

Сомкин А.А., Сомкина А.Н.

**ИСХОДНЫЕ МОРАЛЬНЫЕ ТРЕБОВАНИЯ И ТАБУ
КАК АКСИОГЕННЫЙ ФАКТОР ГЕНЕЗИСА
ПЕРВОБЫТНОГО ОБЩЕСТВА[©]**

*Национальный исследовательский
Мордовский государственный университет им. Н.П. Огарева,
Россия, Саранск, alexsomkin@mail.ru*

Аннотация. В статье рассматривается гипотеза происхождения общезнанимых ценностей человека как фундаментального условия возникновения первобытного общества. Обосновывается утверждение о важности первых моральных запретов и табу какprotoценностей, ставших аксиогенным фактором социогенеза. Предлагается расширенная система protoценностей первобытного общества, ставших прообразом ценностной системы современного цивилизованного общества.

Ключевые слова: аксиология; ценности; табу; мораль; человек; первобытное общество.

Поступила: 14.02.2023

Принята к печати: 20.07.2023

Somkin A.A., Somkina A.N.

Initial moral requirements and taboos as axiogenic factors
in the genesis of the primitive society[©]

*National Research Ogarev Mordovia State University,
Russia, Saransk, alexsomkin@mail.ru*

Abstract. The paper deals with the hypothesis of the origin of generally significant human values as a fundamental condition for the emergence of a primitive society. The statement about the importance of the first moral prohibitions and taboos as proto-values that have become an axiogenic factor of sociogenesis is substantiated. The authors propose an extended system of proto-values of a primitive society is proposed, which have become a prototype of the value system of the modern civilized society.

Keywords: axiology; values; taboo; morality; man; primitive society.

Received: 14.02.2023

Accepted: 20.07.2023

Introduction

Spiritual values play a key role in the interaction between an individual and social groups and society on the whole. They determine our actions, give us guidelines, help us to assess social events and phenomena, facilitate the establishment of relationships with other people within different social communities [Lapin, 2010, c. 105].

The science of values originated in the antiquity to distinguish between good and evil. However, as an independent philosophical discipline it began to take shape only in the second half of the 19th century, having received a detailed justification in the doctrine of values by H. Lotze. The scholar tried to justify the truth of knowledge through the concept of “objective significance” of logical and mathematical truths [Lotze, 1866]. The next step in developing the value doctrine was made by P. Lapie in his works. Namely the French philosopher suggested the notion “axiology” for the philosophy of values [Lapie, 1902], which became widespread in the social sciences. Very soon axiology was presented by E. von Hartmann as one of the main components in the system of philosophical knowledge [Hartmann, 1880].

Among the foreign philosophical doctrines some major axiological concepts of Western researchers can be distinguished: *naturalistic psychologism*, which considers human biopsychic demands to be the source of values (J. Dewey, C.I. Lewis, A. Meinong, R.B. Perry); *transcendentalism*, for which values act as ideal norms generated by transcendental (Divine) consciousness (going beyond the limits of science) (N. Hartmann, W. Windelband, H. Rickert); *cultural-historical relativism*, focusing on the importance of the pluralism of value systems, which are characteristics of different social groups and individuals (W. Dilthey, A. Toynbee, O. Spengler, P.A. Sorokin); *personalistic ontologism*, which defends the thesis that the value world exists in some kind of “timeless axiological system” given by God, and which acts as the ontological basis of everything social; (M. Scheler); in *sociologism*, value acts as a norm, the way of being which is significant for the subject, and which acts as a means of identifying social ties (M. Weber, F. Znanetsky, T. Parsons).

In our country, axiology was denied the status of a science for a long time just like genetics, cybernetics, and sociology. Its development was held back for a long time. It was considered bourgeois pseudoscience. This was explained by the fact that its initial provisions are incompatible with the principle of communist party membership, which prevailed in our country in the Soviet era for more than 70 years. The first serious works in Russian philosophy devoted to the problems of values began to appear in the late 1960s and were initially developed within the framework of the Marxist paradigm. The first axiologists were S.F. Anisimov, L.I. Arkhangelsky, V.A. Vasilenko, O.G. Drobniitsky, M.S. Kagan, A.M. Korshunov, V.G. Smolyansky, L.N. Stolovich, V.P. Tugarinov, etc.

Axiology is defined as the theory of social values in most dictionaries and textbooks¹. In our opinion, this interpretation is limited and narrow to a certain degree. The fact is that social values always arise as a result of social assessments, so there can be no values without assessments. Moreover, assessments do not only play an auxiliary role in the formation of values, but also help to characterize the extant values. In this regard, axiology should be defined comprehensively as *a theory of social values and assessments*.

¹ See: [Gaidenko, 2001; Plotnikov, 2006; Stolovich, 2007].

As for the definition of the concept “value”, there is also no consensus among scholars¹. In our work we will adhere to a broader interpretation. By social values we will understand “the totality of all natural, social and spiritual phenomena that have a positive significance for society in a certain historical period” [Frolov, 1999, p. 131–136].

