

Zh.K. Rystan* , R. Kemberbay 

L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian national university, Kazakhstan, Nur-Sultan

*e-mail: rystan1994@mail.ru

METHODS USED IN THE GROUNDING OF EPISTEMOLOGY IN THE XX CENTURY ONTOLOGY: THE CASE OF HEIDEGGER AND HARTMANN

The article examines the methods used in contemporary epistemology, we will focus on ontologically based epistemology made by Hartmann and Heidegger. The traditional philosophy which is under big critics should be re-examined and given its original meaning by giving it a new direction. The article is not about how Hartmann and Heidegger were doing it, but it rather about why it is necessary to switch to an ontology structure instead of the main search of traditional philosophy. Mainly it sprouted in the XIX century and took its true form in the XX century. The positivist understanding of science, in the XIX century, argued that science and philosophy had great responsibilities in changing and transforming the world, and accordingly, it reduced philosophy to a discipline based solely on natural sciences, logic and mathematics. According to this understanding, western-based concepts such as 'universality', 'objectivity', and 'rationality' were glorified as indispensable values of modern science.

However, since XX century the positivist understanding has been subjected to serious criticism. One of these general transformations is that Heidegger and Hartmann tried to reconstruct the way of thinking in the search for the absolute in traditional philosophy.

Key words: Epistemology, ontology, method, positivism, objectivity, Hartmann, Heidegger.

Ж.Қ. Рыстан*, Р. Кемербай

Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті, Қазақстан, Нұр-Сұлтан қ.

*e-mail: rystan1994@mail.ru

XX ғасырда эпистемологияны негіздеу мақсатында қолданылған әдістер онтология: Хайдеггер мен Хартманның мысалы

Мақалада қазіргі эпистемологияда қолданылатын әдістер қарастырылады, біз неміс ойшылдары Николай Хартман мен Мартин Хайдеггер жасаған онтологияға негізделген эпистемологияға тоқталамыз. Байыпты сынға ұшыраған дәстүрлі философияны қайта қарап, оған жаңа бағыт бере отырып, бастапқы мағынасына қайтадан оралу керек деген пікірлерін қарастырамыз. Мақалада Хартман мен Хайдеггер мұны қалай жасағаны туралы емес, дәстүрлі философияның негізгі ізденісінің орнына онтологияның құрылымына көшу қажет екені туралы ойларын не себептен пайда болғанына сараптама жасалады. Негізінен бұл үрдіс XIX ғасырда пайда болып XX ғасырда өзінің шынайы күшін алған болатын. XIX ғасырдағы ғылым туралы позитивістік түсінік, ғылым мен философияның әлемді тану және өзгерту жолында үлкен жауапкершілік жүктелген салалар екендігін дәлелдеді, сәйкесінше олар философияны тек жаратылыстан логика мен математикаға негізделген пәнге айналдырды. Осы түсінікке сәйкес «универсиализм», «объективтілік» және «рационалдылық» сияқты батыстық ұғымдар қазіргі ғылымның таптырмайтын құндылықтары ретінде жарияланды.

Алайда, XX ғасырдан бастап позитивістік түсінік ауыр сынға ұшырады. Жалпы түрлендірулердің бірі – Хайдеггер мен Хартман дәстүрлі философияда абсолютті іздеудегі ойлау тәсілін қайта құруға тырысты.

Түйін сөздер: Эпистемология, онтология, әдіс, позитивизм, объективтілік, Хартман, Хайдеггер.

Ж.К. Рыстан*, Р. Кемербай

Евразийский национальный университет им. Л.Н. Гумилева, Казахстан, г. Нур-Султан

*e-mail: rystan1994@mail.ru

Методы, используемые в обосновании эпистемологии в XX веке онтология: пример Хайдеггера и Хартмана

В статье исследуются методы, используемые в современной эпистемологии, в этой статье мы сосредоточимся на онтологически обоснованной эпистемологии, разработанной Хартманом и Хайдеггером. Традиционную философию, которая подвергается серьезной критике, следует пересмотреть и придать ей первоначальный смысл, придав ей новое направление. Статья не о том, как Хартман и Хайдеггер хотели реализовать это, а о том, почему было необходимо перейти к структуре онтологии вместо основного поиска традиционной философии. В основном он зародился в XIX веке и принял свой истинный вид в XX веке. Позитивистское понимание науки в XIX веке утверждало, что наука и философия несут большую ответственность за изменение и преобразование мира, и, соответственно, они свели философию к дисциплине, основанной исключительно на естественных науках, логике и математике. В соответствии с этим пониманием такие западные концепции, как «универсальность», «объективность» и «рациональность», были провозглашены незаменимыми ценностями современной науки.

