

HISTORICISM AS A HERMENEUTIC ORIENTED APPROACH TO A HISTORY

¹ Zh.K. Rystan, ² A.O. Tursynbayeva

ABSTRACT

In this article, we are trying to grasp the role of historicism in the understanding of epistemology in the late of XX century. From Bacon to enlightenment, it has been understood that the only criterion of science based on natural sciences. The extent of science has also been determined as study according to the method of the natural sciences, therefore the sciences concerned with history and society has also determined according to method of the natural sciences. In this article authors aims to introduce to movement called Historicism. Which is emerged in XIX century as a critical viewpoint against classical approach to the science. Most influential figure of this movement was German thinker Wilhelm Dilthey. Dilthey had an anti-positivist attitude towards the established methodology by natural science. Which was saying that in order to be a science every researcher must have rigorous set of rules and their research must based on experiment results, observable facts, and objective evidence. Starting from Dilthey and with help of other philosophical schools new movement called historicism starts its journey to establishing new methodology to human and social science. And this movement made a classification of science. They divided science into natural and spiritual science. Each of science has its own methods and object of study. They believed that to social and human study we cannot apply natural science methods of research due to it is not a physical or biological subject but it is social life and human destiny and history. Considering this process of change, is it possible to talk about historicism as a contemporary epistemological approach? As a methodology, can we talk about history in the separation of positive science? What is the subject of history in social and human sciences? By moving from this questions, we will try to understand the role of historicism in the contemporary philosophy on the hermeneutical phenomenological approach.

Key words: Historicism, Hermeneutics, Methodology, Epistemology, Contemporary Philosophy, Social Science, Natural Science.

^{1,2} Eurasian National University named after L.N. Gumilyev, Astana, Kazakhstan

Corresponding Author:
Zh. Rystan, Rystan1994@mail.ru

Reference to this article:
Rystan Zh., Tursynbayeva A.
Historicism as a Hermeneutic Oriented Approach to a History // Adam alemi. – 2022. – No. (94). – P. 12-20.

Историцизм тарихқа герменевтикалық бағытталған көзқарас ретінде

Аннотация: Бұл мақалада біз XX ғасырдың аяғындағы эпистемологияны түсінудегі историцизмнің рөлін түсінуге тырысамыз. Бэконнан Ағартушылық дәуіріне дейін ғылымның бірден-бір критерийі жаратылыстану ғылымдарына негізделген деп есептелді. Сол дәуірде қалыптасқан түсінік бойынша ғылым деп жаратылыстану ғылымы танылса ал тарих пен қоғамға қатысты ғылымдар да жаратылыстану ғылымдары әдісі бойынша айқындалды. Бұл мақалада авторлар историцизм деп аталатын қозғалыстың шығу себебі мен мақсатын айқындауды мақсат тұтып отыр. Бұл қозғалыс XIX ғасырда ғылымға классикалық көзқарасқа қарсы сыни көзқарас ретінде пайда болды. Бұл қозғалыстағы ең ықпалды тұлға неміс ойшылы Вильгельм Дильтей болды. Дильтей жаратылыстанудың қалыптасқан әдістемесіне антипозитивистік көзқараста болды. Бұл көзқарастың ұстанымы бойынша, ғылым болу үшін

әрбір зерттеушінің қатаң ережелері болуы керек және олардың зерттеулері эксперименттік нәтижелерге, бақыланатын фактілерге, объективті дәлелдерге негізделуі керек дегенді білдірді. Дильтейден бастап және басқа ой мектептерінің көмегімен историцизм деп аталатын жаңа қозғалыс гуманитарлық және әлеуметтік ғылымдар үшін жаңа әдіснама құру жолында өз жобаларын ұсынады. Бұл жаңа жобада әр ғылымның өзіндік әдістері мен зерттеу объектісі болады деді. Адам мен қоғамды тану үшін біз жаратылыстану ғылымын қолдана алмаймыз өйткені ол физикалық немесе биологиялық пән емес, әлеуметтік өмір мен адам тағдыры мен тарихы. Осы өзгеру процесін ескере отырып, историцизмді қазіргі эпистемологиялық көзқарас ретінде тануға болады ма? Әдістеме ретінде тарихты позитивті ғылымнан бөліп алып айтуға болады ма? Қоғамдық және гуманитарлық ғылымдардағы тарихты пәні не болмақ? Осы сұрақтардан шыға отырып, біз герменевтикалық феноменологиялық көзқарастағы историцизмнің қазіргі философиядағы рөлін түсінуге тырысамыз.

