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The purpose of the following scientific exploration is to represent a systematic study of memory genesis through epochs and centuries of the most significant philosophical concepts and ideas. Therefore, the phenomenon of memory in socio-humanitarian knowledge in our scientific research involves a philosophical study of the social sciences and humanities results, as well as their interdisciplinary nature in understanding the crucial aspects of the memory.

Philosophical study of the phenomenon of memory challenges clarification of the subject field of research as an object marked by this concept throughout its progress. Before starting to research memory as a profound system, it is required to overview the fundamental memory genesis concepts, i.e., the categories on which it is grounded.

The study of the memory phenomenon proves our attention to the history of its perception in philosophy, ascertaining the stages of the memory field subject organization, i.e., such research fields, and subjects that succeeding converted a research source for the development of the memory philosophy.

The declared approach allows one to explain the basic categories that define the categorical context, i.e. what is indicated by ‘memory’ issue, how, and what subject field of memory research is provided in its genesis. Besides, the genesis itself is the configuration of an objective connection between memory matters. At the same time, the philosophical interpretation of the memory concept demands a study of methodological approaches and views, helping philosophers and researches to represent distinctive meanings of the memory concepts determined in various philosophical or socio-humanitarian studies and how this memory representation served the practical activities of science.

The author’s analysis of the genesis of the phenomenon of memory increase and comprehension of memory as a holistic system holds the proposed classification of structure stages of philosophical theory in understanding the nature and structure of the “memory” category is represented in this scientific exploration for the first time. The continued profound scientific study conducted at the Memory Institute in 2016-2020 preceded the development of this classification.

In the represented research we have identified specific stages of the memory phenomenon genesis in the history of world philosophy, having verified the classification with the most prominent concepts, ideas, memory models, hypothetic issues, etc., as well as the praxiological judgment of the aforementioned memory phenomenon knowledge.

**Keywords:** memory; memory studies; memory environment; memory «boom»; phenomenology of memory; memory models; skills.
Introduction

The study of the memory phenomenon determines our attention to the history of its perception in philosophy, ascertaining the stages of the memory field subject organization, such research fields, and subjects that later converted a research resource for the development of the philosophy of the memory. The requirement to discover the genesis of the phenomenon of Memory in socio-humanitarian knowledge in our scientific research involves a philosophical study of the social sciences and humanities results, as well as their interdisciplinary nature in understanding the essential aspects of the memory.

The study of the historical and philosophical sequence of issues, themes, and conceptualization is connected with the principle of unity of historical and logical issues implementation, which is applied and will be highlighted in the methodology section.

We suggest to start with the most conceptually significant works of philosophers, which determined the basis for further stages of experiencing the memory phenomenon problem field in Antiquity and the Middle Ages, that evolved approaches to the study of memory.

Consequently, we assume the analysis refers to turning points in the history of memory research, those qualitative changes in understanding, which began to indicate the importance of stages of memory and which led to the emergence of philosophical theories and (or) change vectors in the study of this phenomenon. By this, we mean the mechanisms of memory, heuristic, and memory logical models, the concept of judgment memory in human activity, total that determines the worldview of man and specific historical societies.

The author’s analysis of the genesis of the development of the phenomenon of memory and comprehension of memory as a holistic system holds the proposed classification of stages of formation of philosophical thought in understanding the essence of the category "memory" represented in this work for the first time. The continued deep scientific study conducted at the Memory Institute in 2016-2020 preceded the development of this classification.

The Goal

The current crisis of philosophy in general and the philosophy of memory in particular, as once defined by the American philosopher T. Kuhn (Kuhn, 1975), is a prelude to the development of new theories, so our research regarding the phenomenon of memory (took place in Memory Institute in 2016-2020) is aimed at achieving an answer "what is memory phenomenon".

At the same time, we would like to recall the words of the famous philosopher and logician Alexander Zinoviev, who identified another important problem that actualizes the topic of our study (Zinoviev, 2007: 11-12). He signed "...knowing something about society and understanding that is not the same thing. Meanwhile, many people consider themselves experts in knowing their society only because they know a bit more than in any other field of knowledge". Memory is a similar phenomenon, in which there are supposedly many "experts", but their knowledge is based only on certain theories, which are not always practice-oriented.

