

JUHAN HELLERMA

Mapping Time:  
Analysis of Contemporary Theories  
of Historical Temporality





**JUHAN HELLERMA**

Mapping Time:  
Analysis of Contemporary Theories  
of Historical Temporality



UNIVERSITY OF TARTU  
Press

Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Institute of Philosophy and Semiotics

Dissertation has been accepted for defence of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Philosophy on October 2, 2020 by the Council of the Institute of Philosophy and Semiotics, University of Tartu.

Supervisors: Dr. Jaanus Sooväli, University of Tartu, Estonia;  
Professor Marek Tamm, Tallinn University, Estonia;  
Professor Ethan Kleinberg, Wesleyan University, USA

Opponent: Professor Helge Jordheim, University of Oslo

Defence: The thesis will be defended at the University of Tartu, Estonia, on December 3, 2020, at 16:15, Jakobi 2–336, Department of Philosophy

The work on the dissertation has been supported by the Graduate School of Linguistics, Philosophy and Semiotics at the University of Tartu; the European Social Fund's Doctoral Studies and Internationalisation Programme DoRa, which is carried out by Foundation Archimedes; the national scholarship programme Kristjan Jaak, which is funded and managed by Archimedes Foundation in collaboration with the Ministry of Education and Research; the Centre of Excellence in Estonian Studies (European Union, European Regional Development Fund) and the research projects IUT20-5 (Estonian Ministry of Education and Research); European Regional Development Fund (University of Tartu ASTRA Project PER ASPERA); RANS Professorship of Intellectual History (Department of Philosophy, University of Tartu); Baltic Studies Program at Yale.



European Union  
European Regional  
Development Fund



Investing  
in your future

ISSN 1406-9520

ISBN 978-9949-03-483-3 (print)

ISBN 978-9949-03-484-0 (pdf)

Copyright: Juhan Hellerma, 2020

University of Tartu Press  
[www.tyk.ee](http://www.tyk.ee)

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of this thesis was only possible due to the support of many generous and inspiring people to whom I am sincerely indebted and grateful. Firstly, I wish to thank my three supervisors. Dr. Jaanus Sooväli provided insightful comments and encouragement throughout my studies. Professor Marek Tamm, who introduced me to the subject field of my thesis, continuously offered feedback and guidance that proved crucial to bringing this project to fruition. Last but certainly not least, I want to express my gratitude to Professor Ethan Kleinberg, who kindly welcomed me at Wesleyan University, and facilitated elevating and thought-provoking discussions that provided vital insights into the field of historical theory. Professor Kleinberg likewise offered helpful comments to various article drafts and manuscripts.

In addition, I am thankful to Professor Karl-Heinz Lembeck, who advised me during my semester abroad at Würzburg University. I also remain indebted to Professor emeritus Ülo Matjus, who is the supervisor of my BA and MA thesis. My special appreciation belongs to Ruth S. Noyes, who in addition to sharing encouragement even during the most challenging times agreed to proofread numerous manuscripts and drafts. Finally, I wish to thank my family and friends for their patience and relentless support throughout my PhD pursuit.

The writing of this thesis was facilitated through a series of mobility grants and fellowships taken up at the University of Würzburg, Wesleyan University, and Yale University. Study visits abroad were sponsored by Dora Pluss and Kristjan Jaak scholarships, as well as the Baltic Studies Program at Yale. Editing of various article drafts of the thesis was funded by the Graduate School of Linguistics, Philosophy and Semiotics.



# CONTENTS

LIST OF ORIGINAL PUBLICATIONS .....	8
1. INTRODUCTION.....	9
1.1. Content and structure of the introductory chapter .....	10
1.2. Overview of the articles.....	11
1.3. Philosophical and historical background .....	12
2. KOSELLECK AND THE STUDY OF HISTORICAL TEMPORALITY.....	14
2.1. Modernity and temporal experience .....	15
2.2. <i>Historik</i> and layers of time .....	16
3. REIMAGINING TEMPORAL RELATIONS: OUTLINE OF THREE CONCEPTUAL AVENUES.....	18
3.1. Beyond representation: Examining forms of temporal experience....	19
3.2. Regimes of historicity: Presentism and unprecedented change.....	22
3.3. Reconsidering modern temporal ontology: Cultural memory and <i>Zeitschaft</i> .....	25
4. SHAPING HISTORICITY: RETHINKING HISTORICAL CHANGE ..	28
4.1. Expanding temporal scales and the quest for the geological .....	29
4.2. History and multiple times.....	31
4.3. Entering the unknown.....	34
CONCLUSION .....	36
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	38
PUBLICATIONS .....	41
SUMMARY IN ESTONIAN .....	129
CURRICULUM VITAE .....	132
ELULOOKIRJELDUS.....	135

## LIST OF ORIGINAL PUBLICATIONS

- I. Hellerma, Juhan (2017), “Kas aeg on liigestest lahti? Uuemad arutelud aja üle ajaloos ja ajaloofilosoofias” (“Is Time Out of Joint? Recent Discussions on Time in History and the Philosophy of History”), *Ajalooline Ajakiri. The Estonian Historical Journal*, 4 (162): 475–492.
- II. Hellerma, Juhan (2020), “Koselleck on Modernity, *Historik*, and Layers of Time,” *History and Theory*, 59 (2): 188–209.
- III. Hellerma, Juhan, “Negotiating Presentism: Toward a Renewed Understanding of Historical Change,” resubmitted to *Rethinking History*.
- IV. Hellerma, Juhan (2020), “History on the Move: Reimagining Historical Change and the (Im)possibility of Utopia in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century,” *Journal of the Philosophy of History*, 1–14. Published online first: May 20, 2020.



# 1. INTRODUCTION

The present study takes as its impetus the recent rise of studies concerned with matters of temporality across the humanities more generally, and in the field of the philosophy of history in particular. Aleida Assmann's paradigmatic study ([2013] 2020) *Is Time Out of Joint? On The Rise and Fall of the Modern Time Regime* well illustrates the prevailing perception that time relations are no longer self-evident.<sup>1</sup> Similarly, François Hartog's ([2003] 2015) widely discussed proposal to study 'regimes of historicity' and his diagnosis about 'presentism' as the new dominant form of temporal experience likewise signal that matters of time are gaining fresh scholarly attention. The burgeoning of scholarly production devoted to the topic of temporality broadly conceived would suggest that after the linguistic, cultural, and spatial turns (to name just a few) in the humanities, we are witnessing in recent years a particular 'temporal turn' that posits the study of temporal relations as a theoretical lens inflecting scholarly inquiry. Yet the validity of such a turn *per se* has no bearing on the present study's primary aim to map and critically study relevant aspects of today's questioning of time and history. I structure my analysis around the idea that most temporal frameworks proposed in recent literature primarily negotiate and explore the limits of that which they associate with modern temporal sensitivity. Building on the notion that modernity presents a specific constellation of past, present and future – one often associated with the characterization of future in terms of newness and progress and past as that which is constantly superseded and left behind – these novel perspectives challenge this selfsame constellation and offer new ways of conceptualizing interconnections between the three temporal categories.

Thus, the study at hand explores diverse conceptual accounts – each of which builds a particular conceptual framework and pursues a specific argument – that collectively intersect insofar as they endeavor to expand theoretical perspectives regarding time. These differently motivated accounts may for example critically interrogate the intellectual habit of the modern historian, to posit a boundary between the present and the past, a distinction granting the historian their object and field of study. Theoretical perspectives considered here likewise question the modern preoccupation with the future; drawing especially from growing awareness regarding the extent of human impact on climate and environment, a range of outlooks deem the future not the dimension of betterment and progress, but the domain of impending threats.

Novel perceptions pertaining to scholarly engagement with temporal relations and attempts to theorize changes in the experience of time in the broader social sphere have fostered a discourse on temporality encompassing a plurality of disciplinary viewpoints and contexts. Despite the lively discussion on our current temporal condition, less attention has been given to the question of how to make

---

<sup>1</sup> At the time of writing this introductory chapter the recently published translation of Assmann's book was not available. Thus, reference will be made to the original German edition from 2013 with my own translation of relevant citations.

sense of this plurality itself. Put differently, how should one navigate the conceptual landscape marked by related yet distinct notions such as ‘presence,’ ‘presentism,’ ‘frenetic standstill,’ ‘broad present’ and ‘stranded in the present’.<sup>2</sup> Are various theoretical platforms compatible so that they complement one another, or do they proceed from a diverging and conflicting set of assumptions and intuitions? In the case of the latter, this begs the question as to where exactly these discrepancies are embedded. These and other related issues suggest that overall there is a need for a comparative discourse mapping and critically assessing alternative conceptualizations of time and history, all of which are responding to a shared insight that the modern historicist model of temporality needs to be reconsidered.

In what follows I will pursue two distinct but interrelated objectives. On one level, this study undertakes to differentiate across and between various iterations of theories of temporality according to their conceptual scope and potential interconnections. On another level, building on this conceptual analysis, I inquire into the possibility of transcending the present-oriented temporal regime allegedly indicative of our current moment. This crucially entails an exploration of different conceptual pathways that variously theorize and problematize the present-oriented temporal regime. Special attention will be accorded to the hypothesis that maintains that any attempt to resituate ourselves in history and time and thereby modify and reshape our sense of historicity requires a radical re-assessment of the privileged position of the historical anthropogenic timeframe vis-à-vis a spectrum of environmental timescales. To this end, the dissertation comprises a collection of case studies consisting of four articles, each examining specific aspects pertaining to the overall framework and analyzing a particular set of theoretical outlooks, which cumulatively and collectively elaborate on these two guiding objectives.

## 1.1. Content and structure of the introductory chapter

The general aim of this introductory chapter is to provide a comprehensive framework highlighting thematic interconnections between all four articles and broadening the scope of their individual analysis of relevant issues. The introductory chapter consists of 4 sections. In addition to describing the main topic of the thesis and setting out the structure of the introductory chapter as a whole, the present section includes an overview of the primary substantial points of each article and offers observations regarding the larger philosophical and historical context of the study. The second section will offer an outline of Reinhart Koselleck’s two distinct temporal theories. Koselleck’s studies on modernity, the latter understood

---

<sup>2</sup> Two important essay collections intended to organize various strands within the current interest in temporality have respectively employed the concept of ‘presence’ (Ghosh, Kleinberg 2013) and ‘presentism’ (Tamm, Olivier 2019) as their frame of reference. Consider also Esposito (2017) and Kleinberg (2012).

as a specific temporal experience, and his vision of a plurality of overlapping time 'layers' constitute an important intellectual background for many of the more recent theoretical interventions on time.

The third section will survey conceptualizations of time and history that variously challenge or modify temporal implications stemming from modernity. Specifically, I will conceptualize three analytical categories that will help to organize different theoretical outlooks and analyze their mutual interconnections. I will differentiate between studies exploring individual experiences such as nostalgia and commemoration, those that seek to delineate 'regimes of historicity' potentially indicative of an entire epoch, and finally those that take issue on the ontological level, describing general principles pertaining to the formation of temporal relations. I will conclude that while legitimate within their own parameters, all accounts that fall under any of the three categories ultimately face limitations, insofar as they are rooted in a descriptive analysis and thus take their cue from relations of time already in effect.

In the final section, I will be concerned with the question of the degree to which we can ourselves shape and bring about a change in the way we consider our relationship to time and history. Particularly, I will inquire into the possibility of transcending the widely claimed reign of presentism. This question will prove particularly relevant in light of the growing climate discourse and the alleged onset of the new Anthropocene geological era. Drawing from authors such as Dipesh Chakrabarty and Helge Jordheim, the section will explore the potential of a radical revision of the modern notion of historicity by way of considering the viewpoint of multiple overlapping timescales enforcing a certain decentralization of the human and the historical.

## 1.2. Overview of the articles

The first article, titled "Is Time Out of Joint? Recent Discussions on Time in History and the Philosophy of History," outlines a spectrum of arguments associated with the perception whereby the modern 'regime of historicity' has been challenged by a novel temporal structure. Proceeding from the description of modern temporal sensitivity by mostly relying on the works of Reinhart Koselleck, the article maps out a spectrum of insights highlighting forms of temporal experience that call into question the basic assumption allegedly constitutive of the modern temporal schema: namely that past, present and future can be divided into distinct temporal domains. The article's primary aim is to lay bare broader conceptual borderlines of the current temporal discourse thereby setting up the remaining three articles that will focus on more concrete matters and questions.