Однако с XX века позитивистское понимание подвергается серьезной критике. Одна из этих общих трансформаций заключается в том, что Хайдеггер и Хартман пытались реконструировать образ мышления в поисках абсолютного в традиционной философии.

Ключевые слова: Эпистемология, онтология, метод, позитивизм, объективность, Хартман, Хайдеггер.

Introduction

The main focus of contemporary epistemology, unlike what is generally seen in history, has been to give an analytical definition of knowledge and to explain its conceptual elements. J.L. As Pollack states in his book 'Contemporary Theories of Knowledge', he says that 'the primary issue at the center of epistemology is informational justification'. However, in another contemporary period, a significant part of the philosophers who produced ideas on epistemology argued that the concept of justification in the definition of knowledge is not illuminating at all. And they had acted on the assumption that it caused quite the opposite major problems and responses. As a result, the informational justification literature has been the scene of critical debates and conflicting theories revolving around the axes of interiority-externality, foundationalism-cohesionism, and contextualism. (Mehdiyev, 2011, page 31)

As for contemporary methods of epistemology, they are: an act of analytical knowledge imparted by such figures as G. Frege, B. Russell, and G. Moore, who opened up against Hegelian influence. Here Russell and Whitehead's 'Principia Mathematica' is an important turning point. That is, their method must confine itself to careful analysis of concepts, since it is not a branch of philosophy, logic, or mathematics, nor a natural science comparable to physics or biology. In other words, it is a method

of acquiring science that centers on mathematics. The other method derived from this method is more generally XX. It is a method of acquiring science, which includes the analysis of language, carried out by the philosophers of the XIX century (West, 1998, s. 14-15). This view in English-speaking countries has been threatened by continental European approaches. They are hermeneutic, structuralist, post-empiricist, deconstructionist, etc. approaches (Skinner, 1997, page 14).

Knowledge problems initially constitute one of the main fields of philosophy; Issues such as the source of information, how it is formed, its accuracy and precision are among the most discussed information problems. However, XX. If we look at the opinions of Hartman and Heidegger, who lived in the 19th century, we realize that their thoughts have undergone a profound change. That is, it differs from the thinking of classical philosophers and their executing approaches.

Main part

Ontology: N. Hartmann

Many modern philosophers have explored the limits and foundations of human knowledge; Along with Descartes, Locke saw the source, precision and scope of human knowledge as its main purpose. Moreover, for Berkeley, philosophy consists of the search for wisdom and truth. With him, Hume laid

some kind of foundation for the sciences, but denied the possibility of explaining the ultimate principles of human knowledge. Under the influence of Hume, Kant attempted to give a critique of human cognition, that is, many philosophers, including Descartes, examined the limits and foundations of human knowledge in very different directions (Çüçen, 2011, page 50).

Ontology has been treated together with phenomenology as a self-science in our age, and it has been revived by Hartmann, who takes the independence of the existing from knowledge as a starting point, especially in the field of values. However, he is accepted as the founder of the new ontology, as he accepts that the ontological structure is the basis of all philosophical problems. Hartmann says that there is a unity and integrity of the being that stands in front of us innumerable and constitutes a multiplicity, which also carries this multiplicity and diversity within itself. What provides this integrity or unity is that the existent has a stratified structure (Hartman, 1998, page 17).

Knowledge problems initially constitute one of the main fields of philosophy; Issues such as the source of information, how it is formed, its accuracy and precision are among the most discussed information problems. However, XX. If we look at the opinions of Hartman and Heidegger, who lived in the 19th century, we realize that their thoughts have undergone a profound change. That is, it differs from the thinking of classical philosophers and their executive approaches (Hartman, 1998, s. 1). An advanced expression of this relation of categories was found by Kant on the basis of transcendental idealism and expressed as the identity thesis. But this thesis was later completely overshadowed by the fictional systems of German idealism, and it was forgotten as a result of the years-long struggle of Positivism against German Idealism. Later, however, the wiser New Kantians pulled him out of this oblivion and brought him into the position he deserved; but this too was done on the basis of idealistic assumptions and without a full grasp of what Kant had accomplished; because the thesis of the identity of the categories of knowledge and existence gains full meaning only on the basis of ontology. Although not positively exhausted to the end, it is only here, on the basis of ontology, that a preconception of the knowledge connection in all its dimensions can be achieved, as the theories of the Ancient philosophers clearly saw and the Skeptics grasped the insolubility in this relation. (Hartman, 1998, page 1).

This view of knowledge, which we have mentioned above, as a 'transcendental' view has since become more entrenched, and a number of other important conclusions have been drawn from it. Because this view is not only based on idealist theories, correlativism also starts from the point of inseparability of the connection of subject and object from each other, phenomenology bearing Husserl's mark (which he put forward in "Ideen"), and even the view of historical relativity regarding truth and existence are based on this. Lastly, what we call righteousness is counted as being very different; but the main idea is always the same: we cannot know things 'as they are', all we have of them is variable understandings. (Hartman, 1998, page 1).

This view of knowledge, which we have mentioned above, as a 'transcendental' view has since become more entrenched, and a number of other important conclusions have been drawn from it. Because this view is not only based on idealist theories, correlativism also starts from the point of inseparability of the connection of subject and object from each other, phenomenology (which he put forward in "Ideen") bearing the stamp of Husserl, and even the view of historical relativity regarding truth and existence are based on this view. Lastly, what we call righteousness is counted as being very different; but the main idea is always the same: we cannot know things as they "are", the only thing we have left of them is variable understandings (Hartman, 1998, page 2).

Hartmann says that at the end of these analyzes that comprehend knowledge in all its dimensions, the knowledge relationship is basically an entity relationship. Knowing is an act that goes beyond the subject; It is revealed that the object has an existence of its own beyond being an object. The ontological foundations of knowledge are exhibited in all its dimensions. Knowledge of these fundamentals is capable of illuminating many knowledge problems. Because it is its ontological foundations that determine the quality of knowledge and ultimately its accuracy and certainty. For this reason, these ontological analyzes are needed in order to discuss the problem of accuracy-precision in knowledge (Hartman, 1998, page 9).

Looking at today's epistemological problems with Hartmann's new ontology will reveal the reasons for the deadlocks that some of today's common knowledge views have fallen into, and will end many discussions. Because, Hartmann's view of knowledge and his view of knowledge are the clearest indicator of how this kind of a look, which is

almost forgotten today, can be in the light of many epistemological questions, especially the problem of relativity of accuracy, and looking at information from its object, from the ontological structure of the object. are the successes of those who take steps in philosophy? Hartmann's philosophy is to remind once again the ontological view and achievements of the views of knowledge that forget the object of knowledge. (Tepe, 1998, page viii).

Ontology: M. Heidegger

What is the meaning of being, what is being, his study of being and his etymological studies on being led Heidegger to pre-Socratic natural philosophers? He started to question this question, which he has asked from today, from the very beginning of humanity's philosophical adventure, and that natural philosophers grasped existence a priori and directly, and became the initiator of the metaphysics of this kind of comprehension of existence, together with Plato. Philosophy has now become the universe of explaining the existence of metaphysics. This metaphysical understanding of existence, which continued with Aristotle, gained a linguistic meaning in the Middle Ages and turned into the field of divine existence. Heidegger, who claimed that the existence of modern western philosophy, which started with Descartes, was handled with a metaphysical understanding of its epistemological basis, made his biggest objection to the Cartesian tradition. Heidegger's aim is to develop an ontology-based theory of being (existence) by reinterpreting the dualist understanding of being based on epistemology, which is based on the Cartesian tradition. (Güçen, 2003, page 14).

According to Heidegger's interpretation, the scientific mind of the West gets to work after these attempts fail. But scientific reason retains, if not normative, at least the fundamental metaphysical belief that it makes sense to speak of its causal foundations as absolute or unconditional real grounds. This scientific ontology leads to the concession of natural science to its assumptions about what is real, to our culture's bias in favor of science and scientific method as the only true knowledge. In order to question the dominance of scientific reason, it is necessary to start with the basic assumptions of modern philosophers, since the idea of western metaphysics, which is absolutely and unconditionally true, is rooted in them for the first time. (West, 1998, page 138).

According to Heidegger, the pre-Socratic philosophers Parmenides, Heraclitus and Anaximander are primarily those who think and question Being. These thinkers asked the question 'What is Being?' directly and in a priori way. Heidegger calls these thinkers 'primordial thinkers'. But, he says, post-Socratic thinkers took the question of Being in the background. Therefore, the question of 'What is Being?', which is the subject of traditional philosophy, has left its place to the question of 'What are existing objects and objects?'. As a result, the separation of the world of ideas from the world of appearances, which started with Plato, led to the separation between being and objects. This distinction caused the devaluation of ontology, which is the main subject of philosophy. Because, according to Heidegger, the history of philosophy has brought wrong explanation and interpretation to the question of "Being" with a traditional and metaphysical approach. Thus, the history of philosophy left its place to traditional (Aristotle) metaphysics, and 'Being' separated from objects and 'existence' from 'essence'. As a result of this differentiation, these concepts remained under the influence of assumptions that did not have a clear character. For Heidegger, because of the primacy of essence over existence, the meaning of existence as being-as absolute and prior was lost and forgotten. Here we can see similar elements of Heidegger with Hartmann. Like Heidegger and Hartmann, 'Being', history of philosophy According to Heidegger, post-Socratic thinkers explained the real meaning of 'Being' with metaphysical concepts and made them forget its original meaning. According to Heidegger, traditional philosophy must be studied and given its original meaning (Çüçen, pages 8-9).

Heidegger says that we can grasp being only in its ontological priority. Being that is comprehended and questioned, Dasein finds its meaning not in the light of theories and hypotheses consisting of propositions, but in the existential structure of the being called Dasein, which is the meaning of being in itself. The existential structure of Being, then, can only be grasped by fundamental ontology. Mathematics, theology, natural sciences or human sciences cannot give the meaning of Being. Because all these fields of knowledge are disciplines that deal with existence conceptually. These disciplines, which see Being as an object of knowl-

edge, give a conceptual description of beings, not the meaning of Being. Making Dasein an object of knowledge means explaining it not from its existential structure, but from its conceptual structure. Dasein is first of all not the object of knowledge, but the Being that gives modes of being in itself. Only its own existence can give Dasein's being. (Çüçen, 2003, pages 11-12).

Heidegger defines the analysis of Dasein, which is unfolded in the World of Being, as a dominant subject in his work 'Being and Time'. In The Letter on Humanism, Heidegger speaks of 'Being and Time', of time and the return to being. It asks the question of being understood in time. He emphasizes that the idea that things have an essence has determined Western thought since the Greeks and laid the groundwork for metaphysics. The existence of Essence also requires the existence of a non-essence. Whereas, there is no openness in a subject-object relationship by the self-existing human. Man cannot determine the existent with the epistemological possibility of knowing, the existent being intelligible by the human is only possible by the existence revealing itself in some way. (Pöggeler//Aleman, 1994, pages 26-27).

For Heidegger, if he grasped not only the possibility of being-there, but the possibility of making his existence transparent not only to himself, but of interrogating the meaning of existentialism itself in advance of the meaning of being-there in general, and if in such an inquiry the eyes of being-there were opened for his essential historicity, then in relation to being-there- The insight that the investigation, exhibited in terms of ontological necessity, is itself determined by historicity, is inevitable (Heidegger, 2004, page 45).