Not only the needs of philosophical-methodological and philosophical-theoretical nature determined the choice of the topic of our study, but also the need for practical activities because memory is often the decisive mechanism of human activity, social group, community, society. Therefore, the philosophical understanding of memory creates a defining space that affects the awareness of the world, worldview, worldview and picture of the world, which determines not only the activities but also the worldview of the subject of life.

The goal of the following scientific exploration is to represent a systematic study of memory genesis through epochs and centuries of the most significant philosophical concepts and ideas. Thus, the phenomenon of memory in socio-humanitarian knowledge in our scientific research involves a philosophical study of the social sciences and humanities results, as well as their interdisciplinary nature in understanding the essential aspects of the memory.

We live in an era of new global threats, information and cognitive construction and reconstruction, so knowledge of the phenomenon of memory in activity is aimed at forming the subject of life as the optimal realization of human fate in specific historical conditions, as a skillful person and creator.

Materials and methods

The current stage in the development of philosophy is characterized by a renewed reflection of the ascending, basic philosophical and methodological guidelines, reducing the teaching of philosophy, narrowing the subject field, and fragmentary philosophical research concerning memory, skills, and abilities. However, there is a problem of determining the dialectical contradiction of tradition and innovation. Thus, the author of this work has the honor to be a representative of the tradition of philosophy and praxeology in memory of Academician G. Popov (Popov, 1951) and considers it necessary to preserve the heritage of this tradition.

However, our scientific research is innovative as it develops this heritage, 're-thinking', and applying its fundamental concepts within the contemporary social world changes, information technologies progress, and cognitive-innovative civilization development. Therefore, we must focus our search on significant events of memory genesis in the social world, in search of truth and knowledge in understanding its basic aspects.

Philosophical study of the phenomenon of memory requires clarification of the subject field of research as an entity marked by this concept throughout its development. Before starting to research memory as a profound system, it is required to dwell on genesis fundamental concepts - the categories on which it is grounded.

From our viewpoint, this allows us to clarify the basic categories that define the categorical context, i.e. what is indicated, how, and what subject field of memory research is provided in its genesis. Besides, the genesis itself is the formation of an objective relationship between memory issues. At the same time, the philosophical definition of the memory concept requires a study of how the meaning of the
concept was determined in various philosophical or socio-humanitarian studies and how this memory representation served the practical activities of science.

Our study starts with an overtone to ancient examples of philosophical thought to analyze, on the one hand, the diversity of the ancient way of memory perception and, on the other, its connection with the medieval and modern European approach to explaining this phenomenon.

We interpret the memory issues in philosophy of activity in measuring the phenomenon of memory in the history of understanding, in philosophical and socio-humanitarian definitions of the subject field of "memory," substantiation of methodological principles and approaches to solving basic problems, analysis of the phenomenon of memory in the context of development. Furthermore, models and mechanisms of memory that determine the activity; the natural character of heredity in the stages of development of activity in time-space conditionality, the configuration of key skills at different concrete-historical stages of activity are defined.

**Results**

The study of the memory phenomenon takes its roots in the classical works of ancient Greek scientists. In particular, Plato’s distinction between the concepts of "world of things" and "world of ideas" leads to a philosophical perception of knowledge as a process of remembering what the soul saw in the world of ideas. This process of recollection in Plato was called anamnesis (Plato, 2000).

Analyzing the phenomenon of memory, Plato focused primarily on the heuristic aspects of reviving, oblivion, and misleading. Contrasting the imprint on the wax table to memorization and the erasure of things written on wax with oblivion, he answers the question "How can memory be true if past (things) are irrevocably absent?". Plato notes that only what is reflected in this wax, we remember and know as long as the image is stored. If there is no place for new prints, the image is erased and then one forgets and no longer knows (Plato, 2000). Thus, Plato analyzed the mechanism of memory through the allegorical memorization of the most important events in human life and the way we forget them, for the first time.

In Plato’s philosophy, memory is the central and most difficult topic for discussion. It is essential to point out those topos in which Plato discusses memory, and from which later thinkers will draw their insights (Plato, 2000).

The metaphor of a trace, or storage for storage, is given in the Theaetetus (Plato, 1936). Plato himself, nevertheless, points out that he is not the author of this image, and Homer has arguments about hearts (kēros), which are not randomly similar in sound to wax (keros), and there are hearts pure, as if well kneaded, and there are rough, dirty and loose ones.

