

The Human Position in Urban Space

Olena Petrykivska

Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Associate Professor,
Odesa I.I. Mechnikov National University (Odesa, Ukraine)

E-mail: cognition@onu.edu.ua

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9790-6340>

Petrykivska, Olena (2021) The Human Position in Urban Space. *Philosophy and Cosmology*, Volume 27, 135-144. <https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/27/10>

The article defines the potential and aspects of the philosophical and anthropological approach in modern urban studies. The theoretical basis is represented by the works of the modern researchers of philosophical anthropology and urban studies, as well as the studies aimed at finding thinking frameworks alternative to anthropocentrism (new materialism, speculative realism, processes ontology). The scientific novelty of the research involves the review of the epistemological status of philosophical anthropology as the methodology of practically oriented thought. The conceptual analysis of the use of the anthropological approach in socio-humanitarian knowledge is presented, its philosophical component is suggested. There have been reconstructed the urban anthropology methodological principles as an actual direction of urban research. The philosophical anthropology resource is the key to the further development of the city pragmatic analysis concerning the non-classical approaches in socio-humanitarian knowledge. On the one hand, philosophical anthropology is presented as an independent discipline, and on the other, as a special focus or aspect of analysis. Thus the epistemological status of philosophical anthropology is clarified, and the possibility of its statements systematization and transforming the compendium into a method of modern practically oriented thought are defined.

Keywords: city, human, philosophical anthropology, anthropological approach, urban anthropology, post-metaphysical philosophy, practicalization, post-non-classical science

Received: 15 March 2021 / Accepted: 24 April 2021 / Published: 1 October 2021

Introduction

The 20th century is marked by the “anthropological turn” in philosophy. Foremost European philosophers (Max Scheler, Ernst Cassirer, Martin Buber, Helmuth Plessner, Arnold Gehlen and others) initiated philosophy’s refocus to the anthropological way of thinking. Nowadays, it is not entirely clear what is behind it. There is a noticeable discrepancy between the content of the created philosophical concepts and secondary reflection on their meaning, between the real use of anthropological reflection as a research method and critique of anthropology.

© Petrykivska, Olena, 2021

The article aims to show some of the philosophical decisions that provide the basis for the anthropological approach to the city. This means that more should be done to draw the deduction of a “new philosophical anthropology” idea claimed in 20th-century German philosophy.

New Urbanism

The principles of new thinking about the social, based on the movement, mobility, and random ordering, are gradually coming into urban studies. The attention is not focused on stable structures and social order. Conversely, the social world is observed as fluid, mobile, unstable, formed by a heterogeneous multiplicity of times and spaces, and consisting of human and non-human forces. Modern manifestations of the city (new media, technological development, flows of people, information, capital, resources, knowledge, and the new urban activism) put the need for New Urbanism on the agenda (Amin & Thrift, 2017).

One of the newest approaches in urban studies is the concept of “the intrinsic logic of cities,” which offers an alternative to the well-established tradition of considering the city primarily as a mirror of social processes. The uniqueness of the city, or its “doxa,” is the background noise ignored by serious researchers for a long time. That is about the city unspecified by traditional science. Still, at the same time, it has the power and determines the state of affairs: local taste, public spirit, inertia, the habit of not being in a hurry, love for the holidays, the style of personal communication (Berking & Loew, 2017). We assume that the local meaning relevant to everyday life and the practical aspects of living through the situations are best caught on by urban anthropology. Urban anthropologists assert the specifics of their approach and its advantages on the traditional urban sociology. Sergey Smirnov relates the new urbanism development in the 20th century with the influence of urban anthropology, “which tried to discover full everyday life in this stone monster. The new urban paradigm has introduced such concepts as “city without borders,” cities with several centres (polycentrism), construction cities, Lego cities, cities as spaces of opportunities and trajectories of movement, cities as repositories of various cultural practices, labyrinth cities and palimpsest cities. In many ways, such New Urbanism was shaped by anthropology influence, seeks to see, to grope for an answer to the main question - what keeps the city as a whole?” (Smirnov, 2021: 29). Urban anthropology is faced with systematizing the urban culture experience and forming the image of an urbanite, keeping in mind the various strategies of human existence (spatial, corporeal, every day, textual).

