

<https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2337-2025-29-2-327-344>
EDN: XKMCTV

Research Article / Научная статья

The Metaparadigm of Scientific Knowledge and Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Legal Culture

Maksim V. Zaloilo  

Institute of Legislation and Comparative Law under the Government
of the Russian Federation, *Moscow, Russian Federation*
z-lo@mail.ru

Abstract. The purpose of the research is to assess the prospects for applying methods and approaches from the humanities and exact sciences to understand the genesis, prerequisites, patterns, features, trends, and vectors of the evolution of legal culture as a distinct cognitive challenge and a multifaceted phenomenon within state-legal reality. The study employs general scientific (dialectical) and system-structural methods, as well as functional comparison and legal forecasting techniques. It analyzes approaches to understanding interdisciplinarity in scientific research, which is presented as a natural outcome of the gradual development of science and the emergence of a symbiotically interconnected and interdependent metascience in both the modern era and the long term. It identifies the key features of interdisciplinary research planning and substantiates the mobility of disciplinary and cognitive boundaries. The challenges of polysemy in scientific work and the evaluation of research outcomes are highlighted, with a proposed solution involving the expansion of interdisciplinary dialogue. Amid the ongoing disciplinary isolation of individual sciences, the article identifies major research shifts in the field of law, reflecting an increase in the metaparadigmality of scientific knowledge, as evidenced by anthropological, comparative, linguistic, and digital turns. It also highlights varieties of theoretical and practical approaches to applying interdisciplinarity in the idealized theoretical framework of scientific inquiry into legal culture. The relevance of memetics in understanding the evolution of legal culture is emphasized, particularly in relation to the processes of translation, copying, variation, and reproduction of memes in law. The article concludes by outlining the cultural potential of an interdisciplinary approach to studying the phenomenon of legal culture.

Key words: interdisciplinarity, scientific methods, metascience, metaparadigmality of scientific knowledge, research shifts, memetics, meme, state-legal reality, legal culture, cultural boundaries

Conflict of interest. The author declares no conflict of interest.

Founding. The study is funded by the grant of the Russian Science Foundation No. 23-28-01773, <https://rscf.ru/project/23-28-01773/>.

Received: 12th November 2024

Accepted: 15th April 2025

© Zaloilo M.V., 2025



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/legalcode>

For citation:

Zaloilo, M.V. (2025) The Metaparadigm of Scientific Knowledge and Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Legal Culture. *RUDN Journal of Law*. 29 (2), 327–344. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2337-2025-29-2-327-344>

Метапарадигмальность научного познания и междисциплинарные повороты в исследовании правовой культуры

М.В. Залоило  

Институт законодательства и сравнительного правоведения
при Правительстве Российской Федерации, г. Москва, Российская Федерация
z-lo@mail.ru

Аннотация. Цель работы – определение перспектив применения методов и подходов гуманитарных и точных наук в постижении генезиса, предпосылок, закономерностей, особенностей, тенденций и векторов эволюции правовой культуры как специфической познавательной проблемы и многоуровневого явления государственно-правовой действительности. В основу исследования положены общенаучный (диалектический), системно-структурный методы, а также методы функционального сравнения и юридического прогнозирования. Проанализированы подходы к пониманию междисциплинарности научных исследований, которая выступает закономерным результатом поэтапного развития науки и формирования в современный период и на долгосрочную перспективу симбиотически взаимосвязанной и взаимообусловленной метанауки. Определены особенности планирования междисциплинарного исследования, обоснована подвижность дисциплинарных и когнитивных границ. Выявлены проблемы полисемии в научной работе и экспертизы полученных результатов, что предложено решать посредством расширения междисциплинарного диалога. На фоне сохраняющейся дисциплинарной замкнутости отдельных наук обозначены основные повороты исследований в области права, свидетельствующие об усилении метапарадигмальности научного познания (антропологический, компаративный, лингвистический, цифровой и пр.). Выделены разновидности сознательных теоретико-практических установок, используемых при применении междисциплинарного подхода с точки зрения организации идеальной теоретической стороны процесса научного познания правовой культуры. Определена актуальность меметики в познании эволюции правовой культуры, исследующей в этом отношении процессы трансляции, копирования, вариаций и воспроизводства мемов в праве. Сделаны выводы о культурологических перспективах применения междисциплинарного подхода в исследовании феномена правовой культуры.

Ключевые слова: междисциплинарность, научные методы, метанаука, метапарадигмальность научного познания, повороты научного знания, меметика, мем, государственно-правовая реальность, правовая культура, культурные границы

Конфликт интересов. Автор заявляет об отсутствии конфликта интересов.

Финансирование. Исследование выполнено за счет гранта Российского научного фонда № 23-28-01773, <https://rscf.ru/project/23-28-01773/>

Поступила в редакцию: 12 ноября 2024 г.

Принята к печати: 15 апреля 2025 г.

Для цитирования:

Залоило М.В. Метопарадигмальность научного познания и междисциплинарные повороты в исследовании правовой культуры // *RUDN Journal of Law*. 2025. Т. 29. № 2. С. 327–344. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2337-2025-29-2-327-344>

Introduction

Legal culture is characterized by a wide range of cultural manifestations in public life and state-legal reality. Given the multifaceted nature of culture, it is appropriate to examine it from various perspectives: at both social and personal levels, in terms of internal characteristics of individuals and their external manifestations, in stable and dynamic states, and through theoretical and practical lenses (Kerimov, 1991:18). As a complex phenomenon of reality, legal culture represents a distinctive cognitive challenge that requires the development of a robust methodology for its study. This methodology should draw on existing disciplinary methods of inquiry while remaining open to the creation of new research tools, as needed, to fully capture the unique dimensions of this phenomenon within state-legal reality. Such an approach must account for all possible facets of legal culture and the influence of various external factors on its development.

The success of addressing this cognitive challenge largely depends on the accurate, well-reasoned and balanced application of an interdisciplinary approach to studying its individual manifestations, as well as the phenomena and trends that shape it, both internally and externally. It is important to recognize that, in the context of legal culture, interdisciplinarity functions not only as a foundational principle of its study but also as an inherent characteristic of legal culture itself, reflecting its versatility.

