



Received: 5 September 2022
Accepted: 1 December 2022
Published: 1 January 2023

¹ Assistant professor of IHCS,
Tehran, Iran.
E-mail: Drshhs44@gmail.com

How to cite this article:
Hosseini, Sayyed Hossein (2023).
A Methodological Analysis of the
Concept of Critique, *The
International Journal of
Humanities* (2023) Vol. 30 (1):
(22-38).

<https://eijh.modares.ac.ir/article-27-64019-en.html>

RESEARCH ARTICLE

A Methodological Analysis of the Concept of Critique

Sayyed Hossein Hosseini¹ 

Abstract: Researching is considered one of the functional needs of the scientific community. However, this field of study is faced with a series of issues, such as the dismissal of the concept of critique as only a secondary phenomenon and the lack of a methodological perspective while dealing with the concept of critique. Thereby, after having an overview of the topic of literary and art criticism, this paper will attempt to argue that in the background of the discussion, the elements of “methodic critique” are ignored. Then, to distinguish the characteristics of methodic critique from that of subjective and non-academic critique, the eight elements of methodic critique will be explained in detail, which include: 1. Systematicity, 2. Model-orientedness, 3. Comprehensiveness, 4. Critical perspective, 5. Having philosophical basis, 6. Expert-orientedness, 7. Creativity, and 8. Being ethical. Undoubtedly, reaching a “(comprehensive) theory of critique in the field of humanities” necessitates an explanation of the necessities, definitions, and characteristics of the concept of methodic critique as avoiding the shortcomings of the study of critique in the field of humanities is impossible without a “theory of critique.”

Keywords: Critique; Methodology; Human Sciences; Theory; Philosophy.

Introduction

Critique is the rejection of the status quo and the establishment of the desired situation. On the one hand, critique is a dispensation of the present, and on the other, a turn to and a move toward the future, and so it can be said to be a mixture of negation and affirmation; as John Dewey said, a mix of risk-taking and exploration, sense and sensibility, desire, knowledge, interest, and vision (Dewey, 2014: 455, 457, 458, 459). In other words, critique oscillates between inner and outer senses, so the critic is on a ceaseless quest and a perpetual movement between form (surface) and content (depth). Perhaps Foucault has one of these two aspects in mind when he presents a one-sided definition of critique as the art of resisting the rule to a large extent (Foucault, 2007).

Research Background

Regarding the background and literature available on the topic, it can be argued that the discussion surrounding the concept of critique has primarily been limited to literary criticism or the philosophy of art and aesthetic criticism. In contrast, the concept of methodic critique, its characteristics, and aspects attracted

comparably less scholarly attention. The present paper has a particular focus on the differences and distinctions of the anatomy of methodic critique in the general field of humanities with the hope that the function of the model of critique not be limited to artistic and literary subjects and thus welcome a new understanding of methodic critique to include other popular disciplines in humanities such as social, political, psychological, educational, philosophical, *kalām* (Islamic speculative theology), logical, mystical, historical, legal, linguistic, archaeological, managerial, geographic, and economic sciences.

Although literature and art are branches of humanities and generally follow common principles as other disciplines of humanities (as opposed to natural sciences), nevertheless, the application of the methodology of literary and art criticism is not possible in every other field in the humanities. Based on the explanations that will be provided surrounding the characteristics of methodic critique, it can be argued that there are severe distinctions and boundaries between methodic critique and literary and art criticism.

For instance, while discussing the philosophy of art in *Art as Experience*, John Dewey defines critique as judgment. Further in the book, he mentions two approaches to critique which are at two opposite extremes naming one legalistic and judicial critique and the other impressionist critique – which he identifies as a reaction toward the ineptness of the former. He believes that a set of characteristics specific to legalistic critique make the practice a radical approach. In a legalistic perspective, critique as judgment is possible since critique would possess an objective criterion; however, in an impressionistic perspective, there is no criterion on the agenda, and emotional reactions and the use of imagery – inspired by the object of art – should replace judgment. Therefore, in a legalistic outlook, critique possesses objective values and criteria since standards have external nature and serve functional ends. However, the impressionist perspective denies such objective standards. Hence Dewey claims that legalistic critique usually tends toward blame, and impressionist critique tends toward praise (Dewey, 2014: 449-460).

