

СУМСЬКИЙ ДЕРЖАВНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ

**СВІТОГЛЯД –
ФІЛОСОФІЯ –
РЕЛІГІЯ**

Збірник наукових праць

Заснований у 2011 р.

Випуск 12

За заг. редакцією д-ра філос. наук, проф. І. П. Мозгового



СУМИ
СУМСЬКИЙ ДЕРЖАВНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ
2017

УДК [140.8:21/29](082)

ББК 87:86-4я43

С24

Засновник: Сумський державний університет.

Реєстраційне свідоцтво КВ № 22560–12460ПР від 01.03.2017 (код за ЄДРПОУ 05408289).

Затверджено наказом МОН України від 21.11.2013 № 1609 як фахове видання.

Рекомендовано до друку вченою радою Сумського державного університету, протокол № 4 від 14 грудня 2017.

Редакційна колегія:

- І. П. Мозговий** – д-р філос. наук, проф. (головний редактор) (Україна);
А. О. Васюріна – канд. філос. наук, доц. (відповідальний секретар) (Україна);
З. Н. Ісмагамбетова – д-р філос. наук, проф. (Казахстан);
Р. Колодзей – д-р мистецтвознавства, проф. (Польща);
С. Констанчак – д-р хабілітат, проф. (Польща);
Т. Г. Румянцева – д-р філос. наук, проф. (Білорусь);
О. П. Бойко – д-р філос. наук, проф. (Україна);
А. М. Колодний – д-р філос. наук, проф. (Україна);
Є. О. Лебідь – д-р філос. наук, доц. (Україна);
О. Н. Саган – д-р філос. наук, проф. (Україна);
Л. В. Теліженко – д-р філос. наук, доц. (Україна);
Л. О. Филипович – д-р філос. наук, проф. (Україна);
В. О. Цикін – д-р філос. наук, проф. (Україна);
О. Ю. Щербина-Яковлева – д-р філос. наук, проф. (Україна);
П. Л. Яроцький – д-р філос. наук, проф. (Україна);
С. І. Побожій – канд. мистецтвознавства, доц. (Україна).

До збірника увійшли праці науковців, присвячені актуальним проблемам у галузі філософії, релігієзнавства, культурології та питанням, пов'язаним із процесом формування цілісного світогляду сучасної людини.

Розрахований на науковців, викладачів філософських дисциплін, аспірантів, студентів, які цікавляться проблемами розвитку гуманітарного знання.

УДК [140.8:21/29](082)

ББК 87:86-4я43

Адреса редакції: Сумський державний університет, 40000, м. Суми, вул. Римського-Корсакова, 2, тел.: (0542) 33–00–24, e-mail: philosophy@ifsk.sumdu.edu.ua; mozg_akadem@ukr.net

РОЗДІЛ 1

ФІЛОСОФІЯ

УДК 1(091)(477)

Vyacheslav Artyukh

MYKHAILO DRAHOMANOV: HISTORY AND PROGRESS¹

In the article the following elements of the positivism paradigm in the philosophical and historical views of Drahomanov such as nature-scientific analogies in understanding the nature of humanitarian and social sciences, necessary involvement of the idea of law in the historical process, the priority of the mental development in the idea of onward, multifactorial approach to explaining motive forces have been revealed.

Ключові слова: positivism, laws of history, progress, multifactorial approach.

Problem statement. Theoretical interest in history, both in history as a process and as a science of this process, is characteristic of a number of Ukrainian thinkers in the modern period. This curiosity was connected to the efforts to understand and define the unique Ukrainian path in history. Generalizing ideas about a distinct Ukrainian history became an important element of self-awareness of Ukrainian nation. This was connected to the “national revival” of the 19th century and to the activity of national intellectuals Myhajlo Maksymovych (1804–1873), Mykola Kostomarov (1817–1885), Pantaleimon Kulish (1819–1897) or Volodymyr Antonovych (1834–1908). Consequently, historiosophy, as a reflection on the historical dimension of the existence of Ukrainian nation became a characteristic feature of the national philosophical tradition. Moreover, the very same period witnessed also an increasing interest in theoretical problems of historical knowledge.