The complexity of contemporary urban culture makes anthropologists rethink their research strategies. The postnonclassical methodologies are actively used in urban anthropology since both the multidimensionality of the city and human are not covered by one type of rationality. Thuswise, new materialism, actor-network theory, processes ontology and speculative realism started to evolve at the beginning of the 20th century. All these researches apply certain non-anthropocentrism in practice and look for alternative thinking frameworks to the “anthropological sleep” (M. Foucault). Speculative realism is interested in radical openness to the object and is on the hunt for the possibility of cognition beyond any form of subjectivity. Within the context of flat ontology, Bruno Latour considers humans on par with things (Latour, 2006). Graham Harman conceptualizes an object as the thing-in-itself and suggests studying what particular objects do (Harman, 2016). Does the statement of a “posthuman” view on the social in urban studies, when things are regarded as independent agents that actively participate in human practices, its incompatibility with the principles of philosophical anthropology? Furthermore, urban research will not be able to finally bridge

the gap between urbanism without a human and anthropology without a city, without a place to live, only if equipped with the philosophical-anthropological approach.

People are not eliminated, but the city is not only the people. The great value of these approaches lies in studying and understanding a conceptually new anthropological situation - the coexistence of people and the increased (and constantly increasing) number of non-humans generated by science and technology. Latour claims that it is easier today to give up the belief in our strangeness due to "the practice of quasi-objects and mediators." "Yet we were born amid sciences, we have known only peace and prosperity, and we love - should we admit it? - the technologies and consumer objects that the philosophers and moralists of earlier generations advise us to abhor. More than earlier generations, ours has digested, integrated, and perhaps socialized them" (Latour, 2006: 207). We no longer believe neither in the virtues nor in the dangers of science and technology. It is easier for us to look for their causes, including anthropological ones. Therefore, there is an active search for a new model for describing our experience of being in the city. The city's anthropology explores the processes of generating new meanings in the course of interactions, during which a transfer and transformation of knowledge from individual to individual, from artefact to individual, from organization to organization takes place. It serves as an important tool for describing and studying key transformations in our societies (Humphrey & Skvirskaja, 2012). Indeed, we need to change ourselves and our self-descriptions to master a new space of human existence associated with technological shifts: to get along with quasi-objects, make risky connections with artefacts, and be part of various kinds of networks. French philosopher Bernard Stiegler, thinking with critical insight the influence of digital media and information technologies on the inner world of a human being, has said: today, the reason is not a condition for total autonomy, since there is no pure autonomy, we can only talk about the relatively local specificity of negentropy (this is a property of a system that struggles against the entropy) (Stiegler, 2018).

In Latour's interpretation, only anthropology is capable of uniting the astonishing trajectory of quasi-objects. Anthropologists have not yet sufficiently mastered the turn to the material aspects of the urban environment. But it is possible. We will have to abandon the dualism inherent in the phenomenological versions of anthropologism - the idea of the existence of two radically different worlds that exist in parallel: the world of facts and the world of meanings, the world of nature and the world of values, the world of physical bodies and the world of consciousness. In his time, Helmuth Plessner wrote that cultural and historical formations do not fit under the dividing into physical and mental (Plessner, 2019). Guided by the physical/mental alternative, it is impossible to experimentally master the historical, social and cultural realities, cut from sensual matter, but appealing to the mental and saturated with the mental. Nowadays, in terms of Bruno Latour's philosophy, we will say that the ability of "symmetric-anthropological" vision is in demand.