Түйін сөздер: Историцизм, герменевтика, методология, эпистемология, қазіргі философия, әлеуметтану, жаратылыстану.

Историцизм как герменевтически ориентированный подход к истории

Аннотация: В данной статье мы пытаемся осмыслить роль историзма в понимании эпистемологии в конце XX века. От Бэкона до Просвещения считалось, что единственный критерий науки основан на естественных науках. Объем науки также был определен как изучение в соответствии с методом естественных наук, поэтому науки, связанные с историей и обществом, также были определены в соответствии с методом естественных наук. В этой статье авторы стремятся представить движение под названием историзм, который возник в XIX веке как критическая точка зрения против классического подхода к науке. Самой влиятельной фигурой этого движения был немецкий мыслитель Вильгельм Дильтей. У Дильтея было антипозитивистское отношение к устоявшейся методологии естествознания. Это означало, что для того, чтобы быть наукой, каждый исследователь должен иметь строгий набор правил, а их исследования должны основываться на результатах экспериментов, наблюдаемых фактах и объективных доказательствах. Начиная с Дильтея и с помощью других философских школ, новое движение, называемое историзмом, начинает свой путь к установлению новой методологии гуманитарных и социальных наук. И это движение составило классификацию науки. Они делили науку на естественную и духовную. Каждая из наук имеет свои методы и объект исследования. Они считали, что к социальному и человеческому изучению мы не можем применять естественнонаучные методы исследования, поскольку это не физический или биологический предмет, а социальная жизнь и человеческая судьба и история. Учитывая этот процесс изменения, можно ли говорить об историзме как современном эпистемологическом подходе? В качестве методологии можно ли говорить об истории в отрыве от позитивной науки? Что является предметом истории в социальных и гуманитарных науках? Отходя от этих вопросов, мы попытаемся понять роль историзма в современной философии на герменевтическом, феноменологическом подходах.

Ключевые слова: Историцизм, герменевтика, методология, эпистемология, современная философия, обществознание, естествознание.

Introduction

Historicism is one of the basic conceptual frameworks of the philosophy of history, which emerged with the contribution of the studies made by Dilthey on the science of history in Germany in the XIX century. It is defined as one of the concepts discussed from the XIX century to the present. Two basic attitudes have been influential behind the debates caused by the problem of historicism in the philosophy of history.

The first of these is the *theoria-historia* distinction drawn epistemologically by Ar-

istotle. In other words, it is the opposition arising from its positioning as an activity of ascending from the practical (*praxis*) aspect to the theoretical (*theoria*). The second is the approach by Dilthey that the arguments of the German History School are based on an epistemology that will cover the humanities and a methodology that problematizes how this epistemology can be obtained, that "everything that exists is the product of its own past", that is, it has its own history.

In this context, these epistemological determinations made by Aristotle and then Dilthey regarding the scope of the con-

cept of history in the tradition of western philosophy began in the XIX. It paved the way for both the emergence and development of the problematic of historicism, which gained its true meaning and content in the middle of the XIX century. In ancient time, with the concern of reaching universal knowledge, the Greeks equated philosophy with theoria activity and marked the knowledge of occurrence, which is subject to particular and random events, including daily actions, as a type of historical knowledge, resulting in the devaluation of history as historical knowledge against theoria. Aristotle's classification of the sciences, placing history under poetry and depreciating it against theoretical sciences, entered philosophy with opposing pairs of concepts such as theoria-historia, theoria-emperia, mind-experiment, which is the basis for the fact that history could not be positioned as a science for many years until the age of enlightenment has been decisive. In his Poetics, Aristotle says that the main difference between history and poetry stems from the fact that the historian deals with the singular and the poet deals with the universal. The historian deals with what really happened, and the poet deals with what could be. With this positioning, Aristotle define the historic knowledge (doxa), which he showed as the knowledge of the multitude, out of the field of theoretical knowledge (episteme), which is the knowledge of truth, and formed the basis of not accepting history as a science. This was later in the XVI century with the methodological contribution of Bacon. From the beginning of the XIX century, it is the basis of the absolute dominance of the natural sciences that will last till today [1, 51-52 pp.].