Therefore, Dewey comes very close to delving into the topic of methodic critique, however. Still, the effort is dead on arrival since he intends to adopt a personal and experimental perspective in dealing with his favorite subject, art critique. Dewey believes there is no fixed standard for works of art to comply with, and so the same rule applies to critique; however, a set of rules can be put forth in the process of judgment so that critique does not result in mere impressionism; rules not of the sort of guidelines and prescriptions but ways to understand what a work of art is as a kind of experience; the kind of experience that constitutes a work of art. Therefore, these results are valid to the point that they are helpful for personal experience. If the results are invalid, one should return to the work of art and, through a better assessment, engage in a new experience (p. 457). He then concludes that although every critic, like every artist, has a particular bias and tendency natural to their subjective nature – which must be turned into an instrument for a keen perception and clear insight – critical judgment, however, not only rises out of the critic's experience of an objective material, but it is his mission to

deepen such an experience in others. Therefore, critique must retrain how works of art are perceived. To believe that critique must assess and judge using a legalistic and moral lens is also restrictive. So, one should expand one's experience using works of art to which critique is subsidiary, not that the critique itself tries to obstruct this process by obtruding the critic's approvals, condemnations, appraisals, and ratings (pp. 477, 488). In conclusion, according to Dewey, like art, critique is a personal experience, and by reading between the lines one can detect his impressionist tendencies. In this view, critique is a subsidiary phenomenon and cannot be seen as equal to or close to the concept of methodic critique which is the topic of this paper.

Roland Barthes also speaks of two styles of critique; "academic critique" and "interpretive or ideological critique." According to Barthes, academic critique practices a positivist method claiming to be objective, while interpretive critique is influenced by ideologies such as Marxism, existentialism, psychoanalysis, and phenomenology. The program of academic critique is marked by a rigorous establishment

of biographical or literary facts, erudition, historical accuracy, and close attention to the poets' and authors' sources. Hence, while academic critique would establish and discover the facts, ideological critique interprets them or makes them 'signify' with reference to an ideological system. Therefore, the investigation of sources is fundamental to academic critique and literary work is the main subject of inquiry. Since such an approach is contingent upon the circumstances of the literary creation, it may fail to reach the essential meaning of the work, the being of literature. That is why essentialist and internal analysis is rejected in academic critique (Barthes, 1989: 27-37; Barthes, 2008: 6).

It is therefore evident that in these perspectives, there is nothing significant to mention about defining and determining methodic critique. Moreover, Barthes's views are limited to the topic of literary criticism. In the debate between French new critique and old critique, he rose to defend interpretative (or new) critique against traditional or university critique (p. 10).

The Concept of Methodic Critique

The importance of scientific or methodic critique as opposed to impressionistic and subjective critique lies in the fact that nowadays, in the field of humanities, the topic of critique studies is facing a series of issues or has been lacking in terms of scholarly attention in academic circles and is not appreciated properly, or that it is facing severe problems the most important of which is the replacement of methodic critique by impressionistic and non-academic critique.

If we consider critique generally evaluative and judgmental, separating points of commonality and difference as well as analyzing the strengths and weaknesses of a phenomenon. In that case, methodic critique could be defined as the “assessment, analysis, and evaluation of strengths (advantages) and weaknesses (disadvantages) of particular works including a perspective, a theory, or a scientific text (such as books, articles, scientific commentaries, and research proposals) in terms of their form (external) and content (internal) with regards to specific scientific criteria.” In that case, the distinctive elements and qualities of methodic critique as opposed

to non-methodic critique must be taken into consideration

The Elements of Methodic Critique

Methodic critique can be distinguished from impressionistic and subjective critique based on eight elements. These include being:

- 1) Systematic: refers to a systematic critique, which includes a goal, order, problem, argument, analysis, and clarity.
- 2) Model-oriented: refers to having knowledge and operational structure based on specific methods.
- 3) Comprehensive: as opposed to being linear and one-dimensional.
- 4) Critical: as opposed to educational and non-analytic perspectives.
- 5) Having a philosophical basis: boasting a theoretical and intellectual depth.
- 6) Expert-oriented: being dedicated to a specific area of knowledge and a specialized discipline.
- 7) Creative and dynamic: refer to expanding the horizons and pushing the boundaries of knowledge, and

8) Ethical: it means complying with the ethics of critique instead of journalistic, political, and social critiques.