Previous research. Among recent publications on the philosophical component of historical attitudes of M. Dragomanov, one should mention the monographic study of A. Krugashov “The Drama of the Intellectual: Political Ideas of Mikhail Drahomanov”, in which the author made a successful attempt to present systematically the political ideology of the Ukrainian scientist in the context of the basic concepts and categories of modern political science. He also touches upon

© Vyacheslav Artyukh, 2017

¹ Author thanks Jan Surman for his translation and comments to this article.

the historiosophical issues, in particular, he concludes that the idea of progress according to M. Drahomanov has analogies with religious faith at the level of his mass functioning. M. Luk, a historian of Ukrainian philosophy, in conjunction with L. Depenchuk's monographic study "The History and Social Philosophy of Mikhail Drahomanov", points to the main source of the philosophical and historical ideas of the "early" M. Dragomanov – his master's thesis "The question of the historical significance of the Roman Empire and Tacitus" and analyzes in detail the individual philosophical and historical ideas of this work. In the article by Oleksiy Yas' "Comparative-historical method in the researches of Mikhail Drahomanov" the specificity of the formation of the comparative method in the historiography of M. Drahomanov is considered and the opinion about his stage-evolutionary basis is defended. O. Yas' comes to the conclusion that the source of this method lies in the philosophy of positivism. It is worth mentioning also a small article by V. Potulnitsky "The idea of progress in the political legacy of M. Drahomanov", in which he makes an interesting statement that, in his recent writings, M. Drahomanov "clearly denies the idea of progress and dialectics and tends to the theory of historical collapse". Given the distinct presence in the methodological basis of many previous publications of an ideological factor (whether it is communist or nationalistic), it seems to us that at the present stage the study of the legacy of Dragomanov becomes an important strategy for "new reading" of the works of the thinker.

The main aim. In our study, we confine ourselves to analyzing the connections between the historical and theoretical ideas of M. Drahomanov with a positivist philosophical and historical paradigm both at the level of historiosophy and at the level of issues of the epistemology of history.

Main dody. One of the most important Ukrainian political thinkers of the second half of the 19th Century was indubitably Myhailo Drahomanov. He was born in 1841 in the territories of the then Little Russia (town of Hadiach) in a family descending from Cossack *Starshina* (officership), which received Russian nobility. After graduating from the Saint Vladimir University in Kiev, he remained at the university hoping for a professorship. In Kiev he took part in the meetings of the ukrainophile organization "Hromada" (*Community*). In 1876 he was expelled from the university for political activism and was forced to emigrate. In the same year he began to publish in Geneva a journal called "Hromada" (*Community*). In the last years of his life, Drahomanov taught as a professor of general history at the Sofia High School (forerunner of the "St. Kliment Ohridski" University of Sofia). In a nutshell his political views can be described as a very individual synthesis of socialism, liberalism and anarchism and he is credited to have influenced a whole generation of ukrainophile intellectuals both in Ukraine and in Galicia.

Drahomanov's acquaintance with the positivist ideas began with his *gymnasium* teacher in Poltava, Oleksander Stronin (1826–1889). Drahomanov remembered later that Stronin taught him: "If you want to do philosophy, you have to be conscious not to fall into the trap of abstraction without a factual foundation" [7,

p. 596]. Stronin, who was later exiled to Archangelsk Oblast, wrote there his known works “History and Method” (1869), “Politics as Science” (1872) and “History of the public sphere” (1886), where he presented himself as a follower of positivist approach in historiography and sociology.

Drohomanov’s ideas presented his contemporaries the possible ways to divide the theoretical historical factors (*нобыдое*) from the sphere of national ideology and to replace a dogmatic view of history by one based on principles of the positivist scientificity. In his writing, one also finds a syncretic moment of unanimity of historiographical, sociological and philosophical-historical problematics.

As many other Ukrainian (little-Russian) intellectuals of the second half of the 19th century, Drahomanov identified the factors of historical development not in the religious-mystical sphere, as it was characteristic for the romanticist thinkers, but in the rational sphere. The fundamental principle of this idea was that society develops according to certain laws. It was the search for these laws, that became the main aim of positivism-oriented philosophers, historians and sociologists.

In his magister’s dissertation *The Problem of the Historical Significance of the Roman Empire and Tacitus (Vopros ob istoricheskom znachenii Rimskoi imperii i Tatsit, 1869)*, Drahomanov made the mere fact of existence of a philosophy of history, which he understood as an “assessment of the present and of the past”, dependent on the relation of the ideal to the reality. So far, the ideal has been reduced to three options: a) either one believed, that an ideal order existed in the past; b) or one thought that realization of the ideal is not possible in this life, but only in the ideal life; or, c) one argued that a gradual betterment is possible even in the current world, and that the desire to improve the world would lead to making the real life similar to the ideal one. It was this third ideal that Drahomanov called the theory of progress [2, p. 40]. In fact, it seems that in his writings all modern philosophy of history is possible only in the terms of theory of progress. And this is perfectly consistent with the representatives of the early positivism like John Stuart Mill (1806–1873), who wrote in his *A System of Logic* (1843, Russian translation 1865–1867), that “philosophy of history” is at the same time a verification and initial form of “the philosophy of the progress of society” [2, p. 40].

