"Post-Non-Classical" or "Post-Neoclassical" Epistemology?

Turana Alibeyova[1]

[1] *Azerbaijan National Academy of Science, Institute of Philosophy and Sociology*
115 Ave. Huseyn Javid, Baki City, Z1073, Azerbaijan

Abstract. The article examines the theoretical, conceptual and methodological relations between scientific rationality, epistemological concepts and types of epistemology. Several relevant philosophical aspects of classifying epistemology into classical, non-classical and post-non-classical types are analysed. It was highlighted that at the current juncture, there are conceptual approaches to the elements above of scientific knowledge acquisition, justification, rationality, knowledge application, and the criteria for its authenticity. In this context, philosophers argue for developing new epistemological frameworks to facilitate an adequate philosophical comprehension of contemporary scientific knowledge. A variety of ideas have been proposed. In addition, there is a need to clarify terminology.

Furthermore, philosophers are engaged in a debate regarding the most appropriate terminology to describe modern epistemology. One such debate concerns the merits of designating modern epistemology as "post-non-classical" or "post-neoclassical" about science. The article demonstrates that in addition to these, the norms, rules, boundaries of scientific understanding, the strategy and methodology of scientific activity, the rationality of scientific knowledge, its justification, the criteria of scientific truth and their search logic have been renewed. Researchers have finally designated this innovation as a post-non-classical (or post-neoclassical) type of scientific understanding. The article analysed whether modern epistemology is correctly described as "post-non-classical" or "post-neoclassical" from a philosophical perspective. The methodological principles of systematicity, non-linearity, intersubjectivity and synergetic formation were selected for the interdisciplinary approach. System analysis and dynamic integration are employed as methodologies. The scientific novelty is that the modern epistemological situation can be described as either "post-non-classical" or "post-neoclassical," which is related to how scientific understanding has evolved historically. In this context, the distinction between the terms is not a matter of differing interpretations of the underlying processes. This represents a distinct articulation of analogous concepts.

Keywords: classical; non-classical; post-non-classical; neoclassical; post-neoclassical; scientific rationality; anthropometric systems; complexity; uncertainty.

INTRODUCTION

Those engaged in the study of modern scientific understanding from an epistemological perspective express a unanimous opinion that there have been significant developments in this field since the second half of the 20th century. The differences in views are evident during the philosophical and methodological reflection on these changes' substantive and functional aspects. The question of "what constitutes the defining characteristics of modern scientific understanding" has been the subject of considerable debate among philosophers and methodologists. These differences are reflected in the various responses to the question

and the terminology used to describe the emerging epistemology and scientific rationality. In addition to the considerations above, ensuring that the concepts above are expressed appropriately is also crucial.

Two key terms characterise the contemporary epistemological landscape: "post-non-classical" and "post-neoclassical", which describe a new epistemology that has emerged in response to the limitations of the neoclassical paradigm. These terms reflect both the content of cognitive renewal, the direction of change, and the intention to reflect the appropriate relationship between tradition and innovation in scientific cognition's epistemological, methodological, and worldview aspects. In this article, we will examine the modern epistemological (and scientifically rational) features in the context of their interaction.

In the highlighted context, we'll mention a philosophical terminological point that we consider relevant to the topic of this article. It is important to note that the epistemological system as a whole is not the same as scientific rationality. However, it can be seen from the ideas presented in the philosophical and scientific literature that the formation of the epistemological and methodological content of the epistemological system depends on the type of scientific rationality. From this perspective, we posit that the designation of scientific rationality as "classical," "non-classical," "post-non-classical," "neoclassical," or "post-neoclassical" carries a philosophical significance. The classification above allows for the analysis of the concepts of "classical science," "non-classical science," "post-non-classical science," "neoclassical science" and "postenoclassical science." At this juncture, it is possible to undertake a comparative analysis of these concepts. The distinctions between these categories are so subtle that overlooking them is not considered a constructive approach in the context of modern scientific criteria.

Literature review

In this context, the research conducted by A. Abbasov in Azerbaijan favours the term "post neoclassical." According to the Azerbaijani philosopher, this term enables us to envisage scientific rationality as a unified process. At the same time, he concludes that modern epistemology is essentially a "new classic" [1].