In general, culture encompasses all aspects of human activities, thoughts, emotion, reason, and will, making it an essential attribute of human existence and action. No sphere of social life can be conceived outside of the framework of culture. In the context of legal culture, its influence extends to all conscious attitudes and manifestations of objective reality that are connected, directly or indirectly, to legal phenomena. As a complex and multilayered phenomenon of both ideal and material dimensions, legal culture reflects the state of legal life. This includes the characteristics of established legal consciousness, commonly accepted methods of organizing law-making and law enforcement processes, scientific legal knowledge¹, and, more broadly, the specifics of the society's social and technological development at a particular historical stage of its existence.

The study of legal culture aims to achieve several objectives: to determine its place among the phenomena of legal life and within the broader structure of objective reality; to identify systemic relationships and patterns; and to highlight the value of legal culture in shaping the ideal aspects of human existence. This includes its relationship to general culture, moral norms, legal awareness, and legal behavior (both collective and individual). Additionally, the study seeks to enhance the humanistic and civilizational orientation of political and legal regulation of public relations, technical processes, and the functioning of political and legal institutions.

¹ The conceptualization of legal phenomena, categories, and institutions as complex, multi-component, and multilevel historical forms of social interaction is one of the primary functions of legal science (Vedeneev, 2024:144-155).

Taking into account the above, a comprehensive interdisciplinary approach² to the study of legal culture – applied not exclusively but alongside other established methods of examining state-legal reality (Vlasenko, 2019:9) – ensures proper consideration of all possible influencing factors³. This approach allows for the testing of a wide range of effective cognitive and practical methods, the development of new specific techniques, and the utilization of data from various accumulated sources of knowledge. Together, these elements enable researchers to achieve a necessary level of quality and scientific depth in their work, ultimately fulfilling the goal of scientific enquiry: to expand and enhance knowledge, thereby enriching the intellectual achievements of civilization.

Interdisciplinarity in science: Pathways to deeper understanding

The phenomenon of interdisciplinarity of scientific research can be viewed from two distinct perspectives (Kreps, 2019:115–120; Lysak, 2016):

1 As a relationship between two or more disciplines that share related terminology, systems, and objects of research. This approach allows for a broader and more thorough study of issues, contributing to the effective resolution of scientific problems. Within the complex of disciplinary sciences, two type can be distinguished:

- Fundamental sciences: Disciplines that develop programs for studying specific objects.
- Taxonomic sciences: Disciplines with a specific subject organization that utilize the programs of fundamental sciences to study particular groups of objects (Stepin, Gorokhov & Rozov, 1996:181–186);

2 As an extension of the field of knowledge that cannot be fully explored by existing scientific disciplines. In this case, a new branch of knowledge may emerge at the intersection of several “traditional” scientific disciplines, contributing to the expansion of the system of knowledge.

The accumulation of scientific knowledge and technological advancements leads to their concentration, fostering the creation of new models and the increasing integration of various fields of scientific knowledge. Over time, as these branches develop, the distinctions between them become increasingly blurred, which exemplifies the manifestation of interdisciplinarity in science (Ershova & Dolgova, 2012:12)⁴. In general, interdisciplinarity involves the study of interrelated aspects of a common problem, with efforts to construct a unified research perspective (Repina, 2011:28).

² When addressing the issue of an interdisciplinary approach to scientific research, it is essential to consider two opposing trends. On the one hand, there is a growing accumulation of scientific facts, theories, and concepts, accompanied by the increasing differentiation of historically established fields of knowledge. Simultaneously, efforts to identify common methodological and theoretical foundations – serving as paradigmatic links capable of uniting these differentiated areas of scientific knowledge – are expanding. On the other hand, it is becoming increasingly evident that the deep specialization and fragmentation of scientific fields contribute to the dehumanization of knowledge. The trend toward greater specialization in science often hinders the ability to address complex and multifaceted challenges facing modern humanity (Savina, 2017:60).

³ Philosophers emphasize that the process of scientific cognition is influenced not only by the characteristics of the object being studied, but also by numerous socio-cultural factors (Stepin, 2011:109).

⁴ For an overview of approaches to interdisciplinary research in foreign science, refer to: (Azhimov, 2016:70–77).

From a broader cultural and philosophical perspective, scientists conclude that interdisciplinarity is one of the defining features of modern advanced science and intellectual activity. As Kasavin (2010a:6) notes, “Unlike a discipline that symbolizes a synchronous cross-section of the development of science as a social institution, interdisciplinary interaction is a diachronic and emergent moment that characterizes pronounced dynamics and leads to new forms of scientific knowledge organization. In this sense, interdisciplinarity, multidisciplinary, and transdisciplinarity are social mechanisms for the construction of science”.

Interdisciplinarity in science is also evident in the way that advancements in one or more fields can influence developments in others. Conversely, the progress of individual scientist or research group may impact other scientific disciplines. This interconnectedness fosters interdisciplinarity, which enhances the effectiveness of solving pragmatic and cognitive tasks in specific scientific work, often guided by a unified ideological research framework⁵.

The growing need for the widespread application of an interdisciplinary approach in cognitive activity reflects the natural progression of science and the expansion of the knowledge system. Over time, this process has led to the emergence of a symbiotically interconnected and interdependent meta-science. This meta-science unites the accumulated knowledge of humanity, enabling society and the state to address complex challenges quickly and efficiently using the most effective scientific and practical methods available.

Planning of interdisciplinary research: Disciplinary boundaries, polysemy in scientific work, and issues of expertise

The aforementioned scientific insights into the interdisciplinary approach in cognitive activity demonstrate its nearly limitless potential for enhancing humanity’s intellectual capacity. This approach is essential for addressing a diverse array of often complex research challenges that cannot be adequately resolved using the traditional methodology of a single scientific discipline (Schmitt et al., 2023:199–220).

The researchers highlight that the need for interdisciplinary collaboration in scientific research challenges the importance of disciplines as separate branches of knowledge. Meanwhile, cross-industry developments have the potential to continually redefine disciplinary boundaries by creating new research areas, provided that cognitive barriers at the personal level of researchers can be overcome. Highly specialized problems can sometimes be solved without interdisciplinary interaction, but it is less effective for addressing the most relevant issues in science and society. Even if interdisciplinary collaboration does not guarantee new discoveries, it can foster the

⁵ It is no coincidence that the doctrine emphasizes the importance of a unified ideological concept in research, as it is this concept that can ensure the unity of the cognitive process and a uniform understanding of problem’s essence among all participants. The unity of the ideological conception serves as the sole foundation upon which the centrifugal forces inherent in any interdisciplinary research can be overcome. ... The specificity of the ideological concept in interdisciplinary research lies in the fact that its implementation involves setting specific tasks for representatives from different fields of scientific knowledge (Ivanov, 2016:106).

development and improvement of scientific creativity in general (MacKinnon, Hine & Barnard, 2013:407–419).

