

PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY: TRADITION AND CONTEMPORALY TRENDS

Kudrya I. G.

INTRODUCTION

The very fact of the coexistence of the most diverse conceptions of history, the number of which is steadily growing, suggests that each of them covers not more than any one side of the multidimensional phenomenon of the historical one. Analyzing the basic philosophical concepts and cultural-civilization models of history, it is important to bear in mind that their heuristic is rather conditional. After all, the images of history are kind of refracted in every civilization. Images of the history of different civilizations and different epochs are so different that often deny each other. The next reason is that none of these models has exhausted itself completely: changing, modifying, they continue to live. Moreover, they often coexist with each other. In this study, we will proceed from the assumption that all these concepts are to some extent heuristic, all contain some limitations and should be considered in a holistic manner – on the verge of their complementarity. Unfortunately, due to the limited scope of the monograph, we can't dwell on all the concepts of history that are important to us, and we will only touch upon those who create a cross-cutting path to understanding the phenomenon of historical as a cultural phenomenon.

Historical knowledge includes not only specific situations and processes that have taken place in the past. Historians, with their professional commitment to working with primary sources, too often forget about the existence of general problems of scientific interpretation that require study: how to explain long-term historical processes, or the emergence of similar social institutions in absolutely unrelated societies. The wider the scope of the research, the more the need for theory, which not only points to the historian's new data, but also really tries to explain one or another process or pattern. The philosophy of history, even if it does not recognize any other merits for it, brought the basic problems of

history to a scientific advancement. Indeed, without theory, one can't approach the really significant questions of history.

1. The origins of the philosophy of history

Voltaire first introduced into the scientific circle the concept of "philosophy of history". "The phrase 'philosophy of history' has come to have two narrow and widely divergent meanings: the first, that of an epistemological inquiry into the nature of historical truth; the second, speculation as to the 'meaning' or 'goal' of history or the pattern behind historical development. But there are other problems, too, problems associated with the purpose of the study of history, with historical change and causation, with determinism and free will, which, in the eighteenth century at any rate, cannot be dissociated from the first two".¹

He, on the one hand, rejected the traditional Christian view of history as a definite god. On the other hand, it revealed the unjustified hopes that evil in history is eliminated by divine providence, and one should expect that without its purposeful efforts everything will set itself for the better. According to Voltaire, only a constant and intense worldly activity, illuminated by intelligent goals and knowledge of the means of their achievement, can lead to improvement of the situation of man on earth. Only it can reduce physical evil, protecting people from the effects of natural elements, and eliminate moral evil, a foolish and unfair social organization. Reflecting the rationalist attitude of the eighteenth century, Voltaire acted as one of the forerunners of the theory of historical progress. The undoubted merit of Voltaire is that he formulated in new terms the requirements and tasks of the study of the philosophy of history, pointing out the need to study not only and not so much church and dynastic history, but also economic, cultural and political history in the widest sense of the word. With Voltaire's understanding of history, the ideas expressed by Turgot, one of the brightest thinkers of the French Enlightenment.

Physiocrat Turgot, creator of the first theory of progress. "For Turgot, progress was the inevitable consequence of historical development and, at the same time, the creation of the human will acting with an understanding of the past"². In his philosophical and historical works, he

¹ Brumfitt J. H. *Voltaire Historian*. New York: Oxford University Press. 1958. P. 951.

² Younkings E. W. *Champions of a Free Society: Ideas of Capitalism's Philosophers and Economists*. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2008. P. 110.

considered the history of mankind as a natural progressive movement along the ascending line. According to his scheme, the ascension of humanity by the ladder of progress, is associated with the transition from harvesting and hunting to cattle, and then – to agriculture. Since agriculture feeds significantly more people than is necessary for cultivating land, this leads to the division of labor, the emergence of cities, trade. Thus, changes in the material life of Turgot serve as a decisive factor in progress.

Rousseau imagined the historical process as a single and logical one. The principle by which Rousseau explained history is the idea of universal will, coming from the people as a whole, which could be applied not only to the history of the civilized world, but also to the history of all peoples at all times.

The initial principle of the historical theories of materialist philosophers was the idea of man as a sensuous being. Feelings are defined as the engines of history. This is the so-called naturalistic explanation of history, based on physiological needs. Developing this idea, they proposed a scheme of initial stages of history close to the Turgot scheme. According to Diderot, people consistently switched from harvesting to hunting and fishing, then to cattle breeding and, finally, to farming. At the stage of agriculture, private ownership and political organization arose.

Condorcet considered the driving force behind the progress of education and scientific knowledge. “His survey of history is marked not by political changes but by important steps in knowledge”³. These principles are laid down by Condorcet as the basis of the periodization of history, in which he identified nine epochs.

The first five ages cover the development of mankind from primitive times to antiquity inclusive. With the fall of Rome, the sixth era begins, covering the period of the early Middle Ages. However, in the next, the seventh epoch – from the XIV century, before the invention of printing – the human mind again finds lost energy, makes important inventions. But the special acceleration of progress brings the eighth era – from the end of XV to the middle of the XVII century. The ninth era – to the French republic. It was in this era that people came to understand true human

³ Shreedharan E. Manual of historical research methodology. Trivandrum: Centre for South Indian Studies, 2007. P. 319.

rights. Thus, Condorcet has deepened the teachings of his predecessors on progress and first proposed a theory of a unified linear history of mankind with successively changing stages of development, moreover, changes for the better.