The second article "Koselleck on Modernity, *Historik*, and Layers of Time" further elaborates on Koselleck's account regarding the birth of the modern understanding of history and time, and distinguishes it from Koselleck's more formal theory of conditions of possible histories. Specifically, the article inquires

how the latter theory, that Koselleck also conceived deploying the metaphor of ‘layers of time’, interacts with his analysis of modernity at the heart of which is the emergence of the singular notion of ‘history’ and the related transformation of the perception of time. In critical dialogue with a range of alternative interpretations, the article argues that the theoretical categories informing Koselleck’s formal theory further account for the constitution of modern temporal experience by way of exposing basic principles undergirding the possibility of historical change and the modern historical acceleration in particular.

The third article (currently under review) “Negotiating Presentism: Toward a Renewed Understanding of Historical Change” examines a range of theoretical outlooks, particularly those offered by François Hartog, Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht, and Hartmut Rosa. All three authors proclaim the collapse of the future-oriented modern temporal system during the postwar period and its replacement by present-oriented temporal experience punctuated by the perception of immobility and stagnation. The article is critical of the inability of those theories to accommodate kinds of processes of change other than those highlighted within the framework of modernity, and consequently proposes to disentangle the category of modernity and that of historical change. In particular reference to innovative accounts furnished by Zoltán Boldizsár Simon, Dipesh Chakrabarty, and Helge Jordheim, it is shown that an understanding of history that goes beyond the static model suggested by presentism requires reconsidering some of the basic premises sustaining the modern notion of history.

The final article “History on the Move: Reimagining Historical Change and the (Im)possibility of Utopia in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century” deepens the discussion unfolded in the previous article by providing an in-depth analysis of the concept of ‘unprecedented change’ proposed by Simon. Unlike authors theorizing the replacement of a dynamic and goal-oriented modern temporal attitude with static and present-based modes of temporal experience, Simon succeeds in conceptualizing a novel kind of movement, offering thus a distinct account as to what it means to dwell historically in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. In critical dialogue with Simon’s framework, the article argues for an intimate connection between the idea of unprecedented change on the one hand, and the idea of presentism suggested by Hartog on the other. By bringing together and synthesizing insights that at first appear at odds, the article concludes by suggesting a framework equipped to accommodate a plurality of temporal relations and their mutual interactions.

### **1.3. Philosophical and historical background**

The preeminent temporal imaginary for the modern world has been that of a linear succession of stages or epochs forming a pathway simultaneously distancing from the past and moving toward a different future. Inscribed in various philosophical systems, political ideologies, artistic movements, scientific and cultural practices, futurity has served as the primary dimension energizing and mobilizing the present, guiding its action and decision-making. While the present study focuses

on more recent debates, it is important to acknowledge that the premises of modern historical thinking have been subject of critical scrutiny for much longer. For example, the criticism of the idea of continuous progression in time dates back to the 18<sup>th</sup> century, manifesting for example in Johann Gottfried Herder's ([1774] 2003) resistance to reduce individual cultures and societies to mere building blocks of an overarching progress of history. Encountering criticism along the way by thinkers such as Friedrich Nietzsche ([1887] 2004) and Oswald Spengler ([1918] 1980), the concept of history as linear progression faces further challenges in the second half of 20<sup>th</sup> century marked by insights about history as a succession of incommensurate paradigms (Kuhn [1962] 1992) and epistemes (Foucault [1966] 2012), as well as proclamations about the closure of grand narratives (Lyotard 1979) and eventually that of history itself (Fukuyama 1989). Likewise, the clear-cut boundary between past and present allegedly constitutive of the modern temporal thinking has not gone unchallenged. For example, the idea that the past is not primarily an object separate from the present, but is also significant feature of our ontological condition, and is in this sense engrained in the present, gained prominence under the heading 'historicity' in the works of Wilhelm Dilthey ([1910] 1993), Martin Heidegger ([1927] 1993), and Hans-Georg Gadamer ([1960] 2007). Collective memory studies, inaugurated by Maurice Halbwachs ([1925] 1992) during the interwar period, can serve as a further instantiation of a past-present relationship wherein the two dimensions are not broken apart but instead viewed as inextricably conjoined. The historical and systematic mapping of diverse forms of such critical engagement and the conceptual differentiation of its various manifestations is an endeavor still needing to be undertaken. While occasionally making references to the relevant predecessors of the current temporal discourse, as a whole, the present study is less concerned with the historization of today's questioning of time, but rather examines particular issues arising from within it.

## 2. KOSELLECK AND THE STUDY OF HISTORICAL TEMPORALITY

The German historian and theoretician of history Reinhart Koselleck (1923–2006) is undoubtedly one of the most discussed authors in today’s discourse on temporality. Particularly relevant is Koselleck’s sustained effort to historicize the modern notion of time and history. His endeavor to trace the emergence of the modern historical consciousness is directly related to and in large part stems from his engagement with conceptual history, a method mapping the history of specific linguistic expressions. Along with his fellow editors, Koselleck put together a lexicon, *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe: Historisches Lexicon zur politischen-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland*, 7 volumes of which appeared between 1972–1992. Written by more than 100 contributors, the lexicon maps the historical shifts pertaining to the semantics of around 120 relevant social and political concepts, many of which – most notably the article on the concept of history, *Geschichte* – were completed by Koselleck himself. According to Koselleck’s vision, the primary goal of the project was to account for the conceptual articulation of the ideas and perceptions we associate with the modern era. As he notes in the introduction to the lexicon, the project focuses on the “dissolution of the old society of orders and estates, and the development of the modern world” by disclosing “what is distinctively *modern* about the way we conceptualize political and social life” (Koselleck 2011: 8).

With findings derived from conceptual history as one of his main points of reference, Koselleck ([1979] 2004) wrote a series of essays elaborating on the temporal implications of the modern era. In recent literature, these studies have proven influential. Authors invested in exploring the temporal outlook of our present moment – several of whom I will discuss in section 3.2 – often do so explicitly against Koselleck’s description of modernity. Importantly, Koselleck’s contributions to historical temporality are not limited to historicizing the modern notion of historical time. Indeed, Koselleck also developed a distinct theory of temporality engaging in multiple overlapping ‘layers’ of time. In recent decades, Koselleck’s more formal theory of multiple times has likewise started to receive increasing scholarly attention.<sup>3</sup> In what follows, I will sketch the main ideas pertaining to both Koselleck’s engagement with modernity and his theory of layers of time.

---

<sup>3</sup> Relevant time theoretical works are contained in Koselleck’s (2000) essay collection *Zeitschichten. Studien zur Historik*. In the reception of this generally lesser known side of Koselleck’s oeuvre, John Zammuto’s (2004) review article as well as Helge Jordheim’s (2012) innovative engagement represent important benchmarks. Not least importantly, recently a new selection of Koselleck’s (2008) essays appeared in English, precisely to provide a broader reading of Koselleck’s theoretical works.

## 2.1. Modernity and temporal experience

Over the course of a series of studies, Koselleck sought to conceptualize a specific experience of time he conceived as distinguishing the modern era from previous epochs. Combining empirical study of relevant social and political concepts and elements of his historical anthropology, Koselleck argued that the uniqueness of the modern era can be modelled as an increasing gap between experience – a category encompassing all the knowledge inherited from the past – and expectations: a category referring to the variety of ways one can anticipate the future (Koselleck 2004: 267). The novel form of temporal orientation, while gradually manifesting also in preceding centuries, is conceptually perpetuated in the semantic innovation of the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> and the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, a period Koselleck called *Sattelzeit*.

In this context, Koselleck attributes a pivotal role to the formation of the singular concept of history, *die Geschichte*, that gradually overshadowed the previous use of the term designating the plurality of stories and accounts of the past. Proliferation of expressions such as ‘history as such’ and ‘history in itself’ (*Geschichte überhaupt, Geschichte an sich*,) fostered an understanding of history as a dimension of reality in its own right extending both along spatial and temporal parameters (Koselleck 2004: 93). Not least significantly, the novel concept of history made it possible to conceive the entire unfolding of historical reality in terms of progress and betterment (Koselleck 2004: 140).

Attending to the temporal implications underpinning the novel conceptual landscape, Koselleck elaborates on notions of temporalization and historical time. These concepts were designed to encapsulate the fundamental sensation that the passing of time generates novel circumstances reinforcing a distinct nexus between past, present and future (Koselleck 2004: 236). Accordingly, whereas previously stories of the past were viewed as potentially providing teachings for the present and the future, with modernity the relative continuity between three temporal categories is broken apart. Past now appears as remote and detached from the present, potentially serving as the object of the emerging historical sciences; present acquires an identity of a distinct sphere of contemporaneity and space of action; and future reveals itself as an open domain facilitating utopian visions of a state of affairs yet to be achieved.

Koselleck’s account can further be illustrated by for example considering his analysis of the term ‘revolution.’ On his account, in its premodern iteration, ‘revolution’ indicated points of transition between constitutional forms that succeeded one another along a cyclical pattern, implying thus that any political transformation eventually returned to its point of departure. Within this understanding, historical movement was thus conceived by its analogy to natural processes that are based on circularity and repetition. “Historical experience remained in its almost natural givenness, and in the same way that the succession of the seasons remains forever the same, so mankind *qua* political beings remained bound to a process of change that brought forth nothing new under the sun” (Koselleck 2004: 45).

According to Koselleck, around the end of 18<sup>th</sup> century, ‘revolution’ assumed a meaning that broke from the previous naturalist understanding by casting history as a dynamic process marked by constant ruptures and innovation. “Since then, revolution obviously no longer returned to given conditions or possibilities, but has, since 1789, led forward into an unknown future” (Koselleck 2004: 49). The reconstituted concept of revolution in turn resonates with a series of modern ‘isms’ such as liberalism and communism that represented alternative political visions of the organization of the social life in the future (Koselleck 2004: 248–249).

The emerging historical sensibility Koselleck is describing pivots on the assumption that with modernity both the natural cyclical notion of movement and the Christian expectation of the Final Judgement Day lose their significance in shaping the perception of historical affairs. In other words, with modernity the potential meaning, rhythm and direction are no longer imposed upon history by recourse to some extra-historical measure; rather, *the immanent sphere of history appears as a dimension in its own right and is set free to develop its own inherent temporality*. Given this, the issue of the historical experience of time – how people connect past, present and future – becomes inextricably anchored in the perception of historical change.<sup>4</sup> With the inner-worldly realm of historical change becoming the primary plane upon which human endeavor unfolds, categories of acceleration and decelerations appear as important qualities of the novel experience of time. Against this principal shift, the idea of progress and betterment that can be realized in time is rendered viable.

While natural patterns based on cyclical repetition increasingly lost their explanatory relevance for historical affairs, it is of significance that in relation to the development of natural sciences like cosmology, physics and biology, various natural settings too were no longer viewed as stable constellations solely bound to cyclical and repetitive movement. In other words, similarly to the realm of history, the natural world likewise underwent a process of temporalization, implying thus the perception of these fields in terms of processes with their own unique temporal depth and duration (Koselleck 2018: 161–162). As such, however, these domains, potentially disclosing temporal durations spanning millions of years, were in large part treated as separate and distinct from the domain of history primarily reserved for mapping the development of human affairs. I will return to this point in section four, where I discuss why in recent times the notion of exclusively human history no longer seems applicable; and specifically, how this notion sets in relief the relevance of integrating natural timescales with the historical timeframe of the human.

## **2.2. *Historik* and layers of time**

Over the years, in addition to exploring the birth and constitution of the modern world, Koselleck developed a distinct theoretical approach concerned with basic

---

<sup>4</sup> On historical change, see also Sooväli 2016.



conditions structuring the unfolding of concrete histories. Building on Heidegger's analytic of *Dasein* and Fernand Braudel's distinction between various levels of historical duration, Koselleck delineated the borderlines of his own unique *Historik*. Traditionally, *Historik* stands for a theoretical enterprise invested in clarifying theoretical and methodological principles constitutive of historical inquiry. Koselleck's iteration of the term, at least to a certain degree, deviated from this traditional connotation. He proposed that prior to attending to questions regarding for example evidence and interpretation, we should first shed light on temporal complexities inhering in historical reality itself.

