are not a mechanical reflection of a particular society/community, instead they are largely the substance that makes up “sociality”. The existence of things creates a map of reality in which objects play the function of markers; “things are included in narratives and narratives are included in things” (*Latour, 2006: 154*).

M. Heidegger also drew attention to this fact when he wrote about the compulsion of scientific knowledge: “To the relation of Objects/Things, this consists in the fact that science does not allow the thing itself to exist as a defining reality. Scientific knowledge, imposed as mandatory in relation to the sphere of objects, destroyed things long before the atomic bomb exploded” (*Heidegger, 1993: 319*).

M. Bahtin also denied the mood of traditional / positivist philosophical thinking to seek or establish the truth of things through abstract-theoretical manipulations, while leaving “the immediate reality of things and relations” “beyond the threshold” of knowledge” (*Bahtin, 1999a: 245*). As a result of this approach, there is created “a fundamental gap between the content of this act-of activity and the historical reality of its existence (*Bahtin, 1999b: 8*). This gap, according to the scientist, has a universal character, as a result of which two completely closed and non – communicative worlds are formed-the world of culture and the world of life (*Bahtin 1999b: 7*). The world of “objects” of cultural creativity is an embodied content or content “that has disappeared into being” – on the one hand, and on the other – the world of acts/actions or actions in their concrete historical factuality “eventfulness of being” or in the world of “here – here-being” /Heidegger's Dasein (*Bahtin, 1999b: P. 8, 12, 49*).

The capacious Bahtin term “Event of being” in the context of his philosophy of involvement has at least a double significant connotation: its content is more precisely transmitted by a combination of two words “event” and “co-existence”, which means that being occurs, and is not a given, and at the same time that event (world of acts-actions) and Artifact worlds form a co-existence of being (added, multiplied being). M. Bahtin formulates this unambiguously: “the world as an event, and not as being in its readiness” (*Bahtin, 1986: 384*).

In the 1st half of the XXth century, the well-known sociologist P. Sorokin convincingly proved that it is impossible to talk about socio-cultural phenomena as consisting exclusively of people. But all of them necessarily include a component of intangible values, norms and values, and a third component – material artefacts (*Sorokin, 1992: 160*). Moreover, the scientist justifies the existence of the so-called rebound influence of material artefacts: they determine human behavior and the state of the spirit; surrounded on all sides by numerous artifacts, people constantly – often unconsciously and against their will – absorb the stimuli and meanings that these conductors/objects/material carriers transmit (*Sorokin, 1992: 166*). At the end of the twentieth century, V. Toporov wrote that “a thing testifies to a person in a number of important aspects of his existence” (*Toporov, 1993: 93*).

In the strange cultural environment of the diaspora, an emigrant finds himself in a situation of meeting not only with the personalistic “Alien/Other”, but also with the material world of “Other/Alien” things. Consequently, the development of an alien cultural landscape also occurs through the introduction/appropriation of artifacts to the “Other” world. This process is bilateral and works both for the community of Armenian emigrants and for the



host society. Therefore, the study of artifacts of Armenian culture took place in the plane of interpretation/representation of the materiality of historical as a symbolic and material space structured by interpretive intentions (*Vernier, 2013: 17-18*).

Thus, a full-fledged study of Diaspora culture should also comply with the principles of “Philosophy from below” and include direct work (“direct inclusion”) with material evidence (artifacts, documents) of various chronotopes of the Armenian diaspora in Ukraine, which require an appropriate algorithm for explication of the cultural text, placed in them.

## 5. Conclusion

Content of the concept of “Diaspora culture” today there are no clear content boundaries and unambiguous definition for several reasons: blurring of the content field of concepts and phenomena “Diaspora”, “ethnos” and “nation”, “Diasporian culture” and “culture of Diaspora”. The widespread definition of an ethnos as a group of people who share the same language, a complex of customs and way of life, sanctified by tradition, which differs from the customs of other groups and recognize their common origin, in many cases does not correspond to reality, and this primarily concerns ethnic groups, whose fate has historically developed as the fate of a diaspora community. The closest thing to understanding the fundamental characteristics of an ethnos was scientists who considered such recognition of a common origin and the presence of a collective historical memory. Unlike an ethnos, a nation is primarily a political phenomenon, not a generic one, and it is associated with power/state relations.

