

## PHILOSOPHICAL SCIENCES

### TRANSFORMATION OF HISTORICAL CONSCIOUSNESS: MAIN STAGES

Olena Paradiuk<sup>1</sup>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-050-6-21>

Man's understanding of the necessity of time is the history of the phenomenon of time, its phenomenology and modernization. Thus, awareness of the past generates history as a recollection of the past, its understanding and historical consciousness. Historical consciousness has, conditionally speaking, three levels: a) primary (mythological, mythopoetic, ordinary), b) ideological (state) and c) scientific and philosophical [7, p. 236]. Ideological historicism is the semantic core of historical consciousness. It ensures the unity of society in time as the unity of the past – present – future. Its interaction with primary historicism is found, for example, in the concept of the divine-mystical origin of power. It is connected with a higher level – scientific and philosophical historicism – for example, through the rational concept of the social contract. Scientific and philosophical historicism provides a rational justification and reflectivity of historical consciousness, sets goals and summarizes historical experience.

In the process of transformation of historical consciousness, we can distinguish several stages: 1) mythological (primary or zero) historicism; 2) traditional historicism, corresponding to the historical consciousness of traditional society, 3) classical modernism of modern times, 4) neohistorism of the XX century and 5) post-historicism of the late XX – early XXI century [7, p. 240].

Let's dwell briefly on each of the selected stages. Mythological historicism is characterized by the fact that time is born and manifests itself in the mythological consciousness implicitly, it is structurally woven into the mythological narrative-narrative, but the prototype of history, historicity is already present here [3, p. 117–118]. A story as a sequential narrative of interrelated events has a structure of time filled with events, that is, fixed actions that assume the presence of both an observer and a narrator. However, it is not so much a story as a myth. The self-identification of the myth is carried out not so much through its content, but in the very act of telling, the unity of the story and the ritual that accompanies the story and is an integral part of it. The structure and function in the myth dominate the specific plot

---

<sup>1</sup> South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University named after K.D. Ushynsky, Ukraine

and character, exposing the «timelessness» of the myth. In mythological prehistory, there is no subject of action (hero), no form, no fixation, no evaluation of action, that is, acts that turn the action into a historical event.

Traditional historicism is dominated by the people's historical consciousness, which becomes and develops as overcoming the mythopoetic picture of the world, as its negation. There is an ideological historicism, which is based on mythological and religious worldview. Time, although it begins to think uniformly and objectively, is very slow. The stage of traditional historicism for the European historical consciousness makes sense to further divide, conditionally speaking, into epic, ancient and medieval periods.

In the epic period, the decomposition of mythological consciousness creates the conditions for the emergence of history itself: writing, the state, theoretical knowledge. The event of the past must be marked, recorded, that is, designed, recorded, placed in the system of public consciousness. In the epoch, the rudiments of temporal and historical consciousness are already being viewed [5] and, in fact, its foundations are being formed. However, the historical ideology of the first state formations is still religious and mythological in nature: not only power as an institution has a divine origin, but the ruler himself as its bearer and personification is a god (demigod) or a descendant of God. At the same time, the first peculiar concepts of historicism emerged [5].

The beginnings of rational historical consciousness, appearing in the period of ancient historicism, are associated primarily with the emergence and functioning of such an institution as the polis. Natural principles and laws are affirmed as the simplest socio-historical dependencies and connections recorded in the public consciousness. During this period of flourishing and the beginning of the decomposition of the classical polis, «History» appears – also in the sense of «research», «science» – Herodotus, who opens a new genre of narration, characterized by special attention to facts, but rather chaotic [4, p. 18–26]. Already Thucydides rejects religious-mythological explanations in history, because, from his point of view, social existence in time is created by people, and human nature is unchanged. In the works of Roman historians, a global imperial worldview appears – Pax Romana. Their methodological principles remained the same as those of the Greeks: there is almost no critique of sources, and the unchanging human nature still serves as the basis for the historical explanation.

The medieval theocentric monotheistic worldview defines the transcendent dimension of history, constantly comparing it as temporal duration with divine eternity. Due to this, the historical consciousness is seriously modified: already in the works of Augustine there is an abstract-philosophical explanation and generalization of facts, the cyclical historical time of antiquity

becomes linear, global chronology and periodization are formulated [4, p. 49–56]. The resurrection of mysticism and providentialism and the accompanying degradation of science became a kind of payment for modernization.