Koselleck posited the metaphor of 'time layers' (*Zeitschichten*) as providing the guiding insight. Accordingly, reality consists of multiple overlapping temporal arrangements and processes, each 'layer' exhibiting a particular duration and a unique pace of change. This theoretical outlook thus allows to differentiate various anthropological, social, and natural domains with respect to their inherent dynamic of change and persistence. Koselleck eventually adopted the concept of 'structures of repetition' in order to account for plurality of times, all of which appear as instances or modifications of the universally valid interplay between repetition and innovation (Koselleck 2018: 164).

It is of importance that whereas Koselleck's analysis of modernity explicates a shift in temporal experience, the notion of temporality considered within the theory of layers of time is of a different kind. It theorizes various kinds of structural conditions as they persist and potentially transform throughout the irreversible chain of events and occurrences. Envisioning a particular temporal ontology that transcends the opposition between the linear and cyclical vision of history, this theoretical perspective ultimately does not describe any concrete experience of history. However, *presenting a set of conceptual tools, the framework of layers of time can shed light on and facilitate an analysis of various perceptions of history.*

In the thesis, I claim that Koselleck's multilayered vision of history accounts for the accelerating pace of change occurring in the modern era, particularly in the article "Koselleck on Modernity, *Historik*, and Layers of Time." The pace of change manifests in the increasing mutability of a variety of conditions and settings that previously were stable or changed over longer periods of time. Bringing into light the formal conditions undergirding the possibility of intense historical change, the idea of layers of time directly ties into Koselleck's original definition of modernity. Specifically, if modernity manifests as a break between experience and expectation, it is so due to actor's perception of a world increasingly volatile and prone to fluctuations. In addition to this line of interpretation, in section four I will consider an alternative way of deploying the intellectual resources contained in the framework layers of time. Particularly, drawing from Helge Jordheim's interest in multiple lifetimes, it will become apparent how Koselleck's multilayered vision of time can prove instrumental in the face of the predicaments posed by the increasing intertwinement of the human and the natural and the related idea regarding the onset of the Anthropocene geological era.

### 3. REIMAGINING TEMPORAL RELATIONS: OUTLINE OF THREE CONCEPTUAL AVENUES

The modern historical attitude driven by the anticipation of progress, while contested and critically scrutinized since its inception, arguably suffers a considerable setback during the second half of the 20th century. Among other tendencies, the growing concern about the environment, the prospect of a potential nuclear war and the rapid growth of population undermine the perception of history as progressing toward a better future. As Aleida Assmann (2013: 13) succinctly puts it: “We are no longer taking for granted that change necessarily implies progress.”<sup>5</sup> In other words, it becomes questionable whether the unfolding of history fulfills or realizes an immanent goal or telos, and thus whether various stages of history are meaningfully interconnected. That the perception of historical movement increasingly disassociates from the temporal parameters intrinsic to a modern singular notion of history, gives rise to the question of how to make sense of the temporal configuration that has supplanted the modern one.

On the other hand, it is the relationship with the past that arguably likewise undergoes a significant change. For example, the attention to memory and to the traumatic elements of the past specifically – reified in reparational politics, public fascination with museums, spreading of heritage, retro and nostalgia culture – arguably presents a challenge to the belief that the passing of time, as it were, automatically distances the past from the present. The increasing attention to a range of modes in which past presses into the present has prompted attempts to delineate temporal schemas different from the approach depicting the past as a ‘foreign country’ (Lowenthal 2015).

Traditionally, the primary occupation of historical theory has been to engage with the question about the nature and possibilities of historical knowledge (Beiser 2011: 8). Such an inquiry presupposes a principal rift between the past and the present. The second half of 20<sup>th</sup> century, particularly the appearance of Hayden White’s “Metahistory” ([1973] 2013) inaugurated a new stage in that tradition, calling attention to the fact that history implies forging narratives. White argued that academic history reinforces preconceived narrative patterns inherent in our literary culture, thereby discrediting the status of language as a transparent and neutral mediator between reality and the representation of that reality. The overwhelming focus on history as a discourse of representation resulted in a heightened skepticism regarding historian’s capacity to recover the past ‘as it actually happened’ and facilitated suspicions considering history as a form of fiction.

As recent scholarship illustrates, the notion of the historical past and the related questions about the possibilities and limits of its representation constitute a significant but nevertheless only one of many ways of framing the past-present relationship. This privileging of a particular temporal arrangement potentially

---

<sup>5</sup> Original: “Wir gehen nicht mehr davon aus, dass Veränderung automatisch Verbesserung einschließt.“

blocks attention to a number of others that can be interrogated in view of their own distinct temporal structure. In that context memory, presence, and historical experience are some of the keywords that have gained momentum as of late; indeed, theorizing such alternative ways of how past manifests in the present, how it potentially intrudes the present and imposes itself therein, has been the main occupation of much of the recent theoretical scholarship. *In short, in recent historical theory there has been a growing interest in theorizing and conceptualizing present-past relations that transcend the boundaries of professional historical studies.*

These two tendencies – crumbling of the modern singular notion of history and the related vision of progress on the one hand, and rethinking the dynamic between past and present beyond the temporal parameters carved by modern historiography on the other – set the stage for the following observations, which can be broken down into three basic theoretical categories. The first category encompasses those accounts that interrogate specific and individual experiences of time, such as nostalgia and commemoration for example. The second category encompasses theories that generalize over a spectrum of individual experiences and cast them as symptoms of a temporal order potentially indicative of an entire period or epoch. Theories operating on this conceptual level aim to articulate a ‘regime of historicity’ or a ‘chronotope’ designed to capture the essential form or matrix underlying a multitude of individual attitudes and experiences. The third category involves a group of theoretical outlooks that interrogate the fundamental ontological conditions of all possible time relations and thus seek to establish conceptual ground valid and informative across concrete temporal attitudes and temporal regimes and chronotopes.

This categorization is by no means exhaustive, but rather seeks to provide a preliminary roadmap for ordering different kinds of theoretical platforms emergent within today’s questioning of time. Ultimately, I will argue that all three conceptual approaches, while insightful in their own right, share the basic limitation of not being able to account for the predicaments manifesting within the current climate discourse and the alleged onset of the new geological era Anthropocene. As a result, this will necessitate inquiry into a further set of theoretical perspectives aimed at negotiating prevailing temporal attitudes and fostering novel patterns of time consciousness. What it comes down to, then, is not simply describing time relations already in effect, but uncovering the potential for actively transforming and shaping these very relations.

### **3.1. Beyond representation: Examining forms of temporal experience**

Evincing the tendency in historical theory to reflect on the past in ways that supersede questions of historiography and linguistic representation is the circulation of the concept of ‘presence.’ The presence framework purports to make

conceptual space for an unmediated, sensory and somatic connection with the past that is conceptually distinct from concerns related to *re*-presentation and the construction of meaning conveyed in acts of representation. In the prologue of a collection of essays devoted to the surging paradigm, Ethan Kleinberg (2013: 1) notes that presence discourse represents a “turn away from the seemingly endless interpretations manufactured by ‘theory’ and a return to a relationship with the past predicated on our unmediated access to actual things that we can feel and touch and that bring us into contact with the past.”

Authors adhering to the latter framework draw from the perception that although the desire to get in touch with the ‘reality’ of the past is a phenomena defining our historical culture at large, as a broader temporal strategy it can exceed our time. Frank Ankersmit (2005: 4, 10) for example suggests that focusing on historical experience moves us out of the “prisonhouse of the language” and draws us closer to the romanticist attitude that privileges moods and feelings over knowledge in the way we relate to the past. Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht maintains that in contrast to the disembodied Cartesian subject characteristic of modernity we are now increasingly preoccupied with retrieving existence in its bodily and sensual dimensions. For him, the category of presence precisely captures the longing to immerse oneself into various past worlds, not necessarily for the sake of epistemic considerations, but rather for the sake of experiencing these worlds from within.

We want to know the worlds that existed before we were born, and experience them directly. “Direct experience of the past” would include the possibility of touching, smelling, and tasting those worlds in the objects that constituted them. The concept emphasizes a long-underestimated (if not repressed) sensual side of historical experience – without necessarily being a problematic “aestheticization of the past.” (Gumbrecht 1997: 419)

In a similar vein, Eelco Runia deploys the term ‘presence’ to articulate a relationship with the past – manifest in phenomena such as commemoration, nostalgia and memory – that is distinct from representation and the related pursuit of meaning:

(...) on consideration, it is not *meaning* we want but something else, something that is just as fundamental, something that outside philosophy of history, in society at large, is pursued with a vehemence quite like the vehemence with which philosophers of history believe only meaning can be pursued. (Runia 2014: 53)

Specifically, for Runia, presence is “‘being in touch’ (literally or figuratively) with people, things, events, and feelings that made you into the person you are” (Runia 2014: 53). In an attempt to delineate the essential features proper to the experience of presence, Runia elaborates on notions like metonymy and discontinuity, intended to account for the past whose pastness is at stake.

Whereas the ‘presence’ movement inquiries into a particular kind of past-present relationship that can manifest in different situations and contexts, other

studies, while sharing the overall aim to negotiate the dynamic between past and present, take their cue from concrete historical phenomena such as the experience of a traumatic and violent past. Concerning the latter, the thoroughgoing argument is that the modern temporal framework, inasmuch as it is predicated on the assumption of an irreversible time, is not equipped to accommodate experiences of the past that, as it were, 'haunt' the present and refuse to sink into history.

Moreover, as for example Berber Bevernage argues, the modern historical framework leads to ethically problematic responses when dealing with injustices of the past. "The emphasis on the absence and irreversibility of the past endows the irreversible time of history with something uncomfortable, something unjust, and something almost unacceptable in a moral sense" (Bevernage 2011: 3). Surveying the landscape of retrospective politics, Bevernage points out that since the 1980s a significant shift occurs in the way states and societies dealt with the injustices caused in the past. Accordingly, the attitude of "letting 'bygones be bygones' whenever victims or relatives cannot achieve justice immediately after crimes are committed" was replaced by a renewed engagement with past cruelty and wrongdoings, for example in the form of semi-legal truth commissions (Bevernage 2011: 12).

Bevernage (2011: 5) places the implementation of novel institutional frameworks designed to do justice to the sufferings of the past in the context of 'fragile modernity' that manifests in the growing suspicion about the validity of "the presumption that there is something like a 'natural' and 'given' break or distance between past and present". Faced with that, he sets out to develop a temporal theory that could accommodate "dimensions of persistence or haunting 'presence' of the past and its injustices" (Bevernage 2011: 3).

Yet other kind of studies bring together and elaborate on a particular set of temporal attitudes. For example, in her recent book-length study, Siobhan Kattago explores four modifications of encountering the past focusing on commemoration, nostalgia, silence, and ghostly haunting. Surveying the aftermath of both the Second World War and the fall of Communism, these four attitudes "exemplify ways that individuals experience time and deal with dramatic social and political change from the standpoint of their lived present" (Kattago 2020: 8).

In a similar vein, the authors of the volume *Time: Vocabulary of the Present* examine a plurality of time perceptions emergent in the postwar era. They specifically set out "to guide readers historically and critically toward understanding (especially in the study of the arts, technology, and culture) how the postwar period – our present – is animated by certain kinds of time consciousness" (Burges, Elias 2016: 2). Authors of the volume insists on the simultaneity of multiple temporalities and consequently assume a critical stance toward periodization schemas: "The contemporary is not 'our time' because of its heterogeneity and opacity, and it is not 'a time' or period because it is defined by antinomies. The contemporary present is a conjuncture of times that take time" (Burges, Elias 2016: 4).

### **3.2. Regimes of historicity: Presentism and unprecedented change**

The increasingly manifold and complex engagements with time within society at large and the growing scholarly attention devoted to these engagements arguably attests to a broader transformation of temporal culture. The study of these broader changes apparently implies moving from the level of the particular to that of the general and comprehensive. To this end, what follows undertakes to distinguish conceptualizations of particular forms of temporal experience from approaches concerned with delineating a dominant order of time or ‘regime of historicity’ potentially characteristic of an entire period or epoch. The first article of the thesis “Is Time Out of Joint? Recent Discussions on Time in History and the Philosophy of History” surveys in greater detail various concepts cultivated to the effect of studying such temporal patterns.