Today, a significant number of scientists, as well as most representatives of the modern Armenian diaspora in Ukraine and the world, consider only the culture of historical Armenia with a traditional set of basic ethnic characteristics (language, traditions, customs, confessional – Armenian Apostolic Church/ AAC) to be Armenian. While the theory of dissipative chaos by I. Prigozhin refutes the validity of such a view of any culture, which is a super-complex open dissipative system, and shows the regularity of the formation of autonomous, simultaneous functioning systems of culture in the process of its evolution. The historical dynamics of Armenian culture and the emergence of transcultural Diaspora components in the general world field of Armenian culture particularly clearly illustrates the role of the individual (Prigozhin's concept of “event”) in the creation and specific reproduction of Armenian culture in the diaspora. Also one of the main conceptual foundations of the study of disparate culture are the principles of “Philosophy from below” and ANT, according to which artifacts are not a mechanical reflection of a certain society/community, but they are largely the substance that makes up “sociality”, and therefore all the material monuments of the Armenian diaspora did not appear by chance: they are evidence of the spirit of Armenia and the spirit of the era, these monuments clearly show the transformations that have occurred in the mentality and culture of Armenians on the lands of Ukraine. The culture of the Armenian diaspora on the lands of Ukraine is an autonomous dissipative system relative to the mother culture, which arises as a natural phenomenon due to the prolonged action of new socio-cultural conditions and develops according to its internal ethno-cultural codes. It is a complete original phenomenon that arises as a result of the interaction, organic synthesis of the culture of emigrants and the dominant culture of the country that gave them shelter, and develops as an autonomous and original phenomenon. The originality of this phenomenon in Ukraine is evidenced by the main cultural characteristics of the development of the Armenian diaspora.