An original phenomenon in the philosophy of history was the Scottish Historical School. Its representatives, A. Ferguson and W. Robertson, attached great importance to the history of the development of industry and trade. A. Ferguson sought to open a general law governing the historical development. He proceeded from the position that progress in the development of history plays a decisive role. A. Ferguson divides history into the following stages, each of which corresponds to its type of economic activity: savage (hunters and fishermen), barbarism (pastoralists), civilization (agricultural workers).

I. Kant, in his philosophy of history, put forward the idea of creating a perfect world order by organizing an alliance of peoples, in which even the smallest state would enjoy protection and security. "Political philosophers are turning to Kant for his concepts of provisionality, agency, cosmopolitan right, the public sphere, and of course for his systematic treatment of human freedom in general"⁴. I. Kant was convinced that historical development would lead to this goal, and called for the construction of such a general history, which with the help of an ethical imperative would show the regularity of the process of uniting into one whole human race.

"However idiosyncratic Kant's specific concept of a regulative principle may have been as the source of historical connectedness, the general resort to an extra-historical stability for the purpose was archetypical"⁵. Thus, the philosophy of the history of the Enlightenment was characterized by: 1) the concept of "philosophy of history", that is, the philosophical conception of historical reality; 2) critical attitude to the historical past; 3) the desire to invent the laws of history; 4) a general approach to history; 5) an emphasis on the dynamics of the historical process; 6) the discovery of a new material factor in history: the economy, labor and trade activities of people; 7) setting on a naturalistic understanding of history.

⁴ Kant's Political Theory: Interpretations and Applications by Elizabeth Ellis (ed.). University Park PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2012. P. 1.

⁵ Krieger L. Time's Reasons: Philosophies of History Old and New. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989. P. 50.

The modern concept of world history is closely linked to the philosophy of the history of Hegel and Marx. Both philosophers have developed majestic projects of world history. Hegel and Marx put forward the idea of freedom as the content or purpose of history, thereby abandoning the conversion to transcendental goals. Modern reconstruction of their projects proves their viability.

For Hegel consciousness develops in stages, ranging from simple consciousness to a higher form – self-consciousness. History is the embodiment of the Spirit (Geist), that is, consciousness and freedom (self-determination). “The goal of this contention is, as already indicated, the self-realization, the complete development of spirit, whose proper nature is freedom – freedom in both senses of the term, i.e. liberation from outward control – inasmuch as the law to which it submits has its own explicit sanction – and emancipation from the inward slavery of lust and passion”⁶. As a person develops, it becomes more conscious and free, and history is the development of the spirit. In the process of its development, the spirit becomes more conscious and therefore free. Historical development of societies is the only process that is determined by a single principle.

Hegel's philosophy is an attempt to construct a scheme of world history as a natural process. In the limited, closed national history, he opposes the universalism of world history. Hegel regains the status of world history, which was summed up by romanticism to the level of national spirit. “Unquestionably, however, a gap subsisted between the heterogeneity of historical events and the uniform integration of rational structure, and Hegel filled this gap with the famous, if ambiguous, notion of “the cunning of reason,””⁷. The spirit of each individual is only a step in the development of the world spirit. Hegel combines the principle of universal historical progress, advanced by Enlightenment, and the principle of organic development, promoted by romanticism. The national history of Hegel is inextricably linked with the general, with world history.

Thus, world history is considered by Hegel as the only, organic, natural process of progressive development of mankind. Freedom, according to Hegel, is the content of the world spirit. He regarded world

⁶ Hegel G.W.F. *The Philosophy of History*. Kitchener: Batoche Books, 2001. P. 10.

⁷ Krieger L. *Time's Reasons: Philosophies of History Old and New*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989. P. 56.

history as the necessary progress in the realization of freedom. An important feature of the Hegel philosophy of history is that the historical process has a staged nature.

The history of Hegel's project is three stages:

1. Ancient civilizations of the East (China, India and Persia), where only one person is free – a despot.

2. Antiquity, where some are free (citizens of the policy).

3. The Christian world, where all are free. In the civilizations of the Ancient East, man was not yet aware of his freedom and was completely subordinated to despotism. Only one monarch was free. “The Orientals have not attained the knowledge that Spirit – Man as such – is free; and because they do not know this, they are not free. They only know that one is free. But on this very account, the freedom of that one is only caprice; ferocity – brutal recklessness of passion, or a mildness and tameness of the desires, which is itself only an accident of Nature – mere caprice like the former. – That one is therefore only a Despot; not a free man”⁸. The rest were free mass. In antiquity, they already realized their freedom, but only few were freed. Full freedom reaches in Europe, after the Reformation. This scheme, in an accessible form, demonstrates the growth of freedom in the course of world history. According to Hegel, history develops dialectically, that is, one stage generates the opposite, and as a result of the contradictions between them there is a third stage, which combines elements of the first two stages.

Applying the dialectical method to the study of history, Hegel formulated three principles: the unity and struggle of opposites, denial of negation and the transfer of quantity to quality, thus establishing the laws of historical development. The driving force behind history is internal contradictions, not external forces.

The ultimate goal of history is the triumph of freedom, a spirit that is fully realized in the form of a liberal state. In the realization of complete freedom, Hegel saw the final stage in the history of mankind. Thus, the goal of world history is human freedom. This is not just a state, but an awareness of yourself free. A means to achieve this goal is the state, and the scale of history is worldwide.