Therefore, the soul with an imprint, like the "rough heart" is a Platonic metaphor. Memory, defined by metaphors, builds a "striving beginning," which in the intellect is as if it belongs to himself. The aforementioned describes an aspiring being: wanting, willing, rejecting or accepting - solely called human. In the works of Plato, such attributiveness is given as a model of philosophical work, however the attributiveness of intelligence is thought of as self-evident, automatic (Plato, 1936). In this self-understanding of the intellect orientation to what is always already known and collected in memory, the fact the memory was introduced as a metaphor was forgotten, thus the anthropological metaphor of memory gives rise to technical, skillful handling of human memory.

The discussion about memory is conducted by Plato in terms of print and imprint, as memory is an image, eikon, which in contrast to the images of sophistic memory indicates the existence itself, co-present in the image. It is the metaphor of "image-imprint" that determines the distant fate of understanding what 'memory' is (until the XIX century, while A. Bergson criticized the Platonic metaphor, proposing an alternative model of memory perception) (Plato, 2000).

Aristotle maintains the ancient Greek treatise "On Memory and Recalling" that may also be concerned in the spirit of heuristics and dialectics, inherited from Plato. Aristotle compares the memory of an animal and the memory of a human being and notes the fundamental difference, i.e. animals, unlike humans, do not have a "sense of time." That is, the feeling of "before and after" that helps a person navigate in time and function successfully in society, is essential for humans only.

The second aspect of Aristotle’s research concerns the bond between memory and imagination. Naturally, he asks himself "What do they remember? About feelings, or about things that give rise to feelings?". Here, in his opinion, the significant fact is that memory functions through images that act in two planes: as something in itself (generalized images) and as an image of another (specific objective images) (Aristotle, 2002: 143). We mention both the first and the second side of the image at once yet depending on what the focus is (either the first or the second part of it will prevail).

Aristotle, having followed the philosophical understanding of memory in Plato, introduces the analogy of the imprint as that which organizes the individual human memories: issues that influence us, things leaving an imprint in our common sense. Referring to these prints, we recognize something, because the print reminds us of what left it (Aristotle, 2002). In this case, the imprint itself possesses a dual nature: we may consider it in itself, as we remember the picture itself, as well as we may look "through" it by viewing the image in the picture.

This perception of memory is familiar to us as we do not recollect much when we talk about traces of memory, that we have something "deeply etched" in memory, etc. This metaphor confronts us with the necessity to distinguish the rational part of the soul from that which contains memory since memory, as Aristotle explains in his conclusion, "...belongs to the first sensory perception by which we perceive time."

Thus, at the very beginning of the treatise "On Memory" Aristotle notes that he does not consider it appropriate to compare knowledge and properties of memory, because knowledge is about the present, while memory refers to the past (Aristotle, 2002). Hence, analyzing the development of a philosophical knowledge of the memory phenomenon essence in antiquity, we could assume this stage reveals an empirical study of the processes and contexts of memory, as well as an attempt to get to an understanding of the memory structure of its individual processes (Aristotle, 2002).
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The author of the research suggests to name this period a "latent period" of philosophical perception of the memory phenomenon. Indeed, memory has already been singled out as a separate subject of study, although the essential content is still amenable to analysis, still the first metaphors of memory surface as well as the descriptive analysis attempts of memory logical system. Nevertheless, the memory analysis is reduced to judgment of the mind mechanisms functioning consequences, to such processes as forgetting, reproduction of objects of memory, reproduction of data on memory, etc. The description of memory properties does not indicate the contextual nature of memory, does not suggest a model of memory, its characteristics or patterns of the fundamental mechanism functioning.

The latent period of memory studies unfolds in the philosophy of the Middle Ages. At this period the interest in the question of the relationship between memory and time, the preconditions of which were traced in ancient Greek philosophy. Augustine (in his work 'Confession') reflects on the possibility of the existence and relationship of three dimensions of time: past, present, and future. He notes that "only one thing is clear: neither the future nor the past exists, and it is wrong to speak of the existence of three times: past, present and future. It is more correct to say this the present past, the current present, the present future". (Augustine, 1992: 112). Therefore, he concludes only the present really exists, plus the past and the future are images of situations that happened in the past or should happen in the future.

Augustine pays particular attention to the problem of measuring time, because if we use the words "slow", "fast", then, accordingly, we indicate such features of time as a change of pace and the presence of intervals with different tempos (Augustin, 2008: 141). Thus, the medieval philosophical tradition is based on the recognition of the human existence duration and the soul, and, consequently, memory is considered from the standpoint of time. His research has largely determined the judgment of the following psychological theories of subjective time in the manifestations of memory.