Contemporary system of social values

The contemporary system of social values has a complex structure. It includes four subsystems (generally significant values and alternative values of the individual, state-ideological values, and the highest integrative values of humanity), located on three hierarchical levels. Hierarchy of contemporary values (system-constructive approach) consists of (1) the highest integrative values of humanity; (2) state-ideological values (with orientation within the country: “national idea”); (3) (a) generally significant values, (b) alternative values of the individual.

The purpose of our research is to investigate the first basic level in the system of contemporary social values. According to our scientific hypothesis, it consists of two groups of personal values: generally significant and alternative ones which have their origins in proto-values of the primitive society.

For the first time, the concept of the general significance of value is found in the works of the Russian philosopher N.O. Losskiy, who raised under it “its significance for every subject”. The thinker endowed the absolute values with this characteristic since they were based on the Divine fullness of being. “Absolute value ... is always at the same time generally significant...”, he wrote [Losskiy, 1931, p. 83].

This social phenomenon (“generally significant values”) was further elaborated by N.S. Rozov, researcher from Novosibirsk, although in a slightly different interpretation (as “values that limit” human behavior) [Rozov, 1993, p. 119]. Later, the Saransk researcher D.E. Frolov gave them a clearer formulation as values that “require obligatory compliance” [Frolov, 1999, p. 131–136].

¹ See: [Value, 2005; Zdravomyslov, 2001; Plotnikov, 1998].

However, the mentioned authors did not disclose the genesis of these types of values, did not trace their historical evolution, and did not provide a rationale for their systematic classification.

In our understanding, the generally significant values of the individual are an expression of social restrictions and recommendations in behavior voluntarily accepted by an individual. Such values require obligatory compliance by every citizen of a modern civilized society.

The problem of the genesis of generally significant values

In this paper, we have investigated the genesis of the social values subsystem, have found out the historical period of their emergence and their early (ancient, historically first) varieties. It is fundamentally important here that, according to our hypothesis, their emergence was a fundamentally important axiological reason in the evolution of human beings and human society.

The process of the origin of human and society was complex, with five factors being the most important: 1) catastrophic changes in the natural environment, 2) intermittent genetic shifts in heredity, 3) conscious instrumental activity (human labor), 4) verbal communication (human speech), 5) social relations.

The first people appeared approx. 6 million years ago (the species "Homo" separated from its predecessors – *Australopithecus*). The first groups of hominids lived in primitive herds according to the laws of "zoological individualism". Human society (and "social people") arose much later, about 50 thousand years ago. Here, for the first time, social laws of life based on human morality began to dominate [Drobyshevskiy, 2021, p. 31].

The last three factors are associated with the formation of social values¹. It is necessary to understand when they arose, what generally significant values determined and how they are interconnected.

We do not pay attention to the first two factors because they determined genetic and ensuing biological changes of anthropoids while we are interested in social prerequisites of the human's emergence.

The third factor of anthroposociogenesis was conscious instrumental activity (or human labor). This is due to the peculiarities of the

¹ See: [Frolov, 1989].

labor process, which not only stimulate the development of human consciousness, but also form its external (physical) appearance¹:

1) the expedient character of the labor process (it involves the preliminary setting, a goal and a plan of activity in a person's mind);

2) the generalized character of the labor process (i.e., awareness of the crafted subject properties, for example, awareness of the hardness as the property of a stone ax compared to wood);

3) indirect character (while an animal contacts the environment directly, with the help of claws and teeth, a person does it indirectly, with the help of tools that he places between himself and the environment);

4) social character (i.e., its implementation is carried out in the joint activity of several individuals);

5) active-transformative character (it means a person's desire not to adapt to the environment, but to change it actively);

6) the creative character of the labor process (it means the creation of something new, for example, the creation and improvement of labor tools, the creation of a piece of art, etc.).

The beginning of the transition process from an ape to a human being was the systematic crafting and improvement of tools, i.e. tool making activity. At the same time, the very first, ancient labor tools of primitive people were darts, round stones that were used to protect them against predatory animals or hunting, as well as choppers (stone axes), sharp fragments of stones for processing animal carcasses. It was these tools that were found in the Olduvai Gorge [Leakey, 1975, p. 483].

The fourth factor of anthroposociogenesis was the verbal communication of humans (with the help of human speech). Summarizing the data accumulated in evolutionary linguistics at the turn of the 20th – 21st centuries, T.V. Chernigovskaya identifies the following stages in the development of communication from animal to human [Chernigovskaya, 2017, p. 38]:

– the neuroanatomical substratum formation of the human language in *Homo habilis* 2 million years ago;

– formation of a proto-language with certain specific features (order of elements, verb arguments, grammaticality, etc.) in *Homo erectus* approximately one million years ago;

¹ See: [Frolov, 1989].

- the completion of the “full-fledged” language formation in *Homo sapiens* approximately between 100 and 150 thousand years ago;
- a fully syntactically formed language as a necessary condition for the exchange and transmission of symbolic information can be indirectly dated based on comparison with abstract rock carvings, whose age is about 75 thousand years...”.