When planning interdisciplinary research focused on legal culture, it is crucial to consider its problem-oriented nature. This approach leads to the emergence of fundamentally new knowledge at the intersection of disciplines, enriching them with new research principles without eliminating their individual identities (Lysak, 2016). Consequently, both the subject under study (situated at the intersection of various disciplines) and the scientific tools of the involved disciplines undergo mutual cognitive enrichment.

Significant practical challenges⁶ that may arise from discrepancies between specialized languages and conceptual frameworks of different disciplines are also be addressed in interdisciplinary research planning. Polysemy in scientific work is a major drawback that complicates the adequate perception, interpretation and effective use of research results. Obstacles to interdisciplinary interaction primarily stem from differences in question formulation, methods and professional language (Savelyeva, 2012:124). However, “the development by science of a special language suitable for describing objects unusual from a common-sense perspective is a prerequisite for scientific research” (Stepin, 2011:114). Another problematic aspect is the external expertise of conducted interdisciplinary research, raising questions about the feasibility of adequate critical assessment by specialists from specific branches of knowledge (Lysak, 2016).

Overcoming challenges in interdisciplinary scientific knowledge requires developing unified terminology to eliminate conflicting interpretations of foundational concepts across disciplines (Kreps, 2019:115–120). Establishing such shared terminology serves two critical purposes: it enables effective communication between researchers in related fields and facilitates rigorous peer review of interdisciplinary work. This effort should be complemented by creating a dedicated community of interdisciplinary experts and engaging both theoretical scientists and practitioners relevant to the research subject, which collectively enhances the quality of scholarly expertise.

The doctrine explicitly warns that scientific progress may be hindered by overreliance on established methodologies or insufficient competency in evaluating innovative approaches. To counter this, it advocates for proactive interdisciplinary engagement through multiple channels:

- Recruiting peer reviewers from adjacent disciplines
- Facilitating cross-disciplinary funding opportunities and publication pathways
- Leveraging social media to connect specialists across fields
- Organizing interdisciplinary conferences and debates
- Producing dedicated literature on integration methods (Smaldino & O’Connor, 2022).

⁶ From a philosophical perspective, scholars have identified several problematic areas in scientific knowledge, particularly relevant to interdisciplinary approaches. These include challenges such as the context of discovery, theory incommensurability, complementarity principles, polytheoretical descriptions, conflicts of interpretation, impossibility of radical translation, diverse types of rationality, dialogic processes, discourse frameworks, and constructiveness paradigms (Kasavin, 2010b:34).

Effective interdisciplinary dialogue should emphasize concrete examples of successful collaborations while contextualizing interdisciplinarity within humanity's historical scientific achievements and philosophical foundations (Tessaro, 2022:64). This dual focus ensures methodological innovation remains grounded in epistemological rigor.

Interdisciplinary approaches to research in the field of law

A central challenge in interdisciplinary research lies in overcoming disciplinary isolation – the tendency for studies claiming interdisciplinarity to remain confined to a single disciplinary perspective, despite advocating for broader knowledge synthesis (Ershova & Dolgova, 2012:11). Addressing this requires two key strategies:

1 Forming research teams with experts from diverse fields for complex scientific or applied projects

2 Cultivating researchers' willingness to embrace pluralism in perspectives and methodologies, including the systematic integration of insights from disciplines beyond their primary specialization

For an interdisciplinary field to thrive intellectually, it must adopt boundary-crossing ideas and methods tailored to intersections between disciplines (Thagard, 2014:48-52). This demands that interdisciplinary groups develop shared communication protocols and collaborative practices to transcend cultural divides (Daniel et al., 2022).

However, such boundary-spanning work poses risks, particularly for early-career researchers. Establishing interdisciplinary collaborations often requires:

- Extended timelines to reconcile cultural differences
- Significant effort to align researchers' goals
- Development of unified terminology
- Engagement with unfamiliar literature (Daniel et al., 2022).

Despite these challenges, the long-term benefits of interdisciplinary work – enhanced research quality, deeper theoretical insights, practical relevance, and methodological innovation – outweigh initial investments of time and effort. Ultimately, interdisciplinary approaches not only enrich individual studies but also drive broader advancements in scientific knowledge and its applications.

The interdisciplinary approach to studying legal culture within this research framework should be examined from two complementary perspectives:

1 Theoretically, focusing on the interrelation and interdependence of diverse scientific methods and knowledge sources in understanding legal culture.

2 Practically, considering the application of empirical techniques and databases to analyze manifestations of legal culture in real-world legal contexts, involving various types of specific legal activities. These positions will be explored in greater detail below.

Methodological Developments in Legal Science

Contemporary legal doctrine reflects broader postmodern scientific developments through several key methodological features:

- Metaparadigmatic universalization: Conceptualizing metaparadigmality in scientific knowledge while pursuing universal applicability emphasizes the creativity involved in research, the acceptance of multiple interpretations of reality, the unity of

subject and object in knowledge (human measurability), and the researcher's self-reflection (cognitive approach).

- Creative epistemology: Emphasizing research process creativity and multiple reality interpretations.

- Subject-object unity: Recognizing the human-measured nature of knowledge through cognitive reflexivity.

- Probabilistic systems: Acknowledging contingency in legal evolution and knowledge branching (Lazarev, 2016:19–20).

- Integrative dialogism: Promoting interdisciplinary synthesis through dialogical knowledge integration.

Interdisciplinary Shifts in Historical-Legal Research

Traditionally, research into the genesis, patterns, features, trends and prospects of legal culture's evolution occurs within theoretical-historical legal sciences. Therefore, identifying specific trends ("turns of historical-legal knowledge") that highlight the need for an interdisciplinary approach is of particular interest. These include:

1. Synthetic historical-legal cognition

This approach integrates methodologies from:

- Linguistic analysis
- Legal anthropology
- Practical jurisprudence
- Comparative law

It combines prospective and retrospective analysis while balancing objective reality with subjective cognition elements (Skorobogatov, 2024:12–38).