The formation of classical historicism begins with the elimination of the sacred-mystical basis of history in the Renaissance and Enlightenment. On the one hand, Renaissance humanists and later educators returned to understanding history as the result of the work of great men. On the other hand, socio-historical criticism appears and develops, supported by the practice of critical analysis of sources. It was the critique of sources that gave historical research its scientific status. The idea of the progress of human nature and reason dominates. It is the basis of history and its rational interpretations. The most important phenomena of the New Age were the Hegelian and Marxist systems of philosophy of history, as well as the studies of French and German historians of the nineteenth century. History was presented as a single process of social development, the essence of which lies in itself. However, the prevailing in the second half of the XIX century. positivist methodology fundamentally abandoned both the search for such a basis («essence») of history, and any form of its construction [6, p. 122–128]. Therefore, the unity of history was ensured by quite traditional methods: through understanding it as a sequence of events and facts. The so-called «crisis of events» was formed [6, p. 114–130].

Overcoming this crisis occurred at a new stage in the transformation of historicism. This is the beginning of the destruction of classical historical consciousness and its transformation into non-classical. This modernization was primarily related to the School of Annals, which radically posed problems of historical synthesis and mentality in history. History is understood not as a chain of events, but as a set of problems, so, first, the historian must operate with historical structures and wholes, and the studied epoch must be considered in the context of all factors. The historian begins with a study of the environment, the conditions in which people lived, the means of communication, the state of technology, population density, life expectancy, etc., and ends with the study of art, philosophy and politics. The systemic unity of different levels and layers of history is ensured by mentality – a universal link between social and spiritual history. An important research tool is the analysis of the language of sources, changes in the meanings of words, semantic shifts [2, p. 60–62]. It is impossible to leave the limits of one's mental culture. The historian in search of this conditionality, thus, comes to objectivity in the knowledge of history.

The emergence of posthistorism is closely linked to poststructuralism and postmodernism. Posthistorism abandons «great narratives» in favor of microhistory, partially continuing the tradition of twentieth-century

neohistorism. In this case, the work of the historian is closer to the work of the writer (narrator, narrator), and the story itself – with an anecdote in its traditional sense. The historical narrative becomes poetic and metaphorical, and in the long run even mythopoetic [1]. The problem of objectivity is not posed here as such, and cannot be posed, because the historical text becomes not a narrative of facts (although individual «proposals» may retain this feature and even be characterized in terms of the classical correspondent concept of truth), but a «story», which cannot and should not relate to any object and have an objective content. The historian does not so much describe the past («as it really was») as construct the semantic space of the text.

Thus, historical consciousness within its own transformation makes a kind of circle – from the classical myth it returns to the mythopoetic understanding of the past, from attempts to present the past as a real, albeit very peculiar, object to the metaphorical construction of the past in the present.

### References:

1. Ankersmit F. R. (2003) *Istoriya i tropologiya: vzlet i padeniye metafory* [History and Tropology: The Rise and Fall of Metaphor]. Moscow: Progress-Traditsiya. (in Russian)
2. Gurevich A. Ya. (1993) *Istoricheskiy sintez i Shkola «Annalov»* [Historical synthesis and School «Annals»]. Moscow: Indrik. (in Russian)
3. Kassirer E. (2002) *Filosofiya simvolicheskikh form: v. 3 t. T. 2. Mifologicheskoye myshleniye* [Philosophy of symbolic forms: in 3 vols., vol. 2, Mythological thinking]. Moscow: Universitetskaya kniga. (in Russian)
4. Kollingvud R. Dzh. (1980) *Ideya istorii. Avtobiografiya* [The idea of history, Autobiography]. Moscow: Nauka. (in Russian)
5. Losev A. F. (1977) *Antichnaya filosofiya istorii* [Ancient philosophy of history]. Moscow: Nauka. (in Russian)
6. Riker P. (2000) *Vremya i rasskaz* [Time and narrative]. Moscow: Universitetskaya kniga. (in Russian)
7. Schastlivtsev R. A. (2015) *Yevolyutsiya istorizma i formirovaniye istoricheskogo soznaniya* [Evolution of historicism and the formation of historical consciousness]. *Prepodavatel' XXI vek*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 235–241.