Human speech is defined by the authors as a special system of signs (sound signals) that serves as a means of 1) thinking, 2) communication, 3) sensual expression of a person, 4) their social memory, and also 5) controlling their behavior and activity. This definition reflects the most important social functions of language. Only with the help of language humans were able to communicate, express their feelings, work together and pass on experience from generation to generation. The most important function of the five was thinking. It stimulated the development of the human consciousness and the human brain.

The development of the verbal communication system is directly related to the transition to the systematic manufacturing of tools. “Only one could make tools who was sure that food would be shared with him if necessary, he would be warned of danger, his relatives would not claim his female or place in the hierarchy behind his back, etc. Such a trusting relationship can exist only if there is a developed communication system, which is needed not only in order to directly ‘negotiate’ with each other, but also in order to more effectively suppress attempts to violate social norms of behavior” [Burlak, 2019, p. 247–248].

The fifth factor of anthroposociogenesis was social relations. The earliest, most ancient of them can be considered as moral relations, family and marriage, administrative (organization of labor and military organization), religious and cult (or magic-totemic), artistic and aesthetic (rock painting, sculpture, etc.), the relationship of collective property. All of them arose spontaneously and were traditionally passed down from generation to generation.

However, the most important of them for the further humanitarian development of mankind were moral relations [Semenov, 2002, p. 361]. Three simple moral requirements can be distinguished as a point from which human society (i.e., the tribal system) begins¹:

¹ See: [Frolov, 1989].

- 1) a prohibition (taboo) on closely related marriages (promiscuity, incest, inbreeding); it laid the foundation for the formation of a human form of family and marriage relations;
- 2) a prohibition (taboo) on killing a fellow tribesman;
- 3) the requirement to help any fellow tribesman like himself (i.e., help him, feed him, etc.) regardless of his physical fitness for life (including help for the sick, the elderly, the disabled, etc.); this contributed to the emergence of collective ownership of the food obtained.

The first taboo was of particular importance. It arose spontaneously and was initially aimed at overcoming the “biological impasse” that destroyed the unity of primitive society, disrupted its economic activity, and led to self-destruction [Boroday, 1996, p. 2]. “This necessity, manifesting itself in all the practical activities of developing people, drove them (initially through biosocial selection, and in further development to an ever-greater extent and directly) with an unshakable conviction that the performance of certain actions is disastrous for them and for the herd and that the only way to avoid danger is refraining from these actions” [Semenov, 2002, p. 363]. At the same time, it is important to understand that observance of the taboo was forced not only by fear, but also, as Z. Freud noted, the rudiments of duty and conscience. “The conscience of a taboo is probably the most ancient form in which we encounter the phenomenon of taboo” [Freud, 2005, p. 115].

Within the analyzed context it meant *a social revolution* in herd relations, which led to the formation of a completely new social pattern of life. Therefore, it can be called the *first moral law of human life*.

This, apparently, was the difference between the prohibitions, customs and traditions that had only a handcrafting or protective-domestic character (e.g., widely-practiced prohibitions limited sexual relations in the process of housekeeping activity, during fishing, hunting, grazing, sowing, harvesting, etc. In some tribes that still exist today, such requirements for sexual abstinence have survived to the present day. For example, among South and North American Indians, African Zulus and Masai, among the Pygmies or among the Papuans Motu (New Guinea), Australian natives Maori, etc., there is a mandatory abstinence on the night before the hunt (for more details, see: [Semenov, 2002, p. 380–381; Abbie, 1968, p. 221–231]). These requirements are different from those that bore moral meaning in themselves, and in which the special supernatural value of a person was spontaneously

realized, although initially only as belonging to his community (e.g., before so far “the norms of Australians prescribing mutual assistance and support, cover a rather narrow circle of members of their small teams” [Artemova, 1987, p. 171]).

The essence of this qualitative change in social relations means the great transformation. Originally the primitive herd is based on endogamy (or promiscuity, incest, complete freedom of marriage relations, including close relatives) within the group. In contrast, the primitive tribal community (as the first, the most primitive type of human society) during the evolution began to transit to social relations based on: 1) agamy (the prohibition of marriage within the clan) and 2) exogamy (the establishment of external marriage with other, strictly defined clans). Therefore, each primitive tribe consisted of an even (paired) number of clans: only “external” marital relations of all men (women) of one clan with all women (men) of another (strictly defined) clan within the tribe were allowed. Of course, it did not rule out pair marriages, but they could easily be dissolved.

Why did this kind of relationship arise? In science, historically there have been four main explanations:

1) moral aversion to incest (common for a contemporary mentally healthy person [Bachofen, 2018, 2019; McLennan, 1970]);

2) understanding of its harmfulness to offspring (modern science has proven that marriages between relatives lead to hereditary diseases [Amiraslanova, 2019; Legkoeva, Legkoev, 2021; Bener, Mohammad, 2017]);

3) natural selection and better survival (by strengthening inter-tribal (inter-clan) connections) of people within those tribes in which there are no blood ties [Zolotorev, 1964; Tokarev, 1984; Taylor, 1989]).