The criterion of science was determined as working according to the method of natural sciences. For this reason, sciences dealing with history and society were determined according to the method of natural sciences. In response, German Idealism emerged as a strong historicist tradition. Later, a group of spiritual sciences, which benefited from this tradition that Dilthey started in the XIXth century, revealed that the subject and meth-

od of the historical and social sciences, which he named, was different from the natural sciences. Then, thinkers who adopted this theory claimed that the sciences of spirit could not be outside the world of life.

The historicist view stems from the theoretical and methodological assumptions of critical historiography and knowledge. For this reason, he argues that events must always be seen during historical development and that it is not possible to grasp the essence of human society from a viewpoint that excludes history. Also, historicists believe that every epoch or historical period must be interpreted in terms of the ideas and principles that characterize it; They also claimed that the interpretations of the past periods based on the present are far from explanatory [2, 897 p.].

Historicism is defined as a view that prioritizes historical thinking in understanding historical events and argues that each historical period should be evaluated within itself. According to Bambach, the concept of historicism emerged as a hermeneutic-oriented approach to history. According to this idea, historicism introduces that everything human and social is historical [3].

It is also important when looking at historicism from the perspectives of Islam and other religions. Why? Because, in the tradition of revelation, the messengers of God who came at different times told the same message in different historical situations. But their laws were different. It was because they were in different historical conditions. What is the same thing that remains unchanged in religion? What changed in religion according to the conditions of the time when the prophets were present? If religion changes according to historical conditions, then what qualities of religion can change? What can change and what cannot? In the context of these questions, the discussions of historicism in religious texts have become intense [4].

Methodology

The methodological basis of the research is the methods of historical-phil-

osophical, comparative analysis, and problem-theoretical research. The methodological basis of the research is the methods of historical-philosophical, comparative analysis, and problem-theoretical research. In a comparative analysis we try to compare theories which comes from the ideas. First from Dilthey and contemporary philosophy. This comparison of these two ideas very similar to a contemporary approach of epistemology. As we know from the history of philosophy that contemporary approaches to getting knowledge are very different then classic ideas of epistemology. Therefore, these two ideas good examples of creating the picture of the critique point of nowadays philosophy. Also, we used problem-theoretical research in order to deeply contemplate the theories as well as be able to see the problems which derives from it.

The main topic in this article is Historicism. Which we can identify as a methodology itself for philosophical investigations. In this article we tried to approach to historicism as a view that prioritizes historical thinking in understanding historical events and argues that each historical period should be evaluated within itself. In a narrower and more specific sense, historicism is said to be an approach that asserts that there are predictable universal principles of the historical process, exemplified by Hegel's idealist philosophies of history. According to theories which we used as a mythological tool in this article, the concept of historicism emerged as a hermeneutic-oriented approach to history. According to this idea, historicism introduces that everything human and social is historical.

Historic Background of Historicism

The first emergence of historicism as a concept in the western literature was in the XIX century. It was used by Novalis in the first half of the century. However, in the process, the concept has started to be used in various forms, with different meaning contents, even opposing meanings. Historicism was one of

the hottest topics in 1920s Germany. When historicism is mentioned in this period, the first approach that is considered is «historical positivism». According to historical positivism, historicism is the historian's method of questioning the entire past from adetermined investigation. This method assumes that what is historical is human production, and that the bearer of history is man and his work. This type of historicism, which is mostly attributed to Dilthey and the Dilthey school, was later called historical relativism by E. Troeltsch. Later, E. Rothacker makes a distinction between «historism» and «historicism». According to Rothacker, historicism is a naive naturalism that we see in Hegel and Marx's philosophies of history, and we try to understand the "history of humanity" and the "universe" as a whole. [5, 222 p.].