T. Kuipers (2005), A. Goldman (2019), A. Hoyningen-Huene (2022) and others are similarly positioned. It is noteworthy that they employ a similar argument. In essence, they argue that scientific rationality has evolved in close connection with each other. In this sense, modern scientific rationality can be considered a continuation of previous forms of rationality and can be defined as a new classical rationality. It can be concluded from this that "post-neoclassicism" is used to describe modern science as "real science."

However, most philosophers employ the term "post-non-classical rationality" in their discourse. The classifications above are primarily based on the work of V. Stepin (2009). In addition, V. Arshinov (2021), V. Budanov (2021), S. Lebedev (2013), and A. Lubskiy (2015) employ the term "post-non-classical rationality."

METHODS

The article employs an interdisciplinary methodology. In particular, the principles of systematicity, non-linearity, intersubjectivity, and synergistic formation are used in the question's method.

In this context, the principle of systematicity implies an approach to scientific rationality and epistemological teachings as an open system. This necessity arises from the intrinsic nature of the problem. In other words, we posit that at the historical stage of the push, the types of rationality and the epistemological training corresponding to it exist in the form of an open system.

The principle of non-linearity is related to the non-linear content of the problems between the elements of the object under investigation. Consequently, the content of the transition from one form of rationality to another is a direct consequence of the non-linear relationships between the internal components. This methodological principle assists in comprehending the rationale behind the replacement of classical epistemology by non-classical epistemology.

The principle of intersubjectivity is of great significance. In this article, the author asserts that scientific understanding is inherently in-

tersubjective. It reflects the thesis that scientific understanding is primarily the result of collective creative activity.

Finally, the principle of synergetic formation in the article provides a basis for understanding rationality and epistemological teachings as a formation process in the interaction of the previous and current stages. Consequently, it is possible to conceptualise the logical evolution of scientific knowledge as an open process of a complex and systematic nature.

Following the aforementioned methodological principles, the following methods are applied: system analysis, synthesis and dynamic integration. System analysis examines the process as a whole system, allowing for analysis of its constituent elements in interaction. The synthesis method provides a foundation for the integration of the results of the study into a unified whole or system. The dynamic integration process enables the creation of a holistic picture by integrating the knowledge obtained from applying those two methods. Consequently, dynamic integration illuminates why modern epistemology (and rationality) is designated as post-neoclassical or post-non-classical.

The methodology and methods highlighted in the article are applied to the philosophical understanding of the ideas of several philosophers who have dealt with this scientific problem over the centuries. In addition, A. Goldman's concept of the interconnection between the communicative and socio-cultural aspects in social epistemology [6], T. Kuipers' insights into the neoclassical structure of modern science [9], and A. Montouri's analysis of contemporary scientific rationality in the context of the complexity paradigm [13] are also worthy of consideration. The theses put forward by N. Stehr [17] in the context of the contentisation of knowledge and information in modern science were included as theoretical material in the article.

Furthermore, the article also examines the contributions of post-non-classical rationalists. Among the works above, V. Stein's classification of scientific rationality was analysed [16]. The concepts of V. Arshinov and V. Budanov's "complexity paradigm" and "convergent technologies" were analysed in terms of their contribution to the formation of new scientific rationality [4]. S. Lebedev's views on the principal concepts of post-non-classical epistemology were examined in detail [10] - the ideas presented in A. Lubskoy's article on post-non-classical rationality and the neoclassical model of socio-humanistic sciences were analysed.

This approach allows for the analysis of the impact of scientific rationality on the content of epistemology as a whole, as well as the differences in content, meaning and cognitive function between the terms "post-non-classical" and "post-neoclassical" in that context.

Conversely, in light of the terminological discrepancies, it will be possible to investigate the cognitive and socio-cultural relations between the previous classical and non-classical rationality and the sciences, as well as between modern rationality and scientificity.

Then, examining the discussion in the context of terminological differences is necessary.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Scientific rationality and epistemological classifications in the light of discussions. Modern philosophers tend to emphasise that there are different conceptions of rationality. One is related to rationality as "purposiveness," while the other is related to rationality as "intelligence." According to this classification, a group of researchers take "goal achievement" as a criterion of rationality. According to this position, pursuing a predetermined goal is rational, not conformity to intelligence laws. Consequently, if the objective of any action is not apparent, it is impossible to determine whether it is logical. From this, they conclude that rationality as purposiveness is more fundamental than its meaning as intelligence [14, p. 254].