However, over time, it was proved that all these reasons were of secondary importance – the main reason was 4) the need for intra-herd peace [Bickerton, 2012, p. 125; Semenov, 2019; Frolov, 1989, p. 234; Douglas, 2001]).

As a result of the “first prohibition” that spontaneously arose, all females in the genus were “declared” as unclaimed. All marriages were allowed only with representatives of another clan. This statement put an end to the murderous competition among males. There was peace within the clan (it was already noted above that the tribe always consisted of a pair of clans). This moral prohibition, which regulated the

social relations inside a tribe, was reinforced by totemic and magic cults. Each clan worshiped one totem, most often an animal (crocodile, turtle, snake, etc.). Therefore, it was believed that all members of the clan were united in the flesh. So, one's own flesh was not to be killed, eaten, or made an object of marital relations.

The emergence of early humanity, its departure from the gregarious state is directly related to the taming of natural inclinations. The need for this was caused by the needs of the emerging human society to subordinate the egoistic and aggressive aspirations of a single prehistoric man to the interests of the community represented by a clan or a tribe.

At the first prehistoric stage there was still no society and social relations. Only the beginnings of social values appeared. In our opinion, they can be called proto-values. There are two types of such proto-values:

1) tool activity (as a primitive proto-value, preceding the social value of creative labor);

2) verbal communication (as a primitive proto-value that precedes the corresponding social value of interpersonal communication).

It should be noted that the systematic crafting and improvement of tools as historically the first proto-value was the determining factor of anthropogenesis at the first prehistoric stage. Therefore, F. Engels was right in paying special attention to this issue [Engels, 1961, p. 492]. However, he and his followers erroneously absolutized this aspect, losing sight of the fact that the effect of this phenomenon dominated only at the first stage.

In the course of further development, at the second prehistoric stage (the stage of primitive society, the tribal system), the fifth factor that played a crucial role was social relations. Most authors limit themselves to the study of two types of these relations: moral and family-marital [Semenov, 2002; Morgan, 1964].

In our opinion, seven types of such relations should be distinguished: moral and ethical relations; family and marriage relations; collective labor relations; managerial relations; communicative-speech relations; relations of collective ownership; mutual assistance relations based on parochial altruism.

The validity of this distinction is confirmed by numerous archaeological and ethnographic data [Artemova, 1987; Drobyshevskiy,

2021; Semenov, 2019]. The vast factual material accumulated by ethnographic science is the most important source that makes it possible to restore the history of the primitive pre-human herd.

The first two types of relations, moral and family and marriage, are discussed in detail above. Let us consider the remaining ones.

In addition to negative (forbidding) taboos, positive (prescriptive) taboos also arose, which established new models of social behavior. So, with the advent of the food taboo, distribution relations and collective property relations appeared. Of course, animals do not leave the offspring without food, they share prey with their cubs in the first instance. However, feeding one's own children is a natural instinct, but sharing a part of prey with another, especially not a relative or someone who did not participate in hunting or gathering, is already the beginning of the division of labor (i.e., the emergence of collective labor relations) and, respectively, social relations *per se*.

Such a distribution can be called egalitarian, since it did not take into account either property status, or family ties, or labor contribution. It was fundamentally different from eating behavior in previous eras, when in especially difficult cases, dependents were simply disposed of, and even eaten. As L.H. Morgan assures, it is no coincidence that cannibalism has been “the scourge of mankind” for tens of thousands of years [Morgan, 1964].

The main prohibitions (taboos), which entailed the establishment of a new type of distributive relations, affected two most fundamental human needs, which are food and the reproduction of the clan. The establishment of social order in this area led to a significant increase in security for all members, coherence of labor relations, intensification of social communication, management efficiency, etc., forming an inextricable chain of social norms cementing the primitive subhuman herd [Semenov, 2002, p. 190].

There is evidence that directly testifies to the high level of cohesion of groups of proto-humans in the late pre-historic era. There were discovered skeletons of primitive people who during their lifetime received serious injuries: fractures of bones, ribs, and even amputations of limbs (for example, findings in the Shanidar cave in Iraq, in the cave of Mount Carmel, the skeleton of a Galilean Neanderthal, etc.). It is obvious that the recovery and subsequent existence of individuals found there who received such severe injuries was possible only in a community

in which relations of mutual assistance and care for each of its members were highly developed [Nizovsky, 2004, p. 19–20].

The complication of collective labor relations (battling, the invention of the spear thrower, the bow, etc.) objectively led to the expansion of verbal communication and the resulting need to adapt not so much to the natural environment as to the social one. The formation of coherent speech took place during the transformation of primitive herds into tribal communities, and “herd languages” into tribal languages of a new type. A peculiar phenomenon of primitive ethnolinguistic continuity was born [Sher, Vishnyatskiy, Blednova, 2004, p. 71–73]. Geographical barriers and socio-economic contradictions separated neighboring ethno-tribal groups for a long time and determined the boundaries of the main language families that developed later.