Therefore, the problem of memory phenomenon was modeled in ancient Greek philosophy, and the central attention was paid to the study of the mechanisms of memorization, recollection, and forgetting. The mechanisms of memory activity were studied through analyzing their manifestations, and attempts were made to explain the individual characteristics of man in memory, including ones in connection with the physical structure of man. The latent period is characterized by the emergence in the field of view of a philosophical perception of the memory of the subject field defined by boundaries and demarcations, which has not yet produced a working concept or a category. There are the first requirements for describing approaches to the study of memory, its properties and characteristics. However, memory is not considered as a single system, but rather as a "subsystem" of man, conceived in the context of the arrow of time "past - present - future" in the unity of the concepts of "thinking", "consciousness", "imagination". Yet, the genesis of experiencing the memory essence in the latent period raises the question of 'what is memory as a system'; as well as the question 'whether we should consider memory through the prism of the manifestations of the consequences of the functioning of its blocks and mechanisms' exclusively in the form of recollection and forgetting processes. Moreover, a clear negative position is determined, that catalyzes subsequent research.

The next period in the development of the memory phenomenon comprehension is defined as the first conceptualization of the memory phenomenon. This period is associated with the issue of scientific and philosophical works by such thinkers as Giambattista Vico, Giulio Camillus, Jerome de Carranza, Giordano Bruno, Raymond Lullius, and some others (Yates, 1997).

A significant contribution to the conceptualization of a philosophical understanding of memory is the work "The Art of Memory" by R. Lullius, as he proposed a logical system of "memory system" recognition, through which it is reasonable to formulate numerous theological questions and answers. He uses symbols, an alphabet that signifies different things, and therefore seems similar to symbolic logic. The development of the proto-logic of memory judgment is the significance and contribution of Raymond Lullius to the genesis and science of memory. (Lullius, 1964: 115-173). Later, a similar dilemma was solved by L.Wittgenstein in the analytical philosophy (Wittgenstein, 1994).

The foremost achievement and key difference of this stage of the First conceptual perception from the latent one is re-thinking the approaches to the study of memory and the proposal of the first system models of memory. Thus, for the first time in the history of the genesis of memory, Giulio Camillus, Raymond Lullius and a number of their followers propose to consider memory as a single holistic mechanism, logically following in their research from the general (memory device) to the elements of the interaction of this system. In 1540-1543, through the heyday of the Renaissance, D. Camillus suggested a memory model having developed the concept of memory as a theater (Yates, 1997). Subsequently, the category of "memory model" was proposed and critically analyzed by such thinkers as Giordano Bruno and Raymond Raimund, also using such classification categories as memory.

The concept of "theater of memory" was embodied by Giulio Camillus not only as a theoretical model. In 1532, in Venice, the thinker represented a model of memory in the form of a natural wooden structure - a theater, several people could enter at the same time and watch their specific objects, levels of the hierarchy of memory, its mechanisms, etc.

"It is affirmed this man (Camillus) constructed an amphitheater, an unusual and very skillful work, and anyone who gets there as a spectator gets the opportunity to give a speech about any subject, relative in smoothness except that of Cicero. At first, I did not trust these rumors too much until I heard the same thing in more detail from Baptist Ignazio. It is said, this architect yielded the place in the amphitheater to Cicero... the order or rows of figures are arranged with amazing subtlety and divine skill. - we read that from the correspondence of Vigil Zuhienius and Erasmus (Erasmus, 479).

The memory recognition endured significant changes in the Theater. As illustrated, the structure of the "theater of memory" model is divided into places of memory; on them, in turn, images of memory settle down.
Vigilus addressed the next letter to Erasmus from Venice, where he met Camillus and toured the theater (namely the Theater of Memory). He is in fact a master of memory, as he proved when he taught his method in Bologna. With the theater, the size of the building exceeds what could be expected from a conventional model, the building is large enough to accommodate two people at the same time. "Vigilus further points out: "Inside this wooden building there are many images and small boxes, it is also divided into sections and levels. Each figure and decoration have a special place here. (...) I have earlier written to you about a builder named Julius Camillus. He stutters a lot and has a hard time explaining himself in Latin, (...) but he has a good command of the local language, which he taught in Bologna for some time. I asked him about the purpose of the building, the plans of the work and its results, - speaking in a sublime tone and as if embarrassed by its miraculous effect - he laid out in front of me a few sheets and recited everything written in them from memory, rarely lost, exactly following all the numbers, clauses and subtleties of the Italian style" (Erasmus 496).