Systematic

Methodic critique is supposed to be systematic; however, for it to be so it needs to have seven characteristics:

A) Purposeful: refers to a kind of critique that has a specific direction and is connected to the concerns of the society as opposed to neutral critique that serves no social function. Being purposeful can be attributed to the critic as well as the systematic methodic critique. Hence, methodic critique has a specific orientation and serves an ultimate purpose, and consequently, is not a neutral affair or a critique done only for the sake of critique. Therefore, being purposeful in a sense can describe the systematic methodic critique that can serve a special purpose, such as proposing a solution to a problem or having a social function, and in another sense, can be attributed to a critic who intends to serve a special purpose using methodic critique. However, either way, a critique bereft of

concerns and results does not represent a systematic critique.

B) Structural order: refers to coherence and logical order in the methodic critique. A critique that is incoherent in terms of content, whose parts contradict one another and cannot follow a regular structure (because of being unsystematic), would not naturally be a methodic critique.

C) Methodical: It means to follow a particular method. Methodic critique is a type of critique that follows its oriented and logical order in the form of a unique method to be systematic; besides being purposeful and having structural order, methodic critique has to follow a unique method of its own. Generally, these methods include 1. Rational-philosophical, 2. Empirical-natural, 3. Scriptural-historical, and 4. Intuitive-mystical methods. One of the characteristics of systematic critique is the selection of particular instruments to critique the problem because methodic critique would not be possible without the selection and application of specific methods. A method presents the critic with the proper way to analyze, solve, and critique a scientific problem to choose the

appropriate instrument to assess the problem. Since humanities offer a wide variety of methods without any imposed limitations – from the four categories mentioned above up to semantic, hermeneutic, analytical, phenomenological, comparative, and interdisciplinary methods – it is thus of vital importance that enough care and consideration are put into selecting a particular method of critique.

D) Problem-oriented: systematic critique will be purposeful (the first feature) and organized (the second feature) once it focuses on a scientific problem and recognizes the difference between a “dilemma and topic” and a “problem.” Furthermore, adopting a particular scientific method (the third feature) will concentrate critical attention on analyzing a specific scientific problem. On the other hand, focusing on problem-oriented critique will prevent the diversion of attention to peripheral, secondary, and unoriginal problems. Also, as it concentrates on analyzing, critiquing, and solving a particular problem, it will lead to the systematization of the scientific content of critique. The important point to consider is that critique will

only be problem-oriented when it is the product of a research project defined by a researcher. research is a process of methodical analysis of investigation into an area of study surrounding a particular problem in order to reach discoveries or make new inventions at the boundaries of knowledge. Therefore, a researcher has a concern, looks at the problems methodically, seeks to analyze or solve a particular scientific problem, serves a function, and follows a specific agenda in his scientific endeavors on the way to solve the dilemmas and challenges that concern his society, seeks to offer novel solutions, and is aware of the boundaries and existing expertise in the sciences.

E) The originality of arguments: it means that systematic critique must be well-founded and well-documented to be considered scientific. Well-founded critique is opposite of impressionistic, subjective, journalistic, and biased critique. This feature is extracted from the four features discussed earlier and has a complimentary role; because if we were to reach a purposeful critique (in a well-organized framework having taken into consideration a methodical model, and

centered around a well-defined scientific problem), there would be no other way but to resort to argumentation and reasoning in order to analyze the various problems and topics surrounding the subject-matter; otherwise the problem is only addressed and left unsolved unable to be proved. Undoubtedly, similar to unfounded critique, ill-founded and ill-documented critique is not considered scientific because the kind of critique that is riddled with logical and philosophical fallacies or based on unreliable and unsystematized documents only leads to false conclusions, and scientific dead-ends, not a systematic methodic critique (cf. Dewey, 2014, pp. 465-473).

F) Inclined toward analysis: instead of issuing general rulings, methodic critique must analyze a particular scientific problem since it is very much connected to being problem-oriented and methodical. By focusing on a specific scientific problem that requires proper accompanying argumentation, various dimensions of that problem should be specifically analyzed so that the organized structure of critique is methodically laid out in addition to preventing useless sweeping statements. The more we focus on analyzing

detailed and applicable aspects of a problem in a methodic critique, the better we can evaluate, judge, and then analyze and compare its strengths and weaknesses.