These theoretical outlooks potentially build on a set of individual phenomena as described above and are predicated on the challenging of the modern temporal matrix. This necessitates an accounting for the novel form of temporality that has overshadowed the modern one. Aleida Assmann formulates the premise regarding the viability of such an overarching and unifying temporal pattern: “For time regime itself represents a unifying bond of an epoch and is at the same time a common umbrella for a diversity of cultural activities, scripts and interpretations” (Assmann 2013: 21).<sup>6</sup>

One of the most discussed proposals in this context is offered by François Hartog. He maintains that we have entered a form of temporal orientation that can be labeled ‘presentism.’ The latter privileges present over past and future, which respectively served as central categories of the previous two historically dominant regimes of historicity. Specifically, presentism articulates a strategy of connecting past, present and future that collapses clear boundaries between three temporal categories – a feature, as discussed above, that upholds the modern dynamic vision of history.

Hartog elaborates on presentism along two distinct but by his account inherently related conceptual lines. On the one hand, he refers to the presentist temporal attitude as deriving from the dissolution of the future. The collapse of the future, Hartog argues, envelopes people within an all-embracing present, thus disrupting the linear and directional model of history stemming from modernity. This notion of presentism excludes any attention to both future and past and thus amounts to being fixated on the here and now. This further means that the perception of change is discharged from its capacity to generate historical time, given that the latter implies movement from the past through the present into future. As symptoms of such a configuration of time Hartog discusses for example contemporary media production and consumerism, both magnifying

---

<sup>6</sup> Original: “Da das Zeitregime selbst das verbindende Band einer Epoche und zugleich das gemeinsame Dach für eine Vielfalt kultureller Handlungen, Skripte und Deutungen ist.”

what is currently at hand and crediting the present as the sole and ultimate reality. However, it is this same overwhelmed present, the “distended and bloated ‘now’” that simultaneously proves increasingly evanescent and ephemeral (Hartog 2015: 113).

On the other hand, Hartog reintroduces past and future into his schema by way of treating them as ‘fault lines’ of the self-centered present that becoming aware, as it were, of its groundlessness, starts to generate its own horizons of time. Hartog suggests that the rapid extension of paradigms of memory and heritage during the latter half of 20th century brought to bear a distinct temporality wherein the past, insofar as it is increasingly appropriated to the concerns of the present, manifests as a dimension absorbed by the present. Confronted with a sense of rupture and disconnection with the past, the presentist outlook thus attempts to “reconstitute a past that had already disappeared, or was on the point of disappearing irrevocably” (Hartog 2015: 113). According to Hartog, a similar logic applies to the present-future relationship, as we no longer pursue a better tomorrow, and instead are preoccupied with trying to avoid large-scale catastrophes looming on the horizon. Accordingly, various conservation and preservation initiatives and the cultivation of ethics of responsibility for future generations testify that the future as such has not disappeared, but morphed into a particular extension of the present.

The irreversibility and sustainable development are concepts whose temporalities carry with them the idea of time as continuous and seamless, from us to future generations or from future generations back to us. Of course we look toward the future, but on the basis of an extended present, without interruption or revolution. (Hartog 2015: 200)

Remarkably, the same perception that a linear and progress-driven model of time has collapsed into an experience of an all-pervasive present figures prominently across several other accounts. For example, Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht suggests that over the course of the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, a new time consciousness – manifesting first as a particular latency – started taking shape against the grain of the modern historicist attitude that remained prevalent within political discourse (Gumbrecht 2013: 158). In that process, the self-identical present, and the concomitant notions of past and future, disintegrate into a configuration of time he dubs ‘broad present.’

Between the pasts that engulf us and the menacing future, the present has turned into a dimension of expanding simultaneities. All the pasts of recent memory form a part of this spreading present; it is increasingly hard for us to exclude any kind of fashion or music that originated in recent decades from the time now. The broad present with its concurrent worlds, has, always and already, offered too many possibilities; therefore, the identity it possesses – if it has one at all – lacks clear contours. (Gumbrecht 2014: xiii)

Like Hartog, Gumbrecht stresses that the experience of change no longer produces the effects of historical time, depriving us of the perception dynamic and directed change. “The ever-broadening present has begun to give us the impression that we are stuck in a moment of stagnation. Time ceases to be considered an absolute agent of change” (Gumbrecht 2013: 200). Hartmut Rosa, building on a theory of social acceleration, arrives at a similar conclusion. He suggests that in late modernity we are increasingly caught up in desynchronized patterns of change that generate an impression of stagnation and standstill. “Frenetic standstill therefore means that *nothing remains the way it is* while at the same time *nothing essential changes*” (Rosa 2013: 283).

Zoltán Boldizsár Simon conceptualizes an alternative approach in contrast to frameworks theorizing the appearance of an overwhelming present that has assimilated past and future. Drawing from debates concerning technological and ecological prospects, Simon proclaims that the distinguishing feature of our historical dwelling resides in the anticipation of an ‘unprecedented event’ that challenges the hegemony of the human subject as known today.

A quasi-substantive philosophy of history is a philosophy of history insofar as it postulates a movement, a mechanism, a pattern, or in any case a general scheme, to account for change over time in human affairs, just as substantive philosophies of history did. At the same time, it is only quasi-substantive inasmuch as, due to the abandonment of a compelling developmental continuity between past, present and future, it lacks a proper substance as the unfolding ontological subject. (Simon 2019: 45)

Thus, unlike presentist outlooks that gesture toward a static and immobile experience of time and theorize a specific blurring of distinction between past, present and future, Simon’s framework articulates a novel sense of change and movement that implies a radical disconnect between the same three temporal categories. Simon’s overall endeavor thus breathes new life into the concept of history as movement over time; however, given the qualities described above, this new notion of history significantly differs from the singular notion of history marking the beginning of modernity as theorized by Koselleck.

In turn, history as a disrupted singular is the concept that accounts for change over time in human affairs at a time when a sense of the unprecedented increasingly permeates domains of human life and endeavors. It is the concept of history that captures the emerging historical sensibility of Western societies in times of unprecedented change. (Simon 2019: 57)



### 3.3. Reconsidering modern temporal ontology: Cultural memory and *Zeitschaft*

In addition to examining specific modes of experience and articulating wider and more comprehensive patterns of temporal experience, a third group of theoretical interventions warrants highlighting. These approaches call into question the principal feasibility of past, present and future as ontologically distinct categories, shifting emphasis from interpreting time relations as they are configured within a specific historical context, to theorizing more general and basic conditions underpinning the formation of all concrete temporal engagements.

Aleida Assmann and Achim Landwehr, two proponents of such an approach, build on the perception that modern time relations are no longer evident and require reconsideration. Elaborating on that, they reconceive the current discourse on the crisis of time as an occasion to renew thinking about the inner-workings of historical time on a more fundamental level. To this end, examples such as the rise of memory culture are not exclusively treated as signs of a novel temporal regime, but also as illustrating inherent complexities and multi-facetedness of time relations as such, an insight in turn theorized as central to their innovative framework.

Aleida Assmann's (2013) study considers at length the formation and the eventual collapse of the modern regime of historicity. Assmann aligns with the assertion that the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century brought about significant temporal rupture thus explicitly joining hands with Hartog and others. She contends that the future indeed no longer holds validity as a realm of promise and progress. In line with the broader discourse, she likewise holds that the past, instead of appearing as a distant territory reserved for historical scholarship, now manifests in increasingly diverse ways – illustrated, for example, by memory and heritage culture. Ultimately, however, her insights about the crisis of modern temporality feed into a formulation of a theory of cultural memory that is conceptually distinct from the idea of historically changing time regimes.

Assmann thus initially aligns with the position held by Hartog and others that the rise of memory culture and its dominance in professional historical scholarship constitute a symptom of a new regime of historicity wherein clear temporal distinctions have grown porous and permeable. Building on that, however, she proposes her own theory of cultural memory, which attempts to account for the plurality of time relations *per se* encompassing professional historiography as one of many ways present interacts with past. According to her fundamental premise, present is always, as it were, stretched and extended, insofar as it forms a multitude of relations with both past and future.

But most importantly, and this is indeed crucial, the present is and will remain the place in which humans expand their present in that they create their own future and past. This constructivist principle aims against essentializing treatment of past, present and future as fixed neutral and objective "spaces of time". For what is each time regarded and evaluated as past and future, does not follow any natural logic

but takes on a shape and meaning only within a specific cultural context (Assmann 2013: 273).<sup>7</sup>

Thus, questioning past, present and future as ontologically separate categories refers foremost not to a change in our current regime of historicity, but rather concerns basic principles constitutive of all possible time relations. In other words, by positing an indispensable primacy of the present that constructs and is thus entangled with various pasts and futures, Assmann's theory fosters a form of presentism that is conceptually distinct from the notion of presentism discussed above.

Like Assmann, Achim Landwehr conceives of disputes attending the disintegration of the modern understanding of history as an impetus for challenging modern temporal ontology (Landwehr 2016: 286–287). Moreover, he too insists on the imperative to do away with the understanding of past, present and future as independent and self-contained categories and gain insight into the centrality of the present that interweaves a plurality of time relations. Accordingly, past and future are not separate ontological domains, but coexist as projections of the present (Landwehr 2016: 287). Invoking Saint Augustine's well known account of time, Landwehr contends: "For pasts were not and futures will not be as we describe them, but all these times exist, and namely simultaneously" (Landwehr 2016: 287).<sup>8</sup>

Thus in sharp contrast to the linear notion of time that progresses toward a future and leaves past circumstances behind, a more adequate depiction of time follows upon consideration of the present as an intersection of multiple time relations (*Chronoferenzen*) that as a whole form a particular "timescape" (*Zeitschaft*), to use another of Landwehr's neologisms. Leveraging the idea of a simultaneity of multiple times, Landwehr's account poses a direct criticism to the modern trope of non-simultaneity that results from setting more advanced stages of history against less developed ones (Landwehr 2016: 289–290).

Without delving into further consequences of Landwehr's theorizing, it is important to note that the concept of *Zeitschaft* – analogous to cultural memory – delineates a temporal ontology that highlights and magnifies the dimension of the present and is thus committed to a particular presentist temporal logic. While both theories rightfully force a recognition of the theoretical consequences deriving from the insight that all understandings of the past and future necessarily proceed

---

<sup>7</sup> Original: "Vor allem aber, und das ist ganz entscheidend, ist und bleibt die Gegenwart der Ort, an dem Menschen ihre Gegenwart ausdehnen, indem sie sich ihre Zukunft und Vergangenheit selbst erschaffen. Diese konstruktivistische Perspektive richtet sich gegen eine Essentialisierung der Dimensionen von Vergangenheit, Gegenwart und Zukunft als festgelegten neutralen und objektiven 'Zeiträumen'. Denn was gegebenenfalls als Vergangenheit oder Zukunft verstanden und bewertet wird, folgt nicht einer natürlichen Logik, sondern nimmt erst im Rahmen eines bestimmten kulturellen Rahmens Gestalt und Bedeutung an."

<sup>8</sup> Original: "Denn Vergangenheiten waren nicht und Zukünfte werden nicht sein, wie wir sie beschreiben, sondern all diese Zeiten sind, und zwar gleichzeitig."

from the respective present, I have reservations regarding their explanatory scope. Most importantly, highlighting the constitutive potential of the dimension of the present, it is hard to see how these theories can account for various processes of change. In other words, it seems that by way of denouncing the modern concept of history, such theories at the same *leave out what history is essentially about - change and movement*. A similar point can be made in regard to presentism considered as a regime of historicity. Presentism in the latter sense involves blending past, present and future together into an amorphous temporal fluctuation yielding to a sense of slowdown and stagnation. This gives rise to the question, *how we should think about change and movement when the modern concept of history no longer illuminates our experience, and a significant portion of alternative outlooks succumbs to forms of presentism*. As I will argue below, finding a way forward includes venturing beyond the descriptive level of analysis by way of interrogating the potential of shaping and transforming our sense of time and historicity.

