

EVOLUTION AND FORMS OF SOCIO-POLITICAL ORGANIZATION: STUDIES AT INTERSECTION OF ANTHROPOLOGY AND HISTORY

D.M. Bondarenko

In the middle and second half of the 19th century, when Anthropology was being formed as a special science, in the minds of its first classics, it resonated with historical science quite clearly. They saw the meaning and purpose of Anthropology as being a replacement for History for nonliterate peoples — those whose past could not be studied using written sources. However, at the turn of the 20th century, with the establishment of the postulates about the absence of universality and regularity of the world-historical socio-cultural process, when the sense of internal connection was lost not only between different societies, but also between different periods in the history of one society, the break between Anthropology and History occurred. For most of the 20th century and a quarter of the 21st century, Anthropology and History have been increasingly moving away from each other to the point of almost mutual ignorance within the framework of the currently dominant postmodernism, which asserts the absolute uniqueness of each society (and, consequently, the inadmissibility of using the comparative-historical method) and denies the very possibility of objective knowledge of anything related to human and society, including history and culture. The nowadays obvious gap between History and Anthropology has extremely negative consequences for both disciplines. Restoring the connection between historical and anthropological knowledge offers the prospect of not only giving a new impetus to anthropological theoretical thought, but also of deepening historians' understanding of past phenomena. The connection between Anthropology and History needs to be restored not simply at the level of studying specific scientific topics but to the entire spectrum of issues covered by these disciplines, including the study of a wide range of social, economic, political, and cultural phenomena and processes of the past and present. The necessity

Dmitri Mikhailovich Bondarenko, Corresponding Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, PhD, Professor, Vice-Director of the Institute of Oriental Studies, RAS; Director of the International Center of Anthropology of the HSE University (National Research University "Higher School of Economics"), Moscow, Russia.

Дмитрий Михайлович Бондаренко, член-корреспондент РАН, доктор исторических наук, профессор, заместитель директора Института востоковедения РАН; директор Международного центра антропологии НИУ «Высшая школа экономики».

E-mail: dmitrimb@mail.ru

and fruitfulness of reintegration of History and Anthropology is revealed on the example of the study of evolution and forms of sociopolitical organization — the key topic of the colloquium.

Keywords: Anthropology, History, anthropological theory, historical knowledge, sociopolitical organization.

HISTORY AND ANTHROPOLOGY: A STORY OF ATTRACTION AND REPULSION

It is no coincidence that History and Sociocultural Anthropology have the same progenitor. We all know from childhood that Herodotus is the “father of History”. But he should also rightfully be considered the “father of Anthropology.” In his work “History”, yet in the 5th century BCE, he formulated a number of most essential for Anthropology questions and to address them used methods and hypotheses that became classical for anthropological science many centuries later (Hodgen 1964: 20–28). Thus, already two and a half thousand years ago, in one of the greatest creations of ancient culture, the fruitfulness of the union of “the muse of history and the science of culture” (Carneiro 2000a) in solving the problems of both disciplines was demonstrated.

In the middle and second half of the 19th century, when Anthropology was being formed as a special science, in the minds of its first classics — Lewis Morgan, Adolf Bastian, John McLennan, Edward Tylor, John Lubbock, Julius Lippert and others — it resonated with historical science quite clearly. They saw the meaning and purpose of Anthropology as being a replacement for history for nonliterate peoples — those whose past cannot be studied using written sources. After all, historians have always had the cult of the written source as the only material on the basis of which one can reliably reconstruct the past events, and therefore peoples who did not have a writing system were perceived as “the people without history” (Wolf 1982). But these were peoples precisely without a written history, eventful, with dates and names — the one to which studying historians initially reduced their task. A reconstruction of the eventful history was indeed impossible for nonliterate peoples (at least for the time before they entered into active interaction with peoples who had writing systems), but anthropologists saw their mission in restoring their sociocultural history, or more precisely, in including the cultures of these peoples in the general scheme of the cultural history of humankind.

Nonliterate societies were of interest in themselves, but within the framework of the evolutionist worldview (and Anthropology formed as an evolutionist science), a reconstruction of the sociocultural past of “civilized peoples”, primarily modern Europeans, and of all humanity — its single culture in its temporal dynamics perceived as universal

and unidirectional, was seen as an even more important task. This vision of the sociocultural process assumed that the cultures of all peoples develop in the same direction (from simpler to more complex forms, from lower to higher), only at different pace. Therefore, it was argued that by studying “modern savages”, one can see what the culture in the time of the “childhood of mankind”, the starting point on its path “from savagery through barbarism to civilization” was like, and in particular, what the cultural appearance of today’s “civilized nations” once was.

It is worth noting, however, that a potential conflict between Anthropology and History was inherent from the start. After all, Anthropology was understood as a science that studies cultures that exist today, although archaic in type. The emphasis on this became especially pronounced in the early 20th century, when, thanks to Franz Boas in America and Bronisław Malinowski and Alfred Radcliffe-Brown in Europe, Anthropology began to be clearly positioned as a field discipline. As for History, it is the science about the past. However, this conflict was by no means insurmountable. Rather, it could serve as a driving force for the development of both disciplines. This is evidenced, in particular, by the emergence of such an anthropological subdiscipline as Historical Anthropology, which studies archaic cultures of the past basing on available written sources (e.g., Dube (ed.) 2007), and by considering archaeology (primarily in North America) as a section of Anthropology within the framework of the “four-field approach” to the latter (e.g., Hicks 2013). Yet the most striking proof of this is James Frazer’s “The Golden Bough.” Wanting to understand a specific historical fact – claiming that “The primary aim of this book is to explain the remarkable rule which regulated the succession to the priesthood of Diana at Aricia” (Frazer 1963: V), he created one of the greatest anthropological masterpieces.

It is remarkable that at about the same time, in the middle – second half of the 19th century, historians began to actively study the past of “historical” peoples as not only a chain of events, but also as a series of long-term phenomena that flowed from one another – as a sociocultural process that took the shape of the birth and transformation of social institutions that formed societies. The works of the classical scholar Numa Fustel de Coulanges were of particular importance in this regard.

It should be noted that the philosophical basis of all sciences of that era – natural, social and the humanities – was the Modern European rationalism, rooted in the ancient worldview, developed in the philosophical thought of the Middle Ages, fundamentally transformed during the Renaissance and Reformation, which flourished in the philosophy of the 17th–18th centuries and reflected the general character of the worldview of the era in the West in the 19th century. This worldview affirmed the belief in the cognizability of the world by the power of human reason, since the world itself was seen, if created by God, then not by arbitrariness, but by logic, which found expression in the universal laws of the universe.

These laws were seen as objective and immutable, i.e., embodied uniformly and inevitably always and everywhere, beyond people's will and desires.

It is especially important that the human and society were perceived as an integral part of the universe — of Nature with a capital letter, subject to the same laws as everything in the world. That is exactly why Tylor, and after him many other anthropologists of the first generations, insisted that cultures should be studied by the methods of the natural sciences, and that the elements of culture should be considered in the same way as biological species are considered in natural science. Both the first anthropologists who studied “primitive culture” and the first historians who began to study the past of “historical” peoples as the unfolding of sociocultural processes in time understood their activities as an analysis of the manifestations of the global laws of the universe (Nature) in human societies — past or present, nonliterate or with writing systems — and ultimately in humanity as a single whole, existing in historical time and geographical space.

The history of science is part of intellectual history, which in turn is directly linked to the course of socioeconomic and political history. The First World War marked the end of the “optimistic era” of Western history — the era of unbridled faith in scientific and technological progress, supposedly naturally leading the entire world along the path to “civilization” under the leadership of the peoples who had already achieved it; a path that was initially understood as a movement not just from the lower to the higher and from the simple to the complex, but also from the worse (less moral human being and society) to the better (more moral). The Great War demonstrated most clearly the illusory nature of faith in the moral power of scientific and technological progress, perceived as social progress: it led not to the improvement of the human being and society, but to the invention of more sophisticated means of killing people each other: the First World War was not only the first war of such a scale, but also the first in which tanks, military aircraft, and poison gases were used. Symptomatically, in 1920, the historian John Bury publishes the book titled “Idea of Progress” which he precedes by the dedication and epigraph: “Dedicated to the memories of Charles Francois Castel de Saint-Pierre, Marie Jean Antoine Nicolas Caritat de Condorcet, Auguste Comte, Herbert Spencer, and other optimists mentioned in this volume. *Tantane uos generis tenuit fiducia uestri?*” — “Did your confidence hold those of your kind to such an extent?” (Bury 1920).

However, the most sensitive minds felt the approaching end of the “optimistic era” even before the Great War. In 1888, Friedrich Nietzsche (1931: 44; original emphasis. — *D.B.*) wrote: “Mankind surely does *not* represent an evolution toward a better or stronger or higher level, as progress is now understood. This ‘progress’ is merely a modern idea, which is to say, a false idea”. In philosophy, the approaching end of the “optimistic era” was expressed in the emergence and gradual spread in the intellectual

circles from the last decades of the 19th century of trends that no longer saw humanity as subject to the impact of general and inexorable laws of the universe. For the history of science, the classification of sciences by the founders of the Baden school of neo-Kantianism, Wilhelm Windelband and Heinrich Rickert, was of particular importance. They divided sciences into two types: those designed to discover general laws — nomothetic (generalizing), and describing events — idiographic (individualizing). They classified the natural sciences as the former, and the humanities and social sciences as the latter. That is, they proceeded from the idea that not the entire universe is subject to the impact of objective laws, but only the world of nature (with a lowercase letter); the world of humans, their society and culture changes as a result of individual events that have no internal interconnection and are not conditioned by any general laws.