In addition, with the growth of labor productivity and the increase in free time, it became necessary to institutionalize non-production pre-conditions for behavior. Gradually, these forms of behavior acquired independent social functions, allowing them to streamline part of the free time of hominids, systematically filling it with traditional ritual forms of non-productive communication, which were further consolidated in traditions and customs.

That is, from a socio-philosophical point of view, in addition to the main communicative function, language began to act as a “tool” capable of socializing free time in a non-productive way. For example, Australian aborigines spend their free time in everyday conversations (gossip) [Berndt, Berndt, 1981, p. 260], which, despite the outward inexpressiveness of such a method of communication, enables one to fill one’s free time by establishing new and maintaining old social ties.

As for the attitude of primitive people to certain objective pre-requisites for production and life, outwardly it worked as an attitude to “no one’s” objects of nature such as land, water, plants, animals, etc. But the essence of this seemingly one-sided relationship was the exclusion of “aliens” from the use of these natural objects. Ownership relations actually assigned to each specific community its source of existence. Interestingly, P. Lafargue identified the moment of *usage* as the main, “the only possible and understandable basis for property among savages” [Lafargue, 1959, p. 66].

The next important aspect of the social transformation of a human herd into a tribal community was the emerging admirative rela-

tions as the need for a “united” administration of various types of collective activities. The primitive institution of power served as a mechanism for coordinating the efforts of individuals in the process of joint work. Its emergence reflected the trend of sex and age differentiation of social functions and forms of labor, as well as types of behavior and its social assessments.

In this pre-historical era, the subject and object of regulation coincided, since administering was carried out on the basis of the principle of social self-regulation with the participation of the entire adult population of the community [Andreev, 1998, p. 389]. The structure of the tribal authorities can be represented as follows: 1) the general meeting of the clan (tribe); 2) council of the elders (an elder); 3) chief (commander, chief of the hunt). The general meeting decided all the most important common matters concerning the whole clan (tribe). The meeting elected an elder, military chiefs, hunting chiefs who managed the daily life of the tribal community. A council of the elders met to decide on particularly important matters. Thus, “characteristic features of the primary power were general character, universality, public nature, direct democracy, verbal formulation of patterns of behavior and prohibitions, absence of special punitive bodies and means of coercion” [Ibid., p. 392].

At the same time, “the norms governing the activities of heads of communities, religious leaders, sorcerers, and healers are built in such a way that these functions are performed by people with special talents, outstanding strong-willed qualities, special knowledge and skills. Here, the Australian system not only allows for personal initiative, but also requires it” [Artemova, 1987, p. 182].

We tend to believe that the presence of the seven types of social relations identified by us above as special cultural phenomena marked the emergence of the respective types of social values. Together with the two proto-values that had arisen earlier (which acquired social content during this period and became full-fledged social values), they constituted the archaic system of social values in the primitive society.

Some of them were the main ones for the formation of generally significant proto-values inherent in each individual. And since the most important of them were intra-clan family ties (the period of patriarchy), as well as agamous-exogamous marital relations and paired marriages that began to form (apparently after the invention and wide use of

bows, arrows and polished stone tools; this period is known as the first technical revolution), as we suggest, moral and family-marital relations constituted a special (basic) group of generally significant proto-values of the personality.

On the basis of the other part, alternative proto-values were formed that are inherent in one or another sex and age group of people that make up a tribal community. Based on the foregoing, we can single out a set of generally significant values of the personality during the tribal relations period:

- 1) the vital value of the survival of the tribe (because people could only survive together in the harsh conditions of that time);
- 2) the vital value of helping any fellow tribesman (like oneself);
- 3) the vital value of conscious labor activity (everyone had to make their “contribution” to the joint survival);
- 4) the vital value of forbiddance on closely related marriages (within the clan);
- 5) the vital value of the managerial “organization of the tribe” (usually the tribe had several chiefs: the best hunter, the best warrior, a wise elder, a sorcerer (shaman), an older woman (keeper of the hearth) and so on);
- 6) the vital value of effective verbal communication (only a sufficiently developed language made it possible to work together);
- 7) the vital value of collective property (for a common dwelling, a common hearth, primitive means of labor, etc.);
- 8) the vital value of agamous-exogamous marriage and family relations.

The monolithic cohesion of the tribal society, in which there was no social division of labor and social differentiation, was ensured by consanguineous unity and a natural (sex and age) division of labor. A personality as an individual is just beginning to take shape, separating himself from society only as a result of a gradual historical development and complication of the social organism. Initially, he acts as a directly tribal being, serving in all its manifestations the tasks of self-preservation of the community. Individual life directly coincided with the community, which determined the most characteristic feature of primitive morality, i.e. collectivism and a priority orientation towards the interests of the clan. This was manifested in the absence of domination and subordination, social oppression and inequality, which ensured

the general significance of moral institutions, the inseparability of duties and rights for the individual.

Conclusion

The emergence of morality is based on the social need for mutual agreement, regulation, and coordination of the complex process of reproduction of social life, when such regulation on the basis of biologically inherited reflexes and instincts became impossible. The moral relations themselves were not yet recognized *per se* and were of a prohibitive nature (taboos).