## References

1. Assman, Ya. (2004). *Kulturnaya pamyat: pismo, pamyat o proshlom i politicheskaya identichnost v vysokih kulturah drevnosti* [Cultural memory: writing, memory of the past and political identity in the high cultures of antiquity]. Moskva: Yazyki slavyanskoj kultury. [In Russian].
2. Bahtin, M. (1986). *Estetika slovesnogo tvorchestva* [Aesthetics of verbal creativity]. Moskva: Iskusstvo. [In Russian].
3. Bahtin, M. (1999a). *Avtor i geroj v esteticheskoj deyatel'nosti. Sobranie sochinenij, t. 1. (s. 69–263)* [The author and the hero in aesthetic activity. Collected works]. Moskva: Yazyki slavyanskih kultur. [In Russian].
4. Bahtin, M. (1999b). *K filosofii postupka. Sobranie sochinenij, t. 1. (s. 7–65)* [To the philosophy of action. Collected Works]. Moskva: Yazyki slavyanskih kultur. [In Russian].
5. Dvorzhak, M. (2001). *Istoriya iskusstva kak istoriya Duha* [The history of art as the history of the spirit]. Sankt-Peterburg: Akademicheskij proekt. [In Russian].
6. Grof, S. (1993). *Za predelami mozga* [Beyond the brain. Birth, death and transcendence in Psychotherapy]. Moskva: izd-vo Moskovskogo Transpersonalnogo centra. [In Russian].
7. Gadamer, G.-G. (1991). *Aktualnost prekrasnogo* [The relevance of the beautiful]. Moskva: Iskusstvo. [In Russian].
8. Hajdegger, M. (1993). *Veshch. V kn. "Vremya i bytie". (s. 316–326)* [An item. In "Time and being"]. Moskva: Respublika. [In Russian].
9. Halbvaks, M. (2007). *Socialnye ramki pamyati* [Halbwachs, M. The social framework of memory]. Moskva: Novoe izdatel'stvo. [In Russian].
10. Korniyenko, N. (2008). *Zaproshennyya do haosu. Teatr (hudozhnaya kultura) i synergetyka. Sproby ne liniynosti* [An invitation to chaos. Theater (art culture) and synergetics. Attempts at non-linearity]. Kyiv: NCTM im. Lesya Kurbasa. [In Ukrainian].
11. Latur, B. (2006). *Novogo vremeni ne bylo. Esse po simmetrichnoj antropologii* [There was no new time. An essay on symmetric anthropology]. Sankt-Peterburg: izdatel'stvo Evropejskogo universiteta v Sankt-Peterburge. [In Russian].
12. Mahlin V. (2018). «Uchastnoe myshlenie». *Filosofskij proekt M. M. Bahtina. V "Istoriko-filosofskij ezhegodnik"* ["Participatory thinking". M. M. Bahtin's philosophical project. Historical and Philosophical Yearbook], t. 33, 267–292. Moskva: institut filosofii RAN. [In Russian].
13. Moren, E. (1995). *Utrachennaya paradigma: priroda cheloveka. Per. s franc. M. Sobuckogo* [Morin, E. The Lost paradigm. Human nature. Translated from french. M. Sobuckiy]. Kiev: KARME-SINTO. [In Russian].
14. Moren, E. (2011). *K propasti. Per. s franc. G. Naumovoj* [Morin, E. To the abyss. Translated from french. G. Naumova]. Sankt-Peterburg: Aletejya. [In Russian].
15. Osipyan, A. (b.d.). *Etno-konfessionalnye menshinstva v Pol'skom korolevstve vo vtoroj polovine XIV–pervoj polovine XVII vv.: na primere «gorodskih nacij» Lvova* [Ethno-confessional minorities in the Polish Kingdom in the second half of the XIV – first half of the XVII centuries: on the example of the "urban nations" of Lviv]. Received from: [www.hist.msu.ru/Labs/UkrBel/Osipian.doc](http://www.hist.msu.ru/Labs/UkrBel/Osipian.doc). [In Russian].
16. Panofskij, E. (1999). *Smysl i tolkovanie izobrazitel'nogo iskusstva. Stati po istorii iskusstva (Per. s angl. V. Simonova)* [The meaning and interpretation of fine art. Articles on the history of art (Translated from the English by V. Simonov)]. Sankt-Peterburg: Gumanitarnoe agenstvo «Akademicheskij proekt». [In Russian].

17. Panofskij, E. (2009). *Etyudy po ikonologii: Gumanisticheskie temy v iskusstve Vozrozhdeniya* [Studies on iconology: humanistic themes in Renaissance art]. Sankt-Peterburg: Izdatelskij Dom «Azбуka-klassika». [In Russian].
18. Prigozhin, I., Stengers, I. (2003). *Vremya, kaos, kvant. K resheniyu paradoksa vremeni* [Time, chaos, quantum. To solve the paradox of time]. Moskva: Editorial URSS. [In Russian].
19. Progoff, I. (1966). *Ideya Eranosa. V "Religiya i Zdorove"* [The idea of Eranos. In "Religion and Health"], t. 5, № 4, 307-313. Received from: [www.castalia.ru › articles › ira-progoff-ideya-eranosa](http://www.castalia.ru/articles/ira-progoff-ideya-eranosa). [In Russian].
20. Sorokin, P. (1992). *Chelovek. Civilizaciya. Obshestvo* [Human. Civilization. Society]. Moskva: Politizdat. [In Russian].
21. Toporov, V. (1993). *Vesh v antropocentricheskoj perspective* [An item in an anthropocentric perspective. In "Aequinox"]. V "Aequinox", 70-94. Moskva: Knizhnyj sad, CARTE BLANCHE. [In Russian].
22. Verle, A. (2013). *«Ne nasha veshch»: filosofskie zametki k istoricheskoj antropologii identichnosti* ["Not our thing": Philosophical notes on the Historical Anthropology of Identity. Metamorphoses of history. Scientific Almanac]. V "Metamorfozy istorii". Nauchnyj almanah, vyp. 4, 12-29. Pskov: Pskovskij gosudarstvennyj universitet. [In Russian].