In addition to the practical solution of issues of memorization, learning the skills of rhetoric and pure language, a new mnemonic methodology is formed to study the knowledge of one’s memory based on being in the "theater of memory" which is a representation of the memory model. Later, Giordano Bruno continued this line of understanding memory and presenting its model independently of Camillus. As we know from the correspondence of same Vigilus, after the disappearance of J. Camillus many tried to imitate him, offering their "theaters of memory", "palaces of memory", "grottoes of memory" (probably appealing to antiquity), however, being in the "theaters of memory", simulations to Camillus's concept did not give practical results to his followers: the work of the memory mechanisms of a person who visited such a "theater" never improved.

Giordano Bruno was born four years after Camillus's death in 1548. In 1563 he joined the Dominican Order. The training he received in the Neapolitan monastery presupposed a close acquaintance with the Dominican art of memory, and the complexity, addition, and confusion with which the precepts of Ad Herennium (an ancient treatise on memory) grew in this tradition, as seen in Romberg's treatises, abound in Bruno's books on memory (Bruno, 1879-1891, II). Bruno himself was portrayed as "a connoisseur of masterful memory, as he was described before he left the Dominican Order (Tocco, 1889).

Giordano Bruno has written several books on his representation of the memory concepts; in particular, he was repeatedly invited even by European kings so that he could demonstrate the skill of his memory. Bruno described the science of memory as a "magical" and "occult" sacrament of knowing one’s natural memory and the ability to deal with this phenomenon, to create "separate types of memory" - external or man-made. (Now we should match this metaphor with the technology of creating external drives, disks, etc., the prerequisites for which were generated in the XV-XVI centuries).

Bruno's first book on memory, De umbris idearum (1582), was assigned to King Henry III of France; in his introductory words, Bruno promises to reveal a sealed "secret". The book was the successor of the Teatro Camillii, and Bruno was an Italian who brought the "secret" of memory as a gift to the King of France (Bruno, 1879-1891).

Upon his arrival in England, Bruno completed the technique of communication, using the system of the art of memory, his hermetic religious idea, which is the main content of his book on memory, published in England. In Germany he continued to improve similar techniques, and the last book he published in 1591, just before his return to Italy, was about 'magical memory'. Chotto, testifying at a trial in Venice over Bruno's reputation in Frankfurt, stated that people who took lessons from Bruno in that city told him that "the mentioned Bruno's memory and other similar mysterious things made it his profession" (Bruno, 1879-1891).

Giordano Bruno continues the tradition of the First Conceptual Stage of Memory Development and confirms the latter aspects: 1) one can learn the "art of memory" which is a model of memory that can be imagined and worked with this theoretical construction; 2) the science of memory is a mystery, however, it is subject to concede the following remarkable methodological concepts (most of which are lost later or not defined in the documents).

The third prominent thinker and "creator of the memory model" in the period of the first conceptual perception of the memory phenomenon is Robert Fludd (Godwin, 1979), who studied the works of Pico del Mirandola and "Theater of Memory" by Giulio Camillus, setting himself the task of creating his theater of memory.

Robert Fludd tries to combine specific manifestations of the external world with the centers of the human body (Yates, 1997). He was the first to introduce a concept according to which everything that happens outside (episodes) is related to the structure and functioning of human organ systems. The author does not support this concept and does not share Fludd's position that the work of human organs determines and shapes the course of events in human life. However, the practice of R. Fludd and his concepts deserve special attention (Fludd also proposed models of explaining the activity of individual mechanisms of memory (Godwin, 1979), for example, in the form of a map of the human body indicating the centers causing the act of memory mechanisms, etc.)

The next stage in the formation of the science of memory and philosophical understanding of the diversity of this phenomenon is chronologically connected with the period of modern philosophy. However, we must name this third stage a period of stagnation and degradation in memory judgment, since there is a regression of explaining the phenomenon of memory. Instead of studying memory as a system category, instead of describing the logic of its mechanisms, there blooms simplification and return to the ancient method of memory studies. Critically, we remark the following: memory is no longer seen as something holistic, but memory processes are studied plus the subject field of research is replaced. Now memory determines its functions, which often causes a substitution of memory concepts.

