



СОЦІАЛЬНА ФІЛОСОФІЯ SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY

UDC 930.2:165.5

DOI 10.35433/PhilosophicalSciences.1(99).2026.79-87

EVENT AS A CATEGORY OF HISTORICAL KNOWLEDGE

Y. H. Boreiko*

The article considers an event as a category of historical analysis by identifying the essence of a historical event in comparison with a historical fact and revealing the significance of a historical event by clarifying the subject's reaction to its emergence and development. A historical event is interpreted as a change in current social conditions by a subject or social group, characterised by relative independence in the system of events, integrity and significance for the historical process. The methodological significance of the study is based on the understanding of an event as a concept of historical science that reflects the fundamental connections and relationships between reality and cognition. In the context of understanding the historical process as the dynamic development of social reality, given the multiplicity of temporality, the author considers the event as the source element of the temporal organisation of history. The study substantiates the ontological nature of the event as opposed to the epistemological origin of the fact, whose function is to reflect the event in human consciousness. Unlike the historical nature of an event, the historicity of a fact has a derivative meaning. In historical research, important criteria for determining the significance of an event are the scale of the period under study, the scholar's affiliation with a particular scientific direction, historiographical tradition, etc. An important role in determining the significance of an event is played by the position of the subject of historical knowledge, who selects, interprets and evaluates the place of events in the historical process. The classification of events as historical and their interpretation as significant also depends to a large extent on the environment in which the event occurred and developed, and the context of its analysis and interpretation. At the everyday level of cognition, the subject adapts information about an event to the current social context, interpreting it on the basis of narratives known in society.

Keywords: *historical knowledge, historical event, historical fact, historical time, historical development, subject, social context, significance of the event.*

* Yurii Boreiko / Юрій Бореїко, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor, Professor of the Department of Political Science and Public Administration (Lesya Ukrainka Volyn National University Lutsk, Ukraine)
yboreiko71@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0002-0786-8764

ПОДІЯ ЯК КАТЕГОРІЯ ІСТОРИЧНОГО ПІЗНАННЯ

Ю. Г. Борейко

У статті подія розглядається як категорія історичного аналізу шляхом виявлення сутності історичної події у порівнянні з історичним фактом та розкриття проблеми значущості історичної події шляхом з'ясування реакції суб'єкта на її виникнення та розвиток. Історична подія трактується як зміна суб'єктом або соціальною групою поточних соціальних умов, яка характеризується відносною самостійністю в системі подій, цілісністю та значущістю для історичного процесу. Методологічне значення дослідження ґрунтується на розумінні події як поняття історичної науки, що відображає фундаментальні зв'язки та відношення дійсності і пізнання. У контексті розуміння історичного процесу як динамічного розвитку соціальної реальності, з огляду на множинність часовості, розглянуто подію як джерельний елемент часової організації історії. Дослідження обґрунтовує онтологічну природу події на противагу епістемологічному походженню факту, функція якого полягає у відображенні події в людській свідомості. На відміну від історичної природи події, історичність факту має похідне значення. В історичному дослідженні вагомими критеріями для визначення значущості події є масштаб досліджуваного періоду, належність вченого до певного наукового напрямку, історіографічної традиції тощо. Важливу роль у визначенні значущості події відіграє позиція суб'єкта історичного пізнання, який відбирає, інтерпретує та оцінює місце події в історичному процесі. Віднесення події до розряду історичних та їхня інтерпретація як значущих значною мірою залежить також від середовища появи та розвитку події і контексту її аналізу й інтерпретації. На повсякденному рівні пізнання суб'єкт адаптує інформацію про подію до поточного соціального контексту, інтерпретуючи її на основі відомих у суспільстві наративів.

Ключові слова: історичне пізнання, історична подія, історичний факт, історичний час, історичний розвиток, суб'єкт, соціальний контекст, значущість події.