In favor of this statement is the very fact of human society emergence. Both processes, anthropogenesis and sociogenesis, developed simultaneously, and the personality appeared along with the emergence of the primitive society (clan system). During this period, social relations were first formed, and a person arose as an individual form of being of these relations. It is obvious that no social relations (moral, marital, managerial, aesthetic, etc.) can exist without their individual carriers, i.e. without *personal social subjects* and their moral qualities. The history of the emergence and formation of the modern system of values dates back to the primitive epoch.

In the process of anthroposociogenesis the system of dominance (stronger and more adapted individuals) does not disappear, but it is transformed to a different, social plane. Above the natural, instinctive forms of regulations inherent in animals, specifically human mechanisms for organizing behavioral complexes are built, characterized by a gradual awareness and mastery of a person of their behavior.

While in the modern society individuals often compete, claiming a higher position, access to education, health care service, a well-paid job, etc., such competition was apparently not typical of the primitive society. The main life-meaning goal common for all was collective survival in the harsh conditions of existence and, consequently, mutual assistance of individuals (archaic personalities). But this does not mean that there was no personal meaning of life. It existed but was associated with the desire to find their optimal, the most useful place in the tribal community.

Список литературы

Амирасланова Л. Генетические заболевания при родственных браках // Актуальные проблемы современной медицины и фармации 2019: сб. тез. докл. LXXIII междунар. науч.-практ конф. студ. и мол. уч., 15–17 апр. Минск, 2019 г. / под ред. А.В. Сикорского, В.Я. Хрыщановича. – Минск : БГМУ, 2019. – С. 1576.

Андреев И.Л. Происхождение человека и общества. – 2-е изд., перераб. и доп. – Москва : Мысль, 1998. – 415 с.

Артемова О.Ю. Личность и социальные нормы в раннепервобытной общине. – Москва : Наука, 1987. – 204 с.

Бахоффен И.Я. Материнское право. Исследование гинекократии древнего мира в соответствии с ее религиозной и правовой природой : в 3 т. – Санкт-Петербург : Quadrivium, Т. 1. – 2018. – 384 с.; Т. 2. – 2019. – 352 с.; Т. 3. – 752 с.

Бернхт Р.М., Бернхт К.Х. Мир первых австралийцев. – Москва : Наука, Главная редакция восточной литературы, 1981. – 448 с.

Бикертон Д. Язык Адама: как люди создали язык, как язык создал людей. – Москва : Языки славянских культур, 2012. – 336 с.

Бородай Ю.М. Эротика – смерть – табу: трагедия человеческого сознания. – Москва : Гнозис, Русское феноменологическое общество, 1996. – 416 с.

Бурлак С. Происхождение языка: факты, исследования, гипотезы. – 2-е изд., перераб. и доп. – Москва : Альпина нон-фикшн, 2019. – 609 с.

Гайденко П.П. Аксиология // Философский словарь / под. ред. И.Т. Фролова. – 7-е изд., перераб. и доп. – Москва : Республика, 2001. – С. 17–19.

Дробышевский С.В. Достающее звено. – Москва : Согрис, 2021. – 592 с.

Здравомыслов А.Г. Ценности // Философский словарь / под. ред. И.Т. Фролова. – 7-е изд. перераб. и доп. – Москва : Республика, 2001. – С. 646.

Золотарев А.М. Родовой строй и первобытная мифология. – Москва : Наука, 1964. – 328 с.

Лапин Н.И. Универсальные ценности и многообразие жизненных миров людей // Диалог культур и партнерство цивилизаций: становление глобальной культуры. – Москва , 2010. – С. 105–107.

Лафарг П. За и против коммунизма. Собственность и ее происхождение. – Москва : Политиздат, 1959. – 200 с.

Легкоеева М.В., Легкоеев Б.В. Влияние близкородственных браков на генотип потомства // Молодой ученый. – 2021. – № 49 (391). – С. 309–310. – URL: <https://moluch.ru/archive/391/86277/>

Лосский Н.О. Ценность и бытие. Бог и Царство Божие как основа ценностей. – Париж : ИМКА-Пресс, 1931. – 135 с.

Лотце Р.Г. Микрокозмъ: мысли о естественной и бытовой истории человечества. Опыт антропологии. – Москва : Издание К. Солдатенкова, 1866. – 599 с.

Низовский А.Ю. Загадки антропологии. – Москва : Вече, 2004. – 416 с.

Плотников В.И. Аксиология // Социальная философия: словарь / сост. и ред. В.Е. Кемеров, Т.Х. Керимов. – 2-е изд., испр. и доп. – Москва ; Екатеринбург : Академический проект ; Деловая книга, 2006. – С. 3–13.

Плотников В.И. Ценность // Современный философский словарь / под общ. ред. В.Е. Кемерова. – 2-е изд., испр. и доп. – Лондон ; Франкфурт-на-Майне ; Париж ; Люксембург ; Москва ; Минск : ПАНПРИНТ, 1998. – С. 1001.

Розов Н.С. Философия гуманитарного образования (ценностные основания базового гуманитарного образования в высшей школе). – Москва : Исследовательский центр проблем подготовки специалистов, 1993. – 194 с.