In this context, Popper in his book «The Misery of Historicism» in the XIXth century, he explains what he means by the concept of «historicism»: Historicism means that the main purpose of the social sciences is to make historical predictions. It is an approach that thinks that for this purpose to be real, it can be realized by revealing the laws», «rhythms» and «tendencies» that form the basis of history [6, 25p.].

The second often confused terms is the distinction between «Historism» and «Historicism». In English, French, Italian and Spanish, «historicism» and «historism» are used interchangeably. However, in the era of dialectical and historical materialism, a distinction was made between «historism» and «historicism». In the tradition of Marxism and Leninism, if «historicism» is identical with «bourgeois» concepts of history, «historism» is recognized as a «true scientific» concept. Although the concept of «Historism» has a connection with the concept of «Historicism». For example, the concept of «historism» is explained in James Mark Baldwin's Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology, but the concept of «historicism» is not found in the dictionary. The opposite is the case in the Philosophy diary edited by Dagobert D. Runes (New York, 1942). «Historism» is a translation of historismus from German to English, but it seems that «his-

toricism» is more preferred in dictionaries. The reason for this may be that the English word structure is more prone to language or the concept of «Storicismo», which is its equivalent in Italian, may have gained fame by using it by Benedetto Croce. Since the full description of «historicism» is based on both German and Italian sources, it would then be treated as «historicism», at least for the time being, on the assumption that the word would prevail in English usage [7, 568 p.].

Historicism emerged as a German ideology. The new historical perspective referred to historicism was often described as an intellectual development. It is a unique combination of the concepts of science, humanities and cultural sciences. But it was also firmly believed that when history reveals its meaning, meaning reveals itself only in history. In the history of thought, the understanding of time by different philosophers in different ways and the understanding of time by philosophers who use historicity is not based on the time meaning of any thinker. But when we move from historicism to «historicism», the German idealist philosophy is of great importance here. While they pass from historicism to historicism, it is based on Hegel, holding precisely the concept of time as its basis. And this situation made historicism a German ideology [7, 108 p.]. Therefore, history became the only way to study human relations. For this reason, historians and social philosophers such as Ernst Troeltsch and Friedrich Meinecke used the term historicism both in the XIX. They used it to describe the dominant worldview in the XIX th-century German academic world, as well as in the powerful Bürgertum world. Meinecke spoke of historicism in 1936 as «the pinnacle of understanding human things» [8, 29 p.].

As such, it is necessary to consider a reference to the principles of thought that reveals historicity. Some of the important ones are the ideas of Hegel and Dilthey.

First, it should be understood what historicism is and what role it has in Hegel's philosophy. When we come to Hegel's philosophy, we must remember his concept of the «Absolute Spirit». For Hegel, historicism

is contained in the «Absolute Spirit». To understand this concept, we need to dwell on two concepts in Hegel's philosophy. The first is the concept of «freedom». The «Absolute Spirit» is free, and this freedom continues to increase over time in the world, including humans [7, 113 p.]. World History presents the stages in the development process of the principle whose content is Freedom Consciousness. The task of identifying these stages more closely, taken in their universal nature, is logical; but taken in their concrete nature, they belong to the Philosophy of Spirit. Here we will only indicate that the first stage is the immersion of Spirit in naturalness, the second is its emergence from it into the consciousness of its Freedom [8, 49 p.].

Since freedom, on the one hand, means uncertainty, for the «Absolute Spirit», it means that he does not have a clear knowledge of his later states and only gains by following what is happening in the world, which means his alienation from himself. The first break is incomplete and partial, because it comes from the immediate naturalness, so that it is related to it and yet loaded with it as a moment. The third step is the ascent from this still particular Freedom to its pure Universality, to the self-consciousness and self-feeling of the essence of spirituality. These stages are the basic principles of the universal process [8, 49 p.]. The second concept is the idea of «perfection». In the process of alienation, observation, and re-estrangement, the «Absolute Spirit» not only becomes more complete in terms of knowledge, but also becomes more perfect in the realization of its alienation, that is, in self-realization, depending on this knowledge. Having consumed the shell of its existence, Spirit does not merely pass into another shell, nor does it rise rejuvenated from the ashes of its former form; on the contrary, he is born as an ascended, exalted spirit. Undoubtedly, it arises against itself, it destroys its existence, but while it destroys it, it processes it into a new shape, and its culture becomes equipment and its work elevates it to a new culture [8, 61 p.]. In other words, what Hegel calls «reason»

actually means the self-observation of this process. In this sense, since «reason» coincides with philosophy, philosophy is «being that comes to thought». In short, for Hegel, everything is changing, including reason, and this change is necessary.