In Heidegger's own words, the existence of Being-there finds its meaning in temporality. But temporality is also the condition of the possibility of historicity as a temporal kind of being-there itself, regardless of whether and how being-there is something that exists in 'time'. The determination of historicity lies before what is called history (world-historical events). Being-there is its own past in the way of its being, which, roughly speaking, in any case "becomes" from its own future. Being-there is on its way to being-there and thus has grown into and in a traditional interpretation of being-there, with its understanding of being-there. He constantly under-

stands himself from this, most closely and within a certain range. This understanding reveals and organizes the possibilities of its being. His own past, and that means always the past of his 'generation' does not follow the presence there from behind, but on the contrary in any case already goes ahead of him. (Heidegger, 2004, pages 44-45).

This elemental historicity of being-there may remain hidden from him. But it can also be exposed in a certain way and get the attention it deserves. Being-there can reveal tradition, hide it, and examine it explicitly. Uncovering the tradition and revealing what it conveys and how it conveys can be taken as a task that stands in its own right. Being-there thus brings itself to historical-scientific investigation and research in the type of being. But the science of history, or more precisely, historiography, as the type of being-there-inquiring questioning, is possible only because the being-there is determined through historicity on the basis of its being. As long as this historicity is hidden and hidden from the-there, historical-scientific research and the revealing of history will be rejected. The lack of historical science is not an argument against the historicity of being-there; on the contrary, it is an introduction to it as the incomplete mode of the state of being. A period of time may not be scientific only because it is 'historical'. (Heidegger, 2004, page 45).

Conclusion

These two thinkers drew attention to the fact that science is based on unscientific and irrational elements, which contradicts both the rational, cumulative and progressive understanding of science of the positivists, and the "historical" understanding of science, which is placed on a purely rational basis. This revolution was carried out by the struggle of many thinkers of the second half of the twentieth century. Heidegger and Hartmann argued that instead of building scientific activity on a single basis, such as an unchanging abstract human thought (or mind), they tend to view it in terms of its variability and dynamism in different historical periods. Ontological analysis of the nature of science and knowledge was influential and later it changed the traditional epistemology point of view into existential view.

References

- Çüçen Kadir, 2011. Modern Epistemolojinin iki geleneği. B N. Mehdiyev, Çağdaş Epistemolojiye Giriş. İstanbul, «İnsan Yayınları», 266 s.
- Çüçen Kadir, Heidegger ve Felsefe. <https://docplayer.biz.tr/4689447-Heidegger-ve-felsefe.html>.
- Güçen Kadir. (2003). Heidegger'de Varlık ve Zaman . Bursa, «Asa Kitabevi», 220 s. Hartman Nikolai. (1998). Ontolojinin Işığında Bilgi. (H. Tepe, Çev.). Ankara, «Türkiye Felsefe Kurumu», 264 s.
- Heidegger Martin, (2004). Varlık ve Zaman. (A. Yardımlı, Çev.). İstanbul, «İdea Yayınevi», 101 s.
- Heidegger Martin, (2009). Metafizik Nedir? (Y. Örnek, Çev.). Ankara, «Türkiye Felsefe Kurumu», 264 s.
- Mehdiyev Nebi, (2011). Çağdaş Epistemolojiye Giriş. İstanbul, «İnsan Yayınları», 266 s. Pöggeler//Aleman, (1994). Heidegger Üzerine İki Yazı. (D. Özlem, Çev.). «İnsan Yayınları», 180 s.
- Skinner Quentin, (1997). Teorinin Dönüşü. B Q. Skinner, Çağdaş Temel Kuramlar (A. Demirhan, Çev.). Ankara, «Vadi Yayınları» 196 s.
- Tepe Harun, (1998). Nicolai Hartman ve Bilgiye Ontolojik Bakış. B N. Hartman, Ontolojik Işığında Bilgi (H. Tepe, Çev.). Ankara: «Türkiye Felsefe Kurumu» 78 s.
- West David, (1998). Kıta Avrupası Felsefesine Giriş. (A. Cevizci, Çev.). İstanbul, «Engin Yayıncılık», 318 s.