Hence, the philosophical research of the XVI century is characterized by a fundamentally different approach to the human existence study, as the emphasis shifts from temporal dimensions to the actual instances of knowing the features of human existence. Regarding the perception of what is the basis of cognition - sensations, or cognitive acts -
in the philosophical treatises of the New Age, two courses are defined: empirical and rationalistic one. Therefore, the classic of English philosophy, John Locke, presents an original "theory of knowledge" according to which one of the driving acts of new knowledge is the ability of the mind to retain "simple ideas" derived from sensations or reflections (Locke, 1900).

J. Locke distinguishes two ways a person can use to recall this knowledge: "contemplation" and "memory". In the first case, there is a retention for some time in the circle of the mind of the idea that has penetrated him. The second one covers the ability to restore ideas that, having been reflected, disappeared or were postponed, shaded from the view of the subtopic. Consequently, memory is defined by John Locke as a "room of ideas", in which, as a box or storage for storage, gathers those feelings and reflections that the mind is unable to recognize and analyze, and postpones "for later" by the time it is already enough background and experience. It is worth noting that although the philosophical era of the New Age is defined by a thoroughgoing analysis of the memory processes.

In the spirit of the rationalist tradition, Benedict Spinoza regarded memory, as well. Reflecting on ways to improve the mind, the philosopher defined memory as "the sensation of mind impressions together with the thought of a certain duration of sensation" (Spinoza, 1957). Thus, his memory is the ability of a person to reproduce a specific order of things and record its duration in time. B. Spinoza notes a person's perception of the past is focused on recording certain situations in time, as indicated by the fact that when we want to verify the veracity of any event in the past, we attempt to record the time of this event and mentally correlate it with other situations, that also occurred that time. Subsequently, in contrast to classical empirical philosophy, the philosophy of rationalism focuses on memory perception.

The next representative of English empiricism is Thomas Hobbes; he defines memory as one of the six senses, which in contrast to sight, smell, taste, touch, and hearing is external to consciousness (Hobbes, 1989). The philosopher pays attention to the period of interaction between the object and the person, the so-called "remember what is not remembered." Impressive is the fact that T. Hobbes wrote about the relationship between experience, as a recollection of the sequence of things, and the actual action. Based on some experience of the interdependence of causes and effects of any event, we may expect something inspecting the same causes. Consequently, the philosophy of the New Age is a mechanistic approach to the process of memorization. Reverting to the German school of philosophy, in a critical analysis of the works of Georg Hegel, in particular, his work "Philosophy of Spirit" we discover the following: "Habit is a mechanism of self-feeling, just as memory is a mechanism of intelligence" (Hegel, 2014). Following the work of Kant and Fichte, Hegel founded the doctrine of the Absolute Idea, which seeks self-knowledge. Unlike Kant, the scholar found in contradictions not the source of failure, but the criterion of truth. As is well known, this is what prompted him to discover the "dialectical method" and the famous laws of dialectics. However, "memory" was not the subject of Hegel’s study, although the scientist pointed to a direct association between memory and intelligence, but without explaining the qualitative logical relationship within these categories.

Furthermore, introduced by J. Locke's idea of association as factors that determine the "movement of ideas" and consequently the nature of memory, was the basis of the direction of associationism of German psychology G.Ebbinghaus (Martsinkovskaya, 2004). There is an attempt to "psychologize" the subject field of the phenomenon of memory and to distinguish this subject field from other sciences. A series of experimental studies of the functioning of the human psyche by G. Ebbinghaus (Ebbinghaus, 1998) substantiated the judgment of memory as one of the highest mental functions. In his classic work "On Memory" G. Ebbinghaus restricts the impact on memorizing the amount of material needed, the number of repetitions, the proximity of associative connections, and searches misremembering as a function of time elapsed since learning (Ebbinghaus, 1998: 174).

To analyze the memory phenomenon, in our opinion, of particular importance, are the views of G. Ebbinghaus on the process of forgetting, according to which, the more time passes from the moment of remembering information, the less we remember it. We also regard the following two aspects essential for catching the essence of memory. First, Ebbinghaus explains the difference between relevant and irrelevant information for the community. The experience of events by the community determines the information relevant to him (what is stored). Second, to update information, the contents of memory must be used in activities, as certain forms of activity, recorded in memory blocks, recorded in them. However, how this content is delineated, how it is classified, and by what model memory mechanisms function are questions that remain open for further research (Martsinkovskaya, 2004).