The theory of progress is on its turn a part of a broader concept of historical law and patterns. According to Drahomanov, only accepting the idea of progress one can find a stable basis for the recognition of patterns from the historical events [2, p. 41].

The Ukrainian scholar followed the sociological theory of historical progress and the search for a sociological concept of historical laws was for him the main task of historical research. He understood the history in Comtean sense, as a social science, which aim is to analyze the social dynamics [3, p. 78]. Thus history was for him a constituent of the science of sociology, that studied the past society.

Drahomanov followed the realist positivistic notion of the ideal scientificity, which says that there is one right way of doing science, with natural sciences as

the ideal. Social sciences and humanities, i.e. also history, should comply with it if they want to remain truly scientific. For this reason, Drahoanov believed in history as an objective science and he meticulously sought for possible connections of history's epistemology with this of natural sciences [3, p. 77]. Hence his focus on their methods. Thus Drahoanov considered the concept of "historical law" from the naturalist perspective and neither asked the question about differences between cognitive phenomena and natural ones nor about contradictions between those two. And here, in fact, he followed the idea of "father" of positivism, Auguste Comte, which another representative of early positivism, Mill, completed as follows:

Their [social sciences] method, in short, is the Concrete Deductive Method: that of which astronomy furnishes the most perfect, natural philosophy a somewhat less perfect, example, and the employment of which, with the adaptations and precautions required by the subject, is beginning to regenerate physiology [10, p. 665]².

With the help of the newly discovered concept of evolution in the natural sciences, Drahoanov tries to justify the absurdity of the idea of revolutionary leaps in the development of the society:

Recently also the natural sciences, geology and biology, have shown how long it takes for changes to take place and replaced the word revolution by evolution [...]. The new natural science has to teach anew the literate people and in their ideas on how to change social order, unlearn them from seeing their interests as most important in the state affairs and state changes, from being eager to make revolutions, upheavals...[4, p. 70].

Drahoanov begins constructing his idea of historical law³ by stating the impossibility of stabilizing them in the manner of unmediated concreteness of single historical facts:

If we see in the history – he writes – a whole series of facts of one sort and remove their birthmarks, in many cases it will become clear that some historical phenomena repeat themselves under certain circumstances – and this conclusion is already a law in history. If the observation will show that certain phenomena appear with less intensity or cease to appear, because known condition, which supported them, grow weaker or stop to exist, this observation will similarly lead us to yet another law, that is, in fact, to the same one but differently expressed [3, p. 78].

² One of first "little-Russian" philosophers who started to transfer biological laws to the history of society was already Lesevych. He saw the search for such laws as the main duty of sociologists. He argued, that sociological laws must be studied "in the sense of their imminent subordination to the natural laws" [9, p. 172].

³ Mill, however, sees this situation more differentiated and distinguishes between laws in history and laws in sociology as for their level of generality. For him "History accordingly does, when judiciously examined, afford Empirical Laws of Society. And the problem of general sociology is to ascertain these, and connect them with the laws of human nature, by deductions showing that such were the derivative laws naturally to be expected as the consequences of those ultimate ones" [10, p. 680].

Thus, historical laws are generalizations of these recurring images, which are brought forward to existence by certain conditions. Laws can be located in the mind, since they are formulated because of mental processes of abstraction and generalization. If such recurring images are a result of perceived similarity of several concrete historical facts, which, in their turn, can only exist in their original singular uniqueness, they exist outside of given time and space, out of given geography and chronology; they are formulated, according to Drahomanov, by the means of logical systematization. Drahomanov's comparative method (and actually also the one proposed by Comte), represents this logical principle [3, p. 81], which aims at looking for patterns in groups according to the principle of similarity of classes of certain historical facts. It is exactly at the level of statics where one can observe a certain homogeneity resulting from a comparison of a number of historical facts, which leads to the idea of a law. Sociological statics (immutability of the law) in a sense "covers" the sociological dynamics (temporal changeability of given sociological facts). From the point of view of the sociology, history reaches the status of science only if it follows the trail of recognizing general laws. Knowledge of singular historical facts has no value for history. For Drahomanov the comparative method appears not only as an instrument of investigation, but also as an axiological component of his positivistic style of thought. This method becomes in fact an evolutionary-causal criterion of value of historical sciences.

Further, Drahomanov wrote also about the practical importance of history. The requirement of a practical significance of historical investigations can mean that, a) since history discovers the law-making patterns and a law is something temporary invariable, knowing how a given law is working at one moment one can predict the future. This means that one can know with certainty that this law will work in the same way in the time to come. For the people it remains only "to act in agreement with the direction of the flow of the history" [3, p. 81]; b) History should have educational functions, i.e. give people the sense of a rightful moral behavior. The result is, however, a contradiction to the principle of objectivity of the historical knowledge. If the metaphor of objective knowledge is an exact copy of a certain historical object in the consciousness of a subject without transferring values of this subject into the objective knowledge, then the realization of the educational function – other way round – involves an identification of the individual with some (subjective) values/convictions of a group, and hence a selective approach to history. Indeed, no historical facts can serve as values for the group.

Thus according to Drahomanov, the theory of progress constitutes a basis of the construction of an idea of a historical regularity (*закономірність*). Progress of the human society is conceived not as only as a temporary sequence of a certain class of historical facts, but also as a law, as a necessary and unconditional movement from the beginnings of the human culture to its current state. At the very heart of this conception of progress lies the idea that the progress is a linear development. The theory of linear development was based on the scientific worldview of the modern times, that explained the development of the society by laws of a

mechanical form of movement. The idea of progress as a constant movement forward, as a passage from the lower stages of development to the higher ones, emerged as a secular version of the Christian view of history, when the need of a divine revelation was refuted. Also this idea is based on faith, but in this case it is the faith in the power of reason. Progress can be conceptualized twofold: belief in progress as an endless ascending development, which has no limits, or a belief in progress as a development, which finally leads to the perfect state of society.

Already Mill formulated the positivist model of law of progress in a following way:

[this] law, once ascertained, must [...] enable us to predict future events, just as after a few terms of an infinite series in algebra we are able to detect the principle, of regularity in their formation, and to predict the rest of the series to any number of terms we please [10, p. 679].

In this way, the main feature of historical law and of progress as one of its main manifestations, is for the positivists its prognostic function.

It was precisely the influence of positivism, which made the doctrine of progress the “commonplace” for Ukrainian intellectuals of the second half of the 19th century. For Drahomanov it was not only a realization of progress in three temporal dimension of the social reality, but also the idea of progress itself that influenced the development of the society. Moreover, he wrote about progress of the idea of progress as something primary to thinking about social and industrial development. Here he also followed Comte and his main general law – the theory of three stages of the mental development of humanity (theological, metaphysical and positive). For Comte, the law of three stages embodied the primacy of the human spirit over the biology when he explains the human evolution. He writes: “The history of humanity is directed by the history of human spirit, and this spirit follows a direction that is prescribed by its own nature. Ideas develop in a kind of spontaneous way, whereas new ideas appear as a result of natural development of the old ones” [11, p. 490–491].

Mill similarly considered “every considerable advance in material civilization” to be “preceded by an advance in knowledge.” He wrote further: “order of human progression in all respects will mainly depend on the order of progression in the intellectual convictions of mankind, that is, on the law of the successive transformations of human opinions” [10, p. 688]. Finally, Buckle, English historian who was the first to apply the principles of positivist doctrine to the science of history agreed with it, writing that “social phenomena were subordinate to their physical laws” [1, p. 90]⁴.

⁴ Echoing this idea, another representative of the positivistic doctrine, Lesevych, characterized social progress as a pursuit of the ideas of humanity and regarded the mental activity as the main moving force of the progress [9, p. 168]. In his eyes a given level of development of the mental abilities is also the main criterion of progress [9, p. 178].

In one of his latest publicist works “Paradise and progress” (1894)⁵ Draho-
manov once more retraced the history of the emergence and development of the
idea of progress. In his eyes only the idea of progress can adequately explain hu-
manity’s past, present and the future [6, p. 62]. However, the history of the hu-
manity is a history of spirit, is the history of formation of the people’s thought,
which develops into the direction of the positive thought. The idea that the devel-
opment of human spirit is the most characteristic aspect of all historical changes,
because “ideas control the world” comes from Comte. Draho-
manov finds the ear-
liest formations of the idea of progress in the contexts of religious type of con-
sciousness of people from ancient civilizations, who, dissatisfied with their current
situation, have formulated imaginations of a Golden Age, which was located not
in the future but in the past long gone. This is how the ideas of golden, silver, cop-
per and iron age in human history emerged in the writings of old-Greek writer and
agronomist Hesiod or those of Roman poet Ovid.

In the dualistic religion of the ancient Persians, zoroastrism, the picture of
former happy life is transferred also to the present and the future: when the forces
of good, led by Ormuzd, will defeat in the final battle the forces of evil, led by
Ariman, then the paradise on the earth will follow. Ancient Jews adopted this idea
of paradise on earth from the Persians. Similarly, Bible’s prophetic books and then
the story of the Messiah, paint us a picture of God’s kingdom on Earth. In con-
trast, Christianity follows the idea of chiliasm – thousand-year long kingdom of
Christ.

The very history of the idea of progress begins, according to Draho-
manov, after the Middle Ages, because it is primarily a secular idea. In the early modern
European history, people begin to change their view concerning the world and
start to see their happy future originating from their own efforts. Here the desira-
ble social order and human wellbeing are transformed in the literary genre of uto-
pia, and from the 17th century, scientific revolution changes the idea of priorities
of temporal modes. Now the humanity does not follow a thread of development
from the antiquity when people were wiser and more intelligent than nowadays,
but it is the present and the future that become the embodiments of humanity’s de-
velopment. Utopism creates an image of a perfect state and through the act of faith
makes it possible everywhere.

The emergence of the idea of humanity’s progress is tantamount with an ade-
quate perception of the social activity, because this activity itself develops accord-
ing to the laws of progress. Draho-
manov sees in the writings of Turgot (1727–
1781) and Concordet (1743–1794) the crucial impulses for the dissemination of
the idea of progress, with the latter enlarging this idea to the whole past of the hu-
mankind. After their writings, it became evident that only envisioning the history

⁵ This work was published first in the Kolomyia published journal of Ruthenian-Ukrainian radical party,
“Narod” (1894, № 6–12). Interestingly, nine years later in the same journal Ivan Franko, who was in-
fluenced by Draho-
manov, presented an analysis of the ideas of his teacher, publishing a scientific-
popular work “What is progress” (“Shcho take postup?”, 1903).

of the whole humanity and not of singular nations, one can discern the moment of continuity of the progress, because at the level of nations there exists a possibility of worsening of its historical state and even its demise. Progress can thus be seen only from the perspective of the totality⁶. Consequently, “the truthfulness of thought about the progress is being supplemented by the very growth of this thought, because one sees in the growth also development in time” [3, p. 64].

Basing on the positivistic guidelines, Drahoanov criticizes the idea of “unconditional progress“, which he located in the German speculative philosophy and in particular in writings of Hegel (1770–1831). Drahoanov rejected the providentialism of this history, construction of the idea of a “plan” of history, its national arrogance and the arbitrariness of the choice of the nation which is being chosen by the spirit. Following Hegel one would contradict the verity, since “taking randomly single features, single epochs, from the history of every nation, we are putting together an artificial chain of nations and create a fatalistic doctrine about a mission and change of nations” [2, p. 227–228] – he wrote already in his master thesis.

In general, Drahoanov was quite sympathetic to a following positivistic theory of progress: a) progress of human life is implemented accordingly to the laws, to the epochs, which change not in a fatalistic manner (as in the theory of mission of nations), but in an organic and logical way, following one another. b) This progress depends on the continuous progress of mental development; c) progress of civilization manifests itself and stimulates the growth of scientific, moral and political consciousness [2, p. 374–375].

Drahoanov, possibly under the influence of romantics, similarly as actually another historian, Mykola Kostomarov, divides history into an internal and external one. External history is the history of states, is a history of often random (i.e. not in accordance to laws) attacks and conquests of one nations over the others and here the progress does not always happen. But the internal history is always a field of implementation of the law of progress. And since progress is for Drahoanov happening in the first place at the level of human thought and not at the level of technology or economics, thus such thought will be active mostly in the sphere directly affected by it, that is in the internal history of nations [2, p. 407]. In fact, for Drahoanov progress is a category pertaining mostly to the scientific, moral, religious and aesthetic consciousness and is not a progress of economy or trade. Progress becomes for him an issue of direction of movement toward higher levels of spiritual culture and social justice.