2. Linguistic-constructivist paradigm

This paradigm recognizes language as a tool for constructing legal reality through signification. It demands an interdisciplinary examination of:

- Socio-cultural contexts in legal monument creation
- Historical legal consciousness patterns
- Normative perception enabling new insights (Pashentsev, 2024:39-47; Chestnov, 2014:17–20)

3. Textual-interpretative methodology

This methodology approaches legal sources as multilayered texts requiring:

- Contextualized interpretation and periodization frameworks

This approach proposes examining the legal history of different states through the lens of technological order theory, the life cycle of technological orders, and waves of innovation (development). These factors shape the dynamics of social relations and law itself, acting as a primary regulator in each historical period. This concept views the historical movement of law not as simply recurring processes at regular intervals, but as a cyclical-wave phenomenon. This highlights the connection between the rhythms of legal development and legal cycles with waves of innovation (Zaloilo, 2024a:48–72; Pashentsev, Zaloilo & Dorskaya, 2024);

- Discourse analysis of normative language

This approach suggests rethinking the significance of comparative legal history for modern comparative studies and legal theory, including special attention to legal

traditions, particularly foreign ones⁷, to understand law's dependence on the past and to portray the formation of modern legal systems through the diversity, equivalence, and identity of different peoples and civilizations (Poldnikov, 2024:100–123);

- Reconstruction of period-specific legal mentalities

It is crucial to utilize digital techniques, technologies, and tools in studying the formation and development of state-legal phenomena and processes. Within this framework, a source-centric methodology from the interdisciplinary field of digital legal history is substantiated, expanding scientific and research horizons and ideas about the historical past of the state and law (Lonskaya, 2024:14–33).

These shifts in historical-legal knowledge influence our understanding of legal culture's development in specific historical period. They also stimulate the development of a new historically-oriented research methods, which are integrated to an interdisciplinary approach.

Currently, legal culture evolves in dialectical relationship with political, social, and economic events occurring both nationally and globally. This evolution aligns with the key program and strategic documents of the Russian Federation related to scientific, technological, socio-economic, and cultural development⁸. The continued advancement of Russian legal culture and jurisprudence is inextricably linked to understanding contemporary processes within society, the state, and the foreign policy arena, and consequently, within human consciousness and behavior.

Notably, technological innovations are increasingly driving social development on a global scale, leading to qualitative changes in human civilization and the emergence of a new type of society. Legal culture must address both emerging threats to humanity's existence and changes in the technological order of the global community. Furthermore, it is essential to continue modernizing Russia's public administration system, and doctrinal understanding should facilitate more advanced and accurate forecasts regarding the future development and condition of law, the state, and state-legal phenomena.

Scientific perspectives on legal culture

The complexities of modern state-legal development underscore the importance of using an interdisciplinary approach when studying legal culture and its influencing factors. This approach helps to reveal all possible facets and identify potential challenges within the studied subject areas.

⁷ Legal traditions inherent in the legal system impact not only the political-legal sphere, but also the culture of the relevant society (which, in turn, influences the formation of legal traditions). For more on the mutual influence of the Romano-Germanic legal system and European legal culture, refer to: (Zimmermann, 2007:341–372).

⁸ Refer to, for example: The Strategy of Scientific and Technological Development of the Russian Federation, approved by Decree of the President of the Russian Federation No. 145 dated 02/28/2024 On the Strategy of Scientific and Technological Development of the Russian Federation. Collection of Legislation of the Russian Federation. 2024. No. 10, Art. 1373; Decree of the President of the Russian Federation No. 309 dated 05/07/2024 On the National Development Goals of the Russian Federation for the Period up to 2030 and for the Future up to 2036. Collection of Legislation of the Russian Federation. 2024. No. 20, Art. 2584; The Strategy of the State Cultural Policy for the period up to 2030, approved by the Decree of the Government of the Russian Federation dated No. 2501-r dated 09/11/2024. Collection of Legislation of the Russian Federation. 2024. No. 38, Art. 5715.

Individuals learn about the world through various means, including not only scientific knowledge but also everyday understanding, philosophical inquiry, artistic expression, and religious and mythological exploration. Science, as a specific type of cognitive activity, interacts with these other forms, influencing scientific discoveries, their integration into culture, and the impact of culture on all forms of human cognition (Stepin, 2011:102).

From a theoretical standpoint, an interdisciplinary approach to studying legal culture should involve the conscious⁹ application of the following theoretical and practical attitudes by researchers when organizing the cognitive process of scientific investigation:

When defining the research's purposes and objectives, it is essential to approach legal culture as a multi-layered and exceptionally multidimensional phenomenon that exists not only within legal reality, but also within human civilization as a whole. Its content and evolution are influenced by a wide array of factors, both tangible and intangible. Tangible factors may include a state's geographical location, its level of scientific and technological development at a particular historical stage, and the condition of its environment and economy. Intangible factors encompass collective and individual consciousness, politics, religion, morality, and the general level of cultural development in a particular society and at a specific historical stage. D.A. Kerimov rightly noted that the interaction and mutual influence between general and legal culture is expressed in the fact that the former has a beneficial effect on people's thinking and values, determines the legal sphere of society and the nature of its laws, the behavior of each individual; and legal culture, in turn, protects and creates conditions for the free development of a common culture by developing progressive laws, the establishment of requirements for legal stability and legality (Kerimov, 1991:18);

The researcher must acknowledge that the set of possible and priority methods, doctrinal resources, and practical sources will vary depending on the goals of the scientific work and the specific context of the chosen subject area in a particular historical period to achieve the desired scientific outcome. The functions of science in society, its place in culture, and its interaction with other fields of cultural creativity evolve across different eras. A hallmark of the present is the transformation of scientific activity compared to the classical era – it is becoming more intense, widespread, supported at the state level, and equipped with a range of effective cognitive tools; while maintaining its cultural and ideological function, science also becomes a productive force in society (Stepin, 2011:103–104);

The depth and quality of studying legal culture directly depend on identifying the optimal set and balance of empirical data, as well as leveraging scientific and technological advancements and the epistemological resources from various branches of human knowledge, the methodologies and developments of which can be particularly useful for addressing the specific research;

⁹ The need for a conscious organization of interdisciplinary research stems from at least three factors: the complexity of the subject areas; the need to combine and coordinate ideas, concepts, and facts that previously existed relatively independently of each other; the need to form new problem communities of scientists with different scientific biographies, experiences, and styles of thinking, and different ideas about the criteria of scientific knowledge (Ivanov, 2016:103).