The line of associationism was continued by representatives of American behaviorism E. Thorndike and J. Watson, as in their study memory was placed in the context of the general problem of learning (Martsinkovskaya, 2004). Memory in the behavioral approach was defined accordingly as a mechanism for the automatic skills acquisition formed because of external stimulation. Outstanding Russian scientist S. Rubinstein develops his concept of memory, based on the unity of thought and language. It determines memory through the processes of remembering, recognizing and reproducing an object based on the functional principle of activity (Rubinstein, 2000). The unity of thought and language in the concept of S. Rubinstein is in the process of reproduction, as the object is not only reproduced but also is formed. Consequently, it is the verbal scheme of semantic content that creates this content. Furthermore, it is credible to conclude that of particular importance for the creation of collective memory is interpersonal communication, and not only in the sense of information exchange, but also as an opportunity for the individual to express any requirements.

The next stage in the development of memory ideas genesis we call the second conceptual stage in the study of memory, or the "conceptual revival" of the memory subject field, as it is characterized by a return to the approach to the memory studies as a single system subject to logic, order, defined by mechanisms, logic of work and interaction of...
mechanisms, and also to the expanded subject field of studying of memory and its properties and possibilities. The central point is relevant in the methodological areas that allow for a comparative analysis of these theories and verification of theoretical, philosophically essential patterns in practice. Identification and verification of these patterns is significant in the study of conscious choice in the acquisition of professional skills, thus empowering to get rid of the dependencies of the imposed, i.e., uncontrollable individual fate (according to L. Szondi). An attempt to preserve the subject field of memory in the philosophical field, taking into account the achievements of psychological science, was made by the French thinker and philosopher Henri Bergson (Bergson, 1979).

Representatives of French intuitive philosophy, founded by A. Bergson, opposed the identification of memory and experience (observed in the previous third period of stagnation and degradation of European philosophical thought about memory). Analyzing the mechanisms of memory, he describes two forms: simple reproduction of the studied (such as recitation of a poem) and understanding memory as unique events of the past (when we can determine the place, time and emotions associated with learning one of lines of verse) (Bergson, 1979).

Therefore, A. Bergson argued the existence of a special "figurative" memory, concerning which the brain can merely act for producing memories in the mind, but is not able to generate them or act as their repository, because it is not reduced to simple reproduction recorded in the past events. The researcher modeled problems of the relationship between these two forms of memory, and, consequently, the key problems of attention and recollection. Following not only on the mechanistic interpretation of memory as a repository (which stores important data on our daily lives), intuitive philosophy is close to memory perception as an issue determined by place and time. These conclusions have identified fundamentally new areas in the study of memory as an element of social consciousness, as events crucial to a specific group of people.

A follower of E. Durkheim and A. Bergson, M. Halbwachs (1925) for the first time presented a detailed analysis of the meaning of the concept of "Collective Memory" in its relationship with "historical memory". E. Durkheim, linking the semantic content of social reality with the presence of collective consciousness, emphasized that collective ideas are subject to laws that are different from the laws of existence of individual ideas (Durkheim, 1995). For the emergence of individual representation, the efforts of one individual are sufficient, and for the emergence of collective representation, it is necessary "that several individuals unite their actions and that this combination generates a new result."

Defining the basis of social life, collective ideas are external to individual consciousness and arise due to their organic combination. E. Durkheim distinguishes two forms of existence of collective ideas. The first form is formed because of collective associations - for example, the result of a certain joint activity or as a decision-making process; or as a form of expression of public opinion. The second form of collective ideas exists as presented, which has a time duration and is used by people regardless of whether or not they unite in various social communities (Durkheim, 1995).
Discussions

Study of modern ideas about the phenomenon of memory in the XX - XXI centuries is given concerning the specific "historical memory" which as a problem arose in the context of the study of mass ideas about the past, which began to attract the attention of researchers only in the last decades of the twentieth century. Representatives of various disciplines are involved in this phenomenon: sociology, social psychology, cultural and social anthropology, as well as history. Now it is also studied by specialists in the field of political technology, mass communications, etc.