Statement of the problem. The actualization of interest in the phenomenon of an event is due to significant changes in non-classical and post-classical rationality, which led to search for new tools to explain the evolution of science, including rethinking the understanding of history as a form of scientific knowledge. It is obvious that today history is no longer perceived as a science that deals only with the study of the past. More objective is the view of history as a timeless category that includes various aspects of human activity. In the context of new approaches, the vision of historical development has become widespread through the prism of understanding the discreteness of time, multiple and multilayered nature of temporality, interweaving of time segments of different durations.

Analysis of research and publications. Although the event has acquired the status of a scientific concept in the field of historical knowledge, in the twentieth century, more intensive

research in the subject field of the event took place within the philosophical fields. Relying on the belief that attempts to distinguish general laws within history have not been successful, philosophers have sought to find the specifics of historical knowledge in non-classical and post-classical science. R. Aaron [1], A. Badiou [2], L. Wittgenstein [18], M. Heidegger [10], J. Deleuze [8], P. Reeker [15], A. Whitehead [17], etc. addressed various issues related to the category of "an event".

Instead, historians, describing, analyzing and explaining individual events or their combination, mostly did not aim to understand and define the concept of "the event". However, based on philosophical interpretations of this phenomenon, significant success in the study of this problem in the field of historical science has achieved F. Braudel [4], R. Kozellek [12], R. Collingwood [7], E. Le Roy Ladouri [13], J. Revel [14], R. Chartier [6], etc.

The objective of the article is to understand the event as a category of historical analysis, which involves identifying the essence of a historical event in relation to a historical fact, as well as disclosing the significance of historical events in connection with the subject's interpretation and development of this phenomenon.

Discussion and results. The methodological significance of the study of the event is to understand this phenomenon as a concept of historical science that reflects the fundamental connections and relationships of reality and knowledge. The recognition of event as the basic concept of historical analysis is based on the concept of event history, which involves understanding history as a science of events in their relationships and sequences. The consequence of the critique of the classical paradigm of event history, due to the strengthening of the positions of rationalist science, was the denunciation of the importance of the category of "the event", the shift of attention from the singular to the regular and recurring. The emergence of historical structuralism has led not only to a revision of event history, but also the displacement of political history, which is based on the distinction between insignificant everyday life and important events.

The refusal of a number of scholars from the concept of event history was prompted by a discussion in historical science that unfolded in the 60's and 70's of the twentieth century. The ideas of structural history, embodied by the representatives of the French "school of the Annals", radically changed the development of historical science. According to their views, the study of any aspect of social reality focuses on the study of social structure as a more complex whole, which involves application of an interdisciplinary approach. In this context, the event is considered as a superficial layer of history, so the story-narrative should give way to the story-problem [5].

According to the Annals school representatives, the historian who interprets the event in a short historical

perspective, imposes on this event the external laws of duration, ie increases the proportion of the element of historical chance, incompleteness, distortion. In this way, a personality of a historian becomes essential not only in the process of establishing the causal conditionality of a particular event, but also in its interpretation. In view of this, F. Brodel believed that the time duration of understanding the event should be long enough, because only in this way you can "escape from the captivity of events to return and look at them with different eyes, ask them other questions" [5].

Representatives of cultural history emerged from scientific circles that identified themselves with social history. Thus, the work of E. Le Roux Laduri "Montao" is often considered a cliché work on microhistory, where the focus is on some seemingly marginal events [13]. R. Chartier identified the main object of study of cultural history representations that construct and reflect fragments of reality in which social groups live. The scientist considers events, on the one hand, through the prism of representations of the past, on the other-through the creation of certain rules of representations of real and imaginary, which together make up the culture [6].

The methodological advantages of microhistory were substantiated by J. Revel, noting that this direction allows "to show how many serious things we can say when nothing seems to be happening on the surface" [14]. Moving away from the paradigms of functionalism and structuralism that determine the development of the social sciences, microhistory focuses on everyday life and locality. The advantage of microhistory over the historiographical practice of "The School of Annals" is to elevate the uncertain, exceptional, irregular in everyday life. It is noteworthy that this approach stimulates rehabilitation of the event, which brought together not only representatives of social sciences but also natural sciences.

However, the inherent historiography of the opposition of event and structural history has grounds for criticism. Thus,

despite the fact that events and structures belong to different orders of temporality, structures are revealed and comprehended through events, allow events to occur, exist, be identified [5]. According to P. Reeker, the works of one of the opponents of the event history of F. Brodel are largely saturated with event data. Events affect the structures from within, manifesting itself, on the one hand, in a different rhythm of change of structures, on the other – in the researcher's interest in breaking points of structures, their sudden or slow destruction, the prospect of extinction, which is also manifested in events [15].

The analysis of methodological approaches and scientific works shows, on the one hand, the differences in the interpretation of the event, determining the importance of the event in the historical process, criteria for selection and interpretation of historical events, on the other – the need for more detailed analysis of these and related issues.

Historical event and historical fact.

The change in the vision of historicity, historical time, the role of historical authors and the personality of the historian, which is observed in the modern stage of science, has led to a different attitude to the phenomenon of events, conceptualization of which is increasingly understood through the prism of the temporal essence of human experience. It is noteworthy that the attempt to understand the phenomenon of the event, among other things, indicates an attempt to understand the role and functions of historical knowledge in the modern society.

Representatives of the historical science generally agree with the assessment of the event as a transformation of a settled life, believing that even when a joyful event occurs, it still causes change, causes irregularity. An event is a break in historical time, a break in gradualness, which allows historians to mark and organize time, "space" the time duration.

R. Collingwood distinguishes in the event an external side of social action and an internal content of this phenomenon. The external aspect of the event includes everything that can be described in terms

of bodies and their movements, such as Caesar's crossing of the Rubicon River or drops of his blood on the floor of the Senate building. The scholar interprets the inner side of the event as something that can be described only in terms of categories of thought – Caesar's challenge to the laws of the Republic, or the clash of Caesar's constitutional policy with the policy of his assassins. The historian should always deal with both sides of the event, without making an exception for either [7].

According to researchers, the analysis of the inner side of the event means its correlation with the context, which is characteristic of the historical science, starting with Herodotus. That is why the reasons for raising the event to the rank of historical are not always due to the importance of the event in the eyes of contemporaries. Instead, this happens when the consequences of the event are obvious, which can be considered in a broader context. Contemporaries never experience a historical moment as a historian who knows what happened next. The broad historical context that allows for a comparative analysis of the event with others is not formed at the time of its implementation [19].

In this context, the category of "historical event" should be distinguished from the concept of fact. The understanding of this problem takes place within the interdisciplinary discourse with the participation of philosophers, philologists, representatives of historical science, who study the issues of methodology. Scientists note the incorrect use of the term "fact" in scientific research in relation to phenomena that have an ontological nature. In other words, the concept of "fact" is applied not only to the phenomena of consciousness, but also to the phenomena of objective reality. Ignoring the semantic differences between the fact and the event instead of displaying knowledge about objects leads to the designation of these objects [21: 250]. Undoubtedly, this practice indicates the need for conventional use by the scientific community of the concepts of fact and event, taking into

account the differences in their semantic connotations.

L. Wittgenstein formulated his own view of the essence of facts and events, who put forward the concept of logical dynamics, which provides a description of dynamic logical models of the world. According to the author, the world, ie everything that happens, is not divided traditionally into objects, but into facts. The thinker does not interpret a fact as any combination of objects, but one that can be the subject of a true or false statement [18]. The general logical model of the world proposed by L. Wittgenstein is that objects can be included in events and then contained in actual situations of expression. In contrast to the fact that it is presented as something moving, variable, something that is experiencing formation, the event presupposes coming of the moment when it will take place, ie will be embodied in the present.

Scholars see the essence of the differences between these concepts in the ontological nature of the event and the semantic, mental origin of the fact, as well as in the procedural nature of the event and the non-procedural nature of the fact. Scholars understand the fact as a way of analyzing the events of reality, which aims to highlight the parties that are relevant in terms of semantics of the text. Unlike events that immerse a person in the world, facts translate the world into human consciousness. The fact focuses on the world of knowledge, logical space, and the event – on what is happening in real space and time. The facts belong to the observed world and do not exist regardless of the statements. The fact is not the object of observation, because you can witness the event, but not the fact. Belonging of the fact to the world of knowledge determines its non-procedural nature. Since it is possible to describe the unfolding of events, not facts, it is impossible to say that the fact occurred in a certain era, was long or short, fast or slow. If the event occurs, the fact is stated.

The Ukrainian scientist O. Yeremenko defined a historical event as a change in current social conditions, which is the result of actions taken by an individual or

social group, has relative independence in the system of events, as well as integrity and significance for the historical process. Instead, a historical fact in the researcher's understanding is a reliable knowledge of any subject of the empirical level of history. Fact is a general scientific concept, so it does not express the specifics of historical reality and historical knowledge [21: 248].

When analyzing the discrepancy between an event and a fact, emphasis should be placed on the actuality of the event and the optional nature of the factual event. A certain habit of a famous historical figure can be interpreted as a fact, but should be considered an event, as the latter expresses changes in public life. In other words, the fact is any historical reality that is associated with a change in the overall socio-historical situation or regardless of this change. Events are characterized by historicity, while for the fact this function has a derivative meaning. The ability of facts to denote aspects of reality, properties, features of things and events gives grounds to argue that the event, in contrast to the fact, has a procedural nature [3].

The problem of significance of a historical event. The most important for historical cognition are the events of social life caused by the activities of a man or society. Historians have traditionally considered political events to be among them, as the government has always claimed supremacy in the annals of history, and the ruling elites have shown interest in a certain interpretation of events. Thus, the significance of the event associated with the coming to power of the ruler was automatically recognized as historical, without the need to verify time.

The events of military or diplomatic history – victories and defeats in battles, foreign yoke, revolutions, uprisings, mutinies, riots – have also long been important. Among the significant events were of particular importance, in particular, the decline and fall of states and cities, which drew an analogy with death as a social phenomenon. The significance of death was recognized not

only in relation to the rulers, but also in mass death of people during a war, famine, epidemic, etc.

There is no consensus in the scientific literature on the criteria for determining the significance of a historical event. The significance of the event, according to researchers, can be imagined as the point of intersection of interpretation and objectivity [16]. In turn, the objective aspect of the significance of the event, which is not leveled by the specifics of interpretations, is determined by the stable preservation of the consequences of the event in a historical process [20].

Regarding the selection of events in order to analyze the degree of impact of their consequences on social reality, it should be noted that the same event can be interpreted in terms of significance depending on the objectives of the study. The criteria are the scale of the study period, the scientist's affiliation to a particular scientific field, historiographical tradition, and so on. For example, a significant event for Christian historiography can be neglected in the scientific literature, referring it to the category of secondary phenomena.

In this context, it is interesting to note about distinguishing of several levels of selection of historical events by W. Drey. The first level involves identifying the types of human actions and experiences that are the focus of the researcher's attention, and political or economic history requires its own choice of events. The second level of judgment about the significance of the event is related to the preference for specific actions within the chosen field of human experience. In this case, the reason for the choice is in the field of assessment of the past, which is not limited to moral, aesthetic, intellectual, pragmatic considerations, but can be carried out according to the criteria of representativeness [9].

Thus, an event can be considered historic in view of what phenomenon it caused, because what is not a historically important event can be an important historical event. The event has the ability to be a harbinger of later events, and not a very significant event can become

significant, because it has become a symptom of more important trends or phenomena. Undoubtedly, events that are considered secondary (negotiations, meetings), under certain conditions, even in the eyes of contemporaries acquire a historical character, determining the parameters of a particular macro-event.

According to A. Badiou, the event includes a biased subjective perception, which is part of the event itself. The event is identified only from the standpoint of "an interpretive intervention", ie from the point of view of those who acknowledge the existence of this event. The thinker understands an intervention as any procedure by which a set of effects is recognized as an event. For those who did not dare to intervene and did not determine their belonging to the event, it will forever be doubtful whether the event actually took place [2].

In other words, the event is associated with a sharp and unexpected shift in the semantic field, breaking the ties of meanings and signs. Accordingly, there must be someone who is able to perceive and record this deviation or gap of values. It is, therefore, an entity whose experience will be able to combine the previous and the new, because the event is not outside an observer, but occurs through him.

The role of the subject in the appearance of the event can be considered from another angle. Social life is full of news and adventures that are not necessarily perceived as events, because the definition of events does not depend on intensity, but on quality. Only the subject can combine various elements of social life and interpret their interactions as an event. According to J. Deleuze, the event acts as a filter that sifts through the chaos of a situation, organizing it into certain combinations that are identified by an individual as events [8].

The subjectivity of the researcher is important in classifying events as historical and interpreting them as significant. This statement is based on the absence of natural event marking on the time scale, so it depends on the position of a historian and the experience of protagonists [11]. The degree of

significance of a particular event may be perceived differently by contemporaries and historians. Thanks to another perspective, the historian is able to correlate the event with a certain socio-historical context, which makes it possible to determine the quality of the event, which can be seen by contemporaries.

As we can see, the perception of the significance of an event is significantly influenced not only by the environment of its occurrence and unfolding, but also the context of analysis and interpretation of the event. The importance of the context is emphasized by J. Deleuze, who understood the event as a meaning that does not exist outside the sentence that expresses it [8].

However, the event is not limited to the historical context, although it is closely related to it. It is formed in the depths of this context, but does not directly originate from it. In other words, the event cannot be a natural consequence of its preconditions, because it requires a different perspective, view, vision, which will allow to see the situation differently. That is, again there is a need for an entity that combines many different situations, which is interpreted as an event.

In trying to describe and comprehend the event, the subject uses known narratives, imposing them in the form of interpretive frameworks on the reality that is comprehended, which contributes to structuring. That is, narrativization is a mechanism through which the subject adapts the event to experience by organizing information about it. Adaptation of the event takes place in the form of symbolization – the process of creating concepts that are analogous to the subject, phenomenon, event, as well as concentrate their generalized features. With the help of these concepts, the subject does not appeal to a single event, but focuses on the large-scale nature of the subject of understanding. In the process of symbolization, concepts are produced that act not only as carriers of certain meanings, but also as indicators that orient the subject to the significance

of the context to be perceived and interpreted [19: 6].

The role of the subject is manifested not only in the appearance, but also in the continued existence of the event. The researcher's idea may include the inclusion of the event in various interactions – causality, sequence, interdependence, chain of events and more. Thus, in the process of creating a counterfeit history, a chronological chain of events is constructed, which could be the result of the absence of an event of interest, thus checking the soundness of the generally accepted interpretation. Continuity and necessity, according to scientists, are spontaneously born from a historical perspective. The starting point of this process is the goal, because we know what was, not what could be [1].

Through the media, a historical event can be artificially presented as significant, creating space for various manipulations. Along with the negative connotation, this situation creates for the researcher a number of perspectives, which are, in particular, the possibility of using ways of interpreting the event in a particular society to analyze the specifics of the development of its social structures.

Conclusions. Analysis of an event as a category of historical knowledge shows its importance as one of the main and most difficult to understand concepts in historical science. In particular, in historiography, which for much of its existence has been based on event history, the event has always been and remains the starting point of historical analysis. An important function of the event is the temporal organization of history, ie the demarcation of historical periods. In this context, the event is interpreted as a break in historical time, an indicator of which are the most epoch-making events that reflect the essence of the period. On the basis of the analysis of semantic connotations of the concepts "fact" and "event" it is possible to state the ontological nature of the event and the epistemological origin of the fact. If the event actually occurs, the fact is designed to adequately reflect the event in the human mind. The historicity of a fact is derived from the historical nature of the

event to which the fact is related in some way. The significance of an event depends on the nature of the selection, interpretation and general assessment of the role of the event in the historical

process. At the same time, an important role belongs to the subject of historical knowledge, which adapts the perception and understanding of the event in a particular context.

LITERATURE

1. Aron R. Introduction à la philosophie de l'histoire: essai sur les limites de l'objectivité historique. Paris: Gallimard, 1991. 521 p.
2. Badiou A. Manifesto for Philosophy. Madarasz N. (Trans.). New York: State Univ of New York Pr., 1999. 128 p.
3. Boreiko Y., Fedotova T. The COVID-19 Pandemic as an Extreme Event: Effects, Reactions, Consequences. *European Journal of Transformation Studies*. 2021. Vol. 9. № 2. P. 125–142. DOI: 10.5604/01.3001.0015.7454
4. Braudel F. History and the social sciences: the long duration. *American Behavioral Scientist*. 1960. № 3 (6). P. 3–13.
5. Braudel F. The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II: Vol. I. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995. 1375 p.
6. Chartier R. Cultural History: Between Practices and Representations. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1988. 209 p.
7. Collingwood R. G. An Autobiography and Other Writings. Oxford: OUP Oxford, 2013. 581 p.
8. Deleuze G. Logic of Sense. London: Bloomsbury, 2015. 376 p.
9. Dray W. H. On Importance in History. H. E. Kiefer, M. K. Munitz (eds). *Mind, Science, and History*. Albany: State Univ. of New York Press, 1970. P. 251–269.
10. Heidegger M. On Time and Being. Stambaugh J (Trans.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002. 84 p.
11. Koselleck R. Futures Past: The Semantics of Historical Time. Cambridge: Mass.: MIT Press, 1985. 280 p.
12. Koselleck R. Sediments of Time: On Possible Histories. Trans. and ed. by S.-L. Hoffmann and S. Franzel. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2019. 301 p.
13. Le Roy Ladurie E. Montaillou. The Promised Land of Error. New-York: G. Braziller, 1979. 383 p.
14. Revel J. L'histoire au ras du sol. In *Levi Le pouvoir au village. Histoire d'un exorciste dans le Piémont du XVIIe siècle* 2. Paris: Gallimard, 1989. P. I-XXXII.
15. Ricoeur P. La mémoire, l'histoire, l'oubli. P.: Seuil, 2000. 676 p.
16. Ricoeur P. Time and Narrative. Vol. 1. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990. 381 p.
17. Whitehead A. Philosophy: Selected Essays. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1972. 217 p.
18. Wittgenstein L. Logical-Philosophical Treatise. Voettcher R. (Trans.). North Charleston: Independently published, 2015. 160 p.
19. Борецько Ю. Г. Інтерпретація культурної події і умовах соціальних змін: український вимір. *Вісник Національної академії керівних кадрів культури і мистецтв*. 2020. № 1. С. 3–7. DOI: 10.32461/2226-3209.1.2020.196553
20. Єременко О. М. Історична подія в контексті європейської традиції (соціально-філософський аналіз): автореф. дис. д-ра філос. наук, 09.00.03, Дніпропетровськ, 2010. 37 с.
21. Єременко О. М. Поняття "факт" і "подія": смислова схожість і відмінність. *Філософські дослідження*. 2014. Вип. 14. С. 245–254.

REFERENCES (TRANSLATED & TRANSLITERATED)

1. Aron, R. (1991). Introduction à la philosophie de l'histoire: essai sur les limites de l'objectivité historique. [Introduction to the Philosophy of History: An Essay on the Limits of Historical Objectivity]. Paris: Gallimard Group (in French).

2. Badiou, A. (1999). *Manifesto for Philosophy*. Madarasz N. (Trans.). New York: State Univ of New York Pr. (in English).
3. Boreiko, Y., Fedotova, T. (2021). The COVID-19 Pandemic as an Extreme Event: Effects, Reactions, Consequences. *European Journal of Transformation Studies*. Vol. 9. № 2. P. 125–142. DOI: 10.5604/01.3001.0015.7454 (in English).
4. Braudel, F. (1960). History and the social sciences: the long duration. *American Behavioral Scientist*. № 3 (6). P. 3–13 (in English).
5. Braudel, F. (1995). *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II: Vol. I*. Berkeley: University of California Press (in English).
6. Chartier, R. (1988). *Cultural History: Between Practices and Representations*. Cambridge: Polity Press (in English).
7. Collingwood, R. G. (2013). *An Autobiography and Other Writings*. Oxford: OUP Oxford (in English).
8. Deleuze, G. (2015). *Logic of Sense*. London: Bloomsbury (in English).
9. Dray, W. H. (1970). On Importance in History. H. E. Kiefer, M. K. Munitz (eds). *Mind, Science, and History*. Albany: State Univ. of New York Press. P. 251–269 (in English).
10. Heidegger, M. (2002). On Time and Being. Stambaugh J (Trans.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press (in English).
11. Koselleck, R. (1985). *Futures Past: The Semantics of Historical Time*. Cambridge: Mass.: MIT Press (in English).
12. Koselleck, R. (2019). *Sediments of Time: On Possible Histories*. Trans. and ed. by S.-L. Hoffmann and S. Franzel. Stanford: Stanford UP (in English).
13. Le Roy Ladurie E. (1979). *Montaillou. The Promised Land of Error*. New-York: G. Braziller (in English).
14. Revel, J. (1989). L'histoire au ras du sol. [History at Ground Level]. In *Levi Le pouvoir au village. Histoire d'un exorciste dans le Piémont du XVIIe siècle*. Paris: Gallimard (in French).
15. Ricoeur, P. (2000). *La mémoire, l'histoire, l'oubli*. [Memory, History, Forgetting]. P.: Seuil (in French).
16. Ricoeur, P. (1990). *Time and Narrative. Vol. 1*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press (in English).
17. Whitehead, A. (1972). *Philosophy: Selected Essays*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press (in English).
18. Wittgenstein, L. (2015). *Logical-Philosophical Treatise*. Boettcher R. (Trans.). North Charleston: Independently published (in English).
19. Boreiko, Yu. H. (2020). Interpretatsiia kulturnoi podii i umovakh stsiialnykh zmin: ukrainskyi vymir. [Interpretation of a cultural event and the conditions of social change: the Ukrainian dimension. *Visnyk Natsionalnoi akademii kerivnykh kadriiv kultury i mystetstv*. № 1. С. 3–7. DOI: 10.32461/2226-3209.1.2020.196553 (in Ukrainian).
20. Yeremenko, O. M. (2010). Istorychna podiia v konteksti yevropeiskoi tradytsii (sotsialno-filosofskyi analiz). [Historical event in the context of European tradition (socio-philosophical analysis)]: avtoref. dys. d-ra filos. nauk, 09.00.03, Dnipropetrovsk (in Ukrainian).
21. Yeremenko, O. M. (2014). Poniattia "fakt" i "podii": smyslova skhozhist i vidminnist. [The concepts of "fact" and "event": semantic similarities and differences]. *Filosofski doslidzhennia*. Vyp. 14. S. 245–254 (in Ukrainian).

Receive: January 23, 2026
Accepted: February 14, 2026