Семенов Ю.И. Как возникло человечество. – 2-е изд., с нов. предисл. и прилож. – Москва : Гос. публ. ист. б-ка России, 2002. – 790 с.

Семенов Ю.И. Происхождение и развитие экономики: от первобытного коммунизма к обществам с частной собственностью, классами и государством (древневосточному, античному и феодальному). – Москва : КРАСАНД, 2019. – 720 с.

Столович Л.Н. Аксиология // Русская философия : энциклопедия / под. общ. ред. М.А. Маслина. – Москва : Алгоритм, 2007. – С. 13–14.

Тейлор Э.Б. Первобытная культура. – Москва : Политиздат, 1989. – 572 с.

Токарев С.А. Ранние формы религии и их развитие. – Москва : Наука, 1984. – 399 с.

Фрейд З. Тотем и табу / пер. с нем. М.В. Вульфа. – Санкт-Петербург : Азбука-классика, 2005. – 256 с.

Фролов Д.Е. Иерархия социальных ценностей и смена парадигмы ценностного мышления // Мат-лы международ. науч. конф. «Космизм и новое мышление на Западе и Востоке». – Санкт-Петербург : Нестор, 1999. – С. 131–136.

Фролов И.Т. Что такое человек? Загадка антропогенеза // Введение в философию : в 2 ч. / Фролов И.Т., Араб-Оглы Э.А., Арефьева Г.С. и др. – Москва : Политиздат, 1989. – Ч. 2. – С. 220–237.

Ценность // Философский энциклопедический словарь. – Москва : ИНФРА-М, 2005. – С. 507.

Черниговская Т.В. Чеширская улыбка кота Шрёдингера. Язык и сознание. – 3-е изд. – Москва : Языки славянской культуры, 2017. – 448 с.

Шер Я.А., Вишняцкий Л.Б., Бледнова Н.С. Происхождение знакового поведения. – Москва : Научный мир, 2004. – 280 с.

Энгельс Ф. Роль труда в процессе превращения обезьяны в человека // Маркс К., Энгельс Ф. Сочинения. – 2-е изд. : в 50 т. – Москва : Политиздат, 1961. – Т. 20. – С. 486–499.

Abbie A.A. The homogeneity of Australian Aborigines // Archaeology and Physical Anthropology in Oceania. – 1968. – Vol. 3. – P. 221–231.

Bener A., Mohammad R.R. Global distribution of consanguinity and their impact on complex diseases: genetic disorders from an endogamous population // Egyptian Journal of Medical Human Genetics. – 2017. – Vol. 18 (4). – P. 315–320. DOI: 10.1016/j.ejmhg.2017.01.002

Douglas M. Purity and danger: an analysis of concepts of pollution and taboo. – London ; New York : Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2001. – 193 p.

Hartmann E. von. Zur Geschichte und Begründung des Pessimismus. – Berlin : Carl Duncker's Verlag, 1880. – 141 S.

Lapie P. De justitia apud Aristotelem. – Paris : F. Alcan, 1902. – 75 p.

Leakey M.D. Cultural patterns in the Olduvai sequence // After the Australopithecines: Stratigraphy, ecology, and culture change in the Middle Pleistocene. – Paris : The Hague. 1975. – P. 476–495 p.

McLennan J.F. Primitive marriage. An inquiry into the origin of the form of capture in marriage ceremonies. – Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1970. – 152 p.

Morgan L.H. Ancient society. – Cambridge : Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1964. – 585 p.

References

Amiraslanova, L. (2019). Genetic diseases in consanguineous marriages. In *Actual problems of modern medicine and pharmacy 2019* (pp. 1576). Minsk: BSMU.

Andreev, I.L. (1998). *The origin of man and society*. 2nd ed., revised and add. Moscow: Mysl.

Artemova, O.Yu. (1987). *Personality and social norms in the early primitive community*. Moscow: Nauka.

Bachofen, J.J. (2018; 2019a; 2019b). *Mother law. A study of the gynocracy of the ancient world in accordance with its religious and legal nature*. Saint-Petersburg: Quadrivium: Vol. 1; Vol. 2; Vol. 3.

Berndt, R.M., Berndt, K.H. (1981). *World of the first Australians*. Moscow: Main edition of Eastern literature.

Bickerton, D. (2012). *Adam's language: how people created language, how language created people*. Moscow: Languages of Slavic cultures.

Boroday, Yu.M. (1996). *Erotica – death – taboo: the tragedy of human consciousness*. Moscow: Gnosis, Russian Phenomenological Society.

Burlak, S. (2019). *Origin of language: facts, research, hypotheses*. 2nd ed., revised and add. Moscow: Alpina non-fiction.

Gaidenko, P.P. (2001). Axiology. In *Philosophical Dictionary* (pp. 17–19). Moscow: Respublika.

Drobyshevsky, S.V. (2021). *Retrieving link*. Moscow: Corpus.

Zdravomyslov, A.G. (2001). Values. In *Philosophical Dictionary* (pp. 646). Moscow: Respublika.