Hegel's idea of history as the development of awareness of freedom has become a source of Neo-Hegelianism in the philosophy of history.

⁸ Hegel G.W.F. *The Philosophy of History*. Kitchener: Batoche Books, 2001. P. 31.

Neo-Hegelianism came from the definition of history as freedom. Among representatives of Neo-Hegelianism are B. Croce and R. Collingwood. In their approach to the problems of history, they proceeded from the principles of Hegelianism, but at the same time criticized the Hegel's philosophy of history. Following Hegel, they adopted the thesis of the dialectic of the deployment of consciousness in the life of mankind, but at the same time denied the schematization of the historical process. B. Croce consistently carried out the installation that the awareness of freedom of the individual in conjunction with the common interest, are the main drivers of the historical process. Unlike Hegel, he opposed the idea of a steady increase in the degree of freedom of mankind in history.

Periods of freedom and non-freedom alternate in the process of human development, he believed. B. Croce criticized the position of world history. Principal for his philosophy of history is the distinction between history and chronicle. In the history of B. Croce called what characterizes the reproduction of the past through the prism of the present, needs, motives and goals of the subject. He called the chronicles a dead story, which lost its direct connection with the present and turned into an academic description. The basis of the history of B. Croce was contemporary. "The truth is that chronicle and history are not distinguishable as two forms of history, mutually complementary, or as one subordinate to the other, but as two different spiritual attitudes. History is living chronicle, chronicle is dead history; history is contemporary history, chronicle is past history; history is principally an act of thought, chronicle an act of will. Every history becomes chronicle when it is no longer thought, but only recorded in abstract words, which were once upon a time concrete and expressive"⁹. The ideas of B. Croce were taken up by the presentism, which argued that every generation rewrites history for itself. The historian, as the creator of history, is seeking the meaning of the past through the prism of the present and the future, which does not foresee the writing of a chronicle. B. Croce emphasized the dialectic of history and chronicles. Hence, the regularity of the constant renaissance's of the past, the transformation of the chronicle into history. History was seen by B. Croce as universal in a particular. The historian, combining universal with an individual, creates

⁹ Croce B. Theory & history of historiography. London: G. C. Harrap, 1921. P. 19.

an individualized universal in the light of our present, our own hopes, and goals. Thus, the actual history is a modern history.

Basic principles of Hegelianism to understand the meaning of history shared by R. Collingwood. He not only followed the Hegelian tradition, but constantly sought to entrench it on the basis of English philosophy with its empiricism and reflexive method of analysis. This circumstance makes itself felt in solving the problem of the meaning of history.

The presence of history distinguishes man from all other creatures. History, and not rationality, is the basic feature of human differences from animals. R. Collingwood, like B. Croce, refused to attempt speculative design of world history schemes. R. Collingwood turned to the consciousness of the historical subject. The task of the philosophy of history is to identify the specifics of ideas of self-consciousness. The universal ability by which a historian can find the meaning of history is called historical imagination. Thanks to historical imagination, the historian can imagine the past. R. Collingwood goes through the search for a priori principles of comprehension of the meaning of history, making history a philosophical discipline. There is an a priori idea of history, inherent in a person who directs the activities of her imagination. This idea belongs to every person as an element of the structure of her consciousness, and it opens it in itself as soon as it begins to realize. R. Collingwood criticized source studies, arguing that creative imagination is a decisive factor in the work of the researcher, who must reveal the content of the past.

The influence of the Hegel's philosophy of history is most clearly manifested in the Marx philosophy of history. In Marx's story has the same logic as in Hegel, but another meaning. The Marx's philosophy of history is fully consistent with the name of historical materialism, which belongs to F. Engels. The content of each historical stage is determined by productive forces and production relations. Productive forces: tools, technology and raw materials, along with the workforce that implements their productive potential. The productive forces of interaction with industrial relations, under which Marx understood the division of labor and ownership. This structure is the basis of the superstructure, which includes political institutions, as well as ideology and law.

If for Hegel, the criterion for the development of history is the degree of freedom and self-awareness, then for Marx, the criterion for the

development of history is the state of productive forces. This is the main aspect of historical materialism. Like Hegel, Marx believed that history is a dialectic of the stages of development. However, unlike Hegel, for Marx, the stages of history are determined not from the point of view of the development of spirit, but through the development of production. “This level is the most openly finalistic: it derives, modified only by a 'materialist inversion', from the way Hegel and other philosophers of history organized the epochs of universal history ('oriental despotism' becomes the 'Asiatic mode of production', the 'ancient world' becomes the 'slave mode...' etc.)”¹⁰. Marx distinguished three historical epochs, each of which is characterized by a certain method of production more progressive than the previous one. Ancient society (Greece and Rome) was replaced by a feudal and, accordingly, capitalist (or modern bourgeois) society, which originally appeared in England in the seventeenth century, and then triumphed everywhere in Europe, especially as a result of the French Revolution.

Asia, he made a separate category, different from Europe. According to Marx, the Asian mode of production did not possess sufficient internal dynamics of historical changes, and capitalism (and hence socialism) in the East could have been created only as a result of colonialism. Marx advocated for modernization, the western way. General periodization determined the general direction of the historical process, the concrete implementation of it in different peoples associated with significant modifications, deviations from the general path. This general picture of historical development served as a scheme for understanding the individual aspects of the historical process, its division into certain periods, the clarification of the nature of certain epochs.