## 4. SHAPING HISTORICITY: RETHINKING HISTORICAL CHANGE

As argued in the previous section, the overwhelming emphasis on the present described either as the point of gravitation of a novel regime of historicity or as an ontological principle leads to significant limitations. Insofar as presentism collapses past and future into an all-encompassing present, it eliminates the possibility of acquiring perspectives from outside. In other words, presentism abolishes time, thus depriving us of the perception of the present as inhabiting a certain position within a larger chain of movement and change. This section advocates precisely for the position whereby it is urgent, to modify Koselleck's terminology, to *bring about a certain re-temporalization of history that would help us situate the present in time, rather than exclusively consider time from within the present.*

This task is foremost motivated by the current ecological discourse, specifically the mounting perception that human generated projects have severely impacted natural conditions, calling for a serious reconsideration of the relationship between human society and Earth's manifold systems. Such growing awareness of the entanglements of the human and the environmental strongly challenges the traditional perception according to which history's main subject matter pertains to human affairs, relegating the natural to the background. This mindset, constitutive of a larger trajectory of historical thought, finds expression for example in Collingwood's philosophy of history. He insists that history's main occupation is to represent human thoughts as the basis for actions, thereby setting natural events aside as deprived of such rational deliberation. "The events of the nature are mere events, not the acts of agents whose thought the scientist endeavors to trace. (...) For history, the object to be discovered is not the mere event, but the thought in it" (Collingwood 1973: 214). Likewise, modern political and philosophical discourse invested in envisioning pathways of human development extending from the past into the future tend to consider natural conditions as mere backdrop against which human endeavor unfolds.

For many, this basic premise about the centrality of the human in historical studies is losing ground, particularly due to the perception that the human and environmental no longer constitute separate ontological domains and instead appear increasingly intertwined and convoluted (see e.g. Chakrabarty 2009). The extent of the human impact arguably facilitates an understanding that humans have become actors on a planetary scale, thereby inaugurating a new geological era, the Anthropocene (see e.g. Zalasiewicz et al. 2011, Ellis 2018). I will argue that an understanding of different timescales – more specifically, the ability to place oneself in relation to variously paced durations and rhythms of change – serves as the necessary stepping stone for developing a consciousness of time more adequate to the predicaments shaping our current moment.

Framed thusly, the problem necessitates transcending the descriptive level of analysis. Indeed, rather than *describing* discourses such as memory and heritage

(Hartog) or technology and artificial intelligence (Simon) as manifestations of certain temporal attitudes already in effect, we might instead ask to what extent these attitudes can be *deliberately modified*, and to what end. Specifically, I would inquire into the potential of specific conceptual frameworks insofar as they explicitly or implicitly provide perspectives instrumental for resituating ourselves in history, and indeed reshape and reinvigorate our sense of historicity.

#### **4.1. Expanding temporal scales and the quest for the geological**

An attempt to meet the challenge posed by the dominance of the presentist attitude on the one hand and the simultaneous recognition of the irreducible entanglement of the human and the natural on the other, arguably presupposes invoking time-scales of varying duration, including those that extend beyond the human life span – perhaps even, as I will elaborate shortly, beyond what we consider human history. In short, it means decentralizing the present-based temporal economy by disclosing and perpetuating time horizons that potentially uproot or at least weaken the gravity of the very same presentist logic.

Remarkably, in contemporary historiography a similar re-orientation toward long-term temporal scales is already emergent, for example in the form of deep history, evolutionary history and big history (Shryock and Smail 2011, Russell 2011, Spier 2015), which react critically to professional historians' tendency to fragment time into ever smaller units and in contrast place humanity within deeper seated historical trajectories. Such a move is intended to “remedy a society paralyzed by short-term thinking” and “open up new patterns of imagination with which to understand possible futures” (Guldi and Armitage 2014: 10). The expansion and multiplication of temporal scales thus constitute a specific resurgence of *longue durée* narratives, an idea first introduced and made prominent by the historians of the Annales school, and Fernand Braudel in particular (Sawyer 2015).

Elaborating on novel tendencies within historiography, Leon Ter Schure argues that merely changing the temporal parameters of our historiographical practices is not sufficient to overcome presentism. In search of an alternative avenue, Shure invokes Henri Bergson's concepts of time and duration. “While presentism has turned past and future into nonentities, parts of an omnipresent present, a Bergsonian ontology of time and history allows us to imagine the past instead as a living resource for the invention of the future” (Shure 2019: xxiv). In line with the more general attitude to recuperate the sense of unity between human and the nature, Shure insists that the Bergsonian framework is particularly suited to accommodate such a task:

Instead of isolating human history from the history of the natural world – or, in other words, evolution – Bergsonism implies an understanding of historical time within the broader framework of the time of life. Bergson's conception of time unites the domains of Nature and Culture. (Schure 2019: xxii)

Marcia Bjornerud likewise identifies a need to overcome the preoccupation with the Now underpinning contemporary society and endorses the prospect of building a time-literate society capable of resituating itself in time. With that aim in mind, instead of drawing from philosophical tradition, Bjornerud turns toward the discipline of geology and seeks to conceptualize a sense of time otherwise alien to our everyday life.

Most humans, including those in affluent and technically advanced countries, have no sense of temporal proportion – the *durations* of the great chapters in Earth's history, the *rates* of change during previous intervals of environmental instability, the *intrinsic timescales* of “natural capital” like groundwater systems. (Bjornerud 2018: 7)

Greater awareness of the immense amounts of time inscribed into the planet's geological structures, she suggests, could significantly transform our perception of time:

If widely adopted, an attitude of timefulness could transform our relationship with nature, our fellow humans, and ourselves. Recognizing that our personal and cultural stories have always been embedded in larger, longer – and still elapsing – Earth stories might save us from environmental hubris. (Bjornerud 2018: 178)

Recognizing that it “may not be possible to grasp fully the immensity of geologic time,” Bjornerud is optimistic that “one can at least develop some feeling for its proportions” (Bjornerud 2018: 19). Dipesh Chakrabarty critically inquires into the principal possibility of conceiving geological time in its own terms, distinct from human historical time. Chakrabarty argues that despite wide-spread discourse on the arrival of the Anthropocene – a new geological era wherein humans have become actors on a planetary scale – the very notion of geological time is often assimilated into patterns of world historical thinking in such debates. That anthropocentric categories such as hope, despair and anxiety – all tantamount to the interplay of experience and expectation that Koselleck framed as basic conditions for grasping historical time – continue to dictate the climate discourse, arguably precludes the full comprehension of what is at stake.

This one-sided conversion of Earth-historical time into the time of world history extracts an intellectual price, for if we do not take into account Earth-history processes that outscale our very human sense of time, we do not quite see the depth of the predicament that confronts humans today. (Chakrabarty 2018: 6)

Elaborating on the difficult task of developing an understanding of temporal duration belonging to an order radically different from that underpinning human life, Chakrabarty insists on the inevitability of interpreting world historical time – one within which the modern way of being political is conceivable – as part of much larger patterns of time constitutive of Earth’s natural systems.

Humans cannot afford to give up on the political (and on our demands for justice between the more powerful and the less), but we need to resituate it within the awareness of a predicament that now marks the human condition. Political thought has so far been human centric, holding constant the “world” outside of human concerns or treating its eruptions into the time of human history as intrusions from an “outside.” This “outside” no longer exists. (Chakrabarty 2018: 30)

Chakrabarty’s overall endeavor illustrates that recent attempts to theorize the relevancy of large-scale temporal patterns like that of geological time face an inherent threat of reductionism. Accordingly, events and processes unfolding on timescales of millions of years are intermingled with the perspective of human historical time from which these events are viewed as overwhelming, disastrous, in need of precaution, etc. Following Chakrabarty, such perceptions remain bound to human historical time by virtue of presenting variations of the changing interaction between experience and expectation. Thus it becomes apparent that theories mapping our current historical sensibility (i.e. ways of connecting past, present and future, like the above discussed presentism and unprecedented change), operate on the level of human historical time. These theories illustrate how we perceive and react to certain changes occurring within Earth’s environmental systems, but they do not attend to the distinctiveness of planetary timescales as temporal structures in their own right. This furthermore indicates that the challenge posed by the Anthropocene effectively furnishes an impetus to go beyond all anthropocentric imagination and apprehension of time.

## **4.2. History and multiple times**

That different timescales exhibit significantly divergent relative change and movement and potentially run into conflict is likewise essential to Helge Jordheim’s framework. Indeed, Jordheim pursues the issue even further, advocating a framework capitalizing on the notion of multiple temporalities, and thus not exclusively concerned with the distinction between historical time and geological time. Rethinking the category of chronology, he seeks to open history up to “other scales of time and other scales of life, different from the ones contained in the concept of ‘historical time’ deployed in modernist historiography and experience of history” (Jordheim 2019: 44).

A crucial insight thus follows that time can be considered as an inherent quality of various social and natural arrangements, in contrast to an account exposing time as an external standard within which events and processes occur.

This point of departure is vividly illustrated by Johann Gottfried Herder, one of Jordheim's intellectual predecessors.

In reality every mutable thing has its own inherent standard [*Maß*] of time; this exists even if nothing else is there; no two things in the world have the same standard of time. My pulse, my step, or the flight of my thoughts is not a temporal standard for others; the flow of a river, the growth of a tree is not a temporal standard for all rivers, trees, and plants. Life times of elephants and of the most ephemeral are very different from each other, and how different are not the temporal standards on all planets? In other words, there are (one can say it earnestly and courageously) in the universe at any time innumerable different times. (Cited via Jordheim 2014: 512)

Reinhart Koselleck's theory of multiple time layers (see section 2.2) serves as a further source of inspiration that guides Jordheim. Building on Koselleck's idea establishing historical reality as simultaneous coexistence of structural conditions of varying duration and point of origin, Jordheim concludes that "the most fundamental temporal feature of history is indeed *Ungleichzeitigkeit*, nonsynchronicity, inherent in all concepts, languages, cultures, and events" (Jordheim 2014: 505). This theoretical platform allows Jordheim to draw an important linkage between the singular time of history, traditionally conceived as progress, and the idea of endlessly many times. Accordingly, the concept of history as a singular process driven by the anticipation of progress is facilitated by and through practices of synchronization. Considering ways in which previous authors have accounted for the emergence of the modern historical attitude, Jordheim offers his own original interpretation:

In the course of the eighteenth century, the plurality of historical times characteristic of the emerging modernity was synchronized into the linear, homogeneous, teleological time of progress. This synchronization was achieved by means of a set of different genres, for example, universal histories, encyclopedias, novels, world maps. (Jordheim 2014: 514, compare Jordheim 2018)

Jordheim's account comprises the category of temporal *process* on the one hand, and on the other that of *temporal experience* indicating how a given society arranges the relationship between past, present and future. This distinction allows further differentiation between processes, or times, that participate in the constitution of a specific constellation of temporal experience, and those that are not part of the given temporal regime but can potentially be included.

Hartmut Rosa's account of social acceleration can help explain what is at stake. For him, the late modern perception of inertia, or what he calls frenetic standstill, is a direct result of the relative change in speed with which domains such as politics, economy and technology operate. Specifically, a new temporal experience – the one of late modernity – manifests as a "desynchronization between the 'intrinsic temporality' of politics and the time structures of other social spheres, in particular the economy and technological development" (Rosa 2013: 259).



In Jordheim's account (as many others) explaining our current situation by means of exclusively analyzing the temporal reorganization of *historical processes* – that is, domains traditionally considered as constitutive of the modern concept of history – no longer proves feasible and has to be expanded to include various *natural rhythms and durations*. Arguably, this statement should not only be relevant in the context of the aforementioned historiographical practices, but also with respect to various practices pertaining to the social and political sphere.

Thus, examining various strategies of synchronizing multiple historical times – an intellectual operation responsible for generating the effect of a singular time vector – engenders the question of how to use the same conceptual toolkit to illuminate the context of our present historical climate. Here, Jordheim maintains that our condition is marked by the increasing difficulty of sustaining practices of synchronization, resulting in the mounting perception of being out of sync.

Not only does the world contain a plurality, a multitude of times, which hardly can be separated and grouped into natural or historical, biological, and social, and which circulates within any human society, but these times are “out of sync” with one another. And these nonsynchronicities make it increasingly difficult for us to construct meaningful cause – effect chains or narratives that can be used to plan our actions, or, indeed, anchor our identities. (Jordheim 2014: 513)

Theorizing various temporal arrangements, their mutual interaction and entanglements, is particularly relevant when mapped against the Anthropocene discourse pivoting on the perception that human history can no longer be viewed as separate from the natural environment. Insofar as human history has become intertwined with Earth's natural systems, any attempt to make sense of this new condition must include natural domains with their unique temporal rhythms, bringing about a temporal complexity that renders the modern notion of history inefficient and outdated. “At present, humans are being recast as ‘geological agents,’ and thus placed on a timescale that *outlasts* ‘history’ in the modernist sense by millions of years” (Jordheim 2019: 50).

