

UDC 930.1:81'22:165.194:167
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.39.364974

Roman HOLYK

PhD hab. (History), Senior Researcher, Ivan Krypiakevych Institute of Ukrainian Studies, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, 4 Kozelnyska Street, Lviv, Ukraine, postal code 79026 (roman_holyk70@ukr.net)

ORCID: 0000-0003-3123-1920

Researcher ID : ADZ-9458-2022

Scopus-Author ID: 56205287000

Pavlo VASYLIV

PhD hab. (Theology), Associate Professor of the Department of Theology, Faculty of Theology and Humanities, Research Fellow of the Research Institute of Canon Law and Theological Sciences, Ivano-Frankivsk Academy of John Chrysostom, 22 Garbarska Street, Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine, postal code 76019 (vasylivp@ifaz.edu.ua)

ORCID: 0000-0001-6523-5570

Роман ГОЛИК

доктор історичних наук, старший науковий співробітник, Інститут українознавства ім. І. Крип'якевича НАН України, вул. Козельницька, 4, м. Львів, Україна, індекс 79026 (roman_holyk70@ukr.net)

Павло ВАСИЛІВ

доктор наук з богослов'я, доцент кафедри богослов'я факультету богословських і гуманітарних наук, науковий співробітник Науково-дослідного інституту канонічного права і богословських наук, Івано-Франківська академія Івана Золотоустого, вул. Гарбарська, 22, м. Івано-Франківськ, Україна, індекс 76019 (vasylivp@ifaz.edu.ua)

Bibliographic Description of the Article: Holyk, R., & Vasyliv, P. (2026). Sign and Memory: Semiotic and Hermeneutic Issues of Historical Sciences. *Skhidnoievropeyskyi istorychnyi visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 39, 150–163. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.39.364974

SIGN AND MEMORY: SEMIOTIC AND HERMENEUTIC ISSUES OF HISTORICAL SCIENCES

Abstract. *The purpose of the research is analyze certain aspects of semiotics, hermeneutics, historical cognition and historical memory, the role of the philological and philosophical models in the interpretation of history based on the historiographic sources. The methodology of the research is based on a complex of general scientific (analysis and synthesis, induction and deduction) and special (historical typological, historical systemic, retrospective) methods of scientific research applied to the historiographic texts. Conclusions.* *There is a semiotic hermeneutic structure in the study on history and historical narration. It appears as a kind of hermeneutic circle from the old understanding explanation to the new understanding explanation or a semiotic chain from the old sign (statement) to the new statement as a sign. The sign system of thinking recorded in symbols shapes human memory, limits and expands it. The signs and*

meanings fill the content / semantic dimension / space of memory, and record in it facts, events and things of the historical reality. Due to semantics / understanding of events / facts / things, it is possible to classify them in human thinking, place them in synchronic and diachronic series, and with their help (after verification) to create and interpret historical discourse/narrative. The historical discourse becomes an object of individual and collective memory, which signifies, records, and then rewrites, redefines it, as historical reality changes. The historical sciences also include the concepts of ethnology, linguistics, and cultural studies. A historian is a conscious or unconscious semiotician, since he/she expands. History is a text, discourse, sign, message created by a human being in the past, which is read and interpreted by a present human being. Historiography is a dialogue, a set of communicative / speech acts between an addresser and the addressee, who are in different time dimensions and circumstances. A sign makes individual and collective memory long-lasting, historicizes it. Memory adds a historical dimension to signs. The historical memory and historical science are considered to be: 1) semiotic acts of formulating, coding and decoding messages; 2) hermeneutic acts of understanding and interpreting messages. A sign becomes memory, and memory becomes a sign in order to become history, its signification / definition and understanding. At the same time, they are projected onto the existence of individuals and societies that seek the meaning of events and shape history.

Key words: history, memory, historiography, philosophy of history, sign, meaning, semiotics, hermeneutics, Ukraine, world, cultural studies.

ЗНАК І ПАМ'ЯТЬ: СЕМІОТИЧНІ ТА ГЕРМЕНЕВТИЧНІ ПРОБЛЕМИ ІСТОРИЧНИХ НАУК

Анотація. Мета роботи На підставі історіографічних джерел дослідити окремі аспекти семіотики, герменевтики, історичного пізнання та історичної пам'яті, роль філологічних та філософських моделей в інтерпретації історії. **Методологія дослідження.** При написанні статті використано комплекс загальнонаукових (аналіз та синтез, індукція та дедукція) і спеціальних (історико-типологічний, історико-системний, ретроспективний) методів наукового дослідження, застосованих до історіографічних текстів. **Висновки.** Дослідження історії та історична нарація має семіотико-герменевтичну будову. Вона виявляється своєрідним герменевтичним колом від старого розуміння – пояснення до нового розуміння-пояснення або ж семіотичним ланцюжком від старого знаку (твердження) до нового твердження як знаку. Зафіксована у символах знакова система мислення формує людську пам'ять, обмежуючи і розширюючи її. Знаки і значення заповнюють зміст / семантичний вимір / простір пам'яті, і фіксують в ній факти, події і речі історичної дійсності. Семантика / розуміння подій / фактів / речей, класифікує їх у людському мисленні, ставить у синхронічні та діахронічні ряди, а з їхньою допомогою (після верифікації) творить та інтерпретує історичний дискурс / наратив. Історичний дискурс стає об'єктом індивідуальної й колективної пам'яті, яка його означає, записує, а потім переписує, переозначає, в міру того, як змінюється історична реальність. Історичних наук потрапляють також концепції етнології, мовознавства, культурологія Історик є свідомим чи неусвідомленим семіотиком. Історія є текстом, дискурсом, знаком, повідомленням, створеним людиною в минулому, яке відчитує, інтерпретує нинішня людина. Історіографія – це діалог, сукупність комунікативних / мовленнєвих актів між адресантом і адресатом, які перебувають у різних часових вимірах та обставинах. Знак робить індивідуальну та колективну пам'ять тривалою, історизує її. Пам'ять додає знакам історичного виміру. Історична пам'ять та історична наука є: 1) семіотичними актами формулювання, упакування і розпакування повідомлень; 2) герменевтичними актами розуміння та витлумачення повідомлень, Знак стає пам'яттю, а пам'ять – знаком, щоб стати історією, її сигніфікацією / означенням і розумінням. Водночас вони спроектовані на екзистенцію індивідів та соціумів, які шукають сенс подій і формують історію.

Ключові слова: історія, пам'ять, історіографія, філософія історії, знак, значення, семіотика, герменевтика, Україна, світ, культурологія.

Problem Statement. The issue on the historical thinking and the role of sign systems in its formation and development is one of the fundamental issues on historiography,

philology, cultural studies, philosophy of science and culture. Thinking of a historian is a multidimensional phenomenon, which reflects various aspects of the Humanities. It develops in the direction of the historiographic scientific paradigms. However, the historical discourse is a consequence of the development of language, sign structures necessary for its expression (writing systems) and the structures expressed in it (concepts of worldview, style of thinking, ideas and stereotypes). Historiography depends on the methods of interpreting signs and discourses of the past. Hence, the historical narratives can and should be considered not only as stages of development of (historical) science, but as facts of the historical process itself, and as texts, semiotic and hermeneutic constructs. They are closely related to the issue on the individual and collective memory, which is also a product of semiotics and hermeneutics.

Review of Sources and Recent Research. There are diverse studies on semiotics (the general theory of signs and meanings) and hermeneutics (theories of interpretation, interpretation, etc.), which are among the leading in the Humanities. There were published numerous semiotic studies, which gain popularity, by Umberto Eco (Eco, 1976; Eco, 1986; Eco, 1989), John Deely (Deely, 2005), Tomas Sebeok (Sebeok, 1991; Sebeok, 2001), Roland Barthes (Barthes, 1974; Barthes, 1977; Barthes, 2012) and their followers (Cobley, 2005), as well as the works on religious (Terry, 1885) and philosophical hermeneutics of Hans Georg Gadamer (Gadamer, 1976; Gadamer, 1996), Paul Ricoeur (Ricoeur, 1965), their critics and interpreters (Bayón, 2006). The studies, which were written by Jan and Aleida Assmann (Assmann, 1995; Assmann, 2011; Assmann 2011), Paul Connerton (Connerton, 1989), and Pierre Nora (Nora, 1989), are also relevant in historical and cultural memory. The connections between semiotics/semiology, hermeneutics and historical sciences were partially studied in the field of hermeneutics of the historical process (Ricoeur, 1965), semiotic systems of historiography (Carrard, 1992), semiotics of history, and archaeology (Tamm, 2017; Tamm, & Preucel 2022). In contrast, the methodological issues on historiography and philosophy of history were studied much less in Ukraine (Zashkilniak, 1996; Zashkilniak, 1999), and the semiotic and hermeneutic aspects of these studies were covered in works on the theory of hermeneutics (Kvit, 2003; Ivanyshyn, & Markova, 2025), methodology of historical sciences (Haliv, & Ilnytskyi, 2021; Ilnytskyi, & Haliv, 2022; Haliv, & Ilnytskyi, 2023), history of historiography (Lazurko, & Dikhtievskyi, 2021), history of mentality (Stetsyk, & Vasylyv, 2025), ethnology (Artymyshyn, & Holyk 2021), culture and literature (Holyk, 2001; Holyk, 2006; Holyk, 2019), and Ukrainian historical discourse (Yas, 2014). There is still scarcity of works in historiography, which demonstrate the connection between the historical research, semiotics, and hermeneutics in the context of collective memory.

The purpose of the research is to present the results of the study, based on historiographic sources, certain aspects of semiotics, hermeneutics, historical cognition and historical memory, the role of philological and philosophical models in the interpretation of history.

Research Results. W. James described memory as a direction into the depths of the past, “a general feeling of the past direction in time,” one of the main elements of which is “a particular date (...) defined by its name or phenomenal contents” (James 1920, p. 288). This definition of memory was semiotic historical and consisted of two parts: actual memorization and recollection. At the same time, F. C. Bartlett depicted these processes not as the reproduction of “frozen data,” but as a constructive/reconstructive process of a person’s attitude to the entire mass of past experience (Bartlett 1995). Memorisation and recollection include naming, signification, definition of the past, and elements of its understanding. Memory is divided into individual subjective and objectified, collective,

which in turn contains communicative memory in the signs of oral tradition and cultural memory in written signs (Assmann, 1995; Assmann, 2011; Assmann 2011; Connerton, 1989; Nora, 1989). Knowledge of the distant past is transmitted through the “distant” collective written memory; individual memory becomes the key to understanding the recent past, and, in particular, a historical understanding of time arises (Whitrow, 1982). Semiotics and the hermeneutics of history are based on the above-mentioned principles.

Historiography, from a semiotic and hermeneutic point of view, is a product of written culture and of a remote, written cultural memory. It is based on the synthesis and analysis of a “close” communicative memory of individuals. Historiography can be analyzed as a variety/genre of literary writing (White, 1973), as a variety of oral and written discourses (Van Dijk, 1997) as a set of communicative acts (Searle, 1969) and as a critical analysis/interpretation of these acts, genres, discourses (Van Dijk, 2001). Speaking semiotically and hermeneutically, historical science, like any science, is a set of contemporary texts about the past, which are interpretations of texts of the past (which, in turn, are signs of past events and phenomena). Both are generated by certain languages according to the literary canons of the specific written cultures. That’s how the hermeneutics and semiotics of history intersect/meet with linguistic and literary semiotics and hermeneutics. As an expression of cultural memory, historiography is the interaction and opposition of a scientific, academic and artistic, “literary” writing. The ordinary conversation about history, from which it developed, is part of communicative memory, in which elaborated and neo-prodiscursive genres also cross (Bernstein, 1971). Written and oral history are considered to be the forms of the culture of memory. Oral history is created by a person, who speaks, written history is formed by a person, who writes: an author, a scholar, a writer. There were often combined the roles of a narrator, a scholar and a writer at certain stages, and folklore narrative, mythohistory and literature appeared at the same time as proto-science, and vice versa (Lord, 1971).

It is demonstrated by the history of European historiography (Breisach, 1994; Kelley, 1998). History as “the research” by Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Plutarch or Titus Livius, Suetonius and Sallust Crispus. Hence, ancient mythography as the transition from the mythology of Homer and Hesiod to quasi-historical and historical plots to the written history of Herodotus or Thucydides and later historiography. In this historiography, the discourse of research merged or almost merged with the texts of the sources. Hence the names of these texts: from the “Histories” “Ἱστορίαι” of Herodotus to the Anabasis” “Ἀνάβασις” “Retreat of the Ten Thousand” of Xenophon. At the same time, these mixed texts of the Greco-Roman historical writing formed the “semantic field” of the world historiographic tradition as “the conceptualization of history in the Herodotus-Thucydides sense” (Kelley, 1998, p. 5)

It should be mentioned that medieval historiography, from Eusebius to the Eastern European authors of “Povist Vremennykh Lit” (the Tale of Bygone Years) or the Galician-Volyn Chronicle, was also partly a literary narrative based on the church and secular authorities and models. At the same time, it became an attempt to make the events of earthly history symbols and allegories (signs) of sacred history. The above-mentioned tradition was partly continued in the historiography of the Renaissance, Baroque, and Enlightenment. The historiography of Romanism had features of the romantic literary historiosophy. The bifurcation of writing and style into History and Literature emerged, mainly, in the middle of the 19th century together with positivism as a method of science (on the one hand) and the image of literature as an artistic depiction of the reality (on the other). There emerged the current idea of a written source and archive as a place of accumulation and research of written culture. But

the historiography of the positivist era not only embodied the principles of Auguste Comte, but also adhered to the narrative strategies of literary positivism (White, 1973). Therefore, on the one hand, it separated the metalanguage of science from the language of sources and the language of the artistic literary tradition, and on the other, like the historiography of past eras, it built a literary myth on top of the positivist discourse, making it, according to the Barthes scheme, a sign of this myth (Barthes, 2012). Hence, there was the rise of the social and mental opposition between different types of the authors and interpreters of texts: 1) an “ordinary” person, who writes and explains historical events at the level of the Barthes “zero, everyday level of writing”, 2) a writer, who describes and interprets history from the perspective of metaphorical, figurative speech, 3) a scholar historian, whose interpretations are studies, and the texts are scientific treatises (Barthes, 1977). Historiography and literature are different types of writing, but they constantly cross.

Even the historians, who use completely quantitative and descriptive methods, do not explain the historical events exclusively in the language of exact and natural sciences. A historiographer, for the most part, does not interpret facts with the help of mathematical symbols (Bloch, 1964), but uses only the natural language. Many of its elements are also vague and unacceptable from the point of view of the exact sciences. The objective structures and conjunctures of history are only “a plan of expression” of the consciousness and mentality of people, the main figures of historical process. Hence, some historians write and conduct a research through the prism of “taking” the Other into the world as a being both close and distant at the same time (Marrou, 1954). Historiography is “a struggle of metaphors”, which can contain not only objective judgments but also hidden irony and satire, from the rhetoric and stylistics perspective. Historians’ texts were built, based on the form, according to the archetype/metaphoric model of the Novel, Comedy, Tragedy, with the help of Synecdoche and Irony, Metaphor and Metonymy. The texts, based on the content, embodied the discursive techniques of Mechanism and Contextualism, Formism and Organicism, the ideologues of Anarchism and Liberalism, Radicalism and Conservatism (White, 1973). At the beginning of the 20th century, an example of the “artisticization” of historical thought was Johann Huizinga’s “Autumn of the Middle Ages”, where the historical process is a colourful picture of ideas and figurative forms of thinking. The paintings by Wein Eyck brothers were the role model for Huizinga, hence, his texts were filled with contrasts and semi-contrasts of the past, which the author declared right from the first pages of the book: “Calamities and indigence were more afflicting than at present; it was more difficult to guard against them, and to find solace. Illness and health presented a more striking contrast; the cold and darkness of winter were more real evils. Honours and riches were relished with greater avidity and contrasted more vividly with surrounding misery. We, at the present day, can hardly understand the keenness with which a fur coat, a good fire on the hearth, a soft bed, a glass of wine, were formerly enjoyed” (Huizinga, 1922, p. 9). Such kind of approach was criticized for being too artistic. However, at the end of the 20th century, the French authors followed similar principles, who addressed microhistory of everyday life and history of emotions. The works of the “new history” representatives, even with their “rituals of quantification,” obeyed the principles of literary poetics (Carrard, 1992), and were also directed to imagination and emotions (Burke, 1991). The numbers and schemes are not only the signs of economics and statistics in the works published by Fernand Braudel, but also signifiers of everyday ideas and people’s lives (Braudel, 1985). The supporters of this trend were not, and are not, the structural semioticians or hermeneuticians, but their approach contains elements of both.

Hence, the titles of historical works of the second half of the 20th century, which carry a touch of the literary imagery: “Man in the Face of Death” by Philippe Aries and “Death in the West” by Michel Vavel, “The City under Siege: Fear in the Medieval West” by Jean Delumeau” or simply “The Medieval Imagination”, “The Birth of Purgatory” (Le Goff, 1984; Le Goff, 1988) by Jacques Le Goff or Georges Duby’s “Time of Councils”, etc. The object of study of many of these researches is semiotic systems, for example, gestures and greetings as signs of history in “Monteil” by E. Leroy-Ladurie. It was also evidenced by the final formulas of the book about Montaignou: “Montaignou itself is much more than a courageous but fleeting deviation. It is the factual history of ordinary people. It is Pierre and Beatrice and their love; it is Pierre Maury and his flock; it is the breath of life restored through a repressive Latin register that is a monument of Occitan literature. Montaignou is a physical warmth of the ostal, together with the ever-recurring promise of a peasant heaven. The one within the other, the one supporting the other” (Le Roy Ladurie, 1978, p. 356). There were also found similar attributes in the reconstructive “The Return of Martin Guerra” by Natalie Z. Davis (Davis, 1983). It was partly due to the made attempts in order to understand and revive the past, and partly to the need for the dialogue between historians and readers of their research. According to E. Breisach, different types of history have different popularity depending on how skillfully historical narrative affects imagination. The scientific history has a limited circle of readers; as a political narrative it attracts more resonance, but the greatest resonance is received by “dramatic history” (or history as drama) like Homer’s Iliad and Odyssey (Breisach, 1994, pp. 3, 33). Semiotically speaking, a historian must choose an appropriate discursive or literary genre to remain in touch with the reading public. The combination of historical and artistic forms of expression reflects the specificity of historical thinking, oriented both to the fact and to its meaning and forms of expression. The key here is perhaps Ingarden’s concept of concretisation of a literary work, which partially extends to the historiographical text: in the imagination of the author and the reader, events and characters are transformed from written signs into concrete pictures and images. In this case, the historical text can be accepted as a literary work of art (Ingarden, 1973).

The hermeneutic component of historiography is represented by the historiosophical tradition, for example, of the medieval historians. They interpreted history as realization of biblical prophecies and their own theological schemes (like St. Augustine with his division into “life before the law” – the fall – “life under the law” – the Last Judgment – “life “in the glory of God”, etc.). The modern schemes of Arnold Toynbee, who read history through the prism of “challenge and response, “Departure and Return”, “disintegration and polygenesis”, or Teilhard de Chardin, who saw in it the transition from the Alpha point to the Omega point should also be mentioned in this context (Toynbee, 1972; Teilhard de Chardin, 1961). In such systems, history is a continuum of signs that have a certain genesis, meaning and purpose, as in the theory of Karl Jaspers (Jaspers 1953), or an idea that drives events and contributes to their understanding, as in the concept of R. Collingwood (Collingwood, 1946.). In general, this is an approach to the world as a Book that can be read, and in which Memory / Memoria and History are a kind of court over events, communities and individual actors of these events (Blumenberg, 2022). In each of these approaches, history, in essence, is transformed into a series of signs, the Text is endowed with a Super-meaning. Only Paul Ricoeur claimed that no human being can grasp or read the general meaning radiating from the different loci of History (Ricoeur, 1965, p. 39). However, even behind these Ricoeurian meanings, one can see glimpses of the “written textual” interpretation of the historical events.

There is also an issue regarding the understanding the signs of time, the signs of history. Some authors see here a certain dialogue (question – answer) between a historian and a person / society of the past through the mediation of texts. At the same time, according to R. Collingwood (Collingwood, 1946) a historian's question must be “reasonable”, have some logical and factual basis. The question is answered by a sentence, which, in turn, must be a “correct”, adequate answer to a question. Hence, a coordinated complex of a question and an answer arises, within which a “true” interpretation of events is emerged. Often, a historian asks himself a question in order to recreate in his thinking the train of thought of another person who lived in the past. This means that there is already the part of an answer / interpretation in a historian's question. In other terms and concepts, the historical hermeneutics is considered as a deviation from causal explanation (where the event-cause and the event-effect are related as explanans and esplanandum). A historian, unlike the representatives of the exact sciences, does not ask the question “Why is this necessary?”, but “How is this possible?”, or is generally outside the coordinates of the usual cause-and-effect relationship (Von Wright, 1977). In the context of the history of wars, the destruction of cities and villages for the historical analysis is not a sign of an action of physical forces, man-made or natural cataclysms, but manifestation of a human aggression and military technologies (therefore, a sign of influence of political, economic, emotional structures).

The traditional historiography supporters (Langlois, & Seignobos, 1932; Chabod, 1973) focused on the “signs” that a historian and archeographer should be guided by: the type of material on which the document is written, paleographic indicators, formulas and dating systems used, the style (dictionary, syntax) of the document, its content, etc. It helps attribute the writing to a certain era and distinguish the original from a copy or a forgery (Nickell, 1996), real signs of history from false simulacra, illusions, and dummies of the past, such as the so-called “the Forged Dvůr Králové” and “Zelená Hora Manuscripts”, “slavic runes”, The Book of Veles (also called the Veles Book, Vles book, Vlesbook) or Isenbeck's Plank, James Macpherson's poems of Ossian, “pre-Columbian Mexican crystal skulls” and “The Codex Moguntiacus” or “Black Stones of Ica”. The above-mentioned approach is sometimes applied to such phenomena as The Światowid from Zbrucz River/ Zbruch idol or even to “Slovo o Polky Ihorevim” (The Tale of Ihor's Campaign) (Keenan, 2003). At the same time, in the cultural and historical memory, identifiable signs or sign complexes that are “uncertain” for the historian still remain, such as “The Voynich manuscript”, “The Phaistos Disk”, part of the Etruscan inscriptions or the Indus (Harappa) Script, the Cretan Linear A script, etc. A historian should not trust the signs of everyday life, but in moderation, so as not to create an overinterpretation (Eco, Culler, & Brooke-Rose, 1992), when, as in the novel by W. Eco, an ordinary laundry list will seem like a secret key to the Templar treasures (Eco, 1989).

The role of a semiotic and hermeneutic factor is growing in modern historiography. The “semiotic archaeology” (Gardin, 1980) is a vivid example of the above-mentioned. The archaeologist draws attention to the features that distinguish the objects of the material culture (the material and form of objects, as well as inscriptions, scenes, ornaments) in this context. There are built the “Compilations” (statements, verbal and visual signs for fixing, ordering, identifying the basic features of objects) and the “Explications” (theories that explain, interpret objects) on this basis. At the same time, as in hermeneutic concepts, the archaeologist, like the historian, relies on subjective prejudices, past experience in order to understand and then comment on the thing as a text.

Michel Foucault, the author of “mental archaeology”, when he studied or excavated the historical discourse, emphasized the differences between the traditional, past and contemporary history. According to the author, the traditional history transformed the monument into a document. On the contrary, the past history transformed the “document into a monument”, and history itself into memory. The philosopher insisted on the semiotization and systematization of the past. History, he believed, should “embroider” the fabric of the document, searching for aggregates, sequences and connections in it, and traces that need to be grouped (Foucault, 2002). According to Foucault’s interpretation, the past became both structure and philosophical metaphor. Hence, there emerged the studies on the history of madness and psychiatry (Foucault, 1965), criminal offenses (Foucault, 1975), the clinic and medical thought (Foucault, 1976), corporeality (Foucault, 1978–1986), the idea of prison and imprisonment (Foucault 1977), the history of the history of science itself as a change of words and things (Foucault, 1971).

Semiotics and hermeneutics were always important for those, who did not apply the postmodern approaches: for the historians of heraldry with its set of the visual symbols (the center of the shield, the right/left field of the coat of arms, its top and bottom, mottos), which require an interpreter hermeneutic; for the chronology scholars (whose signs are various dating systems, the names of days, months, religious holidays to which these dates are tied, etc.), numismatics (with its reading of the obverse and reverse of coins,) for the paleographers (for whom the main thing is the graphics of written signs). The historical genealogy and its will also be as a semiotic system of schemes and signs (reflecting birth, marriage, death of individuals).

The interest in semiology and hermeneutics is a consequence of the semiotic hermeneutic turn or mini-revolution in historiographic paradigms (Kuhn, 1996). From the point of view of semiotic and hermeneutic paradigms, historiography and historical sciences have several guides or analogies. The first of the paradigms: history in the light of the history of language and linguistic memory as the main modeling semiotic system. Language and linguistic memory can be described both in synchrony (in one time frame) and in diachrony (from the point of view of the historical changes in time). There are several universal mechanisms of changes in linguistic signs in diachrony (Campbell, 1999), for example: assimilation and dissimilation (similarity and differentiation of phonemes), prosthesis (the appearance of adjunct sounds) and metathesis, sounds in phonetics, analogy (when word forms are “adjusted” to a certain existing pattern in the language) in morphology; the external borrowings and the internal semantic changes (metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche) in vocabulary and phraseology, etc. In social coordinates languages can be divided into languages – the substrates and superstates, languages, argots and dialects, pure and creolized languages, etc. theoretically. Language systems move towards a more accurate and perfect expression of the realities and ideas of the societies in which they develop. Current histories of language exist in two versions: as the so-called historical grammars, which consider only the internal structure of languages, and as histories of literary languages, which consider the external historical and social background of languages through the prism of their written monuments. It is the latter that are closer to the historical discourse and use its language.

The second paradigm: history in the light of literary history as a secondary semiotic system from which historiography once developed. The history of literature is a change in systems and styles that correspond to certain periods of the development of art. There are diverse schemes for the development of literature. The literary process in diachrony is

sometimes interpreted as a change from primitive mythologism (antiquity), idealism (the Middle Ages) to realistic writing (modern times), separating the idealistic and realistic naturalistic lines of literature, etc. Dmytro Čyzevs'kyj's scheme (Čyzevs'kyj, 1997), is well known. According to the scholar, he saw in the history of literature periods of complication and simplification of the stylistics of the text: monumentalism – ornamentalism – reformation literature – baroque – classicism – romanticism – realism, etc. Instead, in “New History of French Literature” edited by Denis Hollier (Hollier, 1989), literary history is tied not to styles as signs of an era, but to the chronology of dates and historical events, on the one hand, to certain literary genres, images, concepts, trends, events in artistic life. In the case of such a literary history, the historical (as an “external” phenomenon) becomes a representative of the literary (“internal”). Some theorists question the existence of the traditional history of literature itself as an illustration of progress or simply the evolution of the canon of the literary thought (Perkins, 1993). Some authors believe that literary history should be tied to social history, others defend the autonomy of both these spheres. In general, the History of Literature is history, but a Different History, just as a literary work can be a historical document, but a Different, specific document. However, for the historians, the history of language and literature constitutes a “plan of expression”, an external form in which historical content is dressed.

History, linguistics and literary studies do not deal with the abstractions, but with society, differentiated according to the ethnocultural principle, which is studied by the historical/social/cultural anthropology or ethnology. The historical ethnological line of semiotics can be considered in several planes. An example was the ethnography of Claude Lévi-Strauss, who wrote in scientific form (“The Structural Anthropology”) and the artistic form (“The Sadness of the Tropics”) at the same time. His thinking often moved between the languages and cultures (the English and French versions of the works). There were also reflected imagery and scientificity in the titles of K. Lévi-Strauss's works (“The Way of the Masks”, “Raw and Cooked”, “Honey and Ashes”), which combine the desire for the mathematical accuracy (“formulas of mediation”) and the artistic descriptiveness in the retelling of myths and rituals. Numerous scholars called for the analysis of a specific ethnographic discourse, ethnological writing (or even “ethnographic fictions” as “true fictions”). Social/cultural anthropology is seen as a discipline born from the dialogue between the representatives of the written culture and bearers of the oral culture. In this case, the texts of ethnologists (authors) are (re-)interpretations of the texts of their field counterparts (respondents), and anthropologists themselves appear as “unmaskers” and “decoders” of oral messages in the language of written culture, mediators between civilizational worlds (Clifford, & Marcus, 1986).

In general, the study on history, historical narrative has a semiotic hermeneutic structure. It turned out to be a kind of hermeneutic circle from the old understanding – explanation to the new understanding explanation (Gadamer 1976; Gadamer 1996) or a semiotic chain from the old sign (statement) to the new statement as a sign: Sign – meaning – interpretation – meaning – sign. In other words, it is about redefining history on the basis of sources. The historian's scientific statement is a space of signs and meanings: subjects, objects / actants (the author and his characters), predicates (their actions, attributes), circumstances – circumstantial (which form the “scene” of the statement) like an ordinary sentence (Tesnière, 2015). Historical narrative is based on certain narrative schemes (“steps”, plot moves, motifs, etc.). The historian's discourse has a semantic, syntactic, and pragmatic dimension, like every semiotic hermeneutic unit: its signs are endowed with meanings and

senses, connected in a communicative chain that unfolds in a certain socio-historical context (which is surrounded by conceptual frameworks/frames) (Van Dijk, 1997).

From the point of view of the philosophy of language, in historiography, as in every scientific discipline, one can single out sentences/statements that are models of past worlds and reflect their configuration or state of affairs (Wittgenstein, 1922). But the meaning of these statements consists in not being within the framework of a positivist vision of the world, nor within the framework of the analysis of “atomic”/“protocol sentences”. The signs of historical narrative reflect “imprecise” knowledge of the world; the historians are aware that they cannot fully describe either memory or history: “Where of one cannot speak, there of one must be silent (Wittgenstein, 1922, p. 189). In general, history is a science “between knowledge and narrative” that exists alongside the knowledge and narratives of historians of literature and philosophy as representatives of “Other” historical sciences (Chartier, 1997, pp. 5, 13). Compared to them, it looks like “Other” literature and philosophy. Any Irene Marrou (Henry Davinson) argued that the texts of the past should be perceived only as intermediaries in “friendly communication” between modern man and his predecessors (the goal of which is to create sympathy for the object of knowledge). He called for moving from text analysis to the culture of the past, and from it to ideas about man, his thinking and the way of expressing thoughts (Marrou 1954). Hence, history is a science of existence as well as of the sign. There is a combination of Symbol, Thought and Referent in the semantic triangle by C.K. Ogden and I.A. Richards (Ogden, & Richards, 1923). From this point of view, the scientific statements of historiography are that symbolic, signified sphere where the positivist denotation/referent of analytical thinking intersects with the hermeneutic way of thinking, the phenomenology of social existence and the phenomenon of man in synchrony and diachrony.

Conclusion. The sign system (semiotics or semiology) of human thinking, fixed in external (linguistic and visual) symbols, forms and shapes human memory, limiting it and, at the same time, expanding it. Signs and meanings fill the content/semantic dimension/space of memory as a set of separate semantic fields and record in it facts, events and things of the surrounding reality as meaningful entities. Semantics/ a certain understanding of events/facts/things, classifies them in human thinking, places them in synchronic and diachronic series or sets, and with their help (after verification) creates and interprets historical discourse/narrative in the memory of people and societies. Hence, discourse becomes an object of individual and collective memory, which nominates, signifies, records it, and then rewrites, re-denotes, transcribes it as historical reality changes. That is why, the historical sciences also include concepts from other disciplines: ethnology, linguistics, and cultural studies. A historian is a conscious or unconscious semiotician, since he/she is an extension of the historical sciences. Therefore, individual moments of historical analysis are both analogue of the analysis of everyday speech and way of thinking, and a structuralist analysis of signs, meanings, and concepts, and a sociological and existential understanding of man as the main object and subject of history. Taking into consideration the above-mentioned, history is a text, discourse, sign, message created by a human being in the past, which is read and interpreted by a human being today. Historiography in such a reading is a dialogue, a set of communicative / speech acts between the addressor and the addressee, who are (mostly) in different time dimensions and circumstances. The sign makes individual and collective memory durable, places it in a historical context, and vice versa, memory (especially collective), using signs, creates history as a discourse/text/narrative, and adds a historical dimension to signs. Memory often depends

on stereotypes and myths, prejudices expressed in linguistic signs. The historical memory and historical science are considered to be: 1) semiotic acts of formulating, packaging and unpacking messages; 2) hermeneutic acts of understanding and interpreting messages. A sign becomes memory, and memory becomes a sign in order to become history, its signification/definition and understanding. Historiographic discourse and memory are projected onto the existence and life of individuals and societies that seek the meaning of events and shape history.

Acknowledgement. We express sincere gratitude to all editorial board members for the consultations provided during the preparation of the article for printing

Funding. The authors received no funding for the research and publication of this article.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Artymyshyn, P., & Holyk, R. (2021). From “One’s Own” to Foreign: Categories and Texts of Soviet Folkloristics and Ethnography. *Letonica*, 43, 92–112. [in English].

Assmann, A. (2011). *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization: Functions, Media, Archives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [in English].

Assmann, J. (1995). Collective Memory and Cultural Identity. Trans. J. Czaplicka. *New German Critique*, 65, 125–133. [in English].

Assmann, J. (2011). *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization: Writing, Remembrance, and Political Imagination*. Cambridge University Press. [in English].

Barthes, R. (1974). *S/Z*, trans. R. Miller. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux. [in English].

Barthes, R. (1977). *Elements of Semiology*, trans. A. Lavers and C. Smith. New York: Hill and Wang. [in English].

Barthes, R. (2012). *Mythologies: The Complete Edition*, transl. R. Howard and A. Lavers. New York: Hill and Wang. [in English].

Bartlett F. C. (1995). *Remembering. A Study in Experimental and Social Psychology*. With a new Introd. by W. Kintsch. Cambridge (Mass.). [in English].

Bayón J. R. (2006). *Hacia una Hermenéutica crítica*. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva. [in Spanish].

Bernstein, B. (Ed.) (1971). *Class, Codes and Control Volume 1: Theoretical Studies towards a Sociology of Language (Primary Socialization, Language and Education Series)*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. [in English].

Braudel, F. (1985). *Civilization and Capitalism 15th – 18th Centuries. Volume 1. The Structure of Everyday Life: The Limit of Possible*. London – Glasgow – Sydney – Auckland – Toronto – Johannesburg. [in English].

Blumenberg, H. (2022). *The Readability of the World*. Trans. R. Savage and D. Roberts. Ithaca, New York, U.S.: Cornell University Press. [in English].

Bloch, M. (1964). *The Historian’s Craft*. New York. [in English].

Breisach, E. (1994). *Historiography. Ancient, Medieval and Modern*. 2nd ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. [in English].

Burke, P. (Ed.) (1991). *New Perspectives on Historical Writing*. Cambridge: Polity Press. [in English].

Campbell, L. (1999). *Historical Linguistics*. Cambridge (Mass.). [in English].

Carrard, P. (1992). *Poetics of the New History: French Historical Discourse from Braudel to Chartier*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press. [in English].

Chartier, R. (1997). *On the Edge of the Cliff: History, Language, and Practice* [trans. L. G. Cochrane]. Baltimore; John Hopkins UP. [in English].

Chabod, F. (1973) *Lezioni di metodo storico* [Lectures on the Historical Method] Roma. [in Italian].

Clifford, J., & Marcus, G. (Ed.) (1986). *Writing Culture. The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley; Los Angeles; London. [in English].

Cobley, P. (Ed.) (2005). *The Routledge Companion to Semiotics and Linguistic*. New York; London: Routledge. [in English].

- Collingwood, R. G.** (1946). *The Idea of History*. London: Oxford University Press. [in English].
- Croce., B.** (1920). *Teoria e storia della storiografia* [Theory and History of Historiography]. Bari: Laterza. [in Italian].
- Connerton, P.** (1989). *How Societies Remember*. Cambridge: Harvard UP. [in English].
- Čyzevs'kyj, D. A.** (1997). *History of Ukrainian Literature (From the 11th to the End of the 19th Century)*. *Luckyj G. S. N. An overview of the Twentieth Century*. New York, Englewood. [in English].
- Davis, N. Z.** (1983). *The Return of Martin Guerre*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. [in English].
- Deely, J.** (2005). *Basics of Semiotics*. Fourth ed. Tartu. [in English].
- Eco, U.** (1976). *A Theory of Semiotics*, Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press. [in English].
- Eco, U.** (1986). *Semiotics and the Philosophy of Language*. Bloomington: Indiana U.P./ Midland Book Edition. [in English].
- Eco, U.** (1989). *The Open Work*, trans. A. Cancogni, Cambridge (Mass): Harvard University Press. [in English].
- Eco, U., Culler, J., Rorty, R., & Brooke-Rose, Ch.** (1992). *Interpretation and Overinterpretation*. Ed. by St. Collini. Cambridge Cambridge University Press. [in English].
- Eco, U.** (1989). *Foucault's Pendulum*, trans. W. Weaver. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich. [in English].
- Fitzsimons, M. A.** (Ed.). (1954). *The Development of Historiography*. Mechanicsburg: Stackpole Company. [in English].
- Foucault, M.** (1965). *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*, trans. Richard Howard, New York: Mentor. [in English].
- Foucault, M.** (1971). *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of Human Sciences*, New York: Pantheon. [in English].
- Foucault, M.** (1976). *The Birth of the Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception*, trans. A.M. Sheridan, London: Tavistock. [in English].
- Foucault, M.** (1978 – 1986.) *The History of Sexuality*, 3 vols., trans. Robert Hurley, New York: Pantheon, Vol. 1–3. [in English].
- Foucault, M.** (1975). *Pierre Riviere, having slaughtered my mother, my sister, and my brother: A Case of Parricide in the 19th Century*, trans. Frank Jellinek, New York: Pantheon; Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press. [in English].
- Foucault, M.** (1977). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan, Vintage. [in English].
- Foucault, M.** (2002). *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Routledge. [in English].
- Gadamer, H. G.** (1976). *Philosophical Hermeneutics*. Trans.by D. E. Linge. Berkeley: University of California Press. [in English].
- Gadamer, H. G.** (1996). *Truth and Method*, 2 ed., trans. J. Weinsheimer and D. G. Marshall. New York: Continuum. [in English].
- Gardin, J.-C.** (1980). *Archaeological Constructs*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [in English].
- Haliv, M., & Hnytskyi, V.** (2021). The Methods of Internal Criticism of Written Sources in the Works of Ukrainian Historians: on the Example of Scientific Narratives on the history of education (1840s – 1930s). *Annales Universitatis apulensis. Series Historica*, 1(25), 281–297. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.29302/auash.2021.25.1.14> [in English].
- Haliv, M., & Hnytskyi, V.** (2023). Education between “class” and “nation”: the influence of the theory of class struggle on Ukrainian educational historiography (1920s – 1980s). *Echa Przeszlosci*, 24(2), 123–139. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31648/ep.9671> [in English].
- Hollier, D.** (Ed.) (1989). *A New History of French Literature*. Cambridge (Mass); London: Harvard University Press. [in English].
- Holyk, R.** (2001). Semiotyka serednovichnoho i ranmodernoho myslennia [The Semiotics of Middle Age and Early Modern Thought]. *Istoriia ukrainskoi kultury v 5-ty tt. Tom 2: Ukrainska kultura XIII – pershoi polovyny XVII stolit* [History of Ukrainian Culture in 5th vol. Vol. 2. (Ukrainian Culture of the 13th – First Half of the 17th Century)], (pp. 183–188). Kyiv. [in Ukrainian].
- Holyk, R.** (2006). The Miracles as Sign and Proof: “Miraculous Semiotics” in the Medieval and Early Modern Ukrainian Mentality. *Letters from Heaven. Popular Religion in Russia and Ukraine*, (pp. 76–99). Ed. by J.-P. Himka and A. Zayarnyuk. Toronto; Buffalo; London. [in English].

- Holyk, R.** (2019). Leksykon ideologiczny galicyjskich Ukraińców w XIX – na początku XX wieku: zasady metodologiczne i podstawowe kategorie. [The Ideological Lexicon of Galician Ukrainians in the 19th – early 20th Centuries: Methodological Principles and Basic Categories]. *Z dziejów pojęć społeczno- politycznych w Polsce. XVIII – XX wiek* [From the History of Socio-Political Concepts in Poland. 18th – 20th Centuries], (pp. 427–452). Warszawa. [in Polish].
- Huizinga, J.** (1922). *The Waning Of The Middle Age*. London and Tonbridge. [in English].
- Ilnytskyi, V., & Haliv, M.** (2022). Theoretical Argumentation in the Historical Narrative of Ukraine of the Second Half of the 19th – First Half of the 20th century (on the Example of Research in the History of Education). *Eminak*, 3(39), 66–80. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.33782/eminak2022.3\(39\).591](https://doi.org/10.33782/eminak2022.3(39).591) [in English].
- Ingarden, R.** (1973). *The Literary Work of Art*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press. [in English].
- Ivanyshyn, P., & Markova, M.** (2025). *Osnovy hermenevtyky: konspekt lektsii* [The Basics of Hermeneutics. Lecture notes] Drohobych: Drohobyt'skyi derzhavnyi pedahohichnyi universytet imeni Ivana Franka. [in Ukrainian]
- James, W.** (1920). *Psychology*. New York. [in English].
- Jaspers, K.** (1953). *The Origin and Goal of History*, transl. M. Bullock. New Haven: Yale University Press. [in English].
- Kalakura, Ya.** (2016). *Metodolohiia istoriohrafichnoho doslidzhennia* [Methodology of Historiographical Research]. Kyiv: VPTs “Kyiv'skyi universytet”. [in Ukrainian].
- Kelley, D. R.** (1998). *Faces of History: Historical Inquiry from Herodotus to Herder*. New Haven: Yale University Press. [in English].
- Keenan, E. L.** (2003). *Josef Dobrovský and the Origins of the Igor' Tale*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard: Ukrainian Research Institute and the Davis Center for Russian and Eurasian Studies. [in English].
- Kolesnyk, I.** (2022). *Global History. Conceptual History*. Kyiv. [in English].
- Kolesnyk, I.** (2013). *Ukrainska istoriohrafia: kontseptualna istoriia* [Ukrainian Historiography: Conceptual History]. Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy. [in Ukrainian].
- Kuhn, T. S.** (1996). *The Structure Of Scientific Revolutions*. 3 ed. Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press.
- Kvit, S. M.** (2003). *Osnovy hermenevtyky* [The Basics of Hermeneutics.] Kyiv. [in Ukrainian].
- Langlois, Ch. V., & Seignobos, Ch.** (1899). *Introduction aux études historiques*. 2-ieme ed. Paris: Librette Hachette. [in French].
- Langlois, Ch. V., & Seignobos, Ch.** (1932). *Introduction to the Study of History*. New York: Henry Holt and Company. [in English].
- Lazurko, L., & Dikhtiievskiy, P.** (2021). From Ancient Times to Rzeczpospolita: History of the Polish State in the Reception of the Journal “Kwartalnik Historyczny” (1887 – 1939). *Skhidnoevropeiskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk – East European Historical Bulletin*, 19, 77–86. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24919/2519-058X.19.233832> [in English].
- Le Goff, J.** (1984). *The Birth of Purgatory*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press. [in English].
- Le Goff, J.** (1988). *Histoire et mémoire* [History and Memory]. Paris: Gallimard. [in French].
- Le Goff, J.** (1988). *The Medieval Imagination*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer, Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press. [in English].
- Le Goff, J.** (1993). *Intellectuals in the Middle Ages*, trans. T. Lavender Fagan. Oxford: Blackwell. [in English].
- Le Roy Ladurie, E.** (1978). *Montaillou: Cathars and Catholics in a French Village. 1294 – 1324*, trans. B. Bray. London: Scolar. [in English].
- Lévi-Strauss, C.** (1963). *Structural Anthropology*, trans. C. Jacobson and B. Grundfest Schoepf, New York: Basic Books. [in English].
- Lévi-Strauss, C.** (1984). *Tristes Tropiques (A World on the Wane)*, trans. J. Weightman and D. Weightman. New York: Atheneum. [in English].
- Lord, A. B.** (1971). *The Singer of Tales*. New York: Atheneum. [in English].
- Marrou, H.-I.** (1954). *De la connaissance historique*. Paris: Éditions du Seil. [in French].
- Meer, R. V.** (2010). The History of a Falsified Mesoamerican Pictorial Manuscript: The Codex Moguntiacus. *Indiana*, 27, 193–228. [in English].
- Nickell, J.** (1996). *Detecting Forgery: Forensic Investigation of Documents*. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky. [in English].

- Nora, P.** (1989). Between Memory and History: Le Lieu de Mémoire. *Representation*, 26, 7–24. [in English].
- Ogden, C. K., & Richards, I. A.** (1923). *The Meaning of Meaning: a Study of the Influence of Language upon Thought and of the Science of Symbolism*. London: K. Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co.; New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co. [in English].
- Perkins, D.** (1993). *Is Literary History Possible?* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. [in English].
- Ricoeur, P.** (1965). *History and Truth*. trans. from fr. Evanston: Northwestern University Press. [in English].
- Searle, J. R.** (1969). *Speech Acts. An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [in English].
- Sebeok, T.** (1991). *A Semiotics in the United States*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. [in English].
- Sebeok, T.** (2001). *Signs: An Introduction to Semiotics*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. [in English].
- Stetsyk, Yu., & Vasylyv, P.** (2025). Religious Mentality of Boryslav Deanery Parish Population of Peremyśl Greek Catholic Diocese (the 30-s of the 20th century). *Skhidnoevropieskyj Istorychnyi Visnyk – East European Historical Bulletin*, 35, 77–87. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24919/2519-058X.35.33268> [in English].
- Tamm, M., & Preucel, R.** (2022). Semiotics in History and Archaeology. In: Pelkey J., Petrilli S. and Melanson Ricciardone S. (Eds.) *Bloomsbury Semiotics. Vol. 3: Semiotics in the Arts and Social Sciences*, (pp. 49–67). London: Bloomsbury Academic. [in English].
- Tamm, M.** (Ed.) (2017). Special Issue: Semiotics and history: Boris Uspenskij 80, guest edited by M. Tamm. *Sign Systems Studies*, 45(3–4). [in English].
- Teilhard de Chardin, P.** (1961). *The Phenomenon of Man*, New York, London, Sydney, Toronto: Harper Torchbooks, Harper & Row, Publishers. [in English].
- Terry, M. S.** (1885). *Biblical Hermeneutics. A Treatise on the Interpretation of the Old and New Testaments*. New York: Phillips & Hunt. [in English].
- Tesnière, L.** (2015). *Elements of Structural Syntax*, transl. by T. Osborne and S. Kahane. Amsterdam & Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins. [in English].
- Toynbee, A.** (1972). *A Study of History: The Abridged One-Volume Edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press and Thames & Hudson. [in English].
- Tucker, A.** (Ed.) (2009). *A Companion to the Philosophy of History and Historiography*. Oxford/Boston: Wiley-Blackwell. [in English].
- Wittgenstein, L.** (1922). *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*. With Introduction by B. Russel. London. [in English].
- Weinryb, E.** (1976). Hermeneutics and History. *Zeitschrift für allgemeine Wissenschaftstheorie / Journal for General Philosophy of Science*, 7(2), 327–339. [in English].
- White, H.** (1973). *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP. [in English].
- Whitrow, G. J.** (1982). *The Natural Philosophy of Time*. 2ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press. [in English].
- Van Dijk, T. A.** (Ed.) (1997). *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. Vol. 1–2. London: Sage. [in English].
- Van Dijk, T. A.** (2001). Critical Discourse Analysis. In D. Tannen, D. Schiffrin, & H. Hamilton (Eds.), *Handbook of discourse analysis*, (pp. 352–371). Oxford: Blackwell. [in English].
- Von Wright, H.** (1977). Explanation and Understanding. *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, 82(1), 108–120. [in English].
- Yas, O.** (2014). *Istoryk i styl. Vyznachni postati ukrainskoho istoriopysannia u svitli kulturnykh epokh (pochatok XIX – 80-ti roky XX st.)* [The Historian and The Style. Prominent Figures of Ukrainian Historiography in the Light of Cultural Epochs (Early 19th – 1980s)]. Kyiv, Vol. 1-2. [in Ukrainian].
- Zashkilniak, L.** (1996). *Vstup do metodolohii istorii* [Introduction to the Methodology of History]. Lviv: LONMIO. [in Ukrainian].
- Zashkilniak, L.** (1999). *Metodolohiia istorii vid davnyntsi do suchasnosti* [Methodology of History from Ancient Times to the Present]. Lviv. [in Ukrainian].

The article was received September 29, 2025.

Article recommended for publishing 30/05/2026.

This article is available under the CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 license