As with the "concept of intelligence", that of rationality can be considered a "construct" that provides an epistemological basis for the scientificity of social and humanitarian knowledge. Nevertheless, it lacks a universal objective referent [12, p. 22]. In addition, the conditions created by the epistemological choices of discourse participants in each cognitive situation are also necessary. For instance, some philosophers view transdisciplinarity as a "special type of cross-disciplinary research" [12, p. 61].

From these ideas, we can conclude that there is no unified position regarding determining the content of the issue, the cognitive goal, the goal, and the rules for obtaining knowledge. Con-

cerning the essence and content of rationality, they employ complex and ambiguous concepts such as "purposiveness" and "intelligence." Suppose purposefulness is understood to express the subject's mental and volitional independence before the cognitive process. In that case, it can be posited that it plays a role in rationality as a factor in direct perception. In this context, the question remains about the epistemological content, rules and mechanisms of rationality.

According to the same line of reasoning, it is challenging to categorise rationality in terms of the concept of "intelligence," which has a broad and multifaceted philosophical definition. The subject under discussion is a quality inherent to the human condition that enables rationality. It is also evident that intelligence is the fundamental aspect of discussing a logical, rational, and mental process in the subject's activity. However, this point does not provide new information for understanding rationality and thus remains trivial.

Finally, approaching the role of rationality as a factor justifying scientificity in socio-humanitarian scientific knowledge through the prism of epistemological choice means not examining the intrinsic nature of the problem but instead considering its role in scientific communication. It is evident that while this approach plays a role in the understanding of rationality, it is insufficient to comprehend the essence of the problem philosophically.

Conversely, an analysis of the data indicates that different approaches to rationality can be grouped into three cognitive categories. Firstly, it can be observed that rationality as a discrete concept possesses many intricate cognitive characteristics. Secondly, since rationality is at the centre of scientific understanding in general, its role is fundamental and comprehensive, which makes its unambiguous understanding much more difficult. Thirdly, it is erroneous to consider rationality as a static concept. Its content, structure, rules, cognitive boundaries, and transformations must be understood historically. The three highlighted aspects render the classification of the concepts of "scientific rationality" and "epistemology" both relevant and necessary, as well as requiring philosophical reflection. Let us consider this aspect of the matter.

a) Types of scientific rationality and epistemology. Firstly, it is necessary to present several philosophical-epistemological points that philosophers have separately emphasised in the epistemological and methodological aspects related to social and humanitarian sciences. It is important to note that the characteristics of the modern era have brought many new problems to the socio-humanitarian understanding. From the perspective of philosophy and science, these concepts are particularly evident, including the notions of "complexity" and "uncertainty." This renders issues such as "multiparadigmism" and "disciplinary diversity in scientific research practice" more pertinent in the methodological domain [12, p. 21]. However, given that the organisation of such sciences at the modern stage is scientific, a severe contradiction emerges. Consequently, studying reality as a complex self-organising system necessitates a holistic approach. The social and humanitarian sciences are dispersed and fragmented due to their disciplinary boundaries. Consequently, the completeness, integrity, complexity, and multidimensionality of social objects under study are not "addressed" by current cognitive processes [12, p. 21].

Philosophers employ figurative language to convey the epistemological, methodological, and psychological implications of contradictions and difficulties in a way that encourages a willingness to "look at the face of complexity without fear" [13]. In this context, contemporary philosophers emphasise other points of epistemological and methodological importance.

For instance, V. Arshinov and B. Budanov posit that the structures of interdisciplinary understanding within the complexity paradigm are inherently uncertain. Among the various cognitive problems that emerge at this time, the "complexity problem formulation" occupies a distinctive position. It is characterised by a "complex logical" and "non-linear process" [4].

In their latest research, V. Arshinov and V. Budanov examine the phenomenon of complexity in the context of the formation of "quantum semiotics." Philosophers posit that a "conceptual character" endowed with the capacity to observe and comprehend complexity should be formed. Such a cognitive observer can be considered a perceiving subject "in the unity of

cyber semiotic, synergetic and quantum-mechanical perspectives" [4, p. 67].

In such complexity, it is challenging to demonstrate a single epistemological and methodological position in their context in the philosophical approach to scientific rationality and epistemological features. Indeed, researchers have observed that searching for solutions to the abovementioned difficulties led to post-non-classicism and post-non-classical rationality. This process revealed the existence of multivariate ness.

In particular, post-non-classicism ideas, as they have been formed in the social and humanitarian sciences, can be divided into three groups. The first group comprises scientific research activities that employ interdisciplinary and polyparadigmatic approaches. This approach selects system analysis (synergistic) as a methodological foundation. System analysis synthesises natural science, social, and humanitarian sciences. In this regard, philosophers have separately observed that V. Stepin established a "universal discourse" for the dialogue between natural science and humanitarian "cultures" [15].

The second group is closely related to the first and may be considered one. The second group is related to the concept of "human-sized objects," as introduced by V. Stepin. In this context, the individual's disposition towards the external world is pivotal. Furthermore, the concept of "human-sized objects" encompasses artificial objects. The integration of diverse scientific disciplines is regarded as a crucial aspect of the comprehension of artificial intelligence. For instance, the socio-humanitarian element of this issue can be considered in the epistemological and methodological intersection of fundamental mathematics and neurobiology [3].

A third group of scholars posits that the most compatible with post-non-classical rationality is a rationality that places significant emphasis on the socio-cultural conditioning of scientific research. For A. Goldman, this represents a historical, scientific and socio-cultural feature that renders social epistemology necessary [6].

P. Hoyningen-Huene considers the issue in a broader context, examining the transformation of scientific ideas about the world. He concludes that the socio-cultural environment will be the main reason for the different ideas about the world in 2044. For those who deny the role of sociality in cognition, this may not be a scientific fact. However, according to evolutionary theory, it is an expected scientific event. It can be concluded that there is no valid scientific hypothesis. Each hypothesis is subject to change due to socio-cultural influences [7].

N. Stehr emphasises that "knowledge does not exist as separate isolated parts." Instead, it exists as a whole in the collective consciousness. In this sense, knowledge is a universal phenomenon. To transform knowledge into practical knowledge, a suitable environment, such as authority and influence, is necessary [17, p. 131-132].

Against these disparate approaches, the philosophical question of the essence, content, and types of scientific rationality appears more pertinent. Modern philosophers typically rely on the epistemological and methodological model proposed by V. Stepin to classify scientific rationality. V. Stepin proposed a tripartite division of scientific rationality. He designated these three types as classical, non-classical, and post-non-classical scientific rationalities [16].

As previously stated, the philosopher determined this kind of division within the action approach to the cognition framework. Researchers have identified three additional aspects of the approach, which they have defined according to specific selection criteria. Firstly, the distinctive characteristics of the system organisation of the objects under study. Secondly, the characteristics of the activity, that is to say, the operation and tools of the cognitive process. These are reflected in the norms and ideals of science. Thirdly, the perceiving subject's value-goal direction and their reflection's peculiarities. This reflection is expressed in the features of the philosophical worldview foundations of science [12, p. 22].

V. Stepin presents the epistemological basis of this classification as follows: classical scientific rationality studies simple systems, non-classical "complex self-regulating systems," and post-non-classical "complex, self-developing systems" [16]. The division of systems into simple, automated, complex and self-developing complex types has two roots: firstly, the internal evolutionary logic of science, and secondly, the peculiarities of the socio-cultural environment of each historical stage.

The interaction of these two aspects, as posited by V. Stepin, gives rise to concrete scientific ideals, norms, methods of reasoning, methods of description, ideals of creation and organisation of knowledge. The philosopher defined the emphasised cognitive feature in the context of the value-goal structure of the perceiving subject [12, p. 22].

One of the critical elements of this debate is the definition of scientific rationality proposed by V. Stepin, which he applied to the natural sciences. Nevertheless, philosophers maintain that these principles can be used to understand social and humanitarian issues. However, it is essential to acknowledge the distinctive characteristics of social and humanitarian science [11; 12].

Another division of rationality is based on the "classical" and "neoclassical" classifications. There is no disagreement regarding the designation of classical rationality. Regarding the concepts of "post-non-classical rationality" and "neoclassical rationality," opinions differ regarding the explanations offered. For instance, A.D.Lyubsky posits that within the context of post-non-classical rationality, one can distinguish between "postmodernist rationality" (which defines the postmodernist model of cognition) and "neoclassical rationality" (which establishes the uniqueness of the neoclassical model of social-humanitarian research). In this context, multiparadigmality is a defining characteristic of neoclassical rationality [11, p. 22]. The approach above suggests that post-non-classical rationality exists in general, with neoclassical rationality representing one of its components. However, in this instance, post-non-classical rationality is regarded as the foundation, with neoclassicism accepted within its parameters.

In contrast to the approaches mentioned above, neoclassical rationality is not considered within the scope of post-non-classical rationality. Instead, it is generally regarded as an alternative to it. In essence, neoclassical rationality represents a more accurate reflection of scientific rationality in the modern era. In particular, scientific cognition did not extend beyond the parameters of classical rationality. The advent of new conditions led to a qualitative shift towards neoclassical rationality. In this sense, scientific understanding retains its originality and authenticity (its classicity). It

merely acquires new qualities and criteria, which provides a rationale for using the term "neoclassical." A. Abbasov, a prominent figure in Azerbaijan philosophy, has expressed his thoughts on this matter [1].

In light of the plethora of perspectives on scientific rationality, there is a spectrum of epistemological approaches. The classification is primarily based on the following categories: classical-non-classical-post-non-classical and classical-non-classical-post-neoclassical epistemology (and science). In addition to these, the terms "classical-non-classical epistemology", "classical science", and "non-classical science" are also used. Several expressions of classical and neoclassical epistemology (and science) are observed.

In light of the aforementioned terminological discrepancies, examining the philosophical implications of the concepts of "post-non-classical epistemology" and "post-neoclassical epistemology" is necessary.

b) Comparative analysis of post-non-classical and post-neoclassical. V. Lektorsky discusses the distinction between classical and non-classical rationality [15]. He employs the terms "classical scientific epistemology" and "non-classical scientific epistemology" to delineate these two distinct approaches to knowledge. He delineates the distinctive characteristics of the epistemology of classical science as follows: criticality, fundamentalism and normativity, subject-centrism, and science-centrism. He then proceeds to delineate the epistemological characteristics of non-classical science, which may be summarised as follows: a rejection of absolute criticism, a rejection of fundamentalism, a rejection of subject-centrism, and a rejection of science-centrism.

V. Stepin examines the issue in the context of scientific norms and ideals, emphasising that the absolute scientific truth is accepted as the epistemology of classical science [16]. Furthermore, there is no scientific understanding of the intermediary between the subject and the object. In non-classical science, the absolute truth of scientific knowledge is questioned, and the concept of relative truth is the main focus of discussion. As previously discussed, the views of V. Lektorskiy and V. Stepin do not contradict each other. Instead, they represent different logical, rational and cognitive aspects of intra-scientific change based on an individual

approach to epistemological problems. In this sense, they are mutually reinforcing.

The question arises regarding how one might distinguish between "post-neoclassical" and "post-non-classical" within this approach. In the analyses found in the philosophical-scientific literature on post-neoclassicism, it is emphasised that the neoclassical model of social-humanitarian studies has not yet become a particular subject of scientific views. Nevertheless, there are various philosophical and scientific ideas about it [11, p. 21]. For instance, in 2001, T. Kuipers published a monograph entitled "Structures in Science", in which he outlined a "synthetic monograph" in response to the works of K. Popper, T. Kuhn and I. Lakatos. This involved integrating the ideas of these philosophers and creating a concept called the "neoclassical approach." The following will present Kuipers's argument [8, p. 5]. At the subsequent stage, T. Kuipers developed his approach further and sought to provide a rationale for neoclassicism within the context of "inductive logic" [9].

In addition to the points mentioned above, it is essential to note that A. Lubskiy's perspective on neoclassicism is not merely an approach to neoclassicism in isolation but within the context of post-non-classicism. He is also associated with the following theoretical approaches: neo-positivism, neo-Marxism, neo-evolutionism, neo-Reberianism, structural functionality, neo-functionality, radical-critical theories, and conflict teachings. At this juncture, the issue is examined in the context of the interrelations between the concepts of "paradigm" and "meta paradigm". In his work, Y. Zbrovsky proposes that one can accept classicism, neoclassicism, postclassicism, non-classicism, and post-non-classicism as meta-paradigms. As a criterion for distinguishing between paradigms and meta-paradigms, one can consider the paradigms and meta-paradigms within each meta-paradigm and the peculiarities of the research object within their framework [18, p. 5-9].

Other philosophers posit that the advent of neoclassical approaches in social and humanitarian sciences can be attributed to various strands of postclassical cultural analysis. J. Alexander approaches neoclassicism from the perspective of understanding the nature and meaning of experience. He posits that every culture can be understood as an "order" of attributes that interact in this sense. Consequently, post-neoclassicism is a cognitive phenomenon that occurs in the context of the interdependence of mental and social activity at the scale of the cultural system in the neofunctionalist prism (J. Alexander is a neofunctionalist). In this context, neoclassicism is a "general cognitive perspective" encompassing diverse approaches [2, p. 36].

Azerbaijani philosopher A. Abbasov employs the "paradigm of complexity" to examine neoclassicism and post-neoclassicism [1]. In a certain sense, there is a similarity between this approach and the neofunctional approach. However, this is a general and relative similarity that is not absolute. There are significant differences between them in terms of their epistemological position. Accordingly, A. Abbasov's understanding of neoclassicism and post-neoclassicism is founded upon the concept of a synergetic-centred system and the principle of cognitive self-organisation based on it.

Following our position, the authors of the approaches above acknowledge the existence of a tradition within the epistemological aspect of science. In essence, the classical stage of science is not entirely negated by the subsequent stage; instead, it displays a number of its hallmarks. Several researchers, such as A. Goldman highlighted the continued relevance of central epistemological issues, including the acquisition, justification and scientific truth of knowledge.

Let us now examine the investigated problem at the level of relations between classical, non-classical and post-neoclassical epistemology (that is, philosophical reflection and models of epistemology as a process and system). According to researchers, modern epistemology (in this context, there is no difference between post-neoclassical and post-non-classical) from classical and non-classical (postpositivism) epistemology, it differs in one general theoretical-methodological point: post-neoclassical epistemology does not regard the contradiction between practice and theory as fundamental, and does not accept science as the sole factor in the dynamics and functionalisation of cognition. Modern epistemology acknowledges that social and humanitarian factors are inextricably linked to the scientific cognitive process. This implies that, in post-neoclassical episte-

mology, the influence of diverse social, historical, cultural and personal factors on scientific comprehension is as significant as the empirical data acquired by the scientist during research [10, p. 69].

The theory of scientific communication, paradigmatic development of scientific knowledge, the sociology of scientific knowledge, radical constructivism, and poststructuralism profoundly impacted the formation of post-neoclassical epistemology. The impact of the teachings above on post-neoclassicism was evidenced in two key areas: firstly, in the dynamics of evolution within science, and secondly, in the aspects of science society (scientific activity-social environment). From the 1970s onwards, the cognitive theory of social epistemology began to gain significant traction. The primary motivating factor is that scientists and philosophers tend to approach scientific activity within the context of the individual-collective, intra-scientific-social environment.

CONCLUSIONS

The analysis above demonstrates that epistemological concepts and types of epistemology differ from each other in the history of science yet also have theoretical-conceptual and methodological connections. From this perspective, the classical, non-classical and post-non-classical types of epistemology reflect the historical stages of scientific cognition and the dynamics of philosophical reflection on this process.

The cognitive process was initially conceived as an individual activity. At this subsequent stage, this distinctive feature was not entirely eradicated. Still, specific steps were taken to acknowledge the necessity of the socio-cultural aspect of scientific activity. This process has led to significant

and enthusiastic discussions in scientific circles since the 1970s. Concurrently, a plethora of disparate approaches and explanations have emerged.

In conclusion, the scene resembled a "square," which serves as a reminder of the significant advantages of pluralistic approaches. This process has given rise to many conceptual approaches to acquiring knowledge, justification, rationality, the application of knowledge and the criteria for its authenticity within science. Consequently, the norms, rules, and boundaries of scientific understanding, the strategy and methodology of scientific activity, the rationality of scientific knowledge, its justification, the criteria of scientific truth, and their search logic have been revised. It is, therefore, appropriate to describe this stage as a new type of scientific understanding, namely post-non-classical (or post-neoclassical) epistemology.

This allows us to conclude that the designation of the contemporary epistemological situation as "post-non-classical" or "post-neoclassical" indicates the historical evolution of scientific understanding despite several minor epistemological differences. The terminological distinction is not a matter of substance but of disparate manifestations of analogous meanings.

However, when we consider contemporary scientific knowledge's intricacies, unpredictability and novel characteristics, the distinctions that previously constituted a "small epistemological difference" may assume significant proportions. In such a scenario, reflecting on the implications of post-neoclassicism and post-non-classicism in a philosophical-scientific context regarding both their substance and functionality would be necessary.

REFERENCES

1. Abbasov, A. (2019). Filosofija slozhnosti kak mezhdisciplinarnaja osnova integracii: logiko-metodologicheskie osobennosti teorii i praktiki [Philosophy of complexity as an interdisciplinary basis for integration: logical and methodological features of theory and practice]. *Scientific-methodological foundations of the integration of natural, social-political and humanitarian sciences*, 40–84 (in Russian).

2. Alexander, J. (2007). Analytical debates: Understanding the relative autonomy of culture. *Sociological Review, 6*(1), 17–37.

3. Alekseev, A.Y. and others (2021). Mezhdisciplinarnyj podhod k problemam iskusstvennogo intellekta, osnovannyj na issledovanijah na styke fundamental'noj matematiki i nejrobiologii [Interdisciplinary approach to the problems of artificial intelligence, based on research at the

intersection of fundamental mathematics and neurobiology]. *Biomasistema, 5*(1), 5–7 (in Russian).

4. Arshinov, V., & Budanov, V. (2016). Paradigma slozhnosti i sociogumanitarnye proekcii konvergentnyh tehnologij [Complexity paradigm and socio-humanitarian projections of convergent technologies]. *Voprosy filosofii, 1*, 59–70 (in Russian).

5. Arshinov, V. I., & Budanov, V. G. (2021). The Phenomenon of Complexity and Quantum Semiotics. *Voprosy Filosofii, 12*, 67–77. doi: 10.21146/0042-8744-2021-12-67-77

6. Goldman, A. (2024, March 22). *Social epistemology*. Retrieved from https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/epistemology-social/

7. Hoyningen-Huene, P. (2022). Is Kuhn's "World Change through Revolutions" Comprehensible? *Epistemology & Philosophy of Science, 59*(4), 55–72. doi: 10.5840/eps202259458

8. Kuipers, T. A. F. (2001). *Structures in Science.* New-York: Springer. doi: 10.1007/978-94-015-9739-5

9. Kuipers, T. (2005). *A brand new type of inductive logic. Reply to Diderik Batens.* Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/30494061_A_brand_new_type_of_inductive_logic_Reply_to_Diderik_Batens

10. Lebedev, S. (2013). Postneklassicheskaja jepistemologija: osnovnye ponjatija [Post-non-classical epistemology: basic concepts]. *Philosophical Sciences, 4*, 69–83 (in Russian).

11. Lubsky, A. (2015). Postneklassicheskaja racional'nost' i neoklassicheskaja model' social'no-gumanitarnyh issledovanij [Post-non-classical rationality and the neoclassical model of social and humanitarian research]. *Nauchnaja mysl' Kavkaza, 1*, 21–30 (in Russian).

12. Lubsky, A. (2016). Transdisciplinarnye issledovanija: problemy sovremennogo gnoseologicheskogo diskursa [Transdisciplinary research: problems of modern epistemological discourse]. *Gumanitarnye, social'no-jekonomicheskie i social'nye nauki, 5*, 61–66 (in Russian).

13. Montuori, A. (2015). *Complex Thought. An Overview of Edgar Morin's Intellectual Journey*. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/4074758/COMPLEX_THOUGHT_An_Overview_of_Edgar_Morin_s_Intellectual_Journey

14. Nikiforov, A. (1998). *Filosofija nauki: istorija i metodologija* [Philosophy of science: history and methodology]. Moscow: Dom inellektual'nykh knig (in Russian).

15. Smirnov, A. (2019). Voprosy filosofii [Questions of Philosophy]. *Nauka, 3*, 5–14 (in Russian).

16. Stepin, V. (2009). Klassika, neklassika, postneklassika: kriterii differenciacii [Classics, non-classics, post-non-classics: criteria for differentiation]. In *Postneklassika: filosofija, nauka, kul'tura* (pp. 249–295) (in Russian).

17. Stehr, N. (2023). Social Scientific Knowledge about Knowledge and Information. *Epistemology & Philosophy of Science, 60*(3), 131–170. doi: 10.5840/eps202360346

18. Zborovsky, G. (2008). Metaparadigmal'naja model' teoreticheskoj sociologii [Metaparadigm model of theoretical sociology]. *Sociologicheskie issledovanija, 4*, 3–19 (in Russian).