Jordheim's proposal to account for our present predicaments by distilling ‘history’ into plurality of timescales, spanning from the lifetime of a microbe to a geological time encompassing millions of years, establishes the present as a *spectrum of intersecting temporal processes*. This outlook differs significantly from ones that theorize stagnation and the reign of the present as characterizing our contemporary situation. Indeed, the framework of multiple temporalities attends to a variety of temporal processes as they occur in of themselves and in relation to one another, without being measured against any preconceived standard of historical unfolding. Whereas theories describing our current regime of historicity (Hartog, Simon *inter alia*), proceed from positing the modern historical attitude as the paradigm of historical change (directed, meaningful, future-oriented), against which they offer an alternative account, multiple temporalities are predicated on a more basic notion of temporal change.

To elaborate on that, Jordheim's framework on the one hand explains the possibility of a singular unified notion of history that appears as the outcome of specific practices of synchronization; on the other hand, however, this very possibility illustrates that various temporal structures themselves, or life times, to use the language preferred by Jordheim, are conceptually independent from and prior to the modern signification of historical change. Particularly in the light of the current climate discourse, prompting attempts to move from anthropocentric thinking to a mode of thinking proceeding from the planet as a whole, these life-times emerge as what they essentially are: a plenitude of temporal processes unfolding on significantly diverging scales.

Jordheim's approach, as well as other above-described views theorizing along similar conceptual lines, thus cast the present as the point in which various durations intersect, and indeed generate the impression of dwelling *in* time, or, for that matter, in a multitude of times. Importantly, this outlook presents a viable alternative to frameworks theorizing the sensation of being entrapped within an all-embracing present. Whereas presentism collapses time, amplifying the image of standstill and lack of movement and change, recourse to the idea of multiple times allows us to conceive 'history' in processual terms. However, such a viewpoint is only made possible by *changing the parameters of the very notion of historical change*. When theories of presentism take their cue from the modern progress-oriented paradigm, attention to multiple temporalities offers a different point of departure and therefore a different set of analytical tools. This process of *disentangling of the notion of change from modern connotations*, I contend, is a vital precondition to making sense of the predicaments punctuating the present moment.

Importantly, as long as the modern progress-oriented attitude is taken to be the frame of reference, the climate discourse and related future prospects of a natural catastrophe, appear as symptoms of a crisis of a specific understanding of history and time. In contrast, we are now called upon to revise our basic understanding of what it means to dwell historically. When accepting a plurality of timescales encompassing both human related domains and natural durations as the ground upon which 'history' unfolds, we thus automatically move beyond the modern framework of history and time. This move has the benefit of placing the historical timeframe within a much larger and multi-faceted temporal context, thereby potentially relieving the sense of entrapment within an all-embracing and infinite present. At the same time, however, this principal shift in our thinking of temporality necessitates a renegotiation of an entire spectrum of further questions. By way of conclusion, I will sketch some of the challenges ahead not only in historical thinking and related disciplines but in society at large.

### 4.3. Entering the unknown

To be sure, the refined attention to multiple timescales, arguably inevitable for navigating in the Anthropocene, can only be a beginning of a reflection. The

growing awareness of the inextricable entanglement of the human and the natural, indeed, the potential dissolution of this very division, forces us to re-envision our epistemological commitments (Domanska 2010) and interrogate the meaning of politics and action.

What does it mean to dwell, to be political, to pursue justice when we live out the everyday with the awareness that what seems “slow” in human and world-historical terms may indeed be “instantaneous” on the scale of Earth history, that living in the Anthropocene means inhabiting these two presents at the same time? (Chakrabarty 2018: 39, compare Latour 2018)

Furthermore, if we are called upon to conceive of humanity as part of a multitude of overlapping and increasingly intertwined processes and timescales, to what degree can we retain the notion of change as fostered, driven and controlled by human agents? If the human situation can no longer be defined by its position within the realities envisioned by the modern notion of history and must be expanded to take on global dimensions, the very notion of the distinctiveness of the human as inherited from Western philosophical thought is called into question. As Jordheim (2019: 54) puts it, the novel platform “will transform completely the conceptions of subjectivity, agency, and even events in history, as past, present and future humans are inscribed into time frames and timescales that differ radically from the 6,000 years of modernist historiography.”

In the present context, it is thus important to emphasize that the proposed changes in our time-related thinking hardly provide ready-made answers or solutions for coming to terms with the predicaments punctuating our present moment. Rather, they enable a means to articulate conceptually deeper underpinnings of these predicaments, and correspondingly explore and potentially broaden the limits of our imagination of time and temporality.

## CONCLUSION

The present thesis proceeds from the premise that a shift has occurred in contemporary scholarship concerning the range of questions engaged by scholars of historical theory. Conventionally, and during the heyday of the linguistic turn shaping the field in the second half of 20<sup>th</sup> century specifically, theory or philosophy of history was viewed as a discipline dealing with various aspects pertaining to the historian's pursuit of historical knowledge and served thus as a particular meta-study of historiography. This is no longer necessarily the case. Indeed, in the most recent decades, scholars of historical theory have significantly expanded their intellectual scope, attending to the variety of ways we relate to the past as well as to the future. This has given rise to the commonplace that the past is not exclusively treated as distant and alien to the present, requiring the historian's resuscitative efforts. Instead, the vision prevails that the interactions between past and present are much more complex and multifaceted, forming a diversity of temporal relations to be studied *per se*. A similar change of direction has occurred in regard to the future. After the atrocities of the Second World War triggered the fall of grand narratives of the so-called speculative philosophy of history, it was no longer viewed as intellectually feasible to theorize large-scale future scenarios. Today, in contrast, the future is returning to the scholarly arena, as historians and theoreticians of history alike explore ways of imagining and making sense of the future. Taken together, these tendencies testify that issues of temporality have moved center-stage, forming a current that in many ways shapes today's reflection on historical matters.

The central insight driving contemporary discourse about temporality is the understanding that modern notions of time and history – invoking history as an ongoing directed movement that facilitates past, present and future as distinct temporal categories – are increasingly disintegrating. In response, scholars have fostered strategies to renew temporal thinking, offering a range of perspectives and innovative frameworks. The current study examines this recent interest in temporality among theorists of history with an eye to two interconnected questions. It first seeks to systematize and achieve conceptual clarity across various instances and forms of theoretical engagement dealing with matters of temporality. Secondly, it advocates the need to rehabilitate the category of change over time without re-introducing implications underpinning the modern notion of change and transformation. Specifically, the thesis interrogates the hypothesis that posits presentism as the temporal arrangement defining our current perception of historical time. Although various authors suggest a slightly different iteration of presentism, the term commonly denotes a sensation of being entrapped within an all-embracing present that has assimilated both past and future. In reaction to that, and particularly in the light of the discourse highlighting damaging effects wreaked by human activity on earthly systems, the thesis suggests a rewiring of the category of historical change. Consequently, instead of theorizing the overwhelming dominance of the present that annihilates time, this study

probes the intellectual potential inherent in the paradigm of multiple overlapping and increasingly entangled temporal vectors, which casts us in the middle of variously paced processes, whose range far exceeds the modern human's historical habitat. In so doing, this approach potentially relieves the gravity of the present-centered temporal attitude. Radically altering the basic parameters of our historical dwelling, however, likewise challenges us to rethink an array of further dimensions, including our understanding of agency, responsibility and action.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ankersmit, Frank (2005), *Sublime Historical Experience*, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Assmann, Aleida (2013), *Ist die Zeit aus den Fugen? Aufstieg und Fall des Zeitregimes Moderne*, München: Carl Hanser Verlag.
- Assmann, Aleida (2020), *Is Time out of Joint? On the Rise and Fall of the Modern Time Regime*, transl. by Sarah Clift, Ithaca: Cornell University Press and Cornell University Library.
- Beiser, Frederick C. (2011), *The German Historicist Tradition*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bevernage, Berber (2011), *History, Memory, and State-Sponsored Violence: Time and Justice*, New York: Routledge.
- Bjornerud, Marcia (2018), *Timefulness: How Thinking Like a Geologist Can Help Save the World*, Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Burges, Joel, Amy J. Elias (eds.) (2016), *Time: Vocabulary of the Present*, New York: New York University Press.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh (2009), "The Climate of History. Four Theses," *Critical Inquiry*, 35 (2): 197–222.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh (2018), "Anthropocene Time," *History and Theory*, 57 (1): 6.
- Collingwood, R.G. (1973). *The Idea of History*. London: Oxford University Press
- Dilthey, Wilhelm (1993), *Der Aufbau der Geschichtlichen Welt in den Geisteswissenschaften*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Domanska, Ewa (2010), "Beyond Anthropocentrism in Historical Studies," *Historein*, 10: 118–130.
- Ellis, Erle C. (2018), *Anthropocene: A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Esposito, Fernando (ed.) (2017), *Zeitwandel. Transformationen geschichtlicher Zeitlichkeiten nach dem Boom*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Foucault, Michel (2002), *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*, London, New York: Routledge.
- Fukuyama, Francis (1989), "The End of History?," *The National Interest*, No. 16 (Summer): 3–18.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg (2007), *Wahrheit und Methode*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Ghosh, Ranjan, Ethan Kleinberg (eds.) (2013), *Presence: Philosophy, History, and Cultural Theory for the Twenty-First Century*, Cornell University Press.
- Guldi, Jo, David Armitage (2014), *The History Manifesto*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumbrecht, Hans Ulrich (1997), *In 1926: Living at the Edge of Time*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Gumbrecht, Hans Ulrich (2013), *After 1945. Latency as Origin of the Present*, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Gumbrecht, Hans Ulrich (2014), *Our Broad Present. Time and Contemporary Culture*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Halbwachs, Maurice (1992), *On Collective Memory*, trans. by Lewis A. Coser, Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press.
- Hartog, François (2015), *Regimes of Historicity. Presentism and Experiences of Time*, transl. by Saskia Brown, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Heidegger, Martin (1993), *Sein und Zeit*, Tübingen: Niemeyer.

- Herder, Johann Gottfried (2003), *Auch eine Philosophie der Geschichte zur Bildung der Menschheit*, Stuttgart: Reclam.
- Jordheim, Helge (2012), "Against Periodization: Koselleck's Theory of Multiple Temporalities," *History and Theory* 51 (2): 151–171.
- Jordheim, Helge (2014), "Introduction: Multiple Times and the Work of Synchronization," *History and Theory* 53 (4): 498–518.
- Jordheim, Helge (2018), "Making Universal Time: Tools of Synchronization," in *Universal History and the Making of the Global*, Hall Bjørnstad, Helge Jordheim, Anne Régent-Susini (eds.), New York: Routledge.
- Jordheim, Helge (2019), "Return to Chronology," in *Rethinking Historical Time. New Approaches to Presentism*, Marek Tamm, Laurent Olivier (eds.), London: Bloomsbury.
- Kattago, Siobhan (2020), *Encountering the Past from within the Present. Modern Experiences of Time*, New York: Routledge.
- Kleinberg, Ethan (2013), "Prologue," in *Presence: Philosophy, History, and Cultural Theory for the Twenty-First Century*, Ranjan Ghosh, Ethan Kleinberg (eds.), Ithaca, London: Cornell University Press.
- Kleinberg, Ethan (ed.) (2012), "The New Metaphysics of Time," *History and Theory*, virtual issue: <https://www.historyandtheory.org/> (accessed May 30, 2020).
- Koselleck, Reinhart (2000), *Zeitschichten. Studien zur Historik*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Koselleck, Reinhart (2004), *Futures Past. On the Semantics of Historical Time*, trans. by Keith Tribe, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Koselleck, Reinhart (2011), "Introduction and Prefaces to the "Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe"," translated and translator's foreword by Michaela Richter, *Contributions to the History of Concepts*, Vol. 6 (1): 1–5, 7–25, 27–37.
- Koselleck, Reinhart (2018), *Sediments of Time. On Possible Histories*, translated and edited by Sean Franzel and Stefan-Ludwig Hoffmann, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Kuhn, Thomas (1996), *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press.
- Landwehr, Achim (2016), *Die anwesende Abwesenheit der Vergangenheit. Essay zur Geschichtstheorie*, S. Fischer: Frankfurt a. M.
- Latour, Bruno (2018), *Down to Earth: Politics in the New Climatic Regime*, transl. Catherine Porter, Cambridge: Polity.
- Lowenthal, David (2015), *The Past is a Foreign Country – Revisited*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Liotard, Jean-François (1979), *La condition postmoderne: rapport sur le savoir*. Paris: Minuit.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich (2004), *Zur Genealogie der Moral: Eine Streitschrift*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Rosa, Hartmut (2013), *Social Acceleration. A New Theory of Modernity*, transl. by Jonathan Trejo-Mathys, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Runia, Eelco (2014), *Moved by the Past: Discontinuity and Historical Mutation*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Russell, Edmund (2011), *Evolutionary History: Uniting History and Biology to Understand Life on Earth*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Sawyer, Stephen W. (2015), "Time after Time: Narratives of the *Longue Durée*," *Transatlantica. Revue d'études américaines. American Studies Journal*, 1: 1–17; available on-line: <https://journals.openedition.org/transatlantica/7344> (accessed May 2, 2020).
- Schure, Leon Ter (2019), *Bergson and History: Transforming the Modern Regime of Historicity*, Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Shryock, Andrew, Daniel Lord Smail (eds.) (2011), *Deep History: The Architecture of Past and Present*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Simon, Zoltán Boldizsár (2019), *History in Times of Unprecedented Change. A theory for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, London: Bloomsbury.
- Sooväli, Jaanus (2016), "Thinking the Future: Criticism and Transformation in Nietzsche and Derrida," in *Nietzsche als Kritiker und Denker der Transformation*, Helmut Heit, Sigridur Thorgeirsdottir (eds.), Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter.
- Spengler, Oswald (1980), *Der Untergang des Abendlandes: Umrisse einer Morphologie der Weltgeschichte*, Sonderausg. in 1 Bd, München: Beck.
- Spier, Fred (2015), *Big History and the Future of Humanity*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn, Chichester, England: Wiley Blackwell.
- Tamm, Marek, Laurent Olivier (eds.) (2019), *Rethinking Historical Time. New Approaches to Presentism*, London: Bloomsbury.
- White, Hayden (2013), *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*, Fortieth Anniversary Edition, Baltimore, Maryland: John Hopkins University Press.
- Zalasiewicz, Jan, Mark Williams, Alan Haywood, Michael Ellis (2011), "The Anthropocene: a new epoch of geological time?," *Philosophical Transactions: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, Vol. 369, No. 1938: 835–841.
- Zammito, John (2004), "Koselleck's Philosophy of Historical Time(s) and the Practice of History," *History and Theory*, 43 (1): 124–135.