Marx argued that not the consciousness of people determines their being, but, on the contrary, their social existence determines their consciousness. According to Marx, the contradiction between productive forces and industrial relations is the main driving force of history. When productive forces reach such a level when their further development is restrained by property relations, there is a change in production relations. The long-term trajectory of historical changes is determined by the dialectics of productive forces and industrial relations, but the moment and the concrete form of transition from one stage of development to

¹⁰ Balibar E. *The Philosophy of Marx*. London: Verso, 2007. P. 94.

another depend on the consciousness of people, their ability to act and the conditions that they inherited. Marx admitted that the superstructure or legal, political and ideological factors (what Hegel called spiritual) factors significantly influence the course of historical development, but the leading factor is the economic factor. There is an interaction between the base and the superstructure. Productive forces, however, prevail. This is the fundamental principle of historical materialism, which makes the Marx's philosophy of history a form of materialism. For Hegel, history is a teleological process whose purpose is a liberal state. Marx criticizes this goal. Marx considered the goal of history communism. Communism was seen as a formation that is changing capitalism, as the future of mankind. The Marx's philosophy of history is not unilateral economic determinism. On the contrary, Marx's main idea was that economic development would lead to spiritual development and freedom, albeit with cruel methods of capitalism.

For Hegel, history is a teleological process whose purpose is a liberal state. Marx criticizes this goal. Marx considered the goal of history communism. Communism was seen as a formation that is changing capitalism, as the future of mankind. The Marx's philosophy of history is not unilateral economic determinism. On the contrary, Marx's main idea was that economic development would lead to spiritual development and freedom, albeit with cruel methods of capitalism.

The neo-Marxist K. Wittfogel developed the original concept of agro-bureaucratic, or hydraulic engineering society. He showed that the East is not a private property, but the power of the bureaucracy determines the course of history. The power of bureaucracy in agrarian societies inevitably acquired a centralized, despotic character due to its role in the organization of hydraulic engineering works. In his study of Eastern society, K. Wittfogel repudiated Marx's idea of an Asian mode of production, deepening its Weber's theory of bureaucracy. K. Wittfogel showed that the bureaucracy in hydraulic despotism is a cohesive organism that differs not only from the modern bourgeoisie, but also from the feudal nobility. Of the three types of despotism, K. Wittfogel attributes Russia to the submargin, along with the classical hydraulic society (China) and the marginal (Byzantium). In these societies there are no classes, as is typical of the West, as socio-economic categories. State power of hydraulic societies is despotic, totalitarian. There is only

one way to include hydrotechnical despotisms in the context of world history – this is an external intervention of capitalism through the form of colonialism.

Along with Hegelianism and Marxism, historicism made a significant contribution to the formation of the philosophy of history. The term historicism was first introduced by F. Schlegel in 1797. Romantics legitimized historicism in the philosophy of history, creating a history of language, law, culture, art, literature. It was in the German historical schools of philology and law, with the greatest consistency, a romantic idea of historicism was developed. In Germany, historical schools, united the most famous representatives of romanticism. In the framework of historicism arose, and then established in the philosophy of history, the direction of historical and philological analysis. Historicism as a method of cognition has established itself in the mythological school presented by Schelling, Schlegel, the brothers Grimm. Representatives of this school laid the foundations for a comparative-historical study of mythology, folklore and literature.

The German historical school of law also constructed the past on the basis of the principle of historicism. F. Savigny and K. Eichhorn made a significant impact on the philosophy of the history of the first half of the XIX century, with its clear formulations of the concept of organic communication and continuity in the development of the people and the state, the ideas of the nation as a collective individuality, the idea of the Volksgeist “national spirit” as the main creative force in history.

The romantic philosophy of history was predominantly political, and the choice as the main subject of the study of the nation contributed to the fact that the basic principles of historicism were developed primarily in relation to the history of individual countries, their rights and state institutions. The romantic philosophy of history formulated the problems of tradition and succession as factors contributing to the development of the nation. In this sense, historicism first made the nationalization of history.

The processes of forming a national identity, liberation movements in Europe mobilized a profound need for historicism. Historicism in the first place focused on the category of the Volksgeist. The concept of the Volksgeist covered a wide range of measurements from climate and religion to the law and customs. The combination of all these dimensions

and their interaction was the content of the *Volksgeist*. This approach opened up the opportunity to focus on clarifying the national identity of the cultures of individual peoples.

A huge role in the formation of historicism belongs to Herder, who departed from the schematic representation of the Enlightenment on historical development as a straightforward process and highlighted the idea of developing history not smoothly, but jump-free, with possible deviations and local cultures. Fundamentally new in Herder's history was an understanding of the cultural identity of peoples. In the national culture of a certain people, namely in language, art and poetry, it was expressed in a national character. "Herder is the father of organic historicism. Organic historicism grasps the second nature of naturalization as the living spirit of a people that informs all its institutions"¹¹. Historicism opposed the Enlightenment progressive conception of history as a development on the ascending line from lower to higher, the theory of the cycle of history, put forward in his time by Vico. According to Vico, the story goes through the stages of childhood (the period of the gods), youth (heroic period), and maturity (human period), in which modern humanity lives.

The human period – the higher, after it the ruin will come, and humanity will again go to the primitive state. "...Vico believed that the 'course' run by ancient civilizations such as those of Greece and Rome was recapitulated in a 'recourse' played out by modern nations. History is cyclical in the sense that individuals constitutionally rework an inherited pattern of evolution on their own terms"¹². Historicism highlighted the principle of individualization of phenomena, events and relationships, emphasizing the search for a unique, original, special, exotic in a historical phenomenon or event. Thus, historicism made it possible to understand the place of every nation in the past, the originality of the culture of each nation, and predicted the future, based on the connection of the present with the past.