Naturally, History and Anthropology found themselves among the idiographic sciences. In Anthropology, the first major relativistic (anti-universalistic) teaching — diffusionism in its versions put forward by Fritz Graebner and Franz Boas — was directly based on the neo-Kantian, completely different from the evolutionist, understanding of the essence of the phenomena it studied and of itself as a scientific discipline. Precisely with the establishment of the postulates about the absence of universality and regularity of the world-historical sociocultural process, when each society at each moment in time began to be seen primarily as a unique entity, and not as a local manifestation of the sociocultural unity of humanity, when the sense of internal connection was lost not only between different societies, but also between different periods in the history of one society, the break between Anthropology and History occurred.

And in the first decades of the 20th century, Boas and his students called for studying cultures only as we see them today (Averkiewa 1979: 75–77, 106–107), while Malinowski wrote directly that history is useless for anthropologists, since knowledge of the past of cultures is unable to provide anything for understanding their present (Tokarev 1978: 235–236). For most of the 20th century and a quarter of the 21st century, Anthropology and History have been increasingly moving away from each other to the point of almost mutual ignorance within the framework of the currently dominant postmodernism, which asserts the absolute uniqueness of each society (and, consequently, the inadmissibility of using the comparative-historical method) and denies the very possibility of objective knowledge of anything related to human and society, including history and culture. In the mid-1990s, a representative large-scale survey of historians and anthropologists from many countries demonstrated a “conflict of paradigms” between the two disciplines, showed that “historians and anthropologists had different agendas ... and these agendas were in fact anchored in the internal dynamics of their disciplines and to their respective responses to wider societal change” (Kalb et al. 1996: 8–9).

The nowadays obvious gap between History and Anthropology has extremely negative consequences for both disciplines. For History, they are expressed, in particular, in the fact that, when dealing with topics to which anthropologists have made a great, fundamental contribution (for example, such as the institution of community or the phenomenon of the sacralization of power), historians do not rely on it, do not use it to the extent necessary, and often simply ignore it. In Anthropology, the feeling of the approaching end of the dominance of postmodernism is slowly but surely growing, and, accordingly, the question is becoming increasingly acute: what will happen to the discipline, what will be its theoretical and methodological foundations after the end of the period of dominance of the extreme relativism postmodernism brought, which denies the legitimacy of creating any general theories, and ultimately the very possibility of cognizing cultural phenomena.

HISTORY AND ANTHROPOLOGY:
PROSPECTS FOR REINTEGRATION.
STUDIES OF THE EVOLUTION AND FORMS
OF SOCIOPOLITICAL ORGANIZATION
AS AN INSTRUCTIVE CASE

Sociopolitical organization is a set of social institutions that form a dynamic system. The rise and transformations of social institutions have been studied in different disciplines, including History and Anthropology for a long time. In particular, yet in the 19th century, historians like Barthold Niebuhr, Augustin Thierry, or Numa Fustel de Coulanges studied the history of ancient societies as a history of their institutions (Gooch 1913). Also in the 19th century, Émile Durkheim wrote about society as not a simple set but rather a system of institutions, and influenced crucially the thinking of such prominent anthropologists of the first half of the 20th century as Marcel Mauss, Alfred Radcliffe-Brown, and Bronisław Malinowski among others (see: Bondarenko 2020: 2–5).

The objective inseparability of Anthropology and History at studying sociopolitical organization as a system of institutions is grounded in the fact that any system of institutions (as well as any separate institution) is formed in specific sociocultural and historical conditions. This should not be ignored by both anthropologists and historians particularly because those specific conditions determine specificity of the structure and mechanisms of functioning of the sociopolitical system, i.e., of the institution interaction within it. The way in which social institutions are interconnected determines the basic principle of society's organization. In my opinion (e.g., Bondarenko 2007, 2020a, 2026), there are two such principles and their dichotomy passes can be observed in all historical periods, in all parts of the world, and at all levels of sociocultural

complexity. As a rule, a society more or less vividly embodies one or the other of them (yet by now, this approach has been applied mostly to pre-modern historical and modern ethnographically observed societies; however, see, e.g.: Bondarenko, Aleksandrov 2026). Sociopolitical organization naturally reflects the basic principle of a society's overall organization. In the course of history, each of these principles has found and finds embodiment in many specific forms.

Even the simplest societies are made up of many social institutions. The organizational principle that a society embodies depends on how its institutions are related — how they are ranked in relation to each other. Carole Crumley introduced the concept of heterarchy into anthropology. In direct accordance with the content of this concept in biophysics, from where she transferred this term to the science of society, Crumley defines heterarchy "...as the relation of elements to one another when they are unranked or when they possess the potential for being ranked in a number of different ways" (see, e.g.: Crumley 1979: 144). Respectively, the opposite to heterarchy situation can be called homoarchy and coined as the relation of elements (social institutions) to one another when they are ranked rigidly one way only and possess no (or very limited) potential for being unranked or ranked in another or a number of different ways, at least without cardinal reshaping of the whole sociopolitical order (see, e.g.: Bondarenko 2006).

The opposite of heterarchy is precisely homoarchy and not hierarchy, because there are no non-hierarchical (not having hierarchies within and between institutions), in the full sense of the word egalitarian, societies. Institutions form a hierarchical structure of society as a system — hierarchical invariably and inevitably. Hierarchy is an attribute of any social system, while in any society one can observe both "vertical" (dominance — subordination) and "horizontal" (equal) social ties (see, e.g.: Blanton 1998; Crumley 2005). However, vertical and horizontal ties play different roles in different societies at any given historical moment or period. So, the question of differences between societies in terms of their organization as systems of institutions is not whether institutions form hierarchies or not, but how these hierarchies of institutions are interconnected.

Even among the so-called egalitarian hunter-gatherers, who may not have had clans or other descent groups, had no concepts of social hierarchy and leadership, and who, inspired by their cosmology, "worked hard to treat everyone as equals" (Flannery, Marcus 2012: 549) while "the accumulation of wealth was considered antisocial" (Barnard 2017: 331) — the Hadza, Birhor, Shoshone, etc. — scholars find minimal social differentiation and, accordingly, hierarchies and inequalities combined with informal leadership (see, e.g.: Johnson, Earle 2000; Lewis 2002; Artemova 2009). From the historical perspective, "the common academic view, where primeval social equality was the natural state of humanity and the starting point of human history, might turn out to be scholarly

construction, inconsistent with ancient realities” (Finlayson, Artemova 2020: 9). Not only should heterarchy not be confused with egalitarianism in the strict sense of the word, but homoarchy should not be identified with hierarchy either.

At the same time, it must be emphasized that it is impossible to find not only societies with a complete absence of hierarchies (including informal ones), but also completely homoarchival societies. On the one hand, as Peter Schweitzer (2000: 129) rightly notes, it is necessary “to break up the general label ‘egalitarian’ into a continuum of actual constellations of inequality”, adding that today “...even ardent supporters of ‘primitive communism’ agree that ‘perfect equality’ does not exist...” On the other hand, at the opposite end of the scale of complexity levels, even such societies as “archaic states”, usually represented as societies with low social mobility and a high degree of bureaucratization (Egypt during the pharaonic era, the Ur III state, the Inca kingdom, etc.), in reality “were both heterarchical *and* hierarchical [homoarchival]” (Marcus, Feinman 1998: 11, original emphasis). Thus, in fact, we should be talking not about heterarchical and homoarchival societies as types that constitute a rigid opposition to each other, but rather about the axis of heterarchy – homoarchy, along which all societies are located at one point or another.

Moreover, at the level of not theory but historical realities, it sometimes seems too difficult to designate a society as “homoarchic” or “heterarchic” even at the most general level of analysis, as in the cases of the late antique Germans and the early medieval “barbarian kingdoms”, in which monarchical power and a fairly rigid social hierarchy were combined (at least initially) with democratic institutions and procedures (for example, the election of a king), no less significant for the functioning of the sociopolitical system as a whole (see, e.g.: Diesner 1966; Claude 1970; Gurevich 1999: 45–57; Sannikov 2003).