The city is filled with complex connections. Urban reality is made up of meetings, contacts, communication, conflicts, consumption, movement and many other interactions (very often beyond consciousness). The world and consciousness are intertwined; it is important to think "social," "natural," "symbolic," and "technical" together. A human should not be narrowed down to nature or society. He/she needs to be moved closer to the middle so that he becomes a mediator and even the very point of mixing. It is necessary to describe the work of mediation, which has a human face. "The expression 'anthropomorphic' considerably underestimates our humanity. We should be talking about morphism. A morphism is a place where technomorphisms, zoomorphisms, phusimorphisms, ideomorphisms, theomorphisms,

sociomorphisms, psychomorphisms, all come together. Their alliances and their exchanges, taken together, are what define the anthropos. An intersection or a blender of morphisms is a fairly accurate definition of it. The closer the anthropos comes to this distribution, the more human it is. The farther away it moves, the more it takes on multiple forms in which its humanity quickly becomes indiscernible, even if its figures are those of the person, the individual, or the self. By seeking to isolate its form from those it churns together, one does not defend humanism, one loses it” (Latour, 2006: 221).

The above Bruno Latour’s statement lets us consider the relevance of the tradition of German philosophical anthropology, the ideas of which matured in a creative dialogue with the sciences, both natural and humanitarian. Within its conceptual boundaries, one can go beyond the limits of only the human (anthropos), put the possible above the real, leave the question on the human essence open, consider the human in its environment and on the borders with the inhuman, be prepared for the fact that empirical material can transform analytical categories used by the researcher.

Ideas of New Philosophical Anthropology and Philosophical Reflection on Anthropology

Anthropology was one of the categories that transformed in the 20th century. The meaning that the previous tradition put into the word *anthropology* turned out to be insufficient. Anthropology was understood as the theory of the human body composition as a product of nature. Moreover, the word anthropology evokes an association with mandatory anthropological guidelines, constants. The humanities understand anthropology as the historical, psychological and biographical research of the human personality and the refusal to consider transpersonal structures and processes. As philosophical anthropology, it is identified with the new European paradigm of human existence comprehension, closely related to classical humanism. Therefore, Martin Heidegger’s prejudiced attitude to anthropology was driven by the very possibility of philosophical anthropology development exclusively from Descartes’ philosophy, which reduced humans to the subject. Heidegger has feared subject self-sufficiency in anthropology, which meant the oblivion of being.

It is undoubtedly essential to refer to the classics to update all the interpretations.

Recently, we have observed a heightening interest in Aristotle’s anthropology among philosophers (Keil & Kreft, 2019) and Kant’s pragmatic anthropology (Cohen, 2014). Thus, the study of the anthropological reflection of Aristotle and Kant contributes to both specifying the empirical aspects of their philosophy and enriching the current debates on the philosophical anthropology goals.

Aristotle’s definition of a man as a rational animal, regular in the philosophical literature, is disputed as there conceptually arise difficulties with the definition of a man (Keil & Kreft, 2019: 36, 43). There cannot be a “complete” or explicit definition of a man, since people are not the subject of the unified science. Moreover, they are “ontologically separated.” This problematization of the definition of human essence is illustrative of modern anthropological disputes.

Kant’s lectures on anthropology have long been ignored and “were deemed a peculiar collection of more or less pointless remarks on a variety of random topics vaguely related to human beings” (Cohen, 2014: 2). However, over the past twenty years, they have recaptured the scientific interest. Today Kant’s lectures help us understand Kant’s thought and flesh out empirical dimensions of his philosophy. The name “anthropology from a pragmatic point of view” refers directly to the practization of philosophy that challenged metaphysics. Kant’s

pragmatic anthropology is the prototype of philosophical anthropology. In his lectures, Kant distinguished it from science (empirical psychology and empirical anthropology) in its standards, methods and goals. However, it was not pulled away from the specifics and the empirical. Pragmatic anthropology shares physical geography's emphasis on the mundane dimension of human existence, but it explains human actions in terms of intentions and goals, not natural causes. Kant starts from the "everyday phenomenology of sensory experience" (ibid: 39) of his audience. He uses scientific psychological theory for a deeper explanation of this phenomenology and to facilitate his pragmatic purpose. Kant's Lectures on Anthropology are a "practical guide" (ibid: 235) for young people; he uses these lectures, which he has given regularly for about thirty years, as a way to help students make their knowledge relevant, applicable and useful. It is a guide to facing life's challenges while fulfilling a purpose.