The problem of representations of large social groups has become the object of attention at the border of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, beginning with the first works of G. Le Bon and J.-G. de Tard on the psychology of the masses ("crowds") (Tarde, 1998). Interest in this topic increased through the first half of the 19th century, along with knowledge of the growing role of the masses in modernized society; in 1930 H. Ortega y Gasset wrote about the "Mass Uprising". A significant area of research is the mass political consciousness, due to the importance of the masses in the political process, including the experience of the elections of the 1930s.

In other words, in the last century, both the social structure of society (it is becoming more differentiated) and the means of communication in the broadest sense (including the ability to capture and disseminate the views of individuals and social groups) have developed. For obvious reasons, the elite - political and intellectual - are growing interest in the opinion of the masses and in their everyday ideas. In addition, the general population is interested in information about their own views and positions. Hence, in particular, the colossal spread of public opinion polls since the 1930s, which were unknown to previous epochs. Such tendencies directly influenced the formation and self-determination of "mass consciousness" and "collective memory".

In the second half of XIX - early XX century to denote mass mental phenomena, various denominations are used: "forms of social consciousness" (K. Marx), "psychology of nations" (G. Steinthal, M. Lazarus, G. Weitz, W. Wundt), "psychology of the masses" and "crowd psychology" (G. Tardé, S. Siegle, G. Le Bon), "collective ideas" (E. Durkheim, M. Moss, A. Hubert), and in the first third of XX century are added, "mentality" (L. Levy-Bruhl, S. Blondel), "public opinion" (G. Tarde, W. Lippman, F. Tennis), "group consciousness" (W. McDougall), "collective unconscious" (K. Jung), etc. (Chesnaton, 2011).

Some of these concepts carried a clear imprint of ideas about some individual mental phenomena, such as the "spirit" or "soul" of the people, the "collective mind", etc. Traces can be found, for example, in the concept of "collective ideas", introduced by E. Durkheim. Later, the very ideas are part of the substantial content of memory, this issue will be discussed in more detail in the next paragraph.

Thus, the degree of homogeneity of group ideas should not be exaggerated. As L. Vygotsky noted, "Everything in us is social, but this does not mean that all the properties of the psyche of an individual are inherent in other members of this group. Only some part of personality psychology can be considered relating to this team, and this part of the personal psyche in terms of its collective manifestation and is studied each time by collective psychology, studying the psychology of the army, church, etc." (Vygotsky, 1986).

Furthermore, we should mention the work of sociologist Maurice Halbwachs, as the vast majority of modern authors who write about "historical memory" operate, as a rule, only some of Freud’s early ideas and/or the concept of "collective memory" (Halbwachs, 1950), proposed in the 1930’s. Therefore, we will dwell on his consideration of the phenomenon of memory. M. Halbwachs's interests are mostly determined by his biography. In high school, he studied with A. Bergson, in the Higher Normal School - with F. Simian, after graduating from university with E. Durkheim. He then taught sociology in Strasbourg, was close to L. Fevre and M. Block, and was a member of the first editorial board of the Annals, impersonating sociology in this interdisciplinary publication.

Halbwachs's interest in memory problems is explained, in particular, by the influence of Bergson and his work "Matter and Memory". In the above-mentioned study "Social Framework of Memory" (1925) Halbwachs showed the social environment limits and organizes memories in space and time, serves as a source of both the memories themselves and the concepts in which they are fixed. Even personal memories have a social dimension because they are in fact complex images that arise only through communication and interaction within social groups (Halbwachs, 1950). Personal experience is integrated into the understanding of the past acquired by society.

Another thesis of Halbwachs is that memory is constantly updated, focusing on the social interests of relevant social groups, and therefore the composition of memories of the past is revised, so they are extremely unreliable to describe what happened.

Hence, the work of M. Halbwachs perfectly fit into the framework of advanced psychological science of the 1920s (Halbwachs, 1950). It was throughout this period the social psychology was formed, and researchers started to pay close attention to the influence of social factors on various types of mental activity, including memory (avail it to mention the work of F. Bartlett, widely known among psychologists). However, as the German scientist J. Assmann concerns, Halbwachs did not limit himself to the analysis of the "social framework" of memory, but went even further, declaring the team a subject of memory and recollection, creating the concept of "group memory" and "memory of the nation", in which the concept of memory turns into a metaphor "(Assman, 2004).

Secondly, the mechanisms of common values production and their meanings in the process of interpersonal communication were analyzed. These studies were conducted, on the one hand, by sociologists (C. Cooley, J. Mead, A. Schutz, G. Garