

## Some Aspects of the Etymology, Ontology and Genesis of the Methodologies of Historical Cognition

Olga Borysova\*

(Article sent on: 13.05.2019/ Article Accepted on: 02.07.2019)

### Abstract

The problems of the methodology of historic cognition have always been related to the most difficult and simultaneously the most interesting themes for historians and philosophers. The current period of the historic cognition development has been recognized by scholars as the epoch of crisis, the reason of which is the fallibility in the epistemological foundations of the two doctrines, which until now have determined the theoretical understanding of the historical process - positivism and historical materialism. And in order to overcome the crisis the historians need to make the search of new methodologies and methods of historical cognition more actively. In this paper the etymology, ontology and genesis of the main methodological approaches in historical cognition are researched on the basis of the analysis of the work of the historians, philosophers, social anthropologists, and others. Relatively to some important methodological problems, the author describes out her own vision and makes the conclusion that the anthropological approach is the latest methodological approach to the cognition of history. It does not go beyond the outlet of the old scientific paradigm, so it can not provide the principle of historicism of exit out of the state of crisis. And she draws attention to the fact Here is caution required that philosophers and historians focus on the problems of time, including historical, whereas paying little attention to the problems of space. In this plane, basing on interdisciplinism, as the author supposes, there have to appear a new discovery of the world importance, which will change the old paradigm of science in general, and historical in particular. At the same time, the author warns against haste in the matter of changing the world-view principle of anthropocentrism to anthropomorphism, in the way as some modern physicists are appeal to.

**Keywords:** history, philosophy, methodology, paradigm, historicism, positivism, thinking, historical thinking

---

\* Doctor of Science (History), Professor, Head of Department for Historical & Philosophic Subjects at Luhansk National Agrarian university (resettled to Kharkiv), [utraesus@ukr.net](mailto:utraesus@ukr.net).

**Actuality of the theme.** The problems of the methodology of historical cognition have always been related to the most difficult and simultaneously to the most interesting themes for the historians and philosophers. After all, modern anthropology, by A. Portman's state, that the presence of spatio-temporal representations precisely distinguishes the individual from the world of animals [14, p. 203], historical consciousness is precisely based on the axis of spatio-temporal coordinates, so it is the main thing that distinguishes the man from animals, which have no history, as well as no culture. It is clear that the study of the problems of the methodology of historical cognition has both general scientific and great humanitarian importance.

**The state of the scientific development of the theme.** M. Block [2], A. J. Toynbee [32], R. J. Collingwood [17], F. Braudel [See. 15], K. Popper [29], M.A. Barg [1], B.M. Kedrov [16], S.M. Krymsky [20], M. Braichevsky [See. 10] and others made their efforts to study the problems of the methodology of historical cognition. V.I. Vernadsky and T. Kuhn's works in the methodology of science did not lose their importance [13; 22]. Nevertheless, the current period of the development of historical cognition is recognized by the scholars as the epoch of crisis [30], the main reason of it was carried the fallibility in the gnosiological foundations of the two doctrines, which until now have determined the theoretical understanding of the historical process – positivism and the historical materialism. So all the works which is written within these doctrines are important, but they bear the crisis footprint, so to find the way out of it the historians need to search for the new methodologies and methods of historical cognition actively.

**The purpose of the article:** to show the genesis of the main methodological approaches in historical cognition.

What is the methodology in historical cognition? The researchers often correlate to the methodology only the set of

methods of historical cognition. This is not an error, but it is not correct. Approaches and their practical application is a research method. The methodology is a much wider and much more intensional concept. **The methodology of historical cognition** it is the general laws and their demonstration in the historical process, the theory of the historical process, the mainest concepts of history, the principles and methods of historical cognition (as we can see, the methods appear in the definition of the methodology at the very end). The development of cognition lies not only in the construction of a complex system of logical thinking (Analytical Method. Non), but also in the processing and qualitative improvement of the foundations on which this system is based (the Synthetic Method, Sic). And than larger area which the figure of the logical foundation describes, than more perfect the process of cognition itself is. The *paradigms of the historical process* develop particularly in this plane. It is impossible to radically change the methodology without changing the paradigm. The paradigm is based on the following foundations:

1) *latent picture of the world* (disciplinary matrix, by T. Kun, or geshtalt). It has on the base the whole space– it is the time. On the base of the position that spatio-temporal representations are based on the idea of the shape of the planet, we could carried out, that the thought of mankind against the shape of the planet was completely natural. It is corresponding to the genesis of the Platonic bodies in the embryo, and particularly there was alternation of forms of *sphere and cube* in it. This corresponds to the main periods in the history of mankind and its science as follows: Antiquity (sphere) → Middle Ages (cube or square) → New time (sphere - from the time of Copernicus) → Modernity (icododecahedron, with the tendency toward the “star tetrahedron” da Vinci, that is a cube form). Relatively, the latent picture of the world was changing, and with it the paradigm of the historical process did [4, p. 44 - 45];

2) *the principle of cognition*. This position is very important for cognition in general and to historical in particular. Here we have the picture: Antiquity - the struggle of anthropomorphism with anthropocentrism → Middle Ages - the victory and domination of anthropomorphism → New time - the victory of anthropocentrism and its domination until our time.

Nowadays, the modern natural science tries to intervene into the field of humanities in order to change the principle of anthropocentrism to anthropomorphism. Based on the latest Physics achievements, the philosophical theory of eonosophy was created [See: 27]. But it has not come into historical science, The paradigm of the history understanding remains old, although the latent picture of the world is already changing, because in academic anthropology the concept "Space" has come since the 1920's, and the man is increasingly seen as a space phenomenon [35]. However, because of the unchanging principle of cognition, historical science continues to be present in the frame of old paradigm. But the principle and the method are exceptionally important things that can undermine even the picture of the world and with it the whole understanding of the history. In historical science there is own principle of cognition - the principle of historicism. Here we agree with M. A Barg that the type of historicism is as objectively given to the historian as the type of culture is given to the contemporary of this era [1, p. 24]. Historians paid more attention to the changes of historicism in time and developed its time typology. And with the study of the spatio factor in science there is a problem [19], which also affects his study in the genesis of historicism;

3) *in the paradigm of the historical process, the basic idea has the concept about space and time*. In our study [4], we have proved that the "reflectivity" of thought (so to say "mesh" of thought) in ideas about time is the main sign of the birth of a new paradigm of history in the past. Today it is not enough.-

scientists do a lot of work, but this does not give a result (a new paradigm), therefore, logically, *it is necessary to “turn” the idea about space.*

Obviously, the development of historical cognition is closely connected with the development of the man thinking itself. Philosopher. Yu. Rothenfeld states that during the thought evolution, there were three stages. The difference between them lies in the use of different categories of concepts. These are *classification (qualitative), comparative and quantitative (metrological)* concepts [DOC.: 31]. Clarifying Rothenfeld, we propose the following scheme of genesis forms of human thinking: -

*philological* thinking (with its two kinds / degrees / - mythological and literary). This includes all mythology and religion, as well as ancient philology. The foundation is to operate of classifying (qualitative) concepts. It is, so to say, “love to the word”;

- *philosophical* (emerged as a philological opposition in the Antiquity time). Foundation – using the comparative concepts. This is “love of a wise word” These two types of thinking are the types of thinking of the ancient man. Let's contrast them with the forms of historical cognition. A *pragmatic* historiographic tradition arose (from the Aristotelian mimesis theory) on the basis of the first type in the time of Antiquity; and on the basis of the second - *paradigmatic* type (is stretching from Sokrat and his disciple Ephora). They are existing all the time, only in one or another period, and in one or another culture dominates one or another.

And from the XVIII century has being developed a new type - *scientific* thinking. The foundation is to use of quantitative concepts. This is “love for the exact word”. But today this is applied only to the exact sciences. All other sciences operate with all the set of above-mentioned concepts, in condition of the

predominance of quantitative ones. Consequently, the process of development of scientific thinking of the mankind is still ongoing. From the same XVIII century in the historical science of the genesis of the pragmatic historiographical tradition gave us a *civilizational* model of history (from G. Rickert), and the genesis of the paradigmatic –gave *formational* (from K. Marx and F. Engels). As we can see, new historical thinking corresponds to the new form of thinking, and, consequently the new methodology of historical cognition. But today both the doctrines, which determined the theoretical understanding of historical development - positivism and historical materialism, proved their insufficiency, as we noted above.

In general, in the historical cognition of the mankind is distinguished THREE methodological approaches of the consideration of the historical process: 1) traditional, classical; 2) non-classical, associated with the disclosure of the non-linear course of history; 3) anthropological (modern).

**I. Traditional methodological approach, or linear.** In it, the history is considered in the traditions of the Enlightenment, and not so much in the traditional educational sense, but in the style of the Frankfurt school T. Adorno and M. Gorkimer. Linear approach to the history also passes through all Middle Ages . In the form of different Theories the progress has come to our day. Another model of history - *cyclic* - arose even in the times of ancient cultivation civilizations, It received a philosophical interpretation in Ancient Greece (Plato, Stoics). The materialist conception of history with its five socio-economic formations became the quintessence of the linear model of history. The cyclical model of history after the collapse of the ancient world goes back to the background, but becomes alive again - in the Arabs at the end of the XIV century. (Ibn Khaldun), among the Europeans there are the Renaissance thinkers and their ideological followers. And later after the crisis of

progressiveness, in M. Danilevsky, K. Leontiev, F. Nietzsche and O. Spengler. Regarding the modern approaches of Western historians, it must be said that the civilization model of history inherent in them is the demonstration of the same ancient pragmatic of historiographical tradition. However, in general, it fits into a linear approach to the study of history [34, p. 25]. The principle of historicism does not stand still, it is developing (M. Barg, I. Boychenko [3] wrote about it). History has already passed two stages of development - practical (from the myth as a type of history to the times of J.Vico, XVI century.) And theoretical (from J.Vico to this day). Each stage was completed by a crisis, and the current state of the crisis in the methodology of the history testifies that historicism is coming into the new stage of its development. It is no coincidence that the so-called "Radicalized historicism", as pointed out by the representatives of historical anthropology. Radicalism is the first sign of crises. And, accordingly, there are objective processes of development of scientific thought and, hopefully, we will see the result soon.

**II. Nonlinear approach.** This approach is opposed to the traditional, it was emerged as its opposition, so this is still connected with it (the paradigm is the same, and this is its binary oppositions). Origins of it are in romanticism (first of all, in Schelling). This approach proved the inability of the educational interpretation of the laws of the history as the laws of intellect. This is especially noticeable in J. Michelet. K. Marx had the features of nonlinearity - it is his "Asian method of production", which did not fit into any of the five socio-economic formations, testified to the existence of nonlinearity in Marx's History understanding. The modern stage of non-linear comprehension of history is a *synergistic approach*. From the list of philosophers from the past G. Leibniz was the closest to such understanding of the structure of the existence in the aspect of its dynamics. In the recent decades, the synergetic concept of the Brussels School I. Prigogine describes the transformation of systems in

the categories of probability and chance. Synergetics gave the opportunity to see the order in a such complicated macrosystem as a society, however the order is not static, but one which is realized through social fluctuations, points of the spontaneous selection, bifurcation [26, p. 12 -17]. We could notice that this is, in principle, nothing other but a *pulsation* that will bind synergy to the next approach in the development of historical cognition.

**III. Anthropological approach.** “Anthropologization” is the leading trend in the development of the all world science now. In historical science, this trend is demonstrated as a process of transformation from the historical description of socio-economic or political-state systems into the *history of a man*. Sciences’ attention is attracted more and more the subject of the study of the “School of the Annals”, which gave out of itself to the world “the master of time and space” F. Braudel [11], or “new” school Annals “etc. A.Jacques Le Hoff [23] generally became the founder of socio-historical anthropology. They can say that in the West the history, as history itself, disappears, it is transforming into historical, social, socio-historical anthropology.

The anthropological approach developed in the linear bosom and being genetically linked with it came out of this as its opposition. But the fact, which the anthropological approach is placed on the top of the corner of the history, is also not something new . About human centerism, as the history regularity, wrote Epipurius, stoics, sophists, Socrates, Cicero, Seneca, B. Pascal, G. Skovoroda. And about the important role of self-cognition and self-realization of man in history, wrote Augustine, Pelagius, all Medieval historiosophy, Leibniz, Shaftesbury et al. We also involve the modern “quantum psycho-history” of the Ukrainian historian V.A. Morgun to this methodological approach. He compared the cycles of *pulsation* (see above about synergy) of all individuals of the space and



made an attempt to give the definition of “man” - it is “an individual combination of waves of space-time” [24, p. 204]. Quantum psycho-history itself is based on physical cycles [25], and gives the opportunity to calculate the cycles of global change in human society. Its main cycle is 405 years. We supplemented it with the allocation of the small cycle, where the visible cycle of the science development is- 40 years [4, p. 350]. Dokuchaev, as well as Maximov, Voyloshnikov and others who were criticized in the USSR for "geographic determinism" payed their attention to this. The interest in research of a systemic nature grows in the “hot” 40 years, and in the “cold” periods, the preference is given to applied research. It is the doctrine that emphasizes the dominant role of the man in the biosphere. Consequently, the anthropologization of modern science is the latest flash of the “cold cycle” of the climate, which was ended with the twentieth century.

Therefore, this methodological approach of historical cognition should be recognized as one which is existed within the old paradigm of the historical process. So, it is the time – for emergence of a new methodological approach, because in the yard – it is obvious warming of the climate. In the historical science, such approach, according to our belief, will lie in the plane: 1) the change of the principle; 2) the change of method; 3) the change of the conception about space dimensionality.

As a result, there is the change of the world picture (disciplinary matrix), that is, the *geshtalt* switching. But before all, there have to be a new discovery of the fundamental importance, which is the base of a new scientific paradigm at all the times. Just after that there will appear a new scientific paradigm in general and the historical process in particular. And here we draw our attention to the fact that V. Morgun highlighted the *western type of thinking* - rational-individualistic, visual, cold, violet, based on the effect of compression (Doppler

effect); and eastern - sensory-collectivist, auditory, warm, infrared, based on the effect of expansion (Antidoplestor effect). He is not alone, V. Kudryavtseva is also expressed such views [21], and O. Panarin imposes it on the civilization map of the world [28]. But all this is just a statement of the general characteristics. The spatial division of the types of thinking into “western” and “eastern” is important, but it is not absolute. Scientists have long seen two types of thinking in science – “Aristotelian” and “Platonic”. The first can be compared with the Western type of thinking (left-hemisphere) determined by B. Morgun, and the second one with the “Eastern” (right-hemisphere). Most of the scientists now belong to the “Aristotelian” type of thinking. But for the development of science, both types of thinking are needed. In addition, it should be noted that as Platon as Aristotle belonged to similar spatial and temporal range, and to one culture. Therefore, the concept of “western” and “eastern” types of thinking do not belong to simple geography, but reproduce different, and even opposing trends in the development of a particular culture, as well as the science (which is objective, because the binary characterise the plasma of consciousness [ Report: 12]). And here it would be appropriate to tell (using the well-known metaphor , which dating back to Tertullian, and used it by the “Ukrainian Toynbee” Yu Pavlenko,) that two dimensions of the perception of history - one internal, which belongs to “Jerusalem” and the second, external, which belongs to- “Athens” were historically formed. In the first dimension there are people with “Platonic” type of thinking, and in the second one - with “Aristotelian”.

Today, everything in science is spinning around the main ideological principle, therefore, historicism as a principle of historical cognition can not go out of a state of crisis. So far, anthropocentrism is a “sacred cow”, which historians are daring to touch (“meta-history” must be remembered), but very cautious. We will say that if the definition “Space” is already in

science valid for a long time, and, if we say “A”, we must go to “Z”, it means to make it the object of science. It will be necessary to identify its structures, to define them and to establish how it affects humanity. We are convinced that person who does it will become new Copernicus.

And in this connection, (as well as to actualize the problem of space in the methodology not only of historical cognition, but also the science in general,) we draw attention to the fact that in the medieval Muslim world, the theory of “seven climates” (al-akalim, in arab), that goes back to Eratosthenes, became the methodological basis of all cosmographic Arabic works. Arabs do not pay great attention to it. I. Konovalova analyzes the Round Map of al-Idrisi (1154), where clearly see the separation of planet in seven climates: “The separation of maps in climates and sections is done by al-Idrisi only mechanically and has nothing common with definition of geographical latitude and longitude” [18, p. 45]. Modern scholars do not know what al-akalim is. It is believed that those are just the simple geographic zones of the planet, and their free separation, as well as the difference in old maps with modern one in reproduction of the geography of the planet, is the disadvantage of ancient geographic knowledge. However, the Arabs used different terms about the concepts: “the face of the planet” (its own appearance), “the image of the planet” (its representation) and “the picture of the Earth” (map), therefore they believed that this is not the same thing. At the same time, the “picture of the Earth” they described in the space of “seven climates”. And the Byzantine Greeks, in which the Arabs borrowed this methodology, the term “seven climates of the universe” is existed [33, p. 129], however is not investigated at all.

Take the classical definition of the "Iklim" ("climate") by Yakut al-Hamavi: "The I climate was named like this, because it was "cut off" from the land that borders it"[36, I, s. 41].

Consequently, the climate is a portion, and it is from the Earth. So how can this be its simple geographic area? This is something else. We were paying attention to this problem, have expressed our thoughts on it [4, p. 180 - 188; 5; 6; 7; 9]. And for its actualization, we submit Yakuta: "... And this inhabited part [is] between the equator and the North Pole. It is divided into seven climates, about the form definition (opt. qualities, image, nature) of which they argue, as we will talk about it [below]. People argue about the idea whether the seven climates are both in the North and in the South, or only in the North, without the South? Hermes states that there are seven climates in the South as well as in the North. But they say that this statement can not be relied on because of lack of evidence. Most state that seven climates [are] only in the North because of the fact that there are many population, and in the South it is too small [for division into climates], so only to the North is divided into the climate "[36, I, p. 41]. It is evident that to the Earth geography al-akalim has an approximate attitude, because their formation depends on the presence of people in the locality. So today, without proper definition of the concept of "climate" and the study of what we were wanted to be said about it by ancient scientists (and this is the scope of work of historians), this problem can not be solved.

And here we note one remarkable moment: we discovered unique coincidences in describing by Augustine and Ibn Tufayl of one phenomenal event [8]. What's interesting: Augustine described, according to him, "time", and Ibn Tufayl described that can be called "internal space". Modern valeologists call it "light", however optical physics calls it - a holographic paradigm. Perhaps here we come to the topic of "climates"? As you can see, there is already an interesting topic for interdisciplinary research.

**Conclusion.** We are confident that interdisciplinarity is an urgent need of the present time, because all the most recent significant scientific discoveries have been made precisely at the junction of the sciences. We are convinced that the historic science will not be an exception to this. At the same time, we can not but note, the scientists should not to hurry with the change of the philosophical principle of anthropocentrism to anthropomorphism just in connection with the advent of new discoveries in the field of physics of the latest philosophical theories (the same eonosphere). Here is caution required. Physicists, in our opinion, are too naive both in terms of religious consciousness and in their relation to religion, and they make here many mistakes., It is, of course, necessary to study and use old, but Marx's statement: "The Dead Grabs Alive" it is impossible to ignore too. Until the scientists have developed at least the foundations of science about the "Space" and their effects on humanity (and effects can be both positive and negative), it is impossible to refuse anthropocentrism. There is a risk to get in the no less dependency than it was before and from which humanity was separated 99,000 and 800 years from its 100,000-year-long presence on the planet. This dependence, we emphasize, was overcome only with the beginning of the development in human the scientific thinking. The fact that Teilhard de Chardin called "living Psyche" (and Goethe called das Dāmonische, returning positive, inherent to the times of Antiquity, understanding) –is a very ambiguous phenomenon and very totalitarian. And although this is a separate topic, it is also worth to draw our attention to it.

## ЛІТЕРАТУРА

Барг М. А. Эпохи и идеи. Становление историзма / М. А. Барг. М.: Мысль, 1987. 348 с.

Блок М. Апология истории или Ремесло историка / М. Блок / Пер. Е. М. Лысенко. М.: Наука, 1986. 254 с.



- Бойченко І. Філософія історії: підручник / І. Бойченко. К.: Знання, 2000. 723 с.
- Борисова О. В. Генеза наукової парадигми історичного процесу в середні віки (V – XV ст.) : монографія / О. В. Борисова. Луганськ: Альма-матер, 2005. 456 с.
- Борисова О. В. Земля в просторі «семи кліматів» у ал-Хварізмі (IX ст.) / О. В. Борисова // Історичні записки: Збірник наукових праць. Вип.7. Луганськ: Видавництво СНУ ім. В.Даля, 2005. С. 216 – 222.
- Борисова О. В. К вопросу о синтезе истории и естествознания в генезисе научной мысли (постановка проблемы) / О. В. Борисова // Матеріали III Міжнародної наук.-метод. конференції «Безпека. Здоров'я. Реабілітація». Вип. III. Луганськ: Знання, 2005. С. 27 – 33.
- Борисова О.В. Проблема історіософії та філософії геопростору (геософії) в етногенезі України / О. В. Борисова // Історія української науки на межі тисячоліть: Збірник наукових праць / Відп. ред. О. Я. Пилипчук. Київ, 2005. С. 42 – 48.
- Борисова О. В. Проблема часу і простору у Аврелія Августина й Ібн Туфейля: співпадаючий аспект / О. В. Борисова // Історичні записки. Збірник наукових праць. – Вип. 2. Луганськ: Видавництво СНУ ім. В.Даля, 2004. С. 23 – 29.
- Борисова О. В. Цей дивний феномен ал-акаліму (Klimata) / О. В. Борисова // Вісник Луганського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка, 2005. №.14. С. 139 – 146.
- Брайчевський С. М. Імплікативна філософія Михайла Брайчевського / С. М. Брайчевський // Національний університет «Києво-Могилянська академія». Наукові записки, 2002. Т. 20. С. 71 – 75.
- Бродель Ф. Матеріальна цивілізація, економіка и капитализм. XV – XVIII вв. (В 3-х тт.) / Ф. Бродель / Пер. с фр. М. Е. Куббеля. М.: Прогресс, 1988.
- Вашкевич Н. Н. Системные языки мозга / Н. Н. Вашкевич. – 2-е изд. М.: Белье альвы, 2002. 400 с.
- Вернадский В. И. Научная мысль как планетарное явление / В. И. Вернадский. М.: Наука, 1991. 271 с.
- Головко Б. А. Філософська антропологія: навч. посібник / Б. А. Головко. К.: ІЗМН, 1997. 240 с..
- Грабски А. Ф. Фернан Бродель, вопросы методологии истории / А. Ф. Грабски // Новая и новейшая история, 1990. № 5. С. 194 – 201.
- Кедров Б. М. Проблемы логики и методологии науки / Б. М. Кедров. М.: Наука, 1990. 352 с.
- Коллингвуд Р. Дж. Идея истории: Автобиография / Р. Дж. Коллингвуд / Пер. и комм. Ю.А.Асеева. М.: Наука, 1980. 485 с.

- Коновалова И. Г. Восточная Европа в сочинении ал-Идриси / И. Г. Коновалова. М.: «Восточная литература» РАН., 1999. 254 с.
- Кононов И. Ф. Проблема пространства в социологии / И. Ф. Кононов // Вісник Харківського національного ун-ту ім. В. Н. Каразіна, 2004. № 621. С. 20 – 26.
- Крымский С. Б. Метаисторические ракурсы философии истории / С. Б. Крымский // Вопросы философии, 2001. № 6. С. 32 – 51.
- Кудрявцева В. И. Начала космономии / В. И. Кудрявцева. Мн.: Бестпринт, 2001. 144 с.
- Кун Т. Структура научных революций / Т. Кун / Пер с англ. И.Е. Валетова. М.: Прогресс, 1975. 287 с.
- Ле Гофф, Жак. Цивилизация средневекового Запада / Ж. Ле Гофф / Пер. с фр., послесл. А. Я. Гуревича. Сретенск: Межконф. центр историко-философ. исследований Толедо, 2000. 370 с.
- Моргун В. А. Громадянське суспільство в контексті типології психоісторії людства / В. А. Моргун // Наука. Релігія. Суспільство. Донецьк, 2003. №1. С. 171 – 212.
- Моргун В. А. Традиційні та сучасні засади космометрії (у контексті відкриття періодичної системи пульсації Космосу – природи, суспільства, людини) / В. А. Моргун // Искусственный интеллект. Донецк, 2003. №4. С. 511 – 569.
- Павленко Ю. В. История мировой цивилизации. Философский анализ / Ю. В. Павленко. – 2-е изд. К.: Феникс, 2004. 760 с.
- Палюшев Б. Физика Бога 2: Пограничные пространства / Б. Палюшев. Пер. с болг. Воздвиженской Т. М.: АСТ, Астрель, 2003. 318 с.
- Панарин А. С. Двуполушарная структура мира: переосмысление дихотомии «Восток – Запад» / А. С. Панарин // Восток, 1998. № 2. С. 26 – 33.
- Поппер К. Р. Ницета историзма / К. Р. Поппер / Пер. с англ. // Философская и социологическая мысль, 1990. № 10. С. 63 – 74.
- Реєнт О. П. Криза сучасної історичної науки: [Методологічний і джерелознавчий аспект] / О. П. Реєнт // Історія України. 1999. № 13. С. 1 – 4.
- Ротенфельд Ю. А. Философия или Тень мудрости. Альтернативное толкование греческой философии / Ю. А. Ротенфельд. М.: Издательские решения, 2017. 184 с.
- Тойнбі А. Дж. Дослідження історії. – ТТ. I, II / А. Дж. Тойнбі / Пер з англ. М.: Основи, 1995. 613 с.; 400 с.
- Феофилакт Симокатта. История / Симокатта Феофилакт. М.: Изд-во АН СССР, 1957. 222 с.

Феллер В. Введение в историческую антропологию: Опыт решения логической проблемы философии истории / В. Феллер. М.: КНОРУС, 2005. 608 с.

Человек как космический феномен: новые гуманитарные и естественнонаучные подходы / Международный сб. исслед. работ. Вып. IV – V. Ижевск: Изд-во Удмуртского ун-та, 1999. 124 с.

معجم البلدان لياقوت الحموي الجزء الاول-القاهرة- ١٩٩٠- ٣٩٨ص

## Bibliography

Barh M. A. Эпоху у ыдеу. Stanovlenye ystoryzma / M. A. Barh. М.: Мысль, 1987. 348 с.

Blok M. Apolohyya ystorry yly Remeslo ystoryka / M. Blok / Per. E. M. Lysenko. М.: Nauka, 1986. 254 с.

Bojchenko I. Filosofiya istoriyi: pidruchnyk / I. Bojchenko. К.: Znannya, 2000. 723 с.

Borysova O. V. Geneza naukovoyi paradyhmy istorychnoho procesu v seredni viky (V – XV st.) : monohrafiya / O. V. Borysova. Luhans'k: Al'ma-mater, 2005. 456 с.

Borysova O. V. Zemlya v prostori «semy klimativ» u al-Xvarizmi (IX st.) O. V. Borysova // Istorychni zapysky: Zbirnyk naukovyx prac". Vyp.7. Luhans'k: Vydavnyctvo SNU im. V.Dalya, 2005. S. 216 – 222.

Borysova O. V. K voprosu o synteze ystorry y estestvoznannya v henezyse nauchnoj mysly (postanovka problemy) / O. V. Borysova // Materialy III Mizhnarodnoyinauk.-metod. konferenciyi «Bezpeka. Zdorov'ya. Reabilitaciya». Vyp. III. Luhans'k: Znannya, 2005. S. 27 – 33.

7. Borysova O.V. Problema istoriosofiyi ta filosofiyi heoprostoru (heosofiyi) v etnohenezi Ukrayiny / O. V. Borysova // Istoryiya ukrayins'koyi nauky na mezhi tysyacholit": Zbirnyk naukovyx prac" / Vidp. red. O. Ya. Pylpchuk. Kyiv, 2005. S. 42 – 48.

Borysova O. V. Problemachasu i prostoru u Avreliya Avhustyna j Ibn Tufejlya: spivpadayuchyj aspekt / O. V. Borysova // Istorychni zapysky. Zbirnyk naukovyx prac". – Vyp. 2. Luhans'k: Vydavnyctvo SNU im. V.Dalya, 2004. S. 23 – 29.

Borysova O. V. Cej dyvnyj fenomen al-akalimu (Klimata) / O. V. Borysova // Visnyk Luhans'koho nacional'noho universytetu imeni Tarasa Shevchenka, 2005. №.14. S. 139 – 146.



Brajchevs"kyj S. M. Implikatyvna filosofiya Myxajla Brajchevs"koho / S. M. Brajchevs"kyj // Nacional"nyjuniversytet «Kyvevo-Mohylyans"ka akademiya». Naukovi zapysky, 2002. T. 20. S. 71 – 75.

Brodel" F. Materyal'naya cyvylyzacyya, ekonomyka y kapytalyzm. XV – XVIII vv. (V 3-x tt.) / F. Brodel" / Per. s fr. M. E. Kubbelya. M.: Prohress, 1988. – 623 s.

Vashkevych N. N. Systemnye yazyky mozha / N. N. Vashkevych. – 2-e yzd. M.: Belyeal"vy, 2002. 400 s.

Vernadskij V. Y. Nauchnaya mysl" kak planetarnoe yavlenye / V. Y. Vernadskij. M.: Nauka, 1991. 271 s.

Holovko B. A. Filososfs"ka antropolohiya: Navch. posibnyk / B. A. Holovko. K.: IZMN, 1997. 240 s..

Hrabsky A. F. Fernan Brodel", voprosy metodolohy yystoryy / A. F. Hrabsky // Novaya y novejshaya ystoryya, 1990. № 5. S. 194 – 201.

Kedrov B. M. Problemy lohyky y metodolohyy nauky / B. M. Kedrov. M.: Nauka, 1990. 352 s.

Kollynhvud R. Dzh. Ydeya ystoryy: Avtobyohrafiya / R. Dzh. Kollynhvud / Per. y komm. Yu.A.Aseeva. M.: Nauka, 1980. 485 s.

Konovalova Y. H. Vostochnaya Evropa v sochynenyi al-Ydrysy / Y. H. Konovalova. M.: «Vostochnayaliteratura» RAN., 1999. 254 s.

Kononov Y. F. Problema prostranstva v socyolohyy / Y. F. Kononov // Visnyk Xarkivs"koho nacional"noho un-tu im. V. N. Karazina, 2004. № 621. S. 20 – 26.

Krymskyj S. B. Metaystorycheskiye rakursy fylosofyy ystoryy / S. B. Krymskyj // Voprosyfylosofyy, 2001. № 6. S. 32 – 51.

Kudryavceva V. Y. Nachala kosmonomyy / V. Y. Kudryavceva. Mn.: Bestprynt, 2001. 144 s.

Kun T. Struktura nauchnykh revolyucyj / T. Kun / Per s anhl. Y.E. Valetova. M.: Prohress, 1975. 287 s.

LeHoff, Zhak. Cyvylyzacyya srednevekovoho Zapada / Zh. LeHoff / Per. s fr., poslesl. A. Ya. Hurevycha. Sretensk: Mezkhkonfess. centrystoryko-fylosof. yssledovanyjToledo, 2000. 370 s.

Morhun V. A. Hromadyans"ke suspil"stvo v konteksti typolohiyi psyxoistoriyi lyudstva / V. A. Morhun // Nauka. Relihiya. Suspil"stvo. Donec"k, 2003. №1. S. 171 – 212.

Morhun V. A. Tradycijni ta suchasni zasady kosmometriyi (u konteksti vidkryttya periodychnoyi systemypul"saciyi Kosmosu – pryrody, suspil"stva, lyudyny) / V. A. Morhun // Yskusstvennyj yntellekt. Doneck, 2003. №4. S. 511 – 569.

PavlenkoYu. V. Ystoryya myrovoj cyvylyzacyy. Fylosofskij analiz / Yu. V. Pavlenko. – 2-e yzd. K.: Fenyks, 2004. 760 s.

Palyushev B. Fyzyka Boha 2: Pohranychnye prostranstva / B. Palyushev. Per. s bolh. Vozdvyzhenskoj T. M.: AST, Astrel, 2003. 318 s.

Panaryn A. S. Dvupolusharnaya struktura myra: pereosmyslenye dyxotomy «Vostok – Zapad» / A. S. Panaryn // Vostok, 1998. № 2. S. 26 – 33.

Popper K. R. Nyshheta ystoryzma / K. R. Popper / Per. s anhl. // Fylosofskaya y socyolohycheskaya mysl", 1990. № 10. S. 63 – 74.

Reyent O. P. Kryza suchasnoyi istorychnoyi nauky: [Metodolohichnyj i dzhereloznavchyj aspekt] / O. P. Reyent // IstoryiaUkrayiny. 1999. № 13. S. 1 – 4.

Rotenfel"dYu. A. Fylosofyyayly Ten" mudrosty. Al"ternatyvnoe tolkovanye hrecheshko jfylosofyy / Yu. A. Rotenfel"d. M.: Yzdatel"skyereshenyya, 2017. 184 s.

Tojnbi A. Dzh. Doslidzhennya istoriyi. – TT. I, II / A. Dzh. Tojnbi / Per z anhl. M.: Osnovy, 1995. 613 s.; 400 s.

Feofylakt Symokatta. Ystoryya / Symokatta Feofylakt. M.: Yzd-vo AN SSSR, 1957. 222 s.

Feller V. Vvedenye v ystorycheskuyu antropolohyyu: Opyt reshenyya lohycheshkoj problemyf ylosofyy ystoryy / V. Feller. M.: KNORUS, 2005. 608 s.

Chelovek kak kosmycheskyj fenomen: novye humanytarnye y estestvennonauchnye podhody / Mezhdunarodnyj sb. yssled. rabot. Vyp. IV – V. Yzhevsk: Yzd-voUdmurtskohoun-ta, 1999. 124 s.

معجم البلدان لياقوت الحموي الجزء الاول-القاهرة- ١٩٩٠- ٣٩٨ص