G) Clarity: as opposed to ambiguity and obscurity, if a systematic critique is ambiguous, it fails to connect to its audience. Hence it would fail to be purposeful. Methodic critique requires clarity to express and analyze its problem, demonstrate its reasons, and even follow a particular method; otherwise, if the language it utilizes is ambiguous or obscure, it leads to a dead-end on all these levels. For instance, one must not forget that a critic, in contrast to an author, is not only facing a single audience but in addition to the primary audience (such as the writer of a book or one holding a particular viewpoint) is facing a series of secondary audiences as well. The third dimension constitutes those who observe and judge the critic's critique. Therefore, in addition to making a conceptual connection to the primary audience (the book's author), he must also consider the necessity of making a clear connection to the secondary audience (the readers of the author's book). Hence every communication barrier is also a barrier to

methodic critique (cf. Qaramaleki, 2013, pp. 113-117).

Model-Oriented

In addition to being systematic, methodic critique possesses models for critique. By models, we do not mean conceptual models that are theoretical and are focused on the symbolic expression of scientific theory (cf. Roodi, 2010, pp. 116, 119). By models, we rather mean a “knowledge and operational structure” which is based on “specific methods” (the third feature of systematic critique) and determines “the levels” in the process of critique “in order of priority” so that by following them we can conduct a methodic critique of a particular problem. Therefore, models and patterns are like instruments and means of measurement that link the realm of mind and abstractions to the realm of reality and objectivity. Through the operational use and application, we can ascertain the fulfillment of the seven essential features of systematic critique. So, to be systematic, critique has to be model-oriented since critique without models will be similar to a ragbag of incoherent materials without order and

necessary comprehensiveness, which neither invites critical attention nor is it repeatable.

Thus, a methodic critique with a model is a critique that is, first, not subjective and emotional, and others can apply it using the predetermined process. So, on the one hand, having a pattern of critique enables the critic to recognize the boundary between an academic speech from one inspired by impressions and avoid lapsing into intense emotions caused by severe critical viewpoints; on the other hand, the method is possible for everyone to use and experience.

Second, by applying the appropriate intended model, there is an opportunity for scientific dialogue, which paves the way for the assessment and evaluation of critique. Therefore, the advantage of models is that they can be assessed. Because of standards or means of measurement for critique, the model can be subject to assessment as it can be quantitatively and qualitatively measured. John Dewey, also on the subject of judicial critic’s blunders and his excessive obligation to objective standards, refers to three characteristics of a standard; its physical aspect, being a measure of other

objects, and being quantitative (cf. Dewey, 2014, pp. 453, 454).

Third, to be model-oriented, critique has to be expert-oriented because we will have to respect the boundaries and principles of different fields of expertise. Consequently, not every model of critique is useful for every end, which further proves the scientific nature of critique.

Fourth, critique's faithful adherence to the scientific model results in the use of academic language along with a progressive language since the presentation of a scientific model necessitates the use of specialized vocabularies, terminology, and concepts in a particular field bearing in mind that scientific language of the model of critique should not impede the progression and creativity of critical viewpoint; instead it should always try to elevate the critic's mind for new intellectual development and the production of novel concepts. Utilizing progressive and stimulating language instead of outdated unevolving language and concepts marks the difference between progressive critique and the kind of critique that only rallies human emotions in the fight against it.

Fifth, the model of methodic critique is explicitly implemented in the form of scientific work such as a theory, perspective, book, article, scientific commentary, and research proposal. As an example, based on the elements that were discussed, the best model to critique a scientific work, is "the structural and hybrid model," which includes seven steps in a process that is defined and determined in the book *The Model of Critique* (cf. Hosseini, 2022, p. 13).

Comprehensive

One of the Elements of methodic critique is its comprehensiveness as opposed to the one-dimensional and narrow point of view. The kind of critique that only partially covers different viewpoints and limits the scope of the investigation to specific dimensions of a problem loses its comprehensiveness and becomes scientifically untenable, risking its scientific authority. Comprehensiveness is integral to a scientific viewpoint and guarantees systematicity and following a perfect model. Therefore, methodic critique in addition to considering the points of commonality, difference, strengths, and

weaknesses, must also consider and analyze the form, content, origin, and status of a scientific work all at the same time.