One further point connecting Drahoanov to the theoretical teachings of positivism is multifactorial determinism, that is the understanding of the historical progress as a result of influence of several factors, combination of social and natu-

⁶ This idea appears already in the magisterial dissertation of Drahoanov: “According to another formula, whole humanity is one single organism, which progresses and improves not in separate parts (nations), but in the general mass whose parts (nations) are but steps of the general development” [2, p. 221].

ral forces. In addition, we can find here geographical determinism of Montesquieu (1689–1755), in Buckle's modification, where major factors causing the development of the society were climate, food, soil and landscape. Further, as was shown already, Drahomanov adds the role of human reason to the geographical factors. In addition, he believes that a historian should "analyze the internal causes of historical events and changes – cultural, economic, social and political ones," [2, p. 40] especially in combinations.

The theory of multiple factors, of principles determining historical events and phenomena, allowed searching for patterns of historical process and played a positive role in the development of the theory of history. Commencing from this theory, Drahomanov rejected the use of one-factor (economical) approach to the explanation of moving forces of the historical process by the Marxist theorists. Concerning Engels' version of historical materialism, he wrote:

You know that I cannot agree to an exclusively economic philosophy of history and politics; this I regard as a sort of metaphysics. Human life is too complex to be explained by only one element... Unfortunately the followers of Marx, or rather those of Engels, seldom investigate anything; they rather draw a priori, and often completely arbitrary, historical and political figures [5, p. 122].

Conclusion. Thus we see that Drahomanov was interested in general-philosophical aspects of positivism and in the methodological aspects of this doctrine. Components of this interest are general admiration for the phenomenon of science, natural-scientific analogies in understanding of the social and human sciences, application of the idea of law to historical process, predominance of the spiritual development in his thinking about progress and multi-factor approach to the explanation of the moving forces of history. As one can observe already in his master's thesis, he declared his rejection of the speculative approach to general history. But Drahomanov can be called positivist only in the broadest sense of this word, since he was never a dogmatic follower of the positivistic doctrine, and concerning this issue wrote even himself, that he does "not stand for any priests of science, positivist-doctrinaires" [6, p. 132].

References

1. Бокль Г. Т. История цивилизаций. История цивилизации в Англии : в 2 т. / Г. Т. Бокль. – М. : Мысль, 2000. – Т. 1. – 461 с.
2. Драгоманов М. Вопрос об историческом значении Римской империи и П. К. Тацит // Хроніка-2000. – К. : Фонд сприяння розвитку мистецтв, 2011. – Вип. 84. Невідомий Драгоманов. – С. 5–418.
3. Драгоманов М. Положение и задачи науки древней истории // Вибране : "...мій задум зложити очерк історії цивілізації на Україні". – К. : Либідь, 1991. – С. 60–83.
4. Драгоманов М. Передне слово до "Громади" // Громада. – Женева, 1878. – № 1. – С. 5–101.

5. Драгоманов М. П. 1-ий лист до Юліана Бачинського // Драгоманов М. П. Переписка / зібрав і зладив М. Павлик. – Львів : Накладом українсько-руської видавничої спілки, 1901. – Т. 1. – С. 122–125.
6. Драгоманів Михайло. Рай і поступ / М. Драгоманов. – Відень : Наклад і друк партійної друкарні, 1915. – 65 с.
7. Драгоманов М. Два учителі // Драгоманов М. Вибране: “мій задум зложити очерк історії цивілізації на Україні”. – К. : Либідь, 1991. – С. 575–604.
8. Дройзен И. Г. Возведение истории в ранг науки // Дройзен И. Г. Историка / пер. с нем. Г. И. Федоровой; под. ред. Д. В. Складнева. – СПб. : Владимир Даль, 2004. – С. 526–548.
9. Лесевич В. Философия истории на научной почве // Отечественные записки. – 1869. – № 1 (январь). – С. 163–196.
10. Милль Д. Ст. Система логики силлогистической и индуктивной : изложение принципов доказательства связи с методом научного исследования / Д. С. Милль / пер. с англ. под ред. В. Н. Ивановского. – М. : ЛЕНАНД, 2011. – 832 с.
11. Шапиро А. Л. Русская историография с древнейших времен до 1917 года / А. Л. Шапиро. – М. : Культура, 1993. – 761 с.

Отримано 30.09.2017

Анотація

Артюх В. Михайло Драгоманов: історія й поступ.

У статті виявлені такі елементи позитивістської парадигми в історико-теоретичних поглядах Драгоманова, як природничо-наукові аналогії у розумінні природи гуманітарно-соціальних наук, обов'язкове привнесення ідеї закону в історичний процес, першість розумового розвитку в уявленнях про поступ, багатфакторний підхід до пояснення рушійних сил історії.

Ключові слова: позитивізм, закони історії, поступ, багатфакторність.