Both social (humanitarian) sciences and exact sciences, can be valuable for studying the essence and individual manifestations of legal culture. Social (humanitarian) sciences provide tools for determining legal culture's place within the broader system of social phenomena and, more specifically, within the legal and political system. They also help establish the relationship between individual manifestations of legal culture and other phenomena in legal and public life, as well as determine likely trajectories, trends, and socio-legal consequences of legal culture's development as a socio-legal phenomenon. In this context, legal culture can be understood as encompassing the culture of economics and politics, social and spiritual life, culture of interpersonal relations, and formation and realization of human rights; it serves as the foundation of overall culture and a criterion for assessing the general culture of society (Kerimov, 1991:21–22). Exact sciences, on the other hand, enable evidence-based, measurable, and verifiable calculations of the quantitative and qualitative characteristics of the phenomenon under study, allowing for the creation of detailed mathematical models of its condition at specific historical stages, including in the past and in the foreseeable future (forecasting potential development scenarios based on the influence of relevant factors). Economic theory, synthesized with historical-legal science, plays a significant role in studying the genesis and evolution of legal culture, for example, within the framework of the cyclical-wave model of state and legal history based on the technological order theory. The economic analysis of law and the application of statistical and mathematical approaches in the legal sphere (Khabrieva, 2010:11), including economic and mathematical modeling of state-legal phenomena and processes, and jurimetrics (Loevinger, 1949:455–493), have gained widespread recognition.

Generally, modern reality necessitates considering a diverse and often multifaceted set of factors when making managerial and legal decisions, which are both products of legal culture and factors influencing its development. These factors can only be adequately addressed and evaluated through an intersectoral and interdisciplinary approaches in scientific research. In this context, from the perspective of legal science development and its application, it is crucial to recognize that modern jurisprudence is grounded in three key areas of understanding of law: legal positivism (legal formalism), sociological positivism (legal realism), and philosophical-legal concepts of law (legal metaphysics). These correspond to three formats of knowledge representation about law – classical, nonclassical, and postclassical jurisprudence – each with its own distinct methods, languages for describing and explaining political-legal phenomena (Vedeneev, 2024:144–155).

Substantively, an interdisciplinary approach to studying legal culture, viewed from both scientific and practical perspectives, has two key implications. First, it enhances the scientific and practical validity of decisions made at various levels of governance and legal regulation. Second, it inevitably complicates the systemic relationships within the state-legal reality, leading to the emergence of new factors and conditions that further complicate the subject field of science¹⁰ (particularly the manifestations of legal culture), making it even more multilevel and multidimensional.

¹⁰ As V.S. Stepin accurately observed, “As science advances, not only new knowledge accumulated, but existing understandings of the world are also reshaped. This process drives changes across all aspects of

We can therefore speak of the mutual influence between “material-ideal” factors of reality and legal culture, with the latter serving as a conscious expression of the collective human mind and the cultural stratum of civilization at a certain historical stage of a state-organized society.

Legal memetics in the scientific explanation of the evolution of legal culture

It is fair to consider memetics as one of the relevant interdisciplinary areas of research on state-legal phenomena and processes in their development. Memetics is a special science focused on the imitation of approved patterns of behavior and thinking, encompassing historical, cultural, political, social, economic, and other types of memes. These memes are understood as conventional units of cultural information contained in the minds of individuals and capable of reproducing themselves, being transmitted from one mind to another.

The term “meme”, reflecting the idea of the initial unit of cultural heritage transmission or imitation, was introduced into scientific use by a British evolutionist and ethologist Richard Dawkins, a professor at Oxford University from 1995 to 2008 (Dawkins, 2013). Dawkins suggested, by analogy with genetic evolution, that human culture develops through translation, copying (replication), variation (modifications and innovations), and reproduction (selection) of memes.

Subsequently, based on the concept of memes, memetics emerged as a field exploring these phenomena, claiming scientific status in the works of individual authors (Shcherbin, 2019:40–47). Currently, memetics is applied in various fields of scientific knowledge, including political science, sociology, philology, economics, and others. It also holds prospects for application in the legal field (Cotter, 2003:779–793; Deakin, 2002:1–42; Fried, 1999:291–316; Henke, 2007:13–26; Lazarev, 2020:5–18; Stake, 2001:1213–1268; Vinnikov, 2023:83–102), where it serves to explain the evolution of law in general and legal culture in particular (Zaloilo, 2024b:32–56). The use of memetics’ methodological and semiotic possibilities is another factor in studying, preserving, and transferring accumulated scientific knowledge to future generations (Ryabova, 2023:123–132).

Examples of memes, according to R. Dawkins, include “melodies, ideas, buzzwords and expressions, ways of cooking chowder or building arches” (Dawkins, 2013:180). In the field of law, memes can be legal ideas, theories, and concepts, legal presumptions and constructions, legal principles, and metaphors in law (Vlasenko, 2022:53–62). The sources of these memes can introduce legal doctrine, legal traditions and values, constitutions, other normative legal acts, explanations of the highest judicial instances, and judicial precedents. These sources encode legal information into a conceptual form, facilitating its intertemporal dissemination (Deakin, 2002:21).

In relation to the study of state-legal phenomena, including legal culture, scientists adapt the achievements and possibilities of memetics for cognitive purposes, taking into

scientific activity, including the objects of study, research methods, modes of communication, and the division and collaboration of scientific labor” (Stepin, 2011:103).

account the peculiarities of these phenomena's development and the specifics of legal and political reality factors.

Regarding state development, legal scholars identify a distinct state meme as a specialized resource of compressed social information (e.g., “the leviathan state”, “the machine state”, “the night watchman state”). They note that its content can replicate itself multiple times under similar social conditions, especially when social forces with vested interests in the meme's continuation are involved in its dissemination. A state meme can be either positive or negative (a malicious meme virus), and its entire occurrence mechanism is based on imitation as its fundamental property (Lazarev, 2020:5–18).

In relation to law, memetics is considered as a refraction of “general cultural” memetics in the legal field (legal memetics). This new and developing direction focused on studying the influence of cultural, social, and historical phenomena and factors on law development, the formation and modification of legal norms and practices, and the creation and application of normative legal acts. The basic concept of this direction is the understanding that law, using technical-legal tools and legal language, encodes socio-legal experience and programs the legal behavior of individuals (Zaloilo, 2024b:32–56).