The philosophy of the history of positivism has become the answer to the challenges of the industrial age. The positivist model of knowledge of history was characterized by the absolutisation of the inductive scientific procedure, the principle of multifactorial synthesis and the unity of the historical process, the theory of evolution, and the priority of mass

¹¹ Roberts D., Murphy P. *Dialectic of Romanticism: a Critique of Modernism*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2004. P. 6.

¹² Hamilton P. *Historicism*. New York: Routledge, 1996. P. 36.

psychology. Positivism abandoned synthetic generalizations, introduced a pluralist theory of factors and empiricism in historical research at the end of the XIX century. The fundamentals of the positivist approach were laid by A. Comte and were developed in the works of H. Spencer.

H. Spencer divided history into two stages: the original, which was divided into two sub-stages: savagery and barbarism, and civilization (respectively: despotic – militaristic and industrial). “This was his dichotomy of militancy and industrialism”¹³. Positivism developed a linear-staged conception of the history of the Enlightenment, as well as the idea of a regular nature of historical development. Positivist philosophy of history emphasized the unity of the historical process, the similarity of the leading historical laws to all peoples. Under the influence of representatives of Anglo-American positivism, the meaning of history was happiness. Positivism believed that the laws of history do not differ from the laws of nature and recognized Darwinian evolutionism.

Positivist philosophy of history is replete with analogies between the biological organism and society. The biological reductionism of positivism was a powerful critique of idealism and providentialism in the philosophy of the history of the second half of the nineteenth century. For the first time, the socio-economic and biological factors of history have become the full object of research. In addition, the phenomenon of social movements has become a new subject of research. For the first time in the philosophy of history there are concepts of civilization, laws, evolution. Positivism laid the foundation for the socio-psychological comprehension of the history presented by the works of W. Wundt, G. Le Bon, G. Tarde, J. Frazer and E. Tylor. Socio-psychological approach investigated the origin and evolution of various institutes of society: family, property, religion, state, ethics and law, as well as psychology of the masses.

Thus, in the classical positivist philosophy of history, which emphasized the importance of collective research objects, the nation was recognized as the main subject of the historical process. If Romantics most often used the terms of the hero and the *Volksgeist*, then the positivists used the concept of popular mass. For romantics, the people's spirit was an ethnographic concept; instead, the popular mass was regarded by positivists as a sociological category.

¹³ Sanderson S. K. *Evolutionism and its critics: deconstructing and reconstructing an evolutionary interpretation of human society*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers, 2007. P. 12.

For a scientific explanation of history, this approach applied psychological and sociological laws. At the turn of the XIX-XX centuries, recognition of sociological and psychological laws by the laws of history has become a characteristic feature of the philosophy of history.

One of the main structural elements of the positivist philosophy of history was the idea of a multifactor of social development. The multifactor approach allowed not only to deeply explore historical facts, but also to come back to the problems of the meaning of history and the search for the regularities of the historical process in a new way. Positivism distinguished two groups of factors of the historical process: external (geographical location of the people, influence of nature, geopolitical position) and internal (economic, political, cultural, psychological). The factor approach opposed the absolutisation of representatives of various idealistic and materialist trends of the philosophy of history of the principle of causality and their attempts to reduce the diversity of the historical process to the manifestation of a single operating principle: material or spiritual. The philosophy of the history of positivism represented the historical process as the interaction of equal factors. History is recognized as a complex system, which operates through the interaction of its various elements (factors). The positivists tried to prove the causal nature of the historical process.

The main elements of the positivist philosophy of history were: the belief in social progress; recognition of the historical process logical and multifactorial; development of the theory of social evolution. In this respect, the local variants of positivism practically did not differ from their European prototype. Biological reductionism deprived the philosophical thought of the ideas of divine Providence and the people's spirit. The theory of social evolution has diminished the significance of individual celebrities in history. Evolutionary theory contributed to the development of ethnology and archeology and more active study of the initial stages of development of world civilization. In particular, it stimulated the use of the historical-comparative method for studying the history of different states. Evolutionary theory relied on the generally accepted principles of the positivists of the notion of the unity of the laws of nature and society and the belief in social progress. Such a rational approach was objectively directed against religion and metaphysics. Fundamentally, from other methodological positions, the issue of the

allocation of the same stages of development in different societies was solved. In addition, the theory of social evolution contributed to the systematization of concrete facts as a cause-and-effect chain. The formulation of historical laws occurred in the investigated period, mainly not deductive, and the inductive-normative method – by generalization of a particular historical material. These attempts contributed to the further development of the philosophy of history. The foreground in the history of sociological and psychological laws is evidence of recognition of the evolutionary and multi-factor nature of the historical process.

If Romantics, not referring to the source, so as not to violate the romantic genre of the story, then in positivism, on the contrary, a detailed reference apparatus becomes one of the main indicators of possession of the specialty historian. Requirements for historical research were extended to the design of the reference and bibliographic apparatus, the content and structure of historical journals. National history as a whole changed direction and began to develop mainly in the context of narrative history. Social history has turned into sociology. The action of the masses was determined by the laws. Positivism was the dominant trend in the philosophy of history in the 1860's – the first decades of the XX century. One can't speak of the unambiguous domination of positivism, since such scientific traditions as romanticism and Hegelianism partly continued to exist. Positivism can be defined as the philosophy of history, which set itself on the service of natural science, as the philosophy of the Middle Ages was the servant of theology. The positivist philosophy of history gave a huge boost to specific historical knowledge, based on an unprecedented study of sources of accuracy and critique. Positivist historians were considered the greatest connoisseurs of historical details.