The question that arises, therefore, when examining a particular society from the described above perspective, is whether the hierarchies in it are ranked rigidly, always uniformly, or not rigidly and situationally: are any two individuals or groups of individuals ranked uniformly in relation to each other in any social context? For example, in the exemplary heterarchical society of the Pathans of the Swat Valley, as it appears in the description of Fredrik Barth (1959), a person could occupy an unequal place in the hierarchies of the three intersecting main elements of social organization: territorial divisions, castes and patrilineal kin groups, supplemented by a significant number of voluntary associations based on neighborhood, marriage and affinity, political and economic clientelism, etc. Thus, an individual X could be superior to a fellow tribesman Y in one social context, but inferior or equal to him in another. One more archetypal example of a complex heterarchical system is the Greek civic community (*polis*) of the Classical period (5th–4th centuries BC), in which citizens who had a lower status in one hierarchy (say, the military) could

well occupy a higher position in others (say, the economic or administrative — in the system of magistrates). Accordingly, it was impossible to claim that one citizen was socially superior or inferior to another in an absolute sense. All citizens were explicitly equalized by law (and by it they were unconditionally elevated above non-citizens — let us recall that there are no completely heterarchical, just as there are no completely homoarchical, societies). At the same time, history provides many examples of situations in which rigid social stratification unambiguously determined the places of individuals and groups in society, at least in formal legal terms. Societies based on deeply elaborated, rigid cast division in India and elsewhere are the most vivid examples of homoarchical systems (Gellner 1995; Quigley 1999: 114–169; Kobishchanov 2000: 64).

People create and modify institutions in accordance with the value systems and behavior patterns developed in their societies, which they learn through socialization as a cultural transmission (Ellen, Fischer 2013: 10–17). As a result, hierarchies of social institutions reflect the hierarchy of values accepted in a society. In other words, each hierarchy is reinforced by a particular value system, which in turn is rooted in the cosmology of the members of a given society — ideas about the structure of the universe, the place, purpose and meaning of their, their society and its institutions' existence in it (Bondarenko 2007; Hicel, Haynes 2018). On the one hand, the dominance of so-called collective ideologies contributes to the establishment of sociocultural heterarchy and limits individual power or even prevents the emergence of its institutions (Flannery, Marcus 2012; Árnason, Raaflaub, Wagner 2013; Wright 2016). On the other hand, a society can be considered homoarchical when it affirms one value, central to all the social hierarchies existing in it, not only integrating but also ranking in a pyramidal manner all the other values and social hierarchies behind which those values stand. In such conditions, this value “encompasses” all the others and makes society, in the words of Louis Dumont (1980, 1986), “holistic”, i.e., homoarchical, when the whole unconditionally dominates over its constituent parts as the highest expression of this all-encompassing and all-pervasive value. Dumont relied on his studies of the caste system in India, attributing the status of “encompassing” to the idea of the degree of ritual purity as determining the place of each caste and individual in Hindu society. Although at present, Dumont's views on the Hindu caste society are often criticized, in my opinion, the significance of his theoretical contribution is confirmed, for example, by the totalitarian societies of the 20th century, in which, say, the ideas of communism, Maoism, etc. clearly played the role attributed by Dumont to ritual purity in India. The importance of Dumont's theoretical propositions can also be confirmed by examples of the so-called traditional societies. In particular, Jan Vansina (Vansina 1992: 21, 24) generalized that “Tropical African kingdoms... were products of an ideology more than of any other force... Tropical African kingdoms were

truly built in the mind first, and were grounded in faith”. Even in simple societies, homoarchization may have occurred through the rise to prominence of ideologies based on the encompassing idea of a fundamental division of all members of society into those who have and do not have access to esoteric knowledge and the right to carry out activities related to it, including management, as evidenced by the Australian Aborigines (Bern 1979; Artemova 2003; Peterson 2020).

However, encompassing is not always rooted directly in the realm of ideas and values. It may well arise as a result of the religious-ideological conceptualization of already existing sociopolitical realities, as happened in Polynesia with the idea of the conical clan, or ramage — that distance from the senior line of descent from the common ancestor is the criterion of stratification. The existence of ramage can be traced back to the Proto-Polynesian culture of the first settlers on the islands and archipelagos of this geographical and historical-cultural region (see, e.g.: Sahlins 1958: XI–XII, 139–180; Goldman 1970; Kirch, Green 2001; Claessen 2018).

In any case, in contrast to holistic (homoarchival) societies, when “there is a multiplicity of ‘hierarchical’ or asymmetrical oppositions, none of which are reducible to any of the others or to a single master opposition or value”, “the... case immediately departs from the Dumontian formulation” (Mosko 1994: 214) — the society does not fit the homoarchival model. This is what can be observed not only in such paradigmatic historical examples of heterarchical cultures as the ancient *polis* and *civitas*, the medieval trading city-states of the Mediterranean and Northern Europe, or the countries of the West since the Renaissance, but also in many “ethnographic” cultures, perhaps less famous but no less important for theorizing: the “egalitarian” hunter-gatherers, the acephalous complex societies of mountain regions such as the Himalayas or the Caucasus, the tribal societies of North America, Eurasia, and Africa, etc. (see: Bondarenko 2006: 12, 93–96).

It is important to note, however, that the emphasis on the individual as a member of society rather than on society as a holistic collective, which is more common in heterarchical societies, does not make them citadels of social equality in any sense of the word. On the contrary, the ideology of individualism, which is positioned and perceived as egalitarian, contributes to the affirmation of social inequality, since it turns interpersonal competition, in which there are always winners and losers, into an important feature of a heterarchical society (Rio, Smedal 2011: 27–34). “In practice the force of egalitarian ideology is present in the concern of persons to demonstrate their social distinction as natural” (Kapferer 2012: 174). This circumstance provides an additional reason to emphasize that heterarchy does not mean the absence of hierarchy or egalitarianism.

Crumley (1995: 3; see also, e.g., 2005: 36, 40–41) insists on “the addition of the term heterarchy to the vocabulary of power relations” and sees the prerequisite for heterarchical sociopolitical organization

in the multiplicity of sources of power, since her concept is aimed at studying precisely the political subsystem of society. In the final analysis, Crumley tends to see the state as only a specific form of political organization. This understanding of the state, in particular, leads Crumley and her followers to an unjustified identification of heterarchy with a democratic political order (Crumley 1995: 3; 2005: 46–47; Vliet 2005, 2008), the absence of a “king” with the absence of any “hierarchical features” in society, or to the identification of heterarchy with the absence of autocracy due to the division of power between the sovereign and collective bodies such as councils of chiefs and secret societies (McIntosh 1999: 9–16, 23, 77). However, firstly, genuine autocracy in this sense is an extremely rare phenomenon in world history; secondly, the true degree of democracy of a political system does not depend entirely on its external form (cf., for example, the countries of the Western and Eastern blocs during the Cold War era, with *de jure* democratic systems of political institutions in both cases); and, thirdly, in many cases the real democracy or non-democracy of a political system may be a derivative of the democratic or non-democratic character of basic social institutions — in pre-industrial and many modern non-Western societies, first of all, the family and the community (Bondarenko, Korotayev 2000; Korotayev, Bondarenko 2000; Barry III 2003).

Contrary to such views, we believe it is correct and even necessary to apply both notions, heterarchy and homoarchy, within the broader framework of social relations and social structure in general, and not only in connection with power relations. Political institutions form only a part of the structure of society, inextricably interconnected with all its other parts (especially in pre-industrial societies), and, as emphasized above, excessive emphasis on the administrative system can lead to an oversimplified identification of heterarchy with a democratic political order (while, in particular, the heterarchical social structure of the Greek *polis* of the Classical period allowed not only democratic, but also aristocratic, oligarchic forms of political organization). A general description of society should be given to it as a whole — as the embodiment of a specific societal type. Moreover, we see in this a possible key to understanding (at least at the initial level) the conditions for the formation of a particular society as predominantly homoarchival or heterarchical. As sociologists point out, “each subsystem of a society is characterized by its own form of stratification: earnings and wealth in the economic sphere; privilege and power in the political system; moral worth and personal trust in religious and family life; and prestige and esteem in the occupational world” (Laumann et al. 1970: 589). Consequently, the more interconnected the subsystems (complexes of institutions serving the same sphere of social life) are, the less the criteria of general social ranking are applicable only to certain spheres of social activity. In other words, the more interdependent the subsystems (complexes of interconnected institutions)

are, the higher the probability that in any social context individuals and their groups will be ranked in the same way on the basis of one value that encompasses all interconnected spheres of society. In this case, the establishment of a homoarchival social order can be recorded. It is also logical that among archaic complex societies, there were more homoarchival than heterarchical ones, since under the conditions of Durkheimian “mechanical solidarity” that prevailed in them, a sufficiently clear division of spheres of social life was a rare case.

Thus, our approach is based on the conviction that, when defining a society as heterarchical or homoarchival, it is necessary to go far beyond the analysis of its political institutions. Society should be considered as an integrity, as a system of institutions of all kinds, which embodies one of the basic principles of societal organization, to which the system of political institutions is also adequate. In particular, the state “... is a specific kind of social organization, expressing a specific type of social order in a society” (Claessen 2003: 161), and not just “a political or governmental unit” (Marcus, Feinman 1998: 4), “something political” (Testart 2012: 105). Society complements and combines political characteristics with social, and through them – with economic ones. (However, it should be borne in mind that the social and political subsystems can develop asynchronously: not always, but often the political system evolves at a faster pace.) At the same time, it is wrong to see societies as isolated entities – they are almost always parts of sociocultural networks within which dynamic transformation processes occur. From this point of view, the examples of the systems of polities of sovereign cities of the Maya in pre-Columbian Central America, the Yoruba and Hausa in pre-colonial West Africa are particularly illustrative: they consisted of societies, in most cases organized predominantly homoarchival, but these systems of polities never turned into integrated empires remaining, on the whole, heterarchical sociocultural networks, even if in some historical periods certain polities (cities) dominated in them.

The basic principle of creating a hierarchy of social institutions significantly affects the nature of relations in society, the direction and pace of its transformation throughout history. These processes can have any direction and lead to either a change (an increase or a decrease) or the preservation of the previous general level of sociocultural complexity of society, to the continued embodiment of the previous basic principle of its organization or a change in the basic principle from heterarchical to homoarchival or vice versa. It is important to note that a change in the organizational principle while maintaining the previous level of sociocultural complexity is a fairly common phenomenon. In these cases, social evolution in its traditional for anthropologists understanding – as a movement from lower to higher, from simple to complex – does not occur. Nevertheless, a radical internal transformation and reorganization of social institutions takes place, while the level of complexity of the sociocultural

system remains the same. (For several of many examples and comparisons of the metamorphoses described in this paragraph among historically, archaeologically, and ethnographically studied societies, see: Leach 1954; Shkunaev 1988; Levy 1995; Korotayev 1996; Berezkin 2000; Kowalewski 2000; Raaflaub 2005; Kradin 2011; Joyce, Barber 2016; Kusimba et al. 2017; Aleksandrov 2026; Ladynin 2026; Vdovchenkov 2026.)

Consequently, the degree of homoarchization is not a valid criterion for determining the general level of development of a society, contrary to the unilinear schemes of social evolution, which assume that an increase in complexity (at least up to the level of a pre-industrial state) is inevitably accompanied by sociopolitical homoarchization — an increase in inequality and social stratification, a reduction in the role of broad sections of the population in political life, etc. In particular, contrary to most theories of the state, political centralization should not be considered a feature of exceptionally state societies, since it is equally inherent in many non-state forms of society (Bondarenko 2006: 25–26; 2014: 221–222), including even some forms of simple societies (see, e.g.: Godelier, Strathern 1991; Redmond 1998). Obvious alternatives to unilinear evolutionary schemes can be easily found, with an open mind, at virtually every level of complexity, including the state level (for a detailed discussion of this issue with many examples, see: Bondarenko et al. 2011; see also, e.g., Grinin et al. 2004).

With all that said, it is necessary to emphasize that the ultimate meaning and task of studying specific societies in the heterarchy — homoarchy paradigm is not in defining them as heterarchical or homoarchival. And the point is not even in the specially mentioned above possibility of societies to be heterarchical or homoarchival only predominantly and never absolutely. At this point, it is useful to recall the discussions of recent decades on the issues of the relationship between the concepts of essentially metaphysical “stage types” and dynamic “transformation processes” and the fruitfulness of approaches that give preference to one or the other of them (see, e.g.: Carneiro 2000). These discussions were provoked by the scholars’ growing dissatisfaction from the second half of the 1980s with the schemes dominant by that time, which represented social evolution as a sequence of universal types (forms) of sociopolitical organization. The discussions have shown that the mere assignment of a particular society to a type provides little for understanding its nature and especially little for understanding the mechanisms of its formation and transformation. As Robert Wenke (1999: 344) wrote, “The important point here is that simple categories such as ‘bands’, ‘tribes’, ‘chiefdoms’, and ‘states’ are static descriptive types that are not of much use in analyzing the origins and functions of the phenomena these labels loosely describe”. Assigning a society to one type or another as the ultimate goal of research was in fact simply putting a label on it. But what does just defining societies by one notion or another give us for understanding

them? The historical and cultural realities of the societies themselves did not depend on these definitions in any way even more so; their typological assessment is nothing more than an academics' interpretation, which, we repeat, gives little for understanding these realities.

Much more promising in terms of their heuristic potential are theories based on ideas not about the implementation of some impersonal "objective laws of development" in societies (a legacy of the 19th century evolutionism and, more broadly, the Western philosophical and intellectual tradition of Modernity), but about the active role of people — not only from political elites but from all social strata — in developing principles of organization and directions of transformation of societies, including through the creation and modification of social institutions. Among the most significant constructs of this kind, in my opinion, are, in particular, the theories of corporate and network strategies and of collective action (see, e.g.: Blanton et al. 1996; Blanton, Fargher 2016), which, like the concept of heterarchy and homoarchy, are called upon "to account for variation among societies of similar complexity and scale" (Blanton et al. 1996: 1). In particular, in the context of the heterarchy — homoarchy concept, we can argue that the strategies for achieving goals and forms of cooperation chosen by members of a particular society, leading (consciously or unconsciously on the part of people) to the preservation, change of old and formation of new institutions and rules of social ranking, differ depending on the general nature of cultures, the value systems and norms of socialization accepted in them. These strategies and forms in themselves can be heterarchical or homoarchical and contribute to the establishment of the corresponding basic principles of organization in societies.

Within the framework of the heterarchy — homoarchy paradigm, it is also important not to limit ourselves to the statement that at certain moments in history of the societies under study, the heterarchical or homoarchical principle of societal organization was embodied to a greater extent, but, starting from this statement, to study in dynamics how specifically in them as integrities and in the institutions that formed them, these principles were combined, the deployment of what sociocultural mechanisms, strategies, processes, and tendencies led to such a result in a concrete historical situation. At the same time, we must not forget that the ratio of heterarchical and homoarchical principles of societal organization can change in any direction at any time with any significant transformation of the system of its institutions.

The dichotomy of heterarchy and homoarchy has largely determined. An adequate understanding of the past, present and future of separate societies and the whole humanity does not seem possible without taking into account the non-unilinear and alternative nature of the global sociocultural process. For this, History and Anthropology's perspectives and approaches should be considered not as just complementary but as fundamentally inseparable.

CONCLUSION

As long ago as in 1968, David Bidney (Bidney 1968: 248) argued that “The lesson to be derived from a study of modern anthropological thought is that a science of cultural anthropology must be historical if it is not to be reduced to a branch of psychology or sociology”. Over the course of more than five and a half decades that have passed since these words were written, the re-historicization of Anthropology has been becoming an increasingly urgent necessity for its development as a theoretical and concrete scientific discipline (which has led to the appearance of several notable publications on this topic since the early 2000s (Carneiro 2000a; Whiteley 2004; Kalb, Tak 2005; Tagliacozzo, Willford 2009; Cowan 2012; Stewart 2016; Roque, Traube 2019)). Moreover, bringing a historical perspective into anthropological studies of industrial and post-industrial societies, which are most often the focus of attention of anthropologists in our time, turns out to be no less necessary than for the successful study of archaic societies (Bondarenko 2022).

Restoring the connection between historical and anthropological knowledge offers the prospect of not only giving a new impetus to anthropological theoretical thought, but also of deepening historians’ understanding of past phenomena. One of the most direct and promising ways of reuniting History and Anthropology is to study the relationship between the historical past, social memory, and contemporary cultural identities (Yelvington 2002). It is no coincidence that the “memory boom” in Anthropology that occurred at the turn of the millennium was directly linked to the “memorial turn” in historical science (Berliner 2005; Krause 2007). However, the connection between Anthropology and History needs to be restored not simply at the level of studying specific scientific topics, and those related not only to cultural memory, but to the entire spectrum of issues covered by these disciplines, including the study of a wide range of social, economic, political, and cultural phenomena and processes of the past and present. It is necessary to restore the connection between Anthropology and History at the theoretical and methodological levels. This is possible, on the one hand, if Anthropology is understood as a science that is fundamentally, essentially historical, which in turn presupposes the recognition of the existence of a sociocultural process unfolding in historical time at the global, regional and local levels. On the other hand, the reunification of anthropological and historical sciences, fruitful for both disciplines, is possible if historians, especially those studying not specific events but fundamental historical phenomena and deep historical processes, stop consciously or unconsciously perceiving anthropological themes, theories, methods, etc. as alien to themselves, as belonging to a completely different field of knowledge and in no way capable of helping them in their research.

REFERENCES

- Aleksandrov G.V. 2026. King Philip's War (1675–1676): Interactions and Transformations of Typologically Different Societies in the Colonial Context. *Principles and Forms of Sociocultural Organization: Historical Contexts of Interaction*. Ed. by D.M. Bondarenko, G.V. Aleksandrov. London: Anthem Press, in press.
- Árnason J.P., Raaflaub K.A., Wagner P. (eds.) 2013. *The Greek Polis and the Invention of Democracy. A Politico-Cultural Transformation and Its Interpretations*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Artemova O.Yu. 2003. Monopolization of Knowledge, Social Inequality, and Female Status: A Cross-Cultural Study. *Cross-Cultural Research*, vol. 37, No 1, 62–80.
- Artemova O.Yu. 2009. *The Kin of Esau: Hunters, Gatherers, Fishers (A Study of Alternative Social Systems)*. Moscow: Smysl. (In Russ.)
- Averkiewa Yu.P. 1979. *A History of Theoretical Thought in American Ethnography*. Moscow: Nauka. (In Russ.)
- Barnard A. 2017. Afterword. *Human Origins: Contributions from Social Anthropology*. Ed. by C. Power, M. Finnegan, H. Callan. New York; Oxford: Berghahn, 319–335.
- Barry III H. 2003. Community Customs Associated with Political Subordination. *Social Evolution and History*, vol. 2, No 1, 116–130.
- Barth F. 1959. *Political Leadership among Swat Pathans*. London: Athlone Press.
- Berezkin Yu.E. 2000. Once Again on Horizontal and Vertical Links in Structure of the Middle Range Societies. *Alternatives of Social Evolution*. Ed. by N.N. Kradin, A.V. Korotayev, D.M. Bondarenko, V. de Munck, P.K. Wason. Vladivostok: Far Eastern Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences Press, 220–224.
- Berliner D.C. 2005. The Abuses of Memory: Reflections on the Memory Boom in Anthropology. *Anthropological Quarterly*, vol. 78, No 1, 197–211.
- Bern J. 1979. Ideology and Domination: Toward a Reconstruction of Australian Aboriginal Social Formation. *Oceania*, vol. 50, No 2, 118–132.
- Bidney D. 1968. *Theoretical Anthropology*. New York: Transaction Publishers.
- Blanton R.E. 1998. Beyond Centralization: Steps Toward a Theory of Egalitarian Behavior in Archaic States. *Archaic States*. Ed. by J. Marcus, G.M. Feinman. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press, 135–172.
- Blanton R.E., Fargher L.F. 2016. *How Humans Cooperate: Confronting the Challenges of Collective Action*. Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado.
- Blanton R.E., Feinman G.M., Kowalewski S.A., Peregrine P.N. 1996. A Dual-Processual Theory for the Evolution of Mesoamerican Civilization. *Current Anthropology*, vol. 37, No 1, 1–14.
- Bondarenko D.M. 2006. *Homoarchy: A Principle of Culture's Organization. The 13th–19th Centuries Benin Kingdom as a Non-state Supercomplex Society*. Moscow: KomKniga.
- Bondarenko D.M. 2007. Homoarchy as a Principle of Sociopolitical Organization: An Introduction. *Anthropos*, vol. 102, No 1, 187–199.
- Bondarenko D.M. 2014. On the Nature and Features of the (Early) State: An Anthropological Reanalysis. *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, vol. 139, No 2, 215–232.
- Bondarenko D.M. 2020. Introduction. *The Evolution of Social Institutions: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Ed. by D.M. Bondarenko, S.A. Kowalewski, D.B. Small. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 1–25.
- Bondarenko D.M. 2020a. Social Institutions and Basic Principles of Societal Organization. *The Evolution of Social Institutions: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Ed. by D.M. Bondarenko, S.A. Kowalewski, D.B. Small. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 51–78.
- Bondarenko D.M. 2022. Cultural Anthropology in the USA. Representations of the Civil War and the Abolition of Slavery in the North and the South. *Anthropos*, vol. 117, No 2, 411–422.

- Bondarenko D.M. 2026. Principles and Forms of Organization of Societies as Systems of Institutions (The “Conceptual Frame” of This Book). *Principles and Forms of Sociocultural Organization: Historical Contexts of Interaction*. Ed. by D.M. Bondarenko, G.V. Aleksandrov. London: Anthem Press, in press.
- Bondarenko D.M., Aleksandrov G.V. (eds.) 2026. *Principles and Forms of Sociocultural Organization: Historical Contexts of Interaction*. London: Anthem Press, in press.
- Bondarenko D.M., Grinin L.E., Korotayev A.V. 2011. Social Evolution: Alternatives and Variations (Introduction). *Evolution: Cosmic, Biological, and Social*. Ed. by L.E. Grinin, A.V. Korotayev, R.L. Carneiro, F. Spier. Volgograd: Uchitel', 215–254.
- Bondarenko D.M., Korotayev A.V. 2000. Family Size and Community Organization: A Cross-Cultural Comparison. *Cross-Cultural Research*, vol. 34, No 2, 152–189.
- Bury J.B. 1920. *Idea of Progress: An Inquiry into Its Origin and Growth*. London: Macmillan and Co.
- Carneiro R.L. 2000. Processes vs. Stages. A False Dichotomy in Tracing the Rise of the State. *Alternatives of Social Evolution*. Ed. by N.N. Kradin, A.V. Korotayev, D.M. Bondarenko, V. de Munck, P.K. Wason. Vladivostok: Far Eastern Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences Press, 52–58.
- Carneiro R.L. 2000a. *The Muse of History and the Science of Culture*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Claessen H.J.M. 2003. Aspects of Law and Order in Early State Societies. *The Law's Beginnings*. Ed. by F.J.M. Feldbrugge. Leiden: Brill/Nijhoff, 161–179.
- Claessen H.J.M. 2018. Sacred Kingship: Cases from Polynesia. *Social Evolution and History*, vol. 17, No 2, 3–26.
- Claude D. 1970. *Geschichte der Westgoten*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer Verlag.
- Cowan J.K. 2012. Anthropology and History. *The SAGE Handbook of Social Anthropology*, vol. 1. Ed. by R. Fardon, O. Harris, T.H.J. Marchand, M. Nuttall, C. Shore, V. Strang, R.A. Wilson. London: SAGE Publications, 121–137.
- Crumley C.L. 1979. Three Locational Models: An Epistemological Assessment for Anthropology and Archaeology. *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory*, vol. 2. Ed. by T.C. Patterson, C.W. Gailey. New York: Academic Press, 141–173.
- Crumley C.L. 1995. Heterarchy and the Analysis of Complex Societies. *Heterarchy and the Analysis of Complex Societies*. Ed. by R.M. Ehrenreich, C.L. Crumley, J.E. Levy. Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association, 1–5.
- Crumley C.L. 2005. Remember How to Organize: Heterarchy Across Disciplines. *Nonlinear Models for Archaeology and Anthropology: Continuing the Revolution*. Ed. by C.S. Beekman, W.W. Baden. Abingdon: Ashgate, 35–50.
- Diesner H.-J. 1966. *Das Vandalenreich. Aufstieg und Untergang*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer Verlag.
- Dube S. (ed.) 2007. *Historical Anthropology*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Dumont L. 1980. *Homo Hierarchicus: The Caste System and Its Implications*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dumont L. 1986. *Essays on Individualism: Modern Ideology in Anthropological Perspective*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ellen R., Fischer M.D. 2013. On the Concept of Cultural Transmission. *Understanding Cultural Transmission in Anthropology. A Critical Synthesis*. Ed. by R. Ellen, S.J. Lycett, S.E. Johns. New York; Oxford: Berghahn, 1–54.
- Finlayson B., Artemova O. 2020. The Invention of Equality: Guest Editors' Foreword. *Prehistoric Archaeology. Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, No 1, 7–12.
- Flannery K., Marcus J. 2012. *The Creation of Inequality: How Our Prehistoric Ancestors Set the Stage for Monarchy, Slavery, and Empire*. Cambridge; London: Harvard University Press.
- Frazer J.G. 1963. *The Golden Bough: A Study in Magic and Religion*. (1 Vol., Abridged Edition). New York: Macmillan.

- Gellner D.N. (ed.) 1995. *Contested Hierarchies: A Collaborative Ethnography of Caste among the Newars of the Kathmandu Valley, Nepal*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Grinin L.E., Carneiro R.L., Bondarenko D.M., Kradin N.N., Korotayev A.V. (eds.) 2004. *The Early State, Its Alternatives and Analogues*. Volgograd: Uchitel'.
- Godelier M., Strathern M. (eds.) 1991. *Big Men and Great Men: Personification of Power in Melanesia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; Paris: Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.
- Goldman I. 1970. *Ancient Polynesian Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gooch G.P. 1913. *History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co.
- Gurevich A.Ya. 1999. The Ancient Germans. *Selected Works. Vol. 1. The Ancient Germans. The Vikings*. Moscow; Saint Petersburg: Universitetskaya kniga, 23–78. (In Russ.)
- Hickel J., Haynes N. (eds.) 2018. *Hierarchy and Value. Comparative Perspectives on Moral Order*. New York; Oxford: Berghahn.
- Hicks D. 2013. Four-Field Anthropology: Charter Myths and Time Warps from St. Louis to Oxford. *Current Anthropology*, vol. 54, No 6, 753–763.
- Hodgen M.T. 1964. *Early Anthropology in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Johnson A.W., Earle T.K. 2000. *The Evolution of Human Societies: From Foraging Group to Agrarian State*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Joyce A.A., Barber S.B. 2016. Alternative Pathways to Power in Formative Oaxaca. *Alternative Pathways to Complexity. A Collection of Essays on Architecture, Economics, Power, and Cross-cultural Analysis*. Ed. by L.F. Fargher, V.Y. Heredia Espinoza. Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado, 41–58.
- Kalb D., Marks H., Tak H. 1996. Historical Anthropology and Anthropological History: Two Distinct Programs. *Focaal*, No 26/27, 5–13.
- Kalb D., Tak H. (eds.) 2005. *Critical Junction: Anthropology and History beyond the Cultural Turn*. New York; Oxford: Berghahn.
- Kapferer B. 2012. *Legends of People, Myths of State. Violence, Intolerance, and Political Culture in Sri Lanka and Australia*. Washington, DC; London: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Kirch P.V., Green R.C. 2001. *Hawaiki, Ancestral Polynesia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kobishchanov Yu.M. 2000. The Community-Caste Systems. *Hierarchy and Power in the History of Civilizations*. Ed. by D.M. Bondarenko, I.V. Sledzevski. Moscow: Institute for African Studies Press, 63–64.
- Korotayev A.V. 1996. *Pre-Islamic Yemen. Sociopolitical Organization of the Sabaean Cultural Area in the 2nd and 3rd Centuries AD*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Korotayev A.V., Bondarenko D.M. 2000. Polygyny and Democracy: A Cross-Cultural Comparison. *Cross-Cultural Research*, vol. 34, No 2, 190–208.
- Kowalewski S.A. 2000. Cyclical Transformations in North American Prehistory. *Alternatives of Social Evolution*. Ed. by N.N. Kradin, A.V. Korotayev, D.M. Bondarenko, V. de Munck, P.K. Wason. Vladivostok: Far Eastern Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences Press, 177–187.
- Kradin N.N. 2011. Heterarchy and Hierarchy among the Ancient Mongolian Nomads. *Social Evolution and History*, vol. 10, No 1, 187–214.
- Krause E.L. 2007. The Turn toward Memory: From History's "Little People" to Anthropology's "Others". *Anthropology's Histories: An Archaeology of Knowledge Presidential Session, 32nd Annual Social Science History Association, Chicago, November 16, 2007*. Available at: https://works.bepress.com/elizabeth_krause/12/download/ (accessed 15.05.2022).
- Kusimba C.M., Kim N.C., Kusimba S.B. 2017. Trade and State Formation in Ancient East African Coast and Southern Zambezia. *Feast, Famine or Fighting? Multiple*

- Pathways to Social Complexity*. Ed. by R.J. Chacon, R.G. Mendoza. New York: Springer, 61–89.
- Ladynin I.A. 2026. Ancient Greek Polis: From Homoarchy to Heterarchy and Back Again. *Principles and Forms of Sociocultural Organization: Historical Contexts of Interaction*. Ed. by D.M. Bondarenko, G.V. Aleksandrov. London: Anthem Press, in press.
- Laumann E.O., Siegel P.M., Hodge R.W. 1970. The Consequences of Stratification. *The Logic of Social Hierarchies*. Ed. by E.O. Laumann, P.M. Siegel, R.W. Hodge. Chicago: Markham, 589–593.
- Leach E.R. 1954. *Political Systems of Highland Burma. A Study of Kachin Social Structure*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Levy J.E. 1995. Heterarchy in Bronze Age Denmark: Settlement Pattern, Gender, and Ritual. *Heterarchy and the Analysis of Complex Societies*. Ed. by R.M. Ehrenreich, C.L. Crumley, J.E. Levy. Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association, 41–53.
- Lewis J. 2002. *Forest Hunter-Gatherers and Their World*. Ph.D. Dissertation. London: University of London.
- Marcus J., Feinman G.M. 1998. Introduction. *Archaic States*. Ed. by J. Marcus, G.M. Feinman. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press, 3–13.
- McIntosh S.K. (ed.) 1999. *Beyond Chiefdoms. Pathways to Complexity in Africa* 1999. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mosko M.S. 1994. Junior Chiefs and Senior Sorcerers: The Contradictions and Inversions of Mekeo Hierarchy. *History and Anthropology*, vol. 7, No 1–4, 195–222.
- Nietzsche F.W. 1931. *The Antichrist*. New York: Knopf.
- Peterson N. 2020. Pre-colonial Inequality in Aboriginal Australia. *Prehistoric Archaeology. Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, No 1, 55–63.
- Quigley D. 1999. *The Interpretation of Caste*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Raaflaub K.A. (ed.) 2005. *Social Struggles in Archaic Rome: New Perspectives on the Conflict of the Orders*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Redmond E.M. (ed.) 1998. *Chiefdoms and Chieftaincy in the Americas*. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.
- Rio K.M., Smedal O.H. 2011. Hierarchy and Its Alternatives: An Introduction to Movements of Totalization and Detotalization. *Hierarchy: Persistence and Transformation in Social Formations*. Ed. by K.M. Rio, O.H. Smedal. New York; Oxford: Berghahn, 1–63.
- Roque R., Traube E.G. 2019. Crossing Histories and Ethnographies. *Crossing Histories and Ethnographies: Following Colonial Historicities in Timor-Leste*. Ed. by R. Roque, E.G. Traube. New York: Berghahn, 1–46.
- Sahlins M.D. 1958. *Social Stratification in Polynesia*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.
- Sannikov S.V. 2003. The Development of Early Forms of Royal Power among the Germanic Peoples: Specifics of State Formation. *History and Sociology of the State*. Ed. by G.A. Pikov. Novosibirsk: Izd-vo NGU, 36–54. (In Russ.)
- Schweitzer P.P. 2000. Hierarchy and Equality among Hunter-Gatherers of the North Pacific Rim: Toward a Structural History of Social Organization. *Alternatives of Social Evolution*. Ed. by N.N. Kradin, A.V. Korotayev, D.M. Bondarenko, V. de Munck, P.K. Wason. Vladivostok: Far Eastern Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences Press, 123–131.
- Shkunaev S.V. 1988. Celts in Western Europe in the 5th–1st Centuries. *A History of Europe. Vol. 1. Ancient Europe*. Ed. by E.S. Golubtsova. Moscow: Nauka, 492–503. (In Russ.)
- Stewart C. 2016. Historicity and Anthropology. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, vol. 45, 79–94.
- Tagliacozzo E., Willford A. 2009. History and Anthropology: Strange Bedfellows. *Clio/Anthropos: Exploring the Boundaries between History and Anthropology*. Ed. by A. Willford, E. Tagliacozzo. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1–26.

- Testart A. 2012. Comment on R.L. Carneiro's Article on the Origin of the State: "The Circumscription Theory: A Clarification, Amplification, and Reformulation". *Social Evolution and History*, vol. 11, No 2, 105–109.
- Tokarev S.A. 1978. *A History of Foreign Ethnography*. Moscow: Vysshaya shkola. (In Russ.)
- Vansina J. 1992. Kings in Tropical Africa. *Kings of Africa. Art and Authority in Central Africa*. Ed. by E. Beumers, H.-J. Koloss. Maastricht: Foundation Kings of Africa, 19–26.
- Vdovchenkov E.V. 2026. Royal Power and Social Order among Early Nomads: Homarchy and Heterarchy in the Western Steppe Zone of Eurasia. *Principles and Forms of Sociocultural Organization: Historical Contexts of Interaction*. Ed. by D.M. Bondarenko, G.V. Aleksandrov. London: Anthem Press, in press.
- Vliet E.C.L. van der 2005. Polis. The Problem of Statehood. *Social Evolution & History*, vol. 4, No 2, 120–150.
- Vliet E.C.L. van der 2008. Polis. The Early State, the Polis and State Formation in Early Greece. *Social Evolution & History*, vol. 7, No 1, 197–221.
- Wenke R.J. 1999. *Patterns in Prehistory: Humankind's First Three Million Years*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Whiteley P.M. 2004. Why Anthropology Needs More History. *Journal of Anthropological Research*, vol. 60, No 4, 487–514.
- Wolf E.R. 1982. *Europe and the People without History*. Berkeley, CA; Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Wright R. 2016. Cognitive Codes and Collective Action at Mari and the Indus. *Alternative Pathways to Complexity. A Collection of Essays on Architecture, Economics, Power, and Cross-cultural Analysis*. Ed. by L.F. Fargher, V.Y. Heredia Espinoza. Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado, 225–238.
- Yelvington K.A. 2002. History, Memory and Identity: A Programmatic Prolegomenon. *Critique of Anthropology*, vol. 22, No 3, 227–256.

ЭВОЛЮЦИЯ И ФОРМЫ СОЦИАЛЬНО-ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОЙ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ: ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ НА ПЕРЕСЕЧЕНИИ АНТРОПОЛОГИИ И ИСТОРИИ

Д.М.Бондаренко

В середине — второй половине XIX в., когда антропология формировалась как особая наука, в сознании её первых классиков она довольно чётко перекликалась с исторической наукой. Они видели в антропологии замену истории для бесписьменных народов — тех, чьё прошлое нельзя было изучать по письменным источникам. Однако на рубеже XX в., с утверждением постулатов об отсутствии универсальности и закономерности всемирно-исторического социокультурного процесса, когда утратилось чувство внутренней связи не только между различными обществами, но и между различными периодами истории одного общества, произошёл разрыв между антропологией и историей. На протяжении большей части XX в. и четверти XXI в. антропология и история всё больше отдалялись друг от друга, доходя почти до взаимного игнорирования в рамках господствующего в настоящее время постмодернизма, который утверждает абсолютную уникальность каждого общества (а следовательно, недопустимость использования сравнительно-исторического метода) и отрицает саму возможность

объективного познания чего-либо, связанного с человеком и обществом, включая историю и культуру. Очевидный сегодня разрыв между историей и антропологией имеет крайне негативные последствия для обеих дисциплин. Восстановление связи между историческим и антропологическим знанием открывает перспективы не только для придания нового импульса антропологической теоретической мысли, но и для углубления понимания историками явлений прошлого. Связь между антропологией и историей необходимо восстанавливать на уровне не просто изучения конкретных научных тем, но всего спектра вопросов, охватываемых этими дисциплинами, включая изучение широкого круга социальных, экономических, политических и культурных явлений и процессов прошлого и настоящего. Необходимость и плодотворность реинтеграции истории и антропологии раскрываются на примере изучения эволюции и форм социально-политической организации.

Ключевые слова: антропология, история, антропологическая теория, историческое знание, социально-политическая организация.

ЛИТЕРАТУРА

- Артёмова О.Ю. 2009. *Колено Исава: охотники, собиратели, рыболовы (опыт изучения альтернативных социальных систем)*. М.: Смысл.
- Аверкиева Ю.П. 1979. *История теоретической мысли в американской этнографии*. М.: Наука.
- Гуревич А.Я. 1999. Древние германцы. *Избранные труды. Т. 1. Древние германцы. Викинги*. М., СПб.: Университетская книга, 23–78.
- Санников С.В. Развитие ранних форм королевской власти у германских народов: особенности политогенеза. *История и социология государства*. Под ред. А.Г. Пикова. Новосибирск: Изд-во НГУ, 36–54.
- Шкунаев С.В. 1988. Кельты в Западной Европе в I–V вв. *История Европы. Т. 1. Древняя Европа*. Под ред. Е.С. Голубцовой. М.: Наука, 492–503.
- Токарев С.А. 1978. *История зарубежной этнографии*. М.: Высшая школа.
- Aleksandrov G.V. 2026. King Philip's War (1675–1676): Interactions and Transformations of Typologically Different Societies in the Colonial Context. *Principles and Forms of Sociocultural Organization: Historical Contexts of Interaction*. Ed. by D.M. Bondarenko, G.V. Aleksandrov. London: Anthem Press, in press.
- Árnason J.P., Raaflaub K.A., Wagner P. (eds.) 2013. *The Greek Polis and the Invention of Democracy. A Politico-Cultural Transformation and Its Interpretations*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Artemova O.Yu. 2003. Monopolization of Knowledge, Social Inequality, and Female Status: A Cross-Cultural Study. *Cross-Cultural Research*, vol. 37, No 1, 62–80.
- Barnard A. 2017. Afterword. *Human Origins: Contributions from Social Anthropology*. Ed. by C. Power, M. Finnegan, H. Callan. New York; Oxford: Berghahn, 319–335.
- Barry III H. 2003. Community Customs Associated with Political Subordination. *Social Evolution and History*, vol. 2, No 1, 116–130.
- Barth F. 1959. *Political Leadership among Swat Pathans*. London: Athlone Press.
- Berezkin Yu.E. 2000. Once Again on Horizontal and Vertical Links in Structure of the Middle Range Societies. *Alternatives of Social Evolution*. Ed. by N.N. Kradin, A.V. Korotayev, D.M. Bondarenko, V. de Munck, P.K. Wason. Vladivostok: Far Eastern Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences Press, 220–224.

- Berliner D.C. 2005. The Abuses of Memory: Reflections on the Memory Boom in Anthropology. *Anthropological Quarterly*, vol. 78, No 1, 197–211.
- Bern J. 1979. Ideology and Domination: Toward a Reconstruction of Australian Aboriginal Social Formation. *Oceania*, vol. 50, No 2, 118–132.
- Bidney D. 1968. *Theoretical Anthropology*. New York: Transaction Publishers.
- Blanton R.E. 1998. Beyond Centralization: Steps Toward a Theory of Egalitarian Behavior in Archaic States. *Archaic States*. Ed. by J. Marcus, G.M. Feinman. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press, 135–172.
- Blanton R.E., Fargher L.F. 2016. *How Humans Cooperate: Confronting the Challenges of Collective Action*. Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado.
- Blanton R.E., Feinman G.M., Kowalewski S.A., Peregrine P.N. 1996. A Dual-Processual Theory for the Evolution of Mesoamerican Civilization. *Current Anthropology*, vol. 37, No 1, 1–14.
- Bondarenko D.M. 2006. *Homoarchy: A Principle of Culture's Organization. The 13th–19th Centuries Benin Kingdom as a Non-state Supercomplex Society*. Moscow: KomKniga.
- Bondarenko D.M. 2007. Homoarchy as a Principle of Sociopolitical Organization: An Introduction. *Anthropos*, vol. 102, No 1, 187–199.
- Bondarenko D.M. 2014. On the Nature and Features of the (Early) State: An Anthropological Reanalysis. *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, vol. 139, No 2, 215–232.
- Bondarenko D.M. 2020. Introduction. *The Evolution of Social Institutions: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Ed. by D.M. Bondarenko, S.A. Kowalewski, D.B. Small. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 1–25.
- Bondarenko D.M. 2020a. Social Institutions and Basic Principles of Societal Organization. *The Evolution of Social Institutions: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Ed. by D.M. Bondarenko, S.A. Kowalewski, D.B. Small. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 51–78.
- Bondarenko D.M. 2022. Cultural Anthropology in the USA. Representations of the Civil War and the Abolition of Slavery in the North and the South. *Anthropos*, vol. 117, No 2, 411–422.
- Bondarenko D.M. 2026. Principles and Forms of Organization of Societies as Systems of Institutions (The “Conceptual Frame” of This Book). *Principles and Forms of Sociocultural Organization: Historical Contexts of Interaction*. Ed. by D.M. Bondarenko, G.V. Aleksandrov. London: Anthem Press, in press.
- Bondarenko D.M., Aleksandrov G.V. (eds.) 2026. *Principles and Forms of Sociocultural Organization: Historical Contexts of Interaction*. London: Anthem Press, in press.
- Bondarenko D.M., Grinin L.E., Korotayev A.V. 2011. Social Evolution: Alternatives and Variations (Introduction). *Evolution: Cosmic, Biological, and Social*. Ed. by L.E. Grinin, A.V. Korotayev, R.L. Carneiro, F. Spier. Volgograd: Uchitel', 215–254.
- Bondarenko D.M., Korotayev A.V. 2000. Family Size and Community Organization: A Cross-Cultural Comparison. *Cross-Cultural Research*, vol. 34, No 2, 152–189.
- Bury J.B. 1920. *Idea of Progress: An Inquiry into Its Origin and Growth*. London: Macmillan and Co.
- Carneiro R.L. 2000. Processes vs. Stages. A False Dichotomy in Tracing the Rise of the State. *Alternatives of Social Evolution*. Ed. by N.N. Kradin, A.V. Korotayev, D.M. Bondarenko, V. de Munck, P.K. Wason. Vladivostok: Far Eastern Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences Press, 52–58.
- Carneiro R.L. 2000a. *The Muse of History and the Science of Culture*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Claessen H.J.M. 2003. Aspects of Law and Order in Early State Societies. *The Law's Beginnings*. Ed. by F.J.M. Feldbrugge. Leiden: Brill/Nijhoff, 161–179.
- Claessen H.J.M. 2018. Sacred Kingship: Cases from Polynesia. *Social Evolution and History*, vol. 17, No 2, 3–26.

- Claude D. 1970. *Geschichte der Westgoten*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer Verlag.
- Cowan J.K. 2012. Anthropology and History. *The SAGE Handbook of Social Anthropology*, vol. 1. Ed. by R. Fardon, O. Harris, T.H.J. Marchand, M. Nuttall, C. Shore, V. Strang, R.A. Wilson. London: SAGE Publications, 121–137.
- Crumley C.L. 1979. Three Locational Models: An Epistemological Assessment for Anthropology and Archaeology. *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory*, vol. 2. Ed. by T.C. Patterson and C.W. Gailey. New York: Academic Press, 141–173.
- Crumley C.L. 1995. Heterarchy and the Analysis of Complex Societies. *Heterarchy and the Analysis of Complex Societies*. Ed. by R.M. Ehrenreich, C.L. Crumley, J.E. Levy. Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association, 1–5.
- Crumley C.L. 2005. Remember How to Organize: Heterarchy Across Disciplines. *Nonlinear Models for Archaeology and Anthropology: Continuing the Revolution*. Ed. by C.S. Beekman, W.W. Baden. Abingdon: Ashgate, 35–50.
- Diesner H.-J. 1966. *Das Vandalenreich. Aufstieg und Untergang*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer Verlag.
- Dube S. (ed.) 2007. *Historical Anthropology*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Hodgen M.T. 1964. *Early Anthropology in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Dumont L. 1980. *Homo Hierarchicus: The Caste System and Its Implications*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dumont L. 1986. *Essays on Individualism: Modern Ideology in Anthropological Perspective*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ellen R., Fischer M.D. 2013. On the Concept of Cultural Transmission. *Understanding Cultural Transmission in Anthropology. A Critical Synthesis*. Ed. by R. Ellen, S.J. Lycett, S.E. Johns. New York; Oxford: Berghahn, 1–54.
- Finlayson B., Artemova O. 2020. The Invention of Equality: Guest Editors' Foreword. *Prehistoric Archaeology. Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, No 1, 7–12.
- Flannery K., Marcus J. 2012. *The Creation of Inequality: How Our Prehistoric Ancestors Set the Stage for Monarchy, Slavery, and Empire*. Cambridge; London: Harvard University Press.
- Frazer J.G. 1963. *The Golden Bough: A Study in Magic and Religion*. (1 Vol., Abridged Edition). New York: Macmillan.
- Gellner D.N. (ed.) 1995. *Contested Hierarchies: A Collaborative Ethnography of Caste among the Newars of the Kathmandu Valley, Nepal*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Godelier M., Strathern M. (eds.) 1991. *Big Men and Great Men: Personification of Power in Melanesia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; Paris: Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.
- Goldman I. 1970. *Ancient Polynesian Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gooch G.P. 1913. *History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co.
- Grinin L.E., Carneiro R.L., Bondarenko D.M., Kradin N.N., Korotayev A.V. (eds.) 2004. *The Early State, Its Alternatives and Analogues*. Volgograd: Uchitel'.
- Hickel J., Haynes N. (eds.) 2018. *Hierarchy and Value. Comparative Perspectives on Moral Order*. New York; Oxford: Berghahn.
- Hicks D. 2013. Four-Field Anthropology: Charter Myths and Time Warps from St. Louis to Oxford. *Current Anthropology*, vol. 54, No 6, 753–763.
- Johnson A.W., Earle T.K. 2000. *The Evolution of Human Societies: From Foraging Group to Agrarian State*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Joyce A.A., Barber S.B. 2016. Alternative Pathways to Power in Formative Oaxaca. *Alternative Pathways to Complexity. A Collection of Essays on Architecture, Economics, Power, and Cross-cultural Analysis*. Ed. by L.F. Fargher, V.Y. Heredia Espinoza. Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado, 41–58.

- Kalb D., Marks H., Tak H. 1996. Historical Anthropology and Anthropological History: Two Distinct Programs. *Focaal*, No 26/27, 5–13.
- Kalb D., Tak H. (eds.) 2005. *Critical Junction: Anthropology and History beyond the Cultural Turn*. New York; Oxford: Berghahn.
- Kapferer B. 2012. *Legends of People, Myths of State. Violence, Intolerance, and Political Culture in Sri Lanka and Australia*. Washington, DC; London: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Kirch P.V., Green R.C. 2001. *Hawaiki, Ancestral Polynesia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kobishchanov Yu.M. 2000. The Community-Caste Systems. *Hierarchy and Power in the History of Civilizations*. Ed. by D.M. Bondarenko, I.V. Sledzevski. Moscow: Institute for African Studies Press, 63–64.
- Korotayev A.V. 1996. *Pre-Islamic Yemen. Sociopolitical Organization of the Sabaeen Cultural Area in the 2nd and 3rd Centuries AD*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Korotayev A.V., Bondarenko D.M. 2000. Polygyny and Democracy: A Cross-Cultural Comparison. *Cross-Cultural Research*, vol. 34, No 2, 190–208.
- Kowalewski S.A. 2000. Cyclical Transformations in North American Prehistory. *Alternatives of Social Evolution*. Ed. by N.N. Kradin, A.V. Korotayev, D.M. Bondarenko, V. de Munck, P.K. Wason. Vladivostok: Far Eastern Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences Press, 177–187.
- Kradin N.N. 2011. Heterarchy and Hierarchy among the Ancient Mongolian Nomads. *Social Evolution and History*, vol. 10, No 1, 187–214.
- Krause E.L. 2007. The Turn toward Memory: From History’s “Little People” to Anthropology’s “Others”. *Anthropology’s Histories: An Archaeology of Knowledge Presidential Session, 32nd Annual Social Science History Association, Chicago, November 16, 2007*. Available at: https://works.bepress.com/elizabeth_krause/12/download/ (accessed 15.05.2022).
- Kusimba C.M., Kim N.C., Kusimba S.B. 2017. Trade and State Formation in Ancient East African Coast and Southern Zambezia. *Feast, Famine or Fighting? Multiple Pathways to Social Complexity*. Ed. by R.J. Chacon, R.G. Mendoza. New York: Springer, 61–89.
- Ladynin I.A. 2026. Ancient Greek Polis: From Homoarchy to Heterarchy and Back Again. *Principles and Forms of Sociocultural Organization: Historical Contexts of Interaction*. Ed. by D.M. Bondarenko, G.V. Aleksandrov. London: Anthem Press, in press.
- Laumann E.O., Siegel P.M., Hodge R.W. 1970. The Consequences of Stratification. *The Logic of Social Hierarchies*. Ed. by E.O. Laumann, P.M. Siegel, R.W. Hodge. Chicago: Markham, 589–593.
- Leach E.R. 1954. *Political Systems of Highland Burma. A Study of Kachin Social Structure*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Levy J.E. 1995. Heterarchy in Bronze Age Denmark: Settlement Pattern, Gender, and Ritual. *Heterarchy and the Analysis of Complex Societies*. Ed. by R.M. Ehrenreich, C.L. Crumley, J.E. Levy. Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association, 41–53.
- Lewis J. 2002. *Forest Hunter-Gatherers and Their World*. Ph.D. Dissertation. London: University of London.
- Marcus J., Feinman G.M. 1998. Introduction. *Archaic States*. Ed. by J. Marcus, G.M. Feinman. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press, 3–13.
- McIntosh S.K. (ed.) 1999. *Beyond Chiefdoms. Pathways to Complexity in Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mosko M.S. 1994. Junior Chiefs and Senior Sorcerers: The Contradictions and Inversions of Mekeo Hierarchy. *History and Anthropology*, vol. 7, No 1–4, 195–222.
- Nietzsche F.W. 1931. *The Antichrist*. New York: Knopf.
- Peterson N. 2020. Pre-colonial Inequality in Aboriginal Australia. *Prehistoric Archaeology. Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, No 1, 55–63.

- Quigley D. 1999. *The Interpretation of Caste*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Raaflaub K.A. (ed.) 2005. *Social Struggles in Archaic Rome: New Perspectives on the Conflict of the Orders*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Redmond E.M. (ed.) 1998. *Chiefdoms and Chieftaincy in the Americas*. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.
- Rio K.M., Smedal O.H. 2011. Hierarchy and Its Alternatives: An Introduction to Movements of Totalization and Detotalization. *Hierarchy: Persistence and Transformation in Social Formations*. Ed. by K.M. Rio, O.H. Smedal. New York; Oxford: Berghahn, 1–63.
- Roque R., Traube E.G. 2019. Crossing Histories and Ethnographies. *Crossing Histories and Ethnographies: Following Colonial Historicities in Timor-Leste*. Ed. by R. Roque, E.G. Traube. New York: Berghahn, 1–46.
- Sahlins M.D. 1958. *Social Stratification in Polynesia*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.
- Schweitzer P.P. 2000. Hierarchy and Equality among Hunter-Gatherers of the North Pacific Rim: Toward a Structural History of Social Organization. *Alternatives of Social Evolution*. Ed. by N.N. Kradin, A.V. Korotayev, D.M. Bondarenko, V. de Munck, P.K. Wason. Vladivostok: Far Eastern Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences Press, 123–131.
- Stewart C. 2016. Historicity and Anthropology. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, vol. 45, 79–94.
- Tagliacozzo E., Willford A. 2009. History and Anthropology: Strange Bedfellows. *Clio/Anthropos: Exploring the Boundaries between History and Anthropology*. Ed. by A. Willford, E. Tagliacozzo. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1–26.
- Testart A. 2012. Comment on R.L. Carneiro's Article on the Origin of the State: "The Circumscription Theory: A Clarification, Amplification, and Reformulation". *Social Evolution and History*, vol. 11, No 2, 105–109.
- Vansina J. 1992. Kings in Tropical Africa. *Kings of Africa. Art and Authority in Central Africa*. Ed. by E. Beumers, H.-J. Koloss. Maastricht: Foundation Kings of Africa, 19–26.
- Vdovchenkov E.V. 2026. Royal Power and Social Order among Early Nomads: Homarchy and Heterarchy in the Western Steppe Zone of Eurasia. *Principles and Forms of Sociocultural Organization: Historical Contexts of Interaction*. Ed. by D.M. Bondarenko, G.V. Aleksandrov. London: Anthem Press, in press.
- Vliet E.C.L. van der 2005. Polis. The Problem of Statehood. *Social Evolution & History*, vol. 4, No 2, 120–150.
- Vliet E.C.L. van der 2008. Polis. The Early State, the Polis and State Formation in Early Greece. *Social Evolution & History*, vol. 7, No 1, 197–221.
- Wenke R.J. 1999. *Patterns in Prehistory: Humankind's First Three Million Years*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Whiteley P.M. 2004. Why Anthropology Needs More History. *Journal of Anthropological Research*, vol. 60, No 4, 487–514.
- Wolf E.R. 1982. *Europe and the People without History*. Berkeley, CA; Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Wright R. 2016. Cognitive Codes and Collective Action at Mari and the Indus. *Alternative Pathways to Complexity. A Collection of Essays on Architecture, Economics, Power, and Cross-cultural Analysis*. Ed. by L.F. Fargher, V.Y. Heredia Espinoza. Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado, 225–238.
- Yelvington K.A. 2002. History, Memory and Identity: A Programmatic Prolegomenon. *Critique of Anthropology*, vol. 22, No 3, 227–256.

Received: 10.09.2025