These rediscoveries have helped to specify that philosophers-anthropologists study abstract and transcendental matters and pay attention to the social and historical embeddedness of human existence. And they allow us to see that philosophers, in their anthropological concepts, are not concerned with setting a human on a winners' podium but with more important things, including those that go beyond the boundaries of a human.

This alone is already sufficient in itself to conclude: Kant's anthropology was a bridge to the practicalization of philosophy. However, Kant outlined but did not complete his anthropology project from the pragmatic viewpoint. Herder latched on to Kant's propensity for the empirical study of humans, he was convinced that philosophy should rely on empirical information on linguistic and cultural diversity; it must, both theoretically and practically, take into account and value human diversity in its diverse culturally specific forms. Herder acts within the framework of "good naturalism," emphasizing not the organic human nature, but their empirical situationality within various cultures (Waldow & de Souza, 2017: 25).

Today many researchers are not satisfied with criticism of modernism and deconstruction, and they want to do something else. As a rule, these are anthropologically and pragmatically oriented researchers (Harvey, 2020). They explore the real world, the external world, as a part of human existence when "organism (consciousness - body) plus environment" (place) are "one indivisible totality" (Ingold, 2000). They are looking for new definitions to convey how we perceive ourselves and the world and how we talk about ourselves. Therefore the world is not constituted by the separation of nature and culture. The things should not always be perceived as compliant recipients of the meanings provided by a human (Ingold, 2011). Attention is focused on the interactions of which life is woven, the genealogy of actions and connections, flows of matter and activities mergers. The task is to demonstrate the all-pervading cooperation of many beings, which forms (without predetermining and planning any agreed outcome) something that, step by step, creates the real world. We suggest "to take seriously a pervasive indigenous insistence that the world is a community of persons, most of whom are not human, but all of whom (when healthy at least) are capable of a relationship, communication and intentional acts" (Harvey, 2020: 115).

Anthropology as a comprehensive study of a human in all its thematic and disciplinary diversity is the most dynamically developing area of socio-humanitarian knowledge. It deals with the systematic scientific comparisons of local worlds to offer a generalized and theoretically based vision of social and cultural dynamics. Today the word "anthropology" does not claim to be a complete description of what is "human," as it was in European culture before the 20th century. The focus is shifting from a stand-alone science "Anthropology" to an "anthropological attitude" or "anthropological approach", a research focus. It is possible

to return the philosophical horizon where human cognition originally resided, using the philosophical-anthropological approach (also sometimes called meta-anthropology). Resting upon it, the humanities will be able, on a modern philosophical basis, to reflect on their grounds and boundaries, return to the question of what does and what does not belong to the concept of “the human.”

Philosophical Anthropology: Methodological Aspect

Now we can reveal the methodological principles of rational meta-anthropology, inspired by Aristotle and Kant, taken up by Herder and representatives of philosophical anthropology of the 20th century. Discussing the methodological dimension of philosophical anthropology means emphasising the relevance and importance of its provisions for the humanities and social sciences.

As a methodology, philosophical anthropology requires compliance with a set of theory conditions: rejecting the idea of an absolute foundation of knowledge; appealing to markedly different ways of seeing knowledge and cognition - through the being of the subject; commitment to the “holism principle”; antireductionism, as a rejection of the one-sided separation of any one aspect of human existence and the reduction the whole variety of essential human traits to it, and implies a rejection of the explanation of human nature; expansion of the experience concept: experimental judgement can claim significance not only in the form of a law characterized by universality and necessity, categorical synthesis is carried out in broader areas of experience; the facts of consciousness, given in the human integrity should be considered as equivalent to each other, since not only the understanding, but the whole complex of human relations to the world (emotional, willed, etc.); takes part in the perception of reality; proceeds from the life-practical experience load (interests and goals), the perception activity; the principle of anthropological reduction, which implies, for example, the rejection of the physical/mental alternative in the study of culture; when studying a human, the analysis of biophysical data should be supplemented with cultural and historical research. Philosophical and anthropological reflection can not be irrespective of either invariance or variability of the human.