Morphology of history – the direction of the philosophy of history, formed on the basis of comparative study, focuses on clarifying the similarities and differences between cultures and civilizations, combining them into classes on essential similarities. As a result of these studies, the links between cultures and their place in history are clarified, certain cultural-historical types are distinguished by degree of similarity. An analysis of these types is the main subject of the morphology of history. The main methodological principle of the morphology of history is the civilization approach – a description of history as a cycle, from birth, flowering to the death of civilizations. Such an approach contributes to

revealing the self-worth of civilization, its place in world history. Traditionally, civilization is interpreted as a type of society that differs from savagery and barbarism by urbanization, writing, and state. Within the framework of the morphology of history, two main areas are distinguished: local civilizations and world civilization. At the root of the concept of local civilizations was N. Danilevsky. “Danilevsky rejects as nonsensical those schemas in which all human history is divided into ancient, medieval, and modern periods”.¹⁴

According to N. Danilevsky, the totality of cultural-historical types or civilizations is the history of mankind. As in nature, living organisms, as well as cultural-historical types appear, grow, reach maturity, and then move downward. Duration of existence of a type is determined by energy. This energy is manifested in activity. Its main types are economic, social, political, artistic, aesthetic, and religious.

Subsequently, the morphology of history was filled with new content. O. Spengler isolated eight cultures: Egyptian, Indian, Babylonian, Chinese, Apollonian (Greco-Roman), magic (Byzantine-Arabic), Faustian (Western European) and Maya. At the stage of formation was the Russian-Siberian culture. The age of each culture depends on its inner life cycle and covers about a thousand years. By completing its cycle, culture dies and passes into the state of civilization.

The fundamental difference between culture and civilization is that the latter acts as a synonym for technology, while the first is a creative activity. “At the heart of Spengler's philosophy of history is the idea of culture as distinct from civilization”¹⁵. A. Toynbee denied the existence of a single history of mankind and recognized only certain, not interconnected closed civilizations. At first he counted twenty one civilizations, and then limited their number to thirteen, excluding minor ones that did not occur or did not receive proper development.

Each of the civilizations passes the same cycle of development – the emergence, growth, fragmentation and decomposition, as a result of which it perishes. “All civilizations, said Toynbee, passed through four stages: genesis, growth, breakdown, and disintegration.

¹⁴ Slaboch M. W. A road to nowhere: The idea of progress and its critics. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2018. P. 64.

¹⁵ Ibid. P. 90.

The mechanism for the emergence of civilizations from primitive societies Toynbee termed «challenge-and-response.»¹⁶. Identical in its essence, there are social and other processes taking place in each of civilization, which allows formulating the laws of history, on the basis of which one can recognize and even predict its course. Thus, according to A. Toynbee, the creative force of history is the creative minority, or an elite, which, taking into account the conditions created in the society, makes appropriate decisions and forces them to persuade and authority or to use violence by another part of the population that is inert. The stimulus of history is the challenges faced by society (challenges). These can be difficult natural conditions, the development of new lands, invasion of the enemy, social oppression, and so on. Society needs to find an answer to this challenge. The development and flowering of civilization directly depends on the ability of the creative minority to serve as a kind of model for the inert majority. If the elite is not able to solve the problem of the historical development, it becomes an inferiority from the creative minority to the ruling minority, which carries out its decisions not through beliefs, but by force, in an optimal way. Such a situation leads to the weakening of the foundations of civilization, and in the future to its death. In the twentieth century, only five main civilizations – Chinese, Indian, Islamic, Russian and Western – have survived.

Philosophy of history K. Jaspers was formed largely under the influence of M. Weber. K. Jaspers distinguishes four periods of human history. The first of them is the Promethean era (prehistory). According to K. Jaspers, almost simultaneously, in the three regions of the world, new types of civilization arise entirely independently of one another. So begins the second period – the era of great historical civilizations. This is Babylonian, Egyptian and Aegean; the Indus civilization and, finally, China. The common features of all these great cultures are state and written language.

However, these cultural periods are not yet known for the spiritual revolution that he defines as the axial time – the period of the birth of philosophy, when people first began to understand the nature of space, mind, soul and the goals of human existence, which remain in the focus of philosophy to this day. Third Period The Axial Age is the time of the birth

¹⁶ Civilizations and World Systems: Studying World-Historical Change. Ed. by Stephen K. Sanderson. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press, 1995. P. 16.

of a new, modern type of man; the emergence of world religions that have replaced paganism; and, finally, the philosophy of its awareness of the uniqueness of the historical mission, the eschatological perspective and transcendental values that changed mythology. Man of the axial time has mastered the transcendental values, has become face to face with history. Man is attached to the transcendental value, becomes equal force in relation to natural and historical processes, able to change them at their discretion, in accordance with their values. According to K. Jaspers, this period begins with the Zarathustra, which lived about 800 BC, and ends about 200 BC, after which the Spiritual Age begins, with the key figures of which are Jesus and Muhammad. In the specified period, says K. Jaspers, there was a fundamental turn in history. In China, during this period, all the directions of Chinese philosophy were formed. In India there are Upanishads, Buddhism begins. In Persia, Zarathustra creates a doctrine of the struggle between good and evil. Palestine has the first religious prophets. In Greece there is an ancient philosophy. Modern science, which was established in the seventeenth century, caused the uniqueness of European culture. Along with the classification of historical epochs, K. Jaspers gives the classification of peoples whose criterion is the concept of axial time: axial peoples – the Chinese, Indians, Iranians, Jews and Greeks; beyond the axial peoples, we are talking about such cultures as Egyptian and Babylonian; the rest – historical peoples and primitive. «The term “axial age” has, therefore, a threefold dimension: The synchronic dimension refers to the simultaneousness of comparable progresses in thinking situated along a geographical axis from the Mediterranean to east Asia. The diachronic dimension refers to the molding influence it has had for all later developments of each of the respective cultures.

The universalistic dimension refers to the “challenge to boundless communication”, that is, the perspective of a common future for mankind, which the axial age has opened up for the first time».¹⁷

2. Modern philosophy of history

In the modern philosophy of history, the direction of the history of concepts has been formed, which is divided into the German school of the

¹⁷ Roetz H. Confucian Ethics of the Axial Age: A Reconstruction under the Aspect of the Breakthrough Toward Postconventional Thinking. P. 24-25.

history of the concepts of “Begriffsgeschichte” and the Anglo-Saxon “History of Concepts”. The ideological foundations of the first direction were formulated by R. Koselleck who, together with O. Brunner and W. Conze, was one of the project leaders in the writing of “The Historical Lexicon of Socio-Political Language in Germany” [Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe, 1972-1993]. “One hypothesis regarding our dictionary of fundamental historical concepts is that, despite continual use of the same words, the political-social language has changed since the eighteenth century, inasmuch as since then a “new time” has been articulated. Coefficients of change and acceleration transform old fields of meaning and, therefore, political and social experience as well. Earlier meanings of a taxonomy that is still in use must be grasped by the historical method and translated into our language”¹⁸. Reconstructing the process of the emergence and change of concepts in a broad socio-cultural context, the representatives of “Begriffsgeschichte” sought to consider the process of disappearance of the old world and the emergence of modern through the prism of the history of its comprehension in the categories of certain concepts.

In the second direction, language is considered as a means of forming and expressing historical consciousness in close connection with practical actions of people, motives of actions and the results of which were recorded in verbal and written form.

According to the leading theoreticians of the Anglo-Saxon school J. Pocock and Q. Skinner, the political language should be considered both as a means of communication and as a deliberate political action. Thus, the main subject of “History of Concepts” is not so much the true meaning of individual concepts, but the method of their use in close connection with different normative-value and political instincts. In general, the history of concepts is the result of the so-called linguistic turn in the philosophy of history.

The next modern direction of the philosophy of history is the theory of historical memory. Representatives of which are J. Assmann and P. Nora. A significant influence on the idea of J. Assmann and P. Nora was made by sociologist M. Halbwachs, who was engaged in the development of the theory of collective memory and the idea of social

¹⁸ Koselleck R. The Practice of Conceptual History. Timing History: Spacing Concepts. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002. P. 5

conditioning of human memory. M. Halbwachs highlighted the forms through which memory is transferred. He noted that the forms of memory should be specific, that is, to have coordinates of time, place and personality. In this case, in the collective consciousness comes the moment of crystallization – freezing, memorizing the society of certain events. M. Halbwachs singled out individual and collective memory. Shapes of memories in collective memory are always examples, teachings. “Halbwach's work on the social foundations of collective memory, therefore, has provided an important theoretical groundwork for the study of the politics of memory in which contemporary historians are currently engaged”.¹⁹

They express the general position of the group, norms of conduct and world perceptions, which are legalized through references to the past. M. Halbwachs highlighted the problem of the correlation of collective memory and history. History, acts directly opposite to collective memory. If for collective memory it is typical to notice only similarity and continuity, then history perceives exclusively the differences and discontinuities of continuity. As a result, M. Halbwachs opposed history and collective memory. Where the past is not even more remembered, that is, not experienced, lost links with persons and places of the past, history begins. According to him, the past does not grow naturally, it is a product of the group's cultural creativity. “It was the great achievement of the French sociologist Maurice Halbwachs to show that our memory depends, like consciousness in general, on socialization and communication, and that memory can be analyzed as a function of our social life (*Les cadres sociaux; La memoire collective*). Memory enables us to live in groups and communities, and living in groups and communities enables us to build a memory”.²⁰

Continuing M. Halbwachs research, J. Assmann studied the ways of manifestation of cultural and collective memory and ways of their identification. J. Assmann compared cultural and collective memory, introduced the basic parameters of similarities and differences. Collective memory embraces memories that are associated with the recent past and are stored in the memory of the generation, has a rather weak design and

¹⁹ Hutton P. H. *History as an Art of Memory*. Hanover, N.H.: UPNE, 1993. P. 7.

²⁰ Assmann J. *Communicative and Cultural Memory // Cultural Memory Studies. An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*, Berlin, New York 2008, p. 109.

may include many variants of interpretation of events, since there are many collective memory carriers.

A. Assmann argues that during the XX century, the temporal model declined more and more.

A new model of history is being formed. “Many explanations have been offered for the new predominance and enduring fascination of the memory paradigm. They include the decline of modernization theory ...; the end of a philosophy of the subject, ...; the end of one-track disciplines in the humanities ... Against this background, the subject of memory emerges both as a new field of interdisciplinary approaches ...”²¹. It is the problems of today, as well as the circumstances of the immediate past and the immediate future, determine the topics of modern philosophy of history.