Hence, a comprehensive methodic critique is neither limited to a quantitative superficial evaluation nor a qualitative content analysis, so we are neither limited to mere formalism nor become fanatical idealists that ignore the connection between content and the outside reality. Comprehensive methodic critique neither magnifies the strengths to be labeled a mere optimist and apologetic nor does it only lays bare the shortcomings and failures to be condemned for being pessimistic and antithetical. In parallel, a comprehensive critique not only considers the intellectual basis, background, scientific and social origin, and the local and temporal aspects of the topic but also considers its methodological status. Similar to formalistic critique, where all vital aspects are considered, in content critique, all that is needed to critique and evaluate the work content must be taken into consideration.

Critical Perspective

It is only natural that methodic critique should adopt a “critical perspective”; otherwise, it

would be devoid of the core element of critique. Although the adoption of a critical perspective is integral to defining the methodic critique – since the keyword used in the definition offered earlier was “assessing and evaluating the advantages and disadvantages in a multifarious way – and in addition, the critical perspective affects all seven features of a systematic critique, the emphasis on the aspects of critical perspective shows the necessity of methodic critique with its complementary conditions such as:

First, when we look at a subject with a critical perspective, not only all the various aspects should be considered, but through an examination of statements and perspectives, we should critique them; otherwise, critique does not constitute mere expression, introduction, reporting, illustration, description, elucidation, detailed explanation, and interpretation of a perspective. Therefore, a critical perspective isn't of a descriptive or elucidating kind, same as a mere statement of opinion that cannot be labeled as an exemplary critical project. Hence, compared with the educational perspective, a critical perspective is a perspective that is perfectly devoted to

research since the purpose of research is pushing the boundaries of knowledge, removing the scientific barriers, and producing new knowledge, and this is not possible through elucidation, interpretation, or transmission of knowledge (how education functions), instead it needs to critique the scientific achievements question the knowledge of its scientific forefathers.

Second, although a critical perspective is not totally comparative in approach, comparison paves the way to critique since it compares various perspectives with one another and discusses their similarities and differences. Hence, one of the features of critical perspective is comparison, and if we identify the nature of comparative studies to be comparison, then such studies should be considered as subdivisions of critical perspective, which on the one hand compares the commonalities and similarities, or differences and conflicts while on the other, is able to compare at least two topics, research items, or two levels of a subject under study in terms of their advantages and strengths, or disadvantages and weaknesses, or even analyze the relations between the corresponding

subjects. Although comparative studies are difficult, they never lose their significance since acquiring such a skill is rewarding for the researcher.

Third, a critical perspective is not a mere formalistic glimpse at a fraction of characteristics and features, meaning that the task of a critical perspective is only to discover and check if a perspective or a subject complies with a particular criterion; rather it moves beyond the surface to reach the very essence of a subject and then tries to be thorough using analysis and assessment; so, a critical perspective is a content and analytic perspective.

Fourth, for instance, based on “the structural and hybrid model,” the basic requirement for a critical perspective while critiquing a scientific work is that when it comes to “coherence and logical order” the intellectual design and structure imposed on the work should be considered in order to be able to evaluate the quality of content integrity in the entirety of the work, and also evaluate it in secondary titles, or for example in the case of “sources,” it attempts to critique and analyze the sources, and the scientific citation rules, or

the quality of analyses and assessments, argumentation capabilities, and the ability to critique the viewpoints are not ignored. Critical perspective especially requires movement from the surface of scientific content to the depth of principles, origins, fundamentals, presuppositions, theories, and paradigms that dominate scientific texts in order to critically measure such correspondences as the correspondence between content, principles, and the critique of scientific principles. On this topic, the critical analysis and evaluation of the degree of correspondence between the research contents of a work and the principles and its accepted presuppositions are necessary for the existence of a critical perspective. In addition, the critical perspective can help challenge the correspondence between the work, society's culture, and its needs. Critical perspective goes beyond the design and invention of the proposed model continuing until methodological assessment and critique are finished – which constitutes the methodological critique and consideration of the theoretical frameworks, methodical contradictions, and methodological

correspondence with the dominant topic, method, theory, and philosophical basis.

Having Philosophical Basis

Being rooted in philosophy is another feature of methodic critique distinguishing it from common popular critique. Since methodic critique is systematic, model-oriented, comprehensive, and possesses a critical outlook, it cannot stand without a philosophical foundation. It means that by looking at the content of methodic critique, the materials can be traced back to philosophical schools and theoretical backgrounds. In contrast, however, impressionistic, journalistic, or common critiques are devoid of any theoretical-philosophical depth because of their shallowness, so they would have to resort to deception and cannot provide in-depth analyses. Such critiques lack the required depth in their vision to investigate the problem concerning their main causes and as such are not to be credited as proper scientific endeavors. Therefore, methodic critique has philosophical depth and intellectual background, and by looking closely at its model-oriented and systematic features, one

can trace its conceptual roots. On that account, we should distinguish five stages from one another: methodic critique, model, method, methodology, and dominant a priori philosophy. In other words, methodic critique is the result of a model based on which it critiques the selected problem; however, this model is extracted from a particular method defined and designed based on a specific methodology, and going back, we can see the dominance and the influence of philosophical schools with their general, fundamental, and foundational perspectives on the formation of methodologies.

Expert-Oriented

Based on the previous features, especially the fifth, methodic critique is specific to the specialists and authoritative figures in the field, and utilizing it requires expertise and proficiency. Laypeople and non-experts unaware of the related concepts, language, and terminology can hardly design and use its model and follow its rules unless well-educated and well-trained.

Creativity and Dynamism

Methodic critique must be dynamic and creative enough to produce new scientific discoveries. Dynamism and creativity mean innovation and introduction of questions, problems, and unique points of view surrounding the subject of critique. In this perspective, the mission assigned to methodic critique is not limited to establishing a relationship with the author and his work for the critic to perceive as finished the critique when critiquing is done. Instead, the methodic critique is tasked with going beyond the author toward the reader to expand the readers' horizons by inviting him to ask proper questions or offering him new ways and methods to solve his problems, or presenting him with other new important topics and problems in order to enrich his vision and expand his vision. Hence, creative methodic critique is not limited to a single scientific work; rather, its ultimate goal is the expansion of horizons meaning the continuation of thinking over a scientific problem. In other words, critical judgment must be able to deepen its experience in others; it means that

the critic's task is active participation in the continuation of the author's mission.

One of the examples of creative critique is critical sensitivity and passion, which consists of the critic's passionate critique, his necessary sensitivity in the presentation of the subject, and following the rules and principles of critique. It is very much connected to the critic's personal character traits who is passionately involved with the problem – as opposed to a passive and apathetic attitude – offering novel solutions seeking to increase scientific creativity. Therefore, a creative critic does not remain silent and adopts a neutral attitude toward the topics that concern himself and his scientific community. He is rather concerned, tries to critique them, and is highly sensitive toward the rules and regulations of methodic critique to be able to bring about reforms – he is hence a reformist. Being passionate is one of the researcher's character traits.

Ethical

Another one of the features is observing ethical standards of methodic critique. The importance lies in that methodic critique (as

opposed to journalistic, political, and social critiques) has only one purpose: scientific enlightenment. Especially what takes the highest priority in methodic critique is the preservation of scientific guidelines and the contents of the six mentioned guidelines in the features of methodic critique, which is impossible without adherence to the ethics of critique. Methodic critique must avoid all sorts of vulgarity, ironic commentary, verbal abuse, insincere praise, and flattery, and personal bias since all the listed offenses are at odds with the intended goals of methodic critique (c.f. Eslami, 2004, pp. 139, 140).

Results

Reform in the humanities is not possible without researching critique and reflecting upon the concept of "methodic critique;" however, the repertoire of studies on critique is very limited. In addition, treating the topic of critique as peripheral and the lack of a systematic look at the concept of methodic critique is also some of the intellectual deficiencies on this topic challenging this field of study. The reform must begin with distinguishing methodic critique from non-

methodic critique and identifying its conceptual elements; methodic critique is systematic, model-oriented, comprehensive, critical, profound, specialized, creative, and ethical. Naturally, the elements mentioned above must be combined into an organized whole to extract any particular feature from the rest. Ultimately, by explaining the necessity,

definitions, and features of methodic critique, one of the component elements of the comprehensive theory of critique will be delineated since avoiding the pitfalls discussed earlier is not possible in the studies connected to researching critique without the development of a theory of critique.

References

- [1] Arendt, H., et al., (2003). *[A collection of articles] Passionate logicians; on philosophers and philosophy. (B. Kaviani, Trans.)* Tehran, ershad publishers. (In persian).
- [2] Barthes, R., (1989). *Interpretive criticism* (M. T. Qiasi, Trans.). Bozorgmehr Publishers (In persian).
- [3] Barthes, R., (2008). *Criticism and Truth* (S. Daqiqian, Trans.). Markaz Publishers (In persian).
- [4] Carroll, Noel, (2009). *On Criticism*, Routledge; London and New York.
- [5] Carroll, Noel, (1999). *Philosophy of Art: A Contemporary Introduction*, Routledge; London and New York.
- [6] Dilthey, W., (2014). *Poetry and Experience* (M. San'ei Darebidi, Trans.). Qoqnoos Publishers. (In persian).
- [7] Dewey, J., (2014). *Art as Experience* (M. Alia, Trans.). Qoqnoos Publishers. (In persian).
- [8] Eslami, S. H., (2004). *Morality of criticism*. Maaref Publishing House (In persian).
- [9] Foucault, M., (1996). What Is Critique. In J. Schmidt (Ed.), *What Is Enlightenment?: Eighteenth-Century Answers and Twentieth-Century Questions (Volume 7) (Philosophical Traditions)* (First ed., pp. 382–398). University of California Press.
- [10] Hosseini, Sayyed Hossein, (2022), *The Model of Critique*, Tehran, nagde farhang publishers (In persian).
- [11] Qazi Moradi, H., (2015). *The dynamics of criticism*. Akhtaran Publishers. (In persian).
- [12] Qaramaleki, A. F., (2013). *Methodology of religious studies*. University of Razavi Islamic Sciences Press (In persian).
- [13] Popper, Karl. R., (1994). *the myth of the framework in defence of science and ratiolity*, routledge, London and NY.
- [14] Roodi, K., (2010). *University and scientific authority*. Imam Sadeq University Press (In persian).
- [15] Warburton, N., (2007). *Philosophy; the essential study guide*. (A. Hasanpour, Trans.). Rooyeshe-Now Publishers (In persian).

تحلیل روش شناختی مفهوم نقد

سیدحسین حسینی^۱



تاریخ دریافت: ۱۴۰۱/۶/۱۴

تاریخ پذیرش: ۱۴۰۱/۹/۱۰

تاریخ انتشار: ۱۴۰۱/۱۰/۱۱

^۱ استادیار فلسفه و روش‌شناسی پژوهشگاه علوم انسانی و مطالعات فرهنگی، تهران، ایران

E-mail: Drshhs44@gmail.com

چکیده: نقدپژوهی یکی از نیازهای کاربردی جامعه علمی به حساب می‌آید؛ اما این حوزه پژوهشی، با آسیب‌هایی روبه‌رو است که از جمله آن، فرعی قلمداد کردن مسئله نقد و فقدان نگاه روشمند به مفهوم نقد است. در این مقاله پس از اشاره به مباحث نقد ادبی و نقد هنری، از این خواهیم گفت که در پیشینه موجود بحث، به موضوع مؤلفه‌های «نقد علمی» (scientific critique) پرداخته نشده است. سپس برای تفکیک شاخصه‌های نقد علمی از نقدهای ذوقی و غیر علمی، به تبیین مؤلفه‌های هشت‌گانه نقد علمی می‌پردازیم که عبارت‌اند از: ۱- نظام‌مندی، ۲- الگومداری، ۳- جامعیت، ۴- نگاه انتقادی، ۵- بنیاد فلسفی داشتن، ۶- تخصص‌مداری، ۷- خلاقیت و ۸- اخلاق‌مداری. بدون تردید برای دستیابی به یک «نظریه جامع نقد در حوزه علوم انسانی» نیازمند تبیین ضرورت‌ها، تعاریف و ویژگی‌های مفهوم نقد علمی هستیم چراکه بدون «نظریه نقد» راهی برای دوری از آسیب‌های مطالعات نقدپژوهی در حوزه علوم انسانی وجود ندارد.

واژه‌های کلیدی: نقد، روش‌شناسی، علوم انسانی، نظریه‌پردازی، فلسفه.

پژوهشگاه علوم انسانی و مطالعات فرهنگی
پرتال جامع علوم انسانی