Accordingly, “state” and “legal” memetics can be considered as special biologically determined and socially refracted interdisciplinary knowledge systems. These systems are based on identifying diverse cultural and behavioral patterns and landmarks in state-legal reality, as well as determining and studying their influence on the formation of patterns and trends in the development of relevant phenomena and processes.

Conclusion

In conclusion, reviewing the interdisciplinary approach in the study of legal culture within this paper highlights that its application is a significant indicator of the quality and depth of cognitive activity. This approach is crucial both for solving scientific problems in relevant research and for achieving practical goals in improving legal activity.

Although organizing interdisciplinary research is challenging – it requires modernizing research attitudes, navigating multiple stages, and investing more time and resources than sectoral research – these difficulties are surmountable and justified. This is because they allow for the consideration of complex and diverse factors of modern life and the intellectual array accumulated by humanity.

In the modern historical period, characterized by expanding interconnections between various fields of knowledge and practical activities, and the blurring of boundaries between them, applying an interdisciplinary approach to studying legal culture is not only desirable but necessary. It ensures a scientifically grounded and practically effective research outcome, maintaining a high level of scientific novelty and relevance for application in legal activity and further advancing scientific and practical knowledge.

The “cultural perspective” offers a promising direction for further interdisciplinary research on legal culture. This involves a special study of certain aspects of legal culture using developments and methods from culturally oriented fields such as general culture, memetics, and the cultural components of history, politics, sociology, economics, theory of law, and comparative law. Additionally, it involves broader applications of cultural

approaches in other sciences. This approach not only highlights the importance of legal culture as a manifestation of legal reality, but also demonstrates its role in other areas of socio-political and legal development influenced by general culture and legal culture.

The ongoing development of legal culture as a branch of human knowledge, ideal conscious attitudes, and practical social relations necessitates the development of a system of methods for its research. This involves deepening the possibilities and expanding the scope of interdisciplinary approaches. It can be unequivocally stated that the future success of legal culture and the system of knowledge about it largely depends on the reasonable and professional use of interdisciplinary approaches. This ensures the depth, quality, scientific novelty, practical validity, and value of research for further knowledge gain in the field.

References / Список литературы

- Azhimov, F.E. (2016) What is the Interdisciplinarity Today? (an Experience of Cultural-Historical Interpretation of Foreign Studies). *Voprosy Filosofii*. (11), 70–77. (in Russian).
Ажимов Ф.Е. Что такое междисциплинарность сегодня? (Опыт культурно-исторической интерпретации зарубежных исследований) // Вопросы философии. 2016. № 11. С. 70–77.
- Chestnov, I.L. (2014) Linguistic “Turn” in Postclassical Jurisprudence. In: Russian State University for the Humanities. *Muromtsev Readings: “The Language and Logic of Legislative Act and Law”*. Moscow, Russian State University for the Humanities Publ., pp. 17–20. (in Russian).
Честнов И.Л. Лингвистический «поворот» в постклассической юриспруденции // Язык и логика закона и права. Муромцевские чтения : материалы XIV Международной научной конференции. М : РГГУ, 2014. С. 17–20.
- Cotter, T.F. (2003) Prolegomenon to a Memetic Theory of Copyright: Comments on Lawrence Lessig's The Creative Commons. *Florida Law Review*. 55, 779–793.
- Daniel, K.L., McConnell, M., Schuchardt, A. & Pfeffer, M.E. (2022) Challenges facing interdisciplinary researchers: Findings from a professional development workshop. *PLoS ONE*. 17 (4), e0267234. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0267234>
- Dawkins, R. (2013) *The Selfish Gene*. Trans. Fomina, N. Moscow, Publishing house AST. (in Russian).
Докинз Р. Эгоистичный ген. М. : Эгоистичный ген / пер. с англ. Н. Фоминой. М. : Издательство АСТ, 2013. 245 с.
- Deakin, S. (2002) Evolution for our Time: A Theory of Legal Memetics. *Current Legal Problems*. 55 (1), 1–42. <https://doi.org/10.1093/clp/55.1.1>
- Ershova, G.G. & Dolgova, E.A. (2012) Historical Perspective of Interdisciplinary Research: Instead of an Introduction. In: Ershova, G.G. & Dolgova, E.A. (eds.). *“Walls and bridges”: Interdisciplinary approaches in historical research: Materials of the International Scientific Conference, Moscow, RSUH, June 13-14, 2012*. Moscow, Sovpadenie Publ., pp. 6–14. (in Russian).
Ершова Г.Г., Долгова Е.А. Историческая перспектива междисциплинарных исследований: вместо вступления // «Стены и мосты»: междисциплинарные подходы в исторических исследованиях : материалы Международной научной конференции, Москва, РГГУ, 13–14 июня 2012 г. / отв. ред. Г.Г. Ершова, Е.А. Долгова. М. : Совпадение, 2012. С. 6–14.
- Fried, M.S. (1999) The Evolution of Legal Concepts: The Memetic Perspective. *Jurimetrics*. 39 (3), 291–316.
- Henke, C. (2007) Memetik Und Recht. *Humboldt Forum Recht*. (2), 13–26.