Zolotarev, A.M. (1964). *Tribal system and primitive mythology*. Moscow: Nauka.

Lapin, N.I. (2010). Universal values and diversity of people's life worlds. In *Dialogue of cultures and partnership of civilizations: the formation of a global culture* (pp. 105–107). Moscow.

Lafargue, P. (1959). *For and against communism. Property and its origin*. Moscow: Politizdat.

Legkoeva, M.V., Legkoev, B.V. (2021). Influence of closely related marriages on the offspring genotype. *Young scientist*, 49 (391), 309–310. Retrieved from: <https://moluch.ru/archive/391/86277/>

Lossky, N.O. (1931). *Value and existence. God and the Kingdom of God as the basis of values*. Paris: YMCA-Press.

Lotze, R.G. (1866). *Microcosm: thoughts on the natural and everyday history of mankind. Anthropological experience*. Moscow: Edition of K. Soldatenkov.

Nizovsky, A.Yu. (2004). *Riddles of Anthropology*. Moscow: Veche.

Plotnikov, V.I. (1998). Value. In *Modern Philosophical Dictionary* (pp. 1001). London, Frankfurt am Main, Paris, Luxembourg, Moscow, Minsk: PANPRINT.

Plotnikov, V.I. (2006). Axiology. In *Social Philosophy: Dictionary* (pp. 3–13). Moscow: Academic project; Yekaterinburg: Delovaya kniga.

Rozov, N.S. (1993). *Philosophy of humanities education (value foundations of basic humanitarian education in higher education)*. Moscow: Research Center for the Problems of Training Specialists.

Semenov, Yu.I. (2002). *How did humanity arise*. 2nd ed., new. foreword and appendix. Moscow: State. publ. hist. library of Russia.

Semenov, Yu.I. (2019). *The origin and development of the economy: from primitive communism to societies with private property, classes and the state (ancient Eastern, ancient and feudal)*. Moscow: KRASAND.

Stolovich, L.N. (2007). Axiology. In *Russian Philosophy: Encyclopedia* (p. 13–14). Moscow: Algorithm.

Taylor, E.B. (1989). *Primitive culture*. Moscow: Politizdat.

Tokarev, S.A. (1984). *Early forms of religion and their development*. Moscow: Nauka.

Freud, Z. (2005). *Totem and taboo*. Saint-Petersburg: ABC Classics.

Frolov, D.E. (1999). The hierarchy of social values and the paradigm shift of value thinking. In *Cosmism and New Thinking in the West and East* (pp. 131–136). Saint-Petersburg: Publishing House Nestor.

Frolov, I.T. (1989). What is a person? The riddle of anthropogenesis. In *Introduction to philosophy* (pp. 220–237). Moscow: Politizdat.

Value (2005). In *Philosophical Encyclopedic Dictionary* (pp. 507). Moscow: INFRA-M.

Chernigovskaya, T.V. (2017). *Cheshire smile of Schrödinger's cat. Language and consciousness*. 3rd ed. Moscow: Languages of Slavic culture.

Sher, Ya.A., Vishnyatsky, L.B., Blednova, N.S. (2004). *The origin of sign behavior*. Moscow: Nauchny Mir.

Engels, F. (1961). The role of labor in the process of transformation of a monkey into a man. In Marx, K., Engels, F. *Works*. 2nd ed. In 50 vol. Moscow: Politizdat. Vol. 20 (pp. 486–499).

Abbie, A.A. (1968). The homogeneity of Australian Aborigines. *Archeology and Physical Anthropology in Oceania*, 3, 221–231.

Bener, A., Mohammad, R.R. (2017). Global distribution of consanguinity and their impact on complex diseases: genetic disorders from an endogamous population. *Egyptian Journal of Medical Human Genetics*, 18(4), 315–320. DOI: 10.1016/j.ejmhg.2017.01.002

Douglas, M. (2001). *Purity and danger: an analysis of concepts of pollution and taboo*. London, New York: Taylor & Francis e-Library.

Hartmann, E. von. (1880). *Zur Geschichte und Begründung des Pessimismus*. Berlin: Carl Duncker's Verlag.

Lapie, P. (1902). *De justitia apud Aristotelem*, Paris: F. Alcan.

Leakey, M.D. (1975). Cultural patterns in the Olduvai sequence. *After the Australopithecines: Stratigraphy, ecology, and culture change in the Middle Pleistocene* (pp. 476–495). Paris: The Hague.

McLennan, J.F. (1970). *Primitive marriage. An inquiry into the origin of the form of capture in marriage ceremonies*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Morgan, L.H. (1964). *Ancient society*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Об авторах

Сомкин Александр Алексеевич – доктор философских наук, профессор, Мордовский государственный университет им. Н.П. Огарева;

Сомкина Алла Николаевна – преподаватель, Мордовский государственный университет им. Н.П. Огарева

About the authors

Somkin Alexander Alekseevich – Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor, Ogarev Mordovia State University;

Somkina Alla Nikolaevna – Lecturer, Ogarev Mordovia State University