First of all, it is the history of the body, the study of the language and body metaphors, the study of how a person relates to his body throughout history, the concept of a political body or an analysis of the policy of power, which is to the individual body, civilization and body. Food was also the object of studying the philosophy of history, and a special direction of research, food studies, united philosophers, historians, ethnographers, anthropologists and sociologists. The phenomenon of food is considered through the categories of food culture, food code of civilization, gastronomic culture.

A powerful impetus to the emergence of an ecological trend in the philosophy of history was the increasingly important role of environmental movements in the modern world. The main themes of the ecological philosophy of history are the Neolithic revolution, imperialism and colonialism, changes in agriculture, the effects of technological revolution and urbanization. The global theme is the historic human impact on climate change. The history of colonization and migration has a significant ecological dimension. Recently, the culturological approach in ecological history becomes more and more relevant. His main feature – the concentration of attention is not on the environment, but on the person in a changing natural environment.

²¹ Assmann J. *Communicative and Cultural Memory // Cultural Memory Studies. An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*, Berlin, New York 2008, p. 109.

CONCLUSIONS

Thus, summing up, we can note the relevance of the problems of the philosophy of history, which is expressed in the novelty of problem-setting and the development of new methods and approaches to the historical process. Speaking theoretical understanding of world history, the philosophy of history answers the question of the objective laws of history and the meaning of history. Philosophy of history serves rational-logical science, which uses the conceptual-categorical apparatus of philosophy in the study of history. The philosophy of history in its broad sense is a theoretical and methodological reflection of world history. All this testifies to the heuristic significance of the philosophy of history, because only it is able to give a holistic view of the purpose, content and orientation of the historical process. The present is determined by the intersection of two global trends: the ecological crisis and the loss of authoritative sources of transcendence – ideals, principles and ethics that were once formulated religions and ideologies. Ecology and transcendence will be the main goal of comprehension the philosophy of history of our time.

SUMMARY

This essay offers an original approach to understanding the philosophy of history and its role in modern historical science. Today, in an age of globalization and fleeting historical changes, the philosophy of history becomes a necessary part of philosophical, historical and cultural studies. The working of ontological, axiological and especially epistemological aspects of the philosophy of history is necessary for solving the actual problems of the theory and methodology of history. The purpose of the essay is to discuss traditional methodological approaches and modern trends in the philosophy of history. Practicality and the leading role of the philosophy of history in historical knowledge come from historical, philosophical and interdisciplinary positions. Completed in an essay, the conceptualization of the basic ideas and approaches of the philosophy of history has a heuristic significance. The essay discusses the most significant theoretical and methodological stages of the development of the philosophy of history: the progressive philosophy of history, the philosophy of the history of Hegel and Marx, historicism, the positivist philosophy of history, the morphology of history, the theory of axial time,

the history of concepts, the theory of historical memory, the history of the body and the ecological philosophy of history.

REFERENCES

1. Assmann A. Cultural memory and Western civilization: Functions, media, archives. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011. 402 p.
2. Assmann J. Communicative and Cultural Memory // Cultural Memory Studies. An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook, Berlin, New York 2008, S. 109-118.
3. Balibar E. The Philosophy of Marx. London: Verso, 2007. 139 p.
4. Brumfitt J. H. Voltaire Historian. New York: Oxford University Press. 1958. 178 p.
5. Civilizations and World Systems: Studying World-Historical Change. Ed. by Stephen K. Sanderson. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press, 1995. 324 p.
6. Croce B. Theory & history of historiography. London: G. C. Harrap, 1921. 328 p.
7. Hamilton P. Historicism. New York: Routledge, 1996. 226 p.
8. Hegel G.W.F. The Philosophy of History. Kitchener: Batoche Books, 2001. 485 p.
9. Hutton P. H. History as an Art of Memory. Hanover, N.H.: UPNE, 1993. 229 p.
10. Kant's Political Theory: Interpretations and Applications by Elizabeth Ellis (ed.). University Park PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2012. 256 p.
11. Koselleck R. The Practice of Conceptual History. Timing History: Spacing Concepts. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002. 363 p.
12. Krieger L. Time's Reasons: Philosophies of History Old and New. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989. 209 p.
13. Roberts D., Murphy P. Dialectic of Romanticism: a Critique of Modernism. London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2004. 236 p.
14. Roetz H. Confucian Ethics of the Axial Age: A Reconstruction under the Aspect of the Breakthrough Toward Postconventional Thinking. 1993. 373 p.

15. Sanderson S. K. Evolutionism and its critics: deconstructing and reconstructing an evolutionary interpretation of human society. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers, 2007. 384 p.

16. Shreedharan E. Manual of historical research methodology. Trivandrum: Centre for South Indian Studies, 2007. 374 p.

17. Slaboch M. W. A road to nowhere: The idea of progress and its critics. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2018. 194 p.

18. Younkens E. W. Champions of a Free Society: Ideas of Capitalism's Philosophers and Economists. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2008. 392 p.

Information about the authors:

Kudrya I. G.

Doctor of Philosophy,

Associate professor of V. I. Vernadsky Tavria national University

Educational and Scientific Humanitarian Institute's

Chair of History

33, I. Kudri str., City of Kyiv, Ukraine