An excellent example of the fruitful interaction of philosophers and scientists in the anthropology field is German Historical Anthropology (the Free University of Berlin, the Interdisciplinary Center for Historical Anthropology, the International Transdisciplinary Journal of Historical Anthropology *Paragrana*), based on the tradition of “New Philosophical Anthropology” by Helmuth Plessner and Arnold Gehlen. The works of the philosopher and sociologist Dietmar Kamper stood at their origin. Today it is a collection of interdisciplinary efforts that study the phenomena and structures of the human, and the designation ‘historical’ presupposes an obligatory initial reflection of one’s historicity. This direction explores the ritual body practices, performative and mimetic practices, elementary situations, and human existence’s basic experience. It studies a basic stock of patterns of thought, feeling, and anthropologically constant behaviour; basic human phenomena and basic situations. “Although it could be understood otherwise, these classifications are not concerned with making statements about humans in general but with gaining an understanding of the multidimensional conditions of life and experience of real people in their respective historical contexts. These anthropological studies investigate the multitude of ways in which the varieties of human life are expressed and presented. This diversity of phenomena is paralleled by the multidimensionality and openendedness of anthropological definitions and research paradigms. In this research, it is necessary to develop a feeling for the difference between

the historical world under investigation and the current frame of reference of the research” (Wulf, 2007: 63). At different times and in different contexts, the change of meaning must be considered. The method of anthropological reflection is interpreted here as “the constant appeal of the researcher to his cultural and historical situation, to his ideas conditioned by the context”, acceptance of the human impossibility to comprehend the fullness of being, the requirement of “defined ambiguity” of a human (his/her openness and finite nature, uncertainty and predetermination) (Wulf, 2007: 261).

The branch of philosophical anthropology from Max Scheler, Helmuth Plessner and Arnold Gehlen seem promising since neither the specified area of philosophical knowledge nor its subject is considered self-sufficient and isolated. On the contrary, philosophical and anthropological reflection is motivated by pragmatics, by what is carried out outside of philosophy and pure consciousness. Otherwise, according to Anatoly Loy, it is doomed to be an addition to ontology, ethics, epistemology (Loy et al., 2017).

Urban studies as an example of the fruitful interaction of philosophers and scientists in the anthropology field

Ash Amin and Nigel Thrift have collected intuitive insights of urban theorists of the late 20th century and raised the issue of a new approach to urbanism (Amin & Thrift, 2017). We are facing the development of specific tools for the implementation of the outlined methodological principles. Therefore, we propose to tap the resources of philosophical anthropology. Using its methodology, the relationship between a human and a city can be re-analyzed, and the concept of “new urbanism” can be implemented.

One addresses anthropology to solve the most important critical and creative task - to imagine the world in times of uncertainty, social upheaval and environmental disasters. Anand Pandian believes that its methods can reveal unseen dimensions of the world at hand and radical experience as the seed of humanity yet to come (Pandian, 2019: 3). Through the efforts of the scientists of different generations, anthropology is centered on the world of coexistence, when various concepts of existence and ways of thinking get along. Anthropology teaches us to see the unexpected around us, face the world’s openness through experience and encounter, and trace the inception of future humanity in the openness. Anthropological methods are both ethical and practical. For anthropology, the nature of humanity is not so much an object as a medium, a quality, with which and on which it works.

From the point of view of philosophical and anthropological methodology, the study of humans can be started at any level. Since we cannot know the complete picture of the human, we should return to Kant’s approach - to trust the “regulatory idea,” which cannot receive an exhaustive theoretical presentation. A human in all the diversity of his manifestations can be understood only through constitutive openness. Within anthropological urbanism, humans will not be eliminated. Also, all the problems will not be reduced to how a human can find and fulfill his/her true self. Rather, the research of cultural transformations, the search for ways to understand life, including human life, through the study of humanity as a space of transformative opportunity will be a priority.