- Ivanov, O.I. (2016) A sociologist in interdisciplinary research. *Discourse*. (2), 102–112. (in Russian).
 Иванов О.И. Социолог в междисциплинарном социальном исследовании // Дискурс. 2016. № 2. С. 102–112.
- Kasavin, I.T. (ed.). (2010a) *Interdisciplinarity in Sciences and Philosophy*. Moscow, IF RAN Publ. (in Russian).
 Касавин И.Т. Междисциплинарность в науках и философии / отв. ред. И.Т. Касавин. М. : ИФ РАН, 2010. 205 с.
- Kasavin, I.T. (2010b) Interdisciplinary Research in the Context of Reflection and Habitus. In: Kasavin, I.T. (ed.). *Interdisciplinarity in Sciences and Philosophy*. Moscow, IF RAN., 15–25. (in Russian).
 Касавин И.Т. Междисциплинарные исследования в контексте рефлексии и габитуса // Междисциплинарность в науках и философии / отв. ред. И.Т. Касавин. М. : ИФРАН, 2010. С. 15–35.
- Kerimov, D.A. (1991) *Culture and technique of law-making*. Moscow, Juridicheskaya literatura Publ. (in Russian).
 Керимов Д.А. Культура и техника законотворчества. М. : Юридическая литература, 1991. 160 с.
- Khabrieva, T.Ya. (2010) Economic-Legal Analysis: Methodological Approach. *Journal of Russian Law*. (12), 5–26. (in Russian).
 Хабриева Т.Я. Экономико-правовой анализ: методологический подход // Журнал российского права. 2010. № 12. С. 5–26.
- Kreps, T.V. (2019) Interdisciplinary approach in research and teaching: Advantages and problems of application. *Scientific Bulletin of the Southern Institute of Management*. (1), 115–120. <https://doi.org/10.31775/2305-3100-2019-1-115-120> (in Russian).
 Крепс Т.В. Междисциплинарный подход в исследованиях и преподавании: преимущества и проблемы применения // Научный вестник Южного института менеджмента. 2019. № 1. С. 115–120. <https://doi.org/10.31775/2305-3100-2019-1-115-120>
- Lazarev, V.V. (2016) Interpretation of Law: Classics, Modern and Postmodern. *Journal of Russian Law*. (8), 15–28. <https://doi.org/10.12737/20900> (in Russian).
 Лазарев В.В. Толкование права: классика, модерн и постмодерн // Журнал российского права. 2016. № 8. С. 15–28.
- Lazarev, V.V. (2020) State in the Light of Memology. *Journal of Russian Law*. (3), 5–18. <https://doi.org/10.12737/jrl.2020.026> (in Russian).
 Лазарев В.В. Государство в свете мемологии // Журнал российского права. 2020. № 3. С. 5–18. <https://doi.org/10.12737/jrl.2020.026>
- Loevinger, L. (1949) Jurimetrics. The next step forward. *Minnesota Law Review*. 33 (5), 455–495.
- Lonskaya, S.V. (2024) Digital History of Law: Principles of Methodology. *Journal of Digital Technologies and Law*. 2 (1), 14–33. <https://doi.org/10.21202/jdtl.2024.2> (in Russian).
 Лонская С.В. Цифровая история права: начала методологии // Journal of Digital Technologies and Law. 2024. Т. 2. № 1. С. 14–33. <https://doi.org/10.21202/jdtl.20242>
- Lysak, I.V. (2016) Interdisciplinarity: Advantages and Problems of Application. *Modern Problems of Science and Education*. (5), 264. (in Russian).
 Лысак И.В. Междисциплинарность: преимущества и проблемы применения // Современные проблемы науки и образования. 2016. № 5. С. 264.
- MacKinnon, P. J., Hine, D. & Barnard, R.T. (2013). Interdisciplinary Science Research and Education. *Higher Education Research and Development*. 32 (3), 407–419. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2012.686482>

- Pashentsev, D.A. (2024) Linguistic Turn in Historical and Legal Studies. In: Pashentsev, D.A. & Zaloilo, M.V. (eds.). *Historical and Legal Yearbook – 2023*. Moscow, Association of Legal Historians Publ., Infotropic Media Publ., pp. 39–47 (in Russian).
Пашенцев Д.А. Лингвистический поворот в историко-правовых исследованиях // Историко-правовой ежегодник – 2023 / под общ. ред. Д.А. Пашенцева, М.В. Залоило. М. : Ассоциация историков права; Инфотропик Медиа, 2024. С. 39–47.
- Pashentsev, D.A., Zaloilo, M.V. & Dorskaya, A.A. (2024). *Changing of Technological Orders and Legal Development of Russia*. Moscow, ILCL, Norma, INFRA-M Publ. (in Russian).
Пашенцев Д.А., Залоило М.В., Дорская А.А. Смена технологических укладов и правовое развитие России. М. : ИЗиСП: Норма: ИНФРА-М, 2024. 184 с.
- Poldnikov, D.Yu. (2024) Legal culture and legal tradition as subject of comparative history of law. In: Pashentsev, D.A. & Zaloilo, M.V. (eds.). *Historical and Legal Yearbook – 2023*. Moscow, Association of Legal Historians; Infotropic Media Publ., pp. 100–123 (in Russian).
Полдников Д.Ю. Правовая культура и правовая традиция как предмет сравнительной истории права / Историко-правовой ежегодник – 2023 / под общ. ред. Д.А. Пашенцева, М.В. Залоило. М. : Ассоциация историков права; Инфотропик Медиа, 2024. С. 100–123.
- Repina, L.P. (2011) *History at the border of the XX–XXI: Social theories and historiographical practices*. Moscow, Krug Publ. (in Russian).
Репина Л.П. Историческая наука на рубеже XX–XXI вв.: социальные теории и историографическая практика. М. : Кругъ, 2011. 559 с.
- Ryabova, M.E. (2023) Meme Culture and Its Impact on the Development of Modern Society. *Bulletin of the Moscow Region State University. Series: Philosophy*. (1), 123–132. <https://doi.org/10.18384/2310-7227-2023-1-123-132> (in Russian).
Рябова М.Э. Мем-культура и ее воздействие на развитие современного общества // Вестник Московского государственного областного университета. Серия: Философские науки. 2023. № 1. С. 123–132. <https://doi.org/10.18384/2310-7227-2023-1-123-132>
- Savelyeva, I.M. (2012) Historical sociology and social history in the XXI century: Bridges and crossings. In: Ershova, G.G. & Dolgova, E.A. (eds.). *“Walls and bridges”: Interdisciplinary approaches in historical research: materials of the International Scientific Conference, Moscow, RSUH, June 13–14, 2012*. Moscow, Sovpadenie Publ., pp. 118–126. (in Russian).
Савельева И.М. Историческая социология и социальная история в XXI веке: мосты и переправы // «Стены и мосты»: междисциплинарные подходы в исторических исследованиях : материалы Международной научной конференции, Москва, РГГУ, 13–14 июня 2012 г. / отв. ред. Г.Г. Ершова, Е.А. Долгова. М.: Совпадение, 2012. С. 118–126.
- Savina, A.K. (2017) Interdisciplinary scientific research abroad in the context of modern reality: State and prospects. *School technologies*. (4), 60–70. (in Russian).
Савина А.К. Междисциплинарные научные исследования за рубежом в контексте современной реальности: состояние и перспективы // Школьные технологии. 2017. № 4. С. 60–70.
- Schmitt, J.B., Goldmann, A., Simon, S.T. & Bieber, S. (2023) Conception and Interpretation of Interdisciplinarity in Research Practice: Findings from Group Discussions in the Emerging Field of Digital Transformation. *Minerva*. (61), 199–220. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11024-023-09489-w>
- Shcherbin, V.K. (2019) Memetics as the new interdisciplinary science and the branch of social semiotics. *Journal of the Belarusian State University. Sociology*. (4), 40–47. (in Russian).
Щербин В.К. Меметика как новая междисциплинарная наука и направление социальной семиотики // Журнал Белорусского государственного университета. Социология. 2019. № 4. С. 40–47.

- Skorobogatov, A.V. (2024) The subject field of historical and legal knowledge. In: Pashentsev, D.A. & Zaloilo, M.V. (eds.). *Historical and Legal Yearbook – 2023*. Moscow, Association of Legal Historians, Infotropic Media Publ., pp. 12–38 (in Russian).
Скоробогатов А.В. Предметное поле историко-правового познания // Историко-правовой ежегодник – 2023 / под общ. ред. Д.А. Пашенцева, М.В. Залоило. М.: Ассоциация историков права; Инфотропик Медиа, 2024. С. 12–38.
- Smaldino, P.E. & O'Connor, C. (2022) Interdisciplinarity can aid the spread of better methods between scientific communities. *Collective Intelligence*. 1 (2), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/26339137221131816>
- Stake, J.E. (2001) Are we buyers or hosts? A memetic approach to the first amendment. *Alabama Law Review*. 52 (4), 1213–1268.
- Stepin, V.S. (2011) *Civilization and culture*. St. Petersburg, SPbGUP Publ. (in Russian).
Степин В.С. Цивилизация и культура. СПб. : СПбГУП, 2011. 408 с.
- Stepin, V.S., Gorokhov, V.G. & Rozov, V.A. (1996) *Philosophy of Science and Technology*. Moscow, Gardarika Publ. (in Russian).
Степин В.С., Горохов В.Г., Розов М.А. Философия науки и техники. М. : Гардарика, 1996. 399 с.
- Thagard, P. (2014) Being Interdisciplinary: Trading Zones in Cognitive Science. *Logos*. 1 (97), 35–60. (in Russian).
Тагард П. Междисциплинарность: торговые зоны в когнитивной науке // Логос. 2014. Т. 1 № 97. С. 35–60.
- Tessaro, L.W.E. (2022) Science and Interdisciplinarity: A Treatise on the Philosophy of Interdisciplinary Research. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Sciences*. 6 (1), 46–68.
- Vedeneev, Yu.A. (2024) The Jurisprudence of Traditions and Innovations of the Postmodern Era in Search of Self. *Lex Russica*. 77 (1), 144–155. <https://doi.org/10.17803/1729-5920.2024.206.1.144-155> (in Russian).
Веденеев Ю.А. Юриспруденция традиций и новаций эпохи постмодерна в поисках себя // Lex russica. 2024. Т. 77. № 1. С. 144–155. <https://doi.org/10.17803/1729-5920.2024.206.1.144-155>
- Vinnikov, A.V. (2023) On special knowledge in assessing the understandability of judicial translation: Linguistics and memetics. *Forensic Examination*. 74 (2), 83–102. (in Russian).
Винников А.В. О специальных знаниях в оценке понимаемости судебного перевода: лингвистика и меметика // Судебная экспертиза. 2023. Т. 74. № 2. С. 83–102.
- Vlasenko, N.A. (2022) Metaphor as a legal expertology method (on the example of the post-Soviet state-legal reality). *Yuridical Techniques*. (16), 53–62. (in Russian).
Власенко Н.А. Метафора как средство правовой экспертологии (на примере постсоветской государственно-правовой реальности) // Юридическая техника. 2022. № 16. С. 53–62.
- Vlasenko, N.A. (2019) Methodological Problems of the Modern Theory of Law. *Journal of Russian Law*. (4), 5–19. https://doi.org/10.12737/art_2019_4_1 (in Russian).
Власенко Н.А. Методологические проблемы современной теории права // Журнал российского права. 2019. № 4. С. 5–19. https://doi.org/10.12737/art_2019_4_1
- Zaloilo, M.V. (2024a) A cyclic wave model of interpretation of the history of law based on the theory of technological orders. In: Pashentsev, D.A. & Zaloilo, M.V. (eds.). *Historical and Legal Yearbook – 2023*. Moscow, Association of Legal Historians; Infotropic Media Publ., 48–72 (in Russian).
Залоило М.В. Циклично-волновая модель интерпретации истории права на основе теории технологических укладов // Историко-правовой ежегодник – 2023 / под общ. ред. Д.А. Пашенцева, М.В. Залоило. М.: Ассоциация историков права; Инфотропик Медиа, 2024. С. 48–72.

Zaloilo, M.V. (2024b) The concept of meme (memetics) and the primary mechanisms of socio-cultural evolution of law. *Law. Journal of the Higher School of Economics*. 17(3), 32–56. <https://doi.org/10.17323/2072-8166.2024.3.32.56> (in Russian).

Залоило М.В. Концепция мема (меметика) и первичные механизмы социокультурной эволюции права // Право. Журнал Высшей школы экономики. 2024. Т. 17. № 3. С. 32–56. <https://doi.org/10.17323/2072-8166.2024.3.32.56>

Zimmermann, R. (2007). Roman Law and European Culture. *New Zealand Law Review*. (2), 341–372.

Сведения об авторе:

Залоило Максим Викторович – кандидат юридических наук, ведущий научный сотрудник, отдел теории права и междисциплинарных исследований законодательства, Институт законодательства и сравнительного правоведения при Правительстве Российской Федерации; 117218, Российская Федерация, г. Москва, ул. Большая Черемушкинская, д. 34

ORCID: 0000-0003-4247-5242, SPIN-код: 5892-5522

e-mail: z-lo@mail.ru

About the author:

Maksim V. Zaloilo – Candidate of Legal Sciences, Leading Researcher, Department of Theory of Law and Interdisciplinary Research of Legislation, Institute of Legislation and Comparative Law under the Government of the Russian Federation; 34 Bolshaya Cheremushkinskaya str., Moscow, 117218, Russian Federation

ORCID: 0000-0003-4247-5242, SPIN-code: 5892-5522

e-mail: z-lo@mail.ru