## **PUBLICATIONS**

## SUMMARY IN ESTONIAN

### Uurides aega: Ajaloolise ajalise tänapäevaste käsituste analüüs

Käesolev doktoritöö tegeleb ajasuhete temaatikaga tänapäeva ajaloo filosoofias. Traditsiooniliselt, sealhulgas 20. sajandi teisel poolel aset leidnud keelelise pöörde kontekstis, nähti ajaloo filosoofia peamise ülesandena ajaloo kui akadeemilise distsipliini kriitilist analüüsi. Selles vaimus uurimused huvitusid ennekõike küsimustest, kuidas on võimalik omandada teadmist minevikus toimunud sündmuste kohta, kas ja mis tähenduses võib ajaloo teadmist nimetada teaduslikuks, ning millist rolli mängib mineviku tunnetamisel keeleline representatsioon. Tänapäevastes debattides on probleemiasetuste haare märgatavalt laienenud. Lisaks eelnimetatud küsimustele pööratakse näiteks tähelepanu sellele, millal ja mis tingimustel kujunes modernsele ajaloo uurimusele omane eeldus selle kohta, et minevikku saab mõista ajaloolisena, see tähendab olevikust eristuva iseseisva olemissfäärina. Ajalooteadusele omaste ajalise tingimuste käsitlemine on omakorda osa laiemast ajateemalisest diskussioonist, milles mõtestatakse ka avaramaid ühiskondlik-kultuurilisi ajalise vorme. Neis käsitlustes rõhutatakse muuhulgas, et oleviku ja mineviku suhet ei tuleks käsitada binaarselt, justkui oleks tegemist kahe üksteisest eraldiseisva ajakategooriaga. Lisaks küsimusele, kuidas on võimalik ületada oleviku ja mineviku vahelist ajalist distantssi, tuleks selle vaatekoha järgi pöörata tähelepanu ka tõsiasjale, et iga olevik on juba alati täidetud minevikuga seotud mõistete ja kujutelmadega. Keskendumine temporaalsete struktuuride ajaloolis-kontseptuaalsele eritlemisele on märgatav ka tulevikuga seotud käsituste puhul. Kui 20. sajandi teisel poolel domineeris umbusk ja skepsis tulevikku ulatuvate ajaloonarratiivide suhtes, siis tänapäeval on tulevikuga seotud ettekujutuste uurimine ja mõtestamine naasnud akadeemilisele areenile, seda nii ajaloolaste kui ajaloo filosoofide töödes. Nende arengute valguses saab kokkuvõtvalt ütelda, et just ajalise seotud teemapüstitused on kujunenud üheks olulisemaks ja viljakamaks ajaloo teoreetilist mõtet kujundavaks suundumuseks.

Tänapäevase ajateemalise diskussiooni üheks oluliseks taustsüsteemiks on modernsusega seotud “aja” ja “ajaloo” mõiste. Siinses uurimuses vaadeldakse modernse ajakogemuse erinevaid aspekte ennekõike saksa ajaloolase ja ajaloo filosoofi Reinhart Kosellecki tööde toel, sest just need on tänapäevastes debattides osutunud iseäranis mõjukaks. Doktoritöö lähtekohaks on laiemalt omaks võetud arusaam, et 18. ja 19. sajandil esile kerkinud ettekujutus lineaarsest, tuleviku suunas progresseeruvast ja seeläbi minevikku aina kaugemale seljataha jätvast ajavoolust ei ole enam kaugeltki endastmõistetav ja vajab übermõtestamist. Doktoritöö uurib seega modernse aja struktuuri kokkuvarisemise tajumisest võrsvaid alternatiivseid ajalise mudeleid, seades endale seejuures kaks omavahel seotud ülesannet. Doktoritöö esimeseks eesmärgiks on kaardistada ja süstematiseerida ajalisust käsitlevate teooriate mitmekesisest maastikku, sh analüüsida eri teooriate omavahelisi seoseid ja kokkupuutepunkte, kuid pöörata tähelepanu ka nendevahelistele pingetele ja vastuoludele. Töö teiseks eesmärgiks on kriitiliselt

analüüsida ajaloolase François Hartogi lansseeritud ning laialt kõlapinda leidnud nn presentismi-hüpoteesi, mille järgi iseloomustab nüüdisaegset ajatunnetust minevikku ja tulevikku endasse-haarava kõikehõlmava oleviku domineerimine. Doktoritöö väidab, et alternatiivide leidmine olevikukesksust rõhutavale presentistlikule ajaskeemile on iseäranis aktuaalne tänapäevase keskkonnakriisi valguses. Viimasega seoses on aina enam poolehoidu leidnud hüpotees, et oleme sisenenud uude antropotseenilisse geoloogilisse ajastusesse, mida defineerib inimtegevuse laiaulatuslik mõju looduskesskonnale. Toetudes uuemas ajalooteoorias esindatud perspektiividele, arendab doktoritöö teesi, et presentismist väljumine eeldab uue ajateadvuse kujundamist, mis asetab inimühiskonna eriilmeliste looduslike protsesside ning nendega seotud ajahorisontide konteksti. Vastukaaluks presentistlikule retoorikale, mis rõhutab ajaloolise liikumise lakkamist, võimaldab antud lähenemine taastada aja tähenduse sündmuste ja protsesside järgnevusena. Ainult et tegemist ei ole enam modernse ettekujutusega progressiivselt kulgevast ning inimtegelikkusega piirnevast ajalooprotsessist, vaid erinevas tempos ja varieeruvatel ajaskaaladel kulgevate nii looduslike kui inimesega seotud protsesside mitmekesisusega. Doktoritöö näitab, et sedalaadi nihe ajaloolisuse mõtestamisel saab võimalikuks üksnes mõistelise uuenduse kaudu, mille käigus revideeritakse ja mõtestatakse ümber modernse traditsiooni poolt kujundatud ajaloo ja ajaloolise muutumise mõisted.

Doktoritöö koosneb kolmest avaldatud artiklist, ühest ilmumise kohta kinnitust ootavast artikli käsikirjast, ning sissejuhatavast ülevaateartiklist. Ülevaateartikli peamiseks eesmärgiks on luua nelja iseseisvat artiklit kokkusiduv ja laiemasse konteksti asetav raamistik, võimaldades ühtlasi edasi arendada olulisi, kuid artiklites vähem käsitlemist leidnud küsimusi ja teemasid. Esmalt kirjeldab ülevaateartikkel 20. sajandi teise poole saksa ajaloolase ja ajaloofilosoofi Reinhart Kosellecki ajalisuse teooriaid, mis moodustavad olulise tausta mitmele viimastel aastakümnetel esile kerkinud käsitlustele. Seejuures eristatakse Kosellecki modernse ajakogemuse käsitlust tema formaalsema iseloomuga “ajakihtide” teooriast. Seejärel kirjeldab ülevaateartikkel kolme liiki ajalisuse teooriaid, mis problematiseerivad või laiendavad modernse ajamudeli peamisi eeldusi. Esiteks leiavad käsitlemist lähenemised, mis tegelevad konkreetsete ajakogemuse vormidega, nagu seda on näiteks nostalgia ja mälestamine. Teiseks tulevad vaatluse alla kõrgema üldistustasemega teooriad, mille eesmärk on sõnastada ühiskondi ja ajastuid laiemalt haaravaid “ajaloolisuse režiime”. Kolmandaks fookuspunktiks on teooriad, mis käsitlevad ajalisust ontoloogilisel tasandil, ning mille peamiseks motivatsiooniks on ületada modernne ettekujutus minevikust, olevikust ja tulevikust kui üksteisest eraldatud ajakategooriatest. Ülevaateartikli neljas osa uurib tänapäevase keskkonnakriisi taustal, kuidas mitte üksnes kirjeldada erinevaid ajasuhteid, vaid ühtlasi, kuidas neid muuta ja teisendada.

Esimene artikkel “Kas aeg on liigestest lahti? Uuemad arutelud aja üle ajaloos ja ajaloofilosoofias” eritleb tänapäevaste ajateemaliste diskussioonide olulisemaid alusmõisteid ja kirjeldab nende diskussioonide peamisi suundumusi ja lähtekohti. Doktoritöö teine artikkel “Koselleck on Modernity, *Historik*, and Layers of Time” analüüsib Reinhart Kosellecki mõjuka modernsuse-käsituse

suhet tema vähem tuntud, kuid viimasel ajal samuti aina laialdasemat käsitlemist leidnud “ajakihtide” teooriaga. Artikkel näitab, et vastupidiselt levinud tõlgendustele ei ole Kosellecki kaks ajalisuse-teooriat läbinisti konfliktised ja üksteisele vastanduvad. Doktoritöö kolmas artikkel (hetkel retsenseerimisel) “Negotiating Presentism: Toward a Renewed Understanding of Historical Change” võtab vaatluse alla presentismi-hüpoteesi, mille järgi iseloomustab meie ajastu ajakogemust omalaadne olevikukesksus. Artikkel arutleb, et kuigi presentism aitab mõtestada mitmeid meie kultuurisituatsioonile iseloomulikke ajasuhteid, on sellel ka selged piirid ja puudujäägid. Toetudes lähenemistele, mis tõukuvad meie ajastut kujundavatest tehnoloogilistest ja ökoloogilistest muutustest, väidab artikkel, et presentistlik tõlgendusmuster tuleks asetada laiemasse, erinevaid lähenemisi hõlmavasse ajalisuse-teooriate võrgustikku. Neljas artikkel “History on the Move: Reimagining Historical Change and the (Im)possibility of Utopia in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century” jätkab alternatiivide otsinguid presentistlikule ajateooriale. Konkreetsemalt võtab artikkel vaatluse alla Zoltán Boldizsár Simoni välja pakutud “enneolematu muutuse” teooria, vaagides selle põhimõttelist erinevust presentismist, kuid näidates ühtlasi, et kahe lähenemise vahel on ka olulised, senistes tõlgendustes vähemärgatud seosed.

## CURRICULUM VITAE

**Name:** Juhan Hellerma  
**Date of birth:** June 2, 1986  
**Citizenship:** Estonian  
**Phone:** +372 53976120  
**Email:** juhan.hellerma@ut.ee

### Education

2014–2020 Doctoral studies, University of Tartu  
2017–2018 Wesleyan University, CT, USA, Visiting Researcher  
2015 University of Würzburg, Germany, Visiting Researcher  
2008–2013 MA in Philosophy (*cum laude*), University of Tartu  
2011 University of Freiburg, Germany, Visiting Student  
2010 University of Konstanz, Germany, Visiting Student  
2005–2008 BA in Philosophy, University of Tartu  
1993–2005 Lasnamäe Üldgümnaasium

### Academic Appointments

1.9.2019–31.8.2020 Junior Research Fellow of Philosophy, University of Tartu  
1.9.2018–31.1.2019 Visiting Assistant in Research, Baltic Studies Program, Yale University

### Research interests

Philosophy of history, temporality, phenomenology

### Selection of publications

#### *Peer-reviewed articles*

Hellerma, Juhan (2020), “Koselleck on Modernity, *Historik*, and Layers of Time,” *History and Theory*, 59 (2):188–209.  
Hellerma, Juhan (2020), “History on the Move: Reimagining Historical Change and the (Im)possibility of Utopia in the 21st Century,” *Journal of the Philosophy of History*, 1–14. Published online first: May 20, 2020.  
Hellerma, Juhan (2017), “Kas aeg on liigestest lahti? Uemad arutelud aja üle ajaloos ja ajaloo filosoofias (Is Time Out of Joint? Recent Discussions on Time in History and the Philosophy of History), *Ajalooline Ajakiri. The Estonian Historical Journal*, 4 (162): 475–492.

#### *Article manuscripts under review*

Hellerma, Juhan, “Negotiating Presentism: Toward a Renewed Understanding of Historical Change,” resubmitted to *Rethinking History*.

### *Commentary and other articles*

Hellerma, Juhan (2017), “Seminar “Mineviku kohalolud” Oslos” (“Seminar “Past Presences” in Oslo”), *Tuna*, 2: 154–156.

Hellerma, Juhan (2014), “Hoiakumuutus kui teekond fenomenoloogiasse” (“Change in Attitude as a Journey to Phenomenology”), *Akadeemia*, 12: 2194–2206.

### *Translation*

Schmied-Kowarzik, Wolfdietrich (2016), “Walther Schmied-Kowarziku teadvus-analüütiline filosoofia,” in *Tagasi mõteldes. Töid filosoofia ajaloost Eestis*. Eds. Jaanus Sooväli, Ülo Matjus, Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus, 214–230.

Husserl, Edmund (2014), “Fenomenoloogiline alusvaatlus” (“The fundamental phenomenological outlook: Excerpt”), *Akadeemia*, 12, 2179–2193.

### **Courses Taught**

*Theory of History*, spring semester 2019/2020, University of Tartu.

*Phenomenology and Historical Thinking in European Intellectual History*, autumn semester 2020/2021, University of Tartu.

### **Awards and Scholarships**

2019	Honorable Mention in the National Research Contest for Doctoral Students organized by the Ministry of Education and Research
2018	Estonian Students Fund in USA Scholarship
2018–2019	The Juris Padegs Research Fellowship at Yale
2018	Kristjan Jaak Scholarship
2017–2018	Dora Pluss T1.2 Scholarship
2017	Dora Pluss T1.1 Scholarship
2017	Dora Pluss T1.2 Scholarship
2016	Kristjan Jaak Scholarship
2015	DoRa T6 Scholarship
2012	DoRa T8 Scholarship
2011	DoRa T7 Scholarship
2010	Erasmus Scholarship

### **Selection of Presentations**

“Negotiating Modern Temporality: Presentism vs Unprecedented Change.” November 2019, Tallinn University.

“Discovering Historicity and the Cosmopolitan Perspective.” *Yale Baltic Studies Visiting Fellows Reunion Conference*, November 2019, Yale University.

“Modernse ajakogemuse filosoofiline piiritlemine. Lätted ja murrangud.” Intellectual History Seminar, April 2019, University of Tartu.

“Historicizing Time: The Origins and Transformations of Modern Temporality.” January 2019, Yale University.

- “How to Study Time: Conceptual History vs Phenomenology of the Everyday.”  
Conference *The Social Life of Time: Power, Discrimination and Transformation*, June 2018, Edinburgh.
- “Koselleck’s Account of Temporalization and Its Critics.” Conference *The Role of Philosophy of History*, October 2017, University of Oulu
- “Phenomenological Perspectives on History and Other: Absence vs Presence.”  
Conference *Intersubjectivity and Values: Phenomenological Perspectives*, June 2016, Nova University Lisbon.
- “Präsenz des Vergangenen. Zeitregime und Geschichtlichkeit des Menschen.”  
Colloquium of the Institute of Philosophy, July 2015, Würzburg University.
- “Herder als Virtuose der historischen Einfühlung.” Conference *Empathy, Sympathy and Antipathy in Poetry and Politics: Johann Gottfried Herder and his Legacy*, September 2015, University of Tartu.

## ELULOOKIRJELDUS

**Nimi** Juhan Hellerma  
**Sünniaeg** 2. Juuni, 1986  
**Kodakondsus:** Eesti  
**Phone** +372 53976120  
**Email:** juhan.hellerma@ut.ee

### Haridustee

2014–2020 Doktoriõpe, Tartu Ülikool  
2017–2018 Wesleyani Ülikool, CT, USA, külalisuurija  
2015 Würzburgi Ülikool, Saksamaa, külalisuurija  
2008–2013 Magistriõpingud filosoofias (*cum laude*), Tartu Ülikool  
2011 Freiburgi Ülikool, Saksamaa, külalistudeng  
2010 Konstanzi Ülikool, Saksamaa külalistudeng  
2005–2008 Bakalaureuseõpingud filosoofias, Tartu Ülikool  
1993–2005 Lasnamäe Üldgümnaasium

### Akadeemilised ametikohad

1.9.2019–31.8.2020 Filosoofia nooremteadur, Tartu Ülikool  
1.9.2018–31.1.2019 Külalisteadur, Balti Uuringite programm, Yale'i Ülikool

### Teadustöö põhisuunad

Ajaloofilosoofia, ajaligus, fenomenoloogia

### Valitud publikatsioone

#### *Eelretsenseeritud artiklid*

Hellerma, Juhan (2020), “Koselleck on Modernity, *Historik*, and Layers of Time,” *History and Theory*, 59 (2):188–209.  
Hellerma, Juhan (2020), “History on the Move: Reimagining Historical Change and the (Im)possibility of Utopia in the 21st Century,” *Journal of the Philosophy of History*, 1–14. Published online first: May 20, 2020.  
Hellerma, Juhan (2017), “Kas aeg on liigestest lahti? Uuemad arutelud aja üle ajaloos ja ajaloofilosoofias,” *Ajalooline Ajakiri*, 4 (162): 475–492.

#### *Retsenseerimisel olevad artikli käsikirjad*

Hellerma, Juhan, “Negotiating Presentism: Toward a Renewed Understanding of Historical Change,” resubmitted to *Rethinking History*.

#### *Kommentaariid ja teised artiklid*

Hellerma, Juhan (2017), “Seminar “Mineviku kohalolud” Oslos,” *Tuna*, 2: 154–156.  
Hellerma, Juhan (2014), “Hoiakumuutus kui teekond fenomenoloogiasse,” *Akadeemia*, 12: 2194–2206.



### *Tõlked*

Schmied-Kowarzik, Wolfdietrich (2016), “Walther Schmied-Kowarziku teadvus-analüütiline filosoofia,” in *Tagasi mõteldes. Töid filosoofia ajaloost Eestis*. Toim. Jaanus Sooväli, Ülo Matjus, Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus, 214–230.  
Husserl, Edmund (2014), “Fenomenoloogiline alusvaatlus,” *Akadeemia*, 12, 2179–2193.

### **Õpetatud kursused**

*Ajalooteooria*, kevadsemester 2019/2020, Tartu Ülikool.

*Fenomenoloogia ja ajaloofilosoofia Euroopa mõtteloos*, sügissemester 2020/2021, Tartu Ülikool.

### **Tunnustused ja stipendiumid**

2019	Tänukiri teadustööde riiklikul konkursil ühiskonnateaduste ja kultuuri valdkonna doktoriõppe üliõpilaste astmes.
2018	Eesti Üliõpilaste Toetusfond USAs stipendium
2018–2019	The Juris Padegs Research Fellowship at Yale
2018	Kristjan Jaagu välisõpingute stipendium
2017–2018	Dora Pluss T1.2 stipendium
2017	Dora Pluss T1.1 stipendium
2017	Dora Pluss T1.2 stipendium
2016	Kristjan Jaagu välisõidu stipendium
2015	DoRa T6 stipendium
2012	DoRa T8 stipendium
2011	DoRa T7 stipendium
2010	Erasmus stipendium

### **Valik ettekandeid**

“Negotiating Modern Temporality: Presentism vs Unprecedented Change.” November 2019, Tallinna Ülikool.

“Discovering Historicity and the Cosmopolitan Perspective.” *Yale Baltic Studies Visiting Fellows Reunion Conference*, november 2019, Yale'i Ülikool.

“Modernse ajakogemuse filosoofiline piiritlemine. Lätted ja murrangud.” Mõtteloo seminar, aprill 2019, Tartu Ülikool.

“Historicizing Time: The Origins and Transformations of Modern Temporality.” Jaanuar 2019, Yale'i Ülikool.

“How to Study Time: Conceptual History vs Phenomenology of the Everyday.” Konverents *The Social Life of Time: Power, Discrimination and Transformation*, juuni 2018, Edinburgh.

“Koselleck's Account of Temporalization and Its Critics.” Konverents *The Role of Philosophy of History*, oktoober 2017, Oulu Ülikool.

“Phenomenological Perspectives on History and Other: Absence vs Presence.” Konverents *Intersubjectivity and Values: Phenomenological Perspectives*, juuni 2016, Lissaboni Uus Ülikool.

“Präsenz des Vergangenen. Zeitregime und Geschichtlichkeit des Menschen.“  
Filosoofia instituudi kollokvium, juuli 2015, Würzburgi Ülikool.  
“Herder als Virtuose der historischen Einfühlung.“ Konverents *Kontinent Herder: Empaatia, sümpaatia ja antipaatia poeetikas ning poliitikas*, september 2015, Tartu Ülikool.

## DISSERTATIONES PHILOSOPHICAE UNIVERSITATIS TARTUENSIS

1. **Jüri Eintalu.** The problem of induction: the presuppositions revisited. Tartu, 2001.
2. **Roomet Jakapi.** Berkeley, mysteries, and meaning: a critique of the non-cognitivist interpretation. Tartu, 2002.
3. **Endla Lõhkivi.** The sociology of scientific knowledge: a philosophical perspective. Tartu, 2002.
4. **Kadri Simm.** Benefit-sharing: an inquiry into justification. Tartu, 2005.
5. **Marek Volt.** The epistemic and logical role of definition in the evaluation of art. Tartu, 2007.
6. **Aive Pevkur.** Professional ethics: philosophy and practice. Tartu, 2011.
7. **Toomas Lott.** Plato on Belief (*doxa*) *Theaetetus* 184B–187A. Tartu, 2012, 208 p.
8. **Jaanus Sooväli.** Decision as Heresy. Tartu, 2013, 153 p.
9. **Ave Mets.** Normativity of scientific laws. Tartu, 2013, 217 p.
10. **Vivian Bohl.** How do we understand others? Beyond theories of mind-reading and interactionism. Tartu, 2014, 184 p.
11. **Uku Tooming.** The Communicative Significance of Beliefs and Desires. Tartu, 2014, 208 p.
12. **Andrus Tool.** Objektiivsuse teema Wilhelm Dilthey vaimuteadustefilosoofias. Tartu, 2014, 329 p.
13. **Janar Mikhelsaar.** Giorgio Agamben and Post-Foundational Political Ontology. Tartu, 2015, 169 p.
14. **Jaana Eigi.** The Social Organisation of Science as a Question for Philosophy of Science. Tartu, 2016, 282 p.
15. **Tarmo Tirol.** Subjektiivsus Jean-Paul Sartre'i eksistentsialismis. Tartu, 2017, 253 p.
16. **Eve Kitsik.** Revisionary Ontology: Improving Concepts to Improve Beliefs. Tartu, 2018, 196 p.