The word “anthropology” hides the true philosophy of Bruno Latour, which has become the basis for urbanism renewal (Amin & Thrift, 2017; Harman, 2016; Harvey, 2020; Latour, 2006). Latour creates a new version of philosophical anthropology, with the help of which he is going to investigate our (modernity people) experience. Understanding of the phenomenon of hybridity in the postmodern world is impossible without anthropology because “a man touches everything, nothing is sufficiently inhuman to dissolve human beings in it and

announce their death. Their will, their actions, their words are too abundant” (Latour, 2006: 220). But anthropology must free itself from subject-object opposition. By implementing the “anthropology of sciences” project, Latour is looking for new anthropology (instead of the new European one), which will not separate people and things, nature and culture. Because actually, everything is kept by mixing, everything happens in the middle, and everything is possible through mediation, translation and networks. “Yet the human, as we now understand, cannot be grasped and saved unless that other part of itself, the share of things, is restored to it. So long as humanism is constructed through contrast with the object that has been abandoned to epistemology, neither the human nor the non-human can be understood” (Latour, 2006: 219). So, Latour’s anthropology makes networks, and not exclusively human beings, a subject of study. Having carried out the necessary transformation, anthropology gains the opportunity to study the central mechanism of any collectives.

The ‘urban’ and ‘human’ have the same characteristics in the new urbanism and the new philosophical anthropology: they are content with open definitions; their identity is supported not by autonomy, but by being included in a large number of relations networks, by the intersection of various signs, information, images; both global and local perspectives are important for them; they monitor new forms by observing “living borders” (Plessner, 2019: 182). The “flat ontology” of Latour’s actor-network theory allows avoiding dualistic ontology, but the headline is that it opens up a possibility to talk about a human’s involvement in communication not only with other people but also with natural and technical objects. The development of ontology is preceded by anthropology clarification. Shifting the emphasis on communication and procedurality, we proceed from the self-organization of emerging complex systemic objects, including humans. It should be noted that life in the city confirms Latour’s thesis that we are capable of symmetry. We are no worse than the aborigines described by Claude Lévi-Strauss; we constantly connect physical, social, and mental networks. We endow quasi-objects with action, will, meaning, speech. Sensemaking and corporeality always form an interactive process. No technologies and their meanings exist separately from society, its institutions, culture and various “assemblies” (hybrids) of technologies and people that we have already created. We need theoretical structures that can reflect this experience, describe it as holistic practices. The experience that not only everything is connected with a human, but also a human is connected with everything. Kantianism enriched with non-classical interpretations of subject-object-interaction is the philosophical basis of the anthropological approach in urban studies. There is a reality outside one’s mind, but we cannot cognize it directly, and we achieve it only by indirect, allegorical, or substitute means. Reality is expressed more fully in the human sphere rather than in the world of inanimate relationships. We have no other tool for city research but a human. Anthropologization, as a methodological goal, presupposes attention to the researcher’s personality (urbanist), the importance of his/her participatory position.

Philosophical anthropology inspires both the complication and clarification of our understanding of the human in the modern urban space. In the new philosophical anthropology, it becomes possible to understand the city not just as an object of human reflection, but as the basis and condition of human subjectivity. Thus, post-non-classical science can be considered a favourable basis for implementing the methodological function of philosophical anthropology, for intellectual meetings of anthropology and philosophy on the territory of a modern city.

Conclusions

The problematization of human existence remains the subject of intense reflections of many modern intellectuals. An expansion of understanding of a human has been observed through the introduction into the interpretation of his/her being and problems involved with the sociohistorical and physiological existence basis. The philosopher learns not to abstract from the human diversity but to immerse himself/herself in it. The principal characteristic of anthropological philosophy is attention to human existence in its substance.

1. The “hybrid” nature of philosophical anthropology, combining the results of theoretical and practical science of human nature, is due to its close connection with empirical anthropology as both deeply empirical and highly speculative action, stretched between a “thick” description of what is, and a dream about what possibly can be. Moreover, anthropological insights provide links between divided philosophical subdisciplines. For example, when the conclusions of metaphysics, ontology, and transcendental philosophy lost their plausibility, the question of how we should perceive ourselves as human beings lays claim to gain the lead.
2. The post-classical versions of philosophical anthropology considered in this article make it possible to reveal false ideas about the crisis of anthropology in modern philosophy. We should rather discuss the search for a new subject and methodological perspectives of anthropological problems. Non-classical science significantly expands our understanding of reality by including anthropological factors into it: conditions of cognition, observation processes, eventuality, complexity, value, freedom, history. A favourable situation is created to implement the methodological function of philosophical anthropology within the boundaries of post-non-classical thinking, concentrated on considering a specific dynamic existence in its formation and variability. We also observe a tendency towards an interdiscursive synthesis of anthropologically “expanded” concepts.
3. These days urban theory is actively engaged in the reflective comprehension of its conditions. The new interpretation of philosophical anthropology opens up a possibility to consider it a methodology of modern anthropologically oriented urban studies. A human himself/herself as an individual being is not the goal of anthropological approaches in urban research. Anthropology is more likely a mediator between a human and non-human. Considering the city as a way of organizing the local human existence means overcoming abstract ideas on the human urban experience. It is in the city that philosophical reflections on a human and the principles of his/her life are verified. In contrast, philosophical and anthropological optics provides the updating of the urban science and aims it at the urban practices studies, which makes the city cognition an art and a way to overcome all kinds of alienation.

References

- Amin, Ash, and Nigel Thrift (2017) *Seeing Like a City*. Vladimir Nikolaev, Trans. from English. Nizhny Novgorod, Red swallow.
- Berking, Helmuth, and Martina Löw (eds.) (2017) *Own Logic of Cities. New Approaches in Urbanism*. Kirill Levinson, Trans. from German. Moscow, NLO.

-
- Cohen, Alix (ed.) (2014) *Kant's Lectures on Anthropology: a Critical Guide*. Cambridge University Press.
- Harman, Graham (2016) *Immaterialism: Objects and Social Theory*. Cambridge, Polity.
- Harvey, Graham (2020) *Food, Sex and Strangers: Understanding Religion as Everyday Life*. Ksenia Kolkunova, Trans. from English. Moscow, NLO.
- Humphrey, Caroline, and Vera Skvirskaja (eds.) (2012) *Post-Cosmopolitan Cities: Explorations of Urban Coexistence*. New York and Oxford, Berghahn.
- Ingold, Timothy (2011) *Being Alive: Essays on Movement, Knowledge and Description*. London, Routledge.
- Ingold, Timothy (2000) *The Perception of the Environment*. London, Routledge.
- Keil, Geert, and Nora Kreft (eds.) (2019) *Aristotle's Anthropology*. Cambridge University Press.
- Latour, Bruno (2006) *There was no New Time. Essays on Symmetrical Anthropology*. Dmitriy Kalugin, Trans. from French. St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg University Publishing House.
- Loy, Anatoly, Evgen Bistritskiy, Michael Boychenko, and Anatoly Ermolenko (2017) Practical Philosophy. *Philosophical Thought*, Volume 3, 6-24.
- Pandian, Anand (2019) *A Possible Anthropology: Methods for Uneasy Times*. Durham and London, Duke University Press.
- Plessner, Helmuth (2019) *Levels of Organic Life and the Human: An Introduction to Philosophical Anthropology*. Fordham University Press.
- Smirnov, Sergey (2021) *City and Man*. Moscow, Lenand.
- Stiegler, Bernard (2018) *The Negathropocene*. London, Open humanities press.
- Waldow, Anik, and Nigel de Souza (eds.) (2017) *Herder: Philosophy and Anthropology*. Oxford University Press.
- Wulf, Christoph (2007) *Anthropology: History, Culture, Philosophy*. Gulnara Khaidarova, Trans. from German. St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg University Publishing House.