

# Historical Reality - Specificity, Format and Essence

Alexey Stepanov<sup>1,\*</sup>, and Ibragimov Yusup<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Chuvash State University, Moskovsky Ave., 15, 428000, Cheboksary, Russia

<sup>2</sup>Kadyrov Chechen State University, Sheripova Street, 32, 364024, Grozny, Russia

**Abstract.** Reproducing the past as a story constitutes a form of human awareness of the specifics of one's own existence. Being is multifaceted, and the story-narrative about its properties and qualities is an integral part of its development. The variety of life forms actualizes various aspects of the experience of social interaction and objectively determines its reproduction. The historical narrative is the result of the conscious actualization by the subject of certain moments of existence. The specificity of the organization of the past as history, the degree of conformity of the parameters of the event and the forms of their identification, the level of correlation of sign-symbolic and essential-semantic structures of reflecting social evolution, the effectiveness of methodological procedures for their development inevitably actualizes issues of the ontological status of historical reality.

## 1 Introduction

People's lives are obviously connected with the search for optimal options for the existence of those expressed in the desire to «be at home everywhere» [1]. The ethos of confidence in the strength of their position is a manifestation of the natural state of a person, the attributive principle of his existence. «Home» equipment personifies overcoming the initial lack of mastery, chaos, ambiguity and unpredictability of being. Correlating existence with objective conditions of self-realization, people are trying to adapt to complexes of objective conditions of existence, including one of the main factors is time.

The problem of existential development of time is dictated by the temporal inconsistency of being, the modality of which - the past, the present, the future determined the conceptual format of ideas about the meanings of human existence and the essence of the world. The modes of time are both the institutions of determining the isolation of moments of being and the form of their connection. If the future is hypothetical and derived from the present, then the past is an attribute of the constitutionalization of the present. The past appears in the perspective of the key characteristic of the present, only the present has a past. This circumstance acts as a determining factor in the formation of a subject integrating a variety of formats of being into the program of its existence. The problem of existential development of time is dictated by the temporal inconsistency of being, the modality of which - the past, the present, the future determined the conceptual format of

---

\*Corresponding author: [stalex73@bk.ru](mailto:stalex73@bk.ru)

ideas about the meanings of human existence and the essence of the world. The modes of time are both the institutions of determining the isolation of moments of being and the form of their connection. If the future is hypothetical and derived from the present, then the past is an attribute of the constitutionalization of the present. The past appears in the perspective of the key characteristic of the present, only the present has a past. This circumstance acts as a determining factor in the formation of a subject integrating a variety of formats of being into the program of its existence.

The ontological specificity of the past determines its inclusion in the existential world of the subject indirectly - through the institutions of reflective consciousness. The conjugation of the past with the structures of consciousness determines its development in the format of artifacts - cultural phenomena expressing certain modes of time. The past is presented as an image of certain moments of being a property that are absent in the present, the subject is deprived of the opportunity to contact the past states of being directly, as a result of which the phenomenal form of their reproduction is of paramount importance. Semantic design of information about the past forms the basis of its constitutionalization as history (greek *historia* - a story about the past). At the same time, in social practices, an unambiguous definition of the concept of «history» was not formed, a literal translation of the term - the story does not remove the problem, moreover, it complements it with new questions.

## 2 Materials and Methods

The theoretical and methodological hypothesis is due to the content of the object-subject component of the study, which includes in its space the problem of the neoclassical approach as a tool for organizing the picture of socio-historical reality. The article implements the principles of comparative analysis of the cognitive foundations of historical knowledge, its logical prerequisites and epistemological procedures. The author considers historical knowledge as a system, the dynamics of which depends on quantitative and qualitative changes occurring both within it and in more general systems of knowledge (specifically scientific, philosophical, etc.).

The neoclassical model involves the synthesis of rational and value-targeted, scientist and humanistic, structural and anthropological, systemic and dynamic paradigms of its organization in their correlation with the socio-cultural conditions for the production of historical knowledge. The cognitive potential of the neoclassical concept provided an opportunity to reveal the parameters of the socio-cultural determination of the content of the picture of socio-historical reality, which, in turn, made it possible to reveal the directions for improving the gnoseological potential of socio-historical research. The resources of the declared concept provided an opportunity to reveal the mechanisms of objectification of the subjective as the most important principle of the formation of the mythology of history, to determine the importance of perceptual projection formats in psychosomatic and socio-cultural institutions of organizing a picture of socio-historical reality.

## 3 Results and Discussion

Reality "obviously one of the significant and at the same time problematic categories of philosophy, the definition of which did not receive an unambiguous interpretation: «So, in G. D. Levin, the term «real» has five independent meanings, in P. S. Dyshevsky - six, in V. I. Porus - more than ten. In the dictionary of A. Laland, the five main semantic meanings of this term are distinguished, which to some extent contradict each other» [2]. The topic of reality has inexhaustible heuristic potential and the appeal of the philosophical community

to this phenomenon in this sense is understandable. The formation of philosophy as a disciplined organized field of knowledge is connected precisely with the establishment of the essence of this phenomenon in the ontological, praxiological and gnoseological aspects.

At the same time, the recent widespread paradigm of postmodernism initiated a situation in which the phenomenon of reality was subjected to extreme deconstruction, as a result of which the space of philosophical reflection itself was reduced to the formalized consistency of describing anything, which, in essence, is comparable, paraphrasing the well-known expression of F. Fukuyama with the «end of philosophy». The beginning of the desacralization of metaphysics in the historical and philosophical perspective turned out to be associated with consistent empiricism where «tangible» experience appears as a direct source and criterion of knowledge, everything else that did not constitute a space of experimental verification is not reliable, illusory and subjective. Theoretical constructions of being, in essence, are nothing more than a vulgar interpretation that is not related to its implementation, including, above all, in the «here and now» format.

The category «reality» (from latin *res* - a thing, *realis* - real, real) is interpreted in an extremely general sense as an institution for specifying being, the format of which does not need additional justification. In the history of rational forms of culture, the problem of reality was actualized in the concepts of realism and anti-realism, within the framework of which ontological and epistemological levels of its identification were distinguished. The variety of approaches of those claiming to comprehend this phenomenon led to the absence of generally recognized definitions of the category under consideration. At the same time, in an extremely general sense, realism is interpreted as a concept recognizing the presence of objective reality, anti-realism - proceeds from the position that the objectivity of reality is no more, but also no less than a methodological construction created on the basis of institutions of idealization, abstraction and generalization. The format of discussions between realists and their opponents affects a wide range of issues from the correspondence of the semantics of scientific concepts to the real properties of objects, to the justification of the nature of truth and the degree of correlation between being and thinking.

In the metaphysical teachings of ancient, medieval, New European and German classics, the line of demarcation of oppositions «thing» - «reality» is unambiguously traced. Philosophers materialists, idealists, objectivists, subjectivists, empiricists and rationalists considered «a thing» as a phenomenon that is not identical to the transcendent - the original, eternal, abstract, self-sufficient, unlimited, not reducible and not deducible from anything «pure» being. On the contrary, the thing had opposite properties «in bodies there is nothing but movement, number and figure», which allowed a person to include it in the sphere of his life world. Things, therefore, were defined as forms of demonstration of essence, in connection with which philosophy as a spiritually practical technology of comprehension of essence inevitably faced the problem of taking things beyond its own disciplinary reflection: «Following natural science... things turned out to be expelled from philosophy itself.... Kant stated that «a thing in itself» is unknowable and cannot be subject to philosophical consideration» [3].

However, things, despite their proficiency, remain the only possible form of expression of the essence, the definition of which is directly related to philosophical practice. This circumstance could not but initiate programs for revising the place of things in philosophical culture, albeit on other conceptual grounds. «We want to return to the» things themselves E. Husserl stated while characterizing the thing not as physical objectivity, but as the structure of consciousness - a phenomenon that allows «to simply accept being as it gives itself, but only within the framework in which it gives itself» [4]. The formation of things as a phenomenological institution formed the conceptual basis for L. Wittgenstein's judgment that: «The world is facts in logical space... Facts cannot, strictly speaking, be determined, but we can explain what we mean by saying that facts make judgments true or

false» [5]. The fact is a specific type of thought inertia, it is a meaningful fragment of being organized by a person within the framework of his development program. The conditioning of facts-things by the analytical format postulated them as the framework of reflective consciousness. At the same time, the fact as such is perceived not as an intellectual construction, but as an existing phenomenon objectively: «historiographer... creates his own objects of observation... To establish a fact is to work it out. In other words, find a certain answer to a certain question. And where there are no questions, there is nothing at all»[6]. Images and prototypes of things in the intentional perspective of the subject are identical, and the objective-subjective ontological oppositions that arise are no more than illusions generated by the transcendental forms of their reproduction: «If reality (realitas noumenon) is represented only by pure reason, then the contradiction between realities is unthinkable» [7]. Reality thus becomes a universal institution of expression of essence.

The existential-phenomenal format of reality does not deny the objective nature of being. Being objectively, but formatting it in the parameters of the entity, is interpretive, conceptually conditioned and schematized. There is an objective process of social change independent of consciousness, but its images and our judgments about it represent the result of extrapolation of subjective representation into the objective world. The image formed by the systems of analytical development is projected into the outside world by being included in the program of practical actions, while the subject himself may not realize this: «Not observation procedures... content of theoretical concepts is determined. On the contrary, postulating the existence of unobservable objects with a certain set of inherent properties characterizes the possibilities and meaning of what is given in observation» [8]. Reality is being mastered by the subject – «a thing for us», which allows a person to provide certainty of his existence and therefore «to be at home everywhere».

## 4 Conclusion

The definition of reality is directly related to the natural synthesis of the experience of being and the experience of its awareness. The problem of reality in the declared discourse is expressed in the content of the paradigms of culture, the format of which allows you to form concepts of its development. Reality in this perspective is positioned as a concretization of being in figurative representation, initiated by the specifics of a certain type of reflection suggesting not only a cognitive, but also a practical attitude, which explains the difference in the definition of the category «history» in natural science and social-humanitarian interpretations: «The idea that there is someone language used by humanity to address the world, which the world prefers - was a pleasant conceit» [9].

The format of historical reality is dictated not so much by the temporal opposition of the present and past as by the technologies of their development, the dialectical connection of theory and practice, faith and knowledge, etc. The ontological specificity of history is due to the complex system of human realization of its existence. History outside of social practice, there is little more than a distracted abstraction that has nothing to do with the past. As an instance isolated from the essence of social existence, it does not exist. In order to be real, a historical phenomenon must be recorded in a certain way in the structures of the social form of existence, if the past does not manifest itself in any way in the culture of the present, then it is not real. In this perspective, the reality of history is due to the sphere of ideological reflection, and in this sense: «we get not the image of what happened in itself, but the image of our perception and its mental processing» [10].

Historical reality does not constitute the past as a "mirror" reflection of the past, but the past, included in existential experience, the past as a system of results of analytical perception of the past. The analytical potential of consciousness organizes all the diversity of reality, history is a narrative project of the event actualized by the existential need of the

subject. Factually mastered, meaning-filled reproduction of the past constitutes the essence of the historical format. At the same time, the insurmountability of the temporal barrier between the past and the present allows us to characterize history as a form of accumulation of conflicting institutions of specificity and abstractness, subjectivity and objectivity, certainty and uncertainty. This circumstance determines the hypothetical nature of the past, the historical model of which inevitably acquires the features of variability, convention, relativity. History becomes the result of extrapolation of the parameters of the known, desired and understandable to the unknown, which allows you to draw parallels between the historical and mythological types of reflection. Mythological and historical have a common imaginative platform of emergence. Historical horizons cannot be identified only with reliable parameters of the known, cognition, in turn, is not limited only to rational parameters of development: «The same real object - both observed and unobserved - has different forms of manifestation in experience and allows different methods of measurement» [11]. The actualization of the imagination is associated with the specifics of the historical non-refutable means of verification and falsification by the absence of the past as a subject reality. «Since it (past reality) is no longer there, it is planned only indirectly, through historical discourse. Here the kinship of history with fiction is revealed», [12] the obvious connection of historical narrative with imagination and brings history closer to mythology. The historian always deals with the image of the past - the result of the quality of culture, to decipher the content of the image - it means to find its real existential meaning. The quality of the historical phenomenon, its factual and axiological support, the effectiveness of their correlation make up the format of historical reality. It is thanks to the imagination that not only history becomes possible, but also culture as a whole. Understanding that a historian does not deal with substantive reality, but with images, theories, concepts, interpretations and assessments, does not reduce the status of historical reality both as an ontological institution and as the most important structure of scientific culture.

## References

1. M. Heidegger, *Basic concepts of metaphysics. World-Finiteness-Loneliness* (2013).
2. E. G. Rukomoinikova, Sc. and Tech. Bul. of St. Peter. St. Polytech. Un-ty, **2-2(100)**, 248 (2010).
3. V. I. Przhilensky, *Quest. of philos.*, **11**, 109 (2010).
4. E. Husserl, *Ideas for Pure Phenomenology and Phenomenological Philosophy* (Academic Project, Moscow, 2009).
5. L. Wittgenstein, *Logical and philosophical treatise* (AST Publishing House, Moscow, 2018).
6. L. Fevr, *Fights for history* (Nauka, Moscow, 1991).
7. I. Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason* (Mysl, Moscow, 1994).
8. V.A. Lektorskiy, *Cogn., underst., constr.*, 20 (2007).
9. R. Rorty, *Log.* **8**, 175 (1996).
10. I. G. Droizen, *The Historian. Lectures on the encyclopedia and methodology of history* (Vladimir Dal, St. Petersburg, 2004).
11. V. S. Stepin, *Constructivism in the theory of knowledge*, 18 (2008).
12. P. Riker, *Memory, history, oblivion* (Publishing House of Humanitarian Literature, Moscow, 2004).