Here we can understand what historicism is in relation to Hegel's philosophy and how it grounds it. Looking at the Hegelian system, the Absolute Spirit, which is the essence of everything, is in a state of constant change. This change is his way of becoming an objective spirit by realizing himself. And after this objective spirit, it is constantly forming in the way of expressing itself. In other words, it makes sense to always speak of a becoming, not of being. In Hegel's own words, «world history», as we know, is generally the unfolding of spirit in time, just as the idea unfolds itself in space as nature [8, 60 p.]. The society that constitutes the objective spirit and the values realized in it consist of an absolute mood that will be transcended later. In such a case, the previously valid «true» must be «true» on its own terms, that is, it only applies and should be valid for those conditions. However, circumstances will change, and «new» truths emerge that meet these requirements. What was previously valid and true will not be true under the new conditions; Hegel introduces them as those who still think they are true, only those who do not realize that that time has changed. Because every era lives with its own realities. In this sense, everything has its own value, and those values must be on their own terms [9, 117-118 pp.].

Dilthey's Approach to Spiritual Science

Historicism, was a movement of thought that emerged in Germany in the XIX century, especially with Wilhelm Dilthey's studies on the science of history. Dilthey is recognized as an important figure in laying the foundation of historicism. Dilthey's view is recognized as a counterpoint to the ideas present in humanism and enlightenment. The scientific methods of natural science are different from Dilthey's science, which calls it «spirit». In Dilthey's philosophy, peo-

ple can only understand individuals and societies historically, so historical research and methods specific to this research have a great importance [10, 193 p.].

Dilthey, who acts with the historical consciousness of the German History School, argues that knowledge is a practical-historical product and that it is based on *historia*. Therefore, he did not adopt Hegel's eschatological understanding of history, but was influenced by Hegel's concept of «spirit». However, in Dilthey, the concept of spirit is a purely social product, the whole of human actions in the historical process [11, 22-25 pp.].

According to Dilthey, in the new age the theory of knowledge the knowing subject is a mental entity «isolated from all kinds of historical identity». However, for Dilthey, «being a rational being» is a certain aspect of the total identity of man, and this aspect can never be completely stripped of this total identity, detached, and remains «pure» on its own without importing anything from this total identity. unthinkable [5, 194 p.]. According to Dilthey, reason is a force within human forces, inextricably linked with these forces. Even with these forces, the one who wants, feels, and sets goals comes first. Therefore, it is the meaning that should be guided in historical and social fields. It processes natural events according to a certain law, but human actions cannot be based on a certain law. Man's will, desires, and goals are driven by human actions rather than external factors. Therefore, «knowledge» can be handled by considering this total identity of man. According to Dilthey, the method of science is successful in natural sciences such as physics and chemistry, but it cannot achieve the same success in its application to the spiritual world, historical and social fields. According to Dilthey, in order to focus on the subject of «knowledge», it is necessary to put human being as one who wants, feels and designs something and sets goals, as the basis for the explanation of knowledge and knowledge concepts (external world, time, substance, first cause). It is necessary to focus on whether the concepts are only things woven with perception, design and thinking material [11, 18 p.].

According to Dilthey, the problem of knowledge cannot be overcome without understanding the nature of this holistic formation, total human identity. On the contrary, what the new age theory of knowledge does is an epistemology that explores the possibilities and limits of knowledge, determines what it is, and begins to examine beliefs, values and judgments in the light of this determination. In other words, while the new age designed a «pure mind being» and put the outside world in front of it in order to do science, it severed the total identity of man, as in Kant. However, according to Dilthey, though science can be reached by referring to the total identity, which includes pure reason. For Dilthey, human integrity is something that has occurred historically.

Therefore, according to Dilthey, what we call «wholeness» is not just a pre-recognition of knowledge, but a developmental history resulting from the sum of our positions. However, only historical development can provide this [11, 17-19 pp.].

The main point we need to understand from Dilthey's thought above is that the method of natural sciences is successful in natural sciences such as physics and chemistry, but this method cannot be applied to the spiritual world, which is the historical and social field. To be more precise, Dilthey never underestimates the rationality, objectivity and precision exhibited in natural science. What he does is divide the sciences into natural and spiritual sciences. His critique of the natural sciences was that of the positivists' attempt to apply the methods of the natural sciences to the study and understanding of human life, which inevitably ignores the essential aspects of human existence. In other words, the purpose of Dilthey's criticism of natural science is to argue that natural science has a method belonging to its own field, and that the science of Spirit also has a method belonging to its own field [11, 84-85 pp.].

XIX century has been a period when knowledge was divided into disciplines and professionalized. History, like other branches of social knowledge, in the process of

becoming a professional discipline at the beginning of the XX century, with the desire to find the concept of discipline, while determining its own field of study, method and research tools, it tries to define which subjects are outside of its jurisdiction, together with the reasons. In this establishment and institutionalization process, the view of the discipline of history towards historical studies in the past and other branches of contemporary social knowledge has undergone a profound break. Underlining the clear difference between historiography in the past and the other social science disciplines of the period has been effective in determining the research areas that professional historiography will take at the center. In the XIX century, epistemology was re-founded in the social and human sciences. Instead of a universal and ahistorical human concept that he placed in the practice of humanities, he tried to make a historical and social human concept functional. To put it differently, he opposed the assumption that the natural sciences offered a suitable and even valid model for the practice of the social sciences [9, 1-2 pp.].

Although modern historical thought has made important developments, it has created important problems due to its inaccuracy. The modern historical thought concept is based on nationalism and is fed by political and economic values. Examples of nationalism that led to racism placed societies in a hierarchical order and showed colonialism as the natural rights of superior races. The understanding of progress in historical thought is one of the factors supporting colonialism. This modern historiography as we speak is shaped as a Eurocentric history. In order to modernize, other nations trying to recognize and apply the West determined the understanding of history based on nationalism and progress and applied it to their own societies. These historical attitudes, which can be called duplicates, try to portray non-European societies as part of European history. This approach has resulted in significant distortions of the histories of non-European societies. Nationalism and its foundation, colonialism, are the most

important causes of the First and Second World Wars, one of the greatest dramas in human history. Colonialism, poverty, alienation from their own historical identities in European foreign countries were the general appearances of the XX century. [12, 10 p.].

The emergence of the philosophy of history, which is one of the important products of the philosophy of the modern age, started with the comparison of the knowledge of history and natural sciences. When the natural sciences, which fit the definition of knowledge in philosophy, were recognized as the central science, the opposite situation was in the historical sciences, which seemed worthless. The more systematic structuring of historical knowledge and the emergence of rules to be applied in research, the defense that history has general-validity, legal, and compulsory characteristics like natural sciences were the efforts of thinkers to scientificize history. Discussions about history have developed in two ways. The first one is the philosophy of history or analytic philosophy of history, which is defined as a philosophy of science that examines the characteristics of the knowledge revealed by studies in history. The other way is historical metaphysics, which examines the structure of human history and explains it in terms of legality, purpose and necessity [12, 11 p.].

Conclusion

Historicism is known as one of the conceptual frameworks of the philosophy of history. This historicism that we are talking about gained different meanings in different periods because it was processed by different thinkers in different countries. In this context, when we look at the origin and development of the idea of historicism within the framework of western thought, it is seen that the concept corresponds to the temporal structure of something, the historical perspective. In the period of positivist understanding of science, the positioning of history as a science was handled by Dilthey. The questions of whether history is positioned as a science and where the position of history is turned into a

common problem of the science of history and the philosophy of history. In order to be a knowledge to be a science, whether it is natural sciences or cultural sciences, it must have a methodology. Thus, the problem here is a methodology problem in the most general sense. Dilthey's aim is to introduce that the cultural or spiritual sciences have their own methodology different from the natural sciences. It was an attitude against the assumption that the methods of natural science could apply equally to all the sciences. The point that should not be misunderstood here is that Dilthey's thought is handled with a different perspective from the understanding of positive science. According to him, the spiritual sciences can only work in their own field, in their own way. He does not intend to enter the field of natural sciences. This idea also envisaged the classification of the sciences in their own order. And the role of historicism in modern time is very crucial. Because as we see from the article without historical approach it's impossible to investigate human's life or nature because everything that happens with people only happening in the history of his period.

References

- 1 Collingwood R. Tarih Felsefesi Üzerine Denemeler [Experiments on the Philosophy of History]. – Istanbul, Ayışığı, 2000. – 163 s. (in Turkish)
- 2 Cevizci A. Felsefe Sözlüğü [Dictionary of Philosophy]. – Istanbul, Paradigma, 1999. – 1356 s. (in Turkish)
- 3 Bambach C. Heidegger, Dilthey and the Crisis of Historicism. – Cornell University Press, 1995. – 105-110 pp.
- 4 Paçacı M. Kuran ve Ben Ne Kadar Tarihseliz? İslami Araştırmalar [How Historical Quran and!? Islamic Research]. – Istanbul, İnsan Yayınları, 1996. – 119 s. (in Turkish)
- 5 Özlem D. Tarih Felsefesi [Philosophy of History]. – Istanbul, Notos Kitap Yayınevi, 2010. – 300 s. (in Turkish)
- 6 Popper K. Tarihselciliğin Sefaleti [The Poverty of Historicism]. – Istanbul, İnsan Yayınları, 1998. – 236 s. (in Turkish)
- 7 Beck Robert. The Meaning of Historicism. – New York, Oxford Journals, 2005. – 188 p.
- 8 Görgün T. Tarihsellik ve Tarihselcilik üze-

Rystan Zh., Tursynbayeva A.

rine bir kaç not. Kurani Kerim Tarihselcilik ve Hermenötik [A Few Notes on Historicity and Historicism. The Holy Quran Historicism and Hermeneutics]. – Istanbul, Paradigma yayınları, 2019. – 240 s. (in Turkish)

9 Iggers G. Yirminci Yüzyılda Tarihyazımı [Historiography in the Twentieth Century]. – Istanbul, Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2000. – 340 s. (in Turkish)

10 Hegel G. Tarih Felsefesi [Philosophy of History]. – Istanbul, İdea Yayınevi, 2006. – 400 s. (in Turkish)

11 Dilthey W. Hermeneutik ve Tin Bilimleri [Hermeneutics and Spiritual Science]. – Istanbul, Paradigma yayınları, 1999. – 123 s. (in Turkish)

12 Bıçak A. Tarih Felsefesi [Philosophy of History]. – Istanbul, Dergah Yayınları, 2015. – 260 s. (in Turkish)

INFORMATION ABOUT AUTHORS

Rystan Zhanerke

PhD student, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan, Rystan1994@mail.ru, ORCID ID: 0000-0001-6390-3037

Tursynbayeva Aigul

Professor, Candidate of Philosophical Science, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan, aigul_73kz@mail.ru ORCID ID: 0000-0002-1900-2685

Рыстан Жанерке Қаппарқызы

PhD студент, Л.Н.Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті, Астана, Қазақстан, Rystan1994@mail.ru ORCID ID: 0000-0001-6390-3037

Тұрсынбаева Айгүл Өмірбекқызы

профессор, философия ғылымдарының кандидаты, Л.Н.Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті, Астана, Қазақстан, aigul_73kz@mail.ru ORCID ID: 0000-0002-1900-2685

Рыстан Жанерке Қаппарқызы

PhD студент, Евразийский национальный университет имени Л.Н. Гумилева, Астана, Казахстан, Rystan1994@mail.ru ORCID ID: 0000-0001-6390-3037

Турсынбаева Айгүль Омирбекқызы

профессор, кандидат философских наук, Евразийский национальный университет имени Л. Н. Гумилева, Астана, Казахстан, aigul_73kz@mail.ru ORCID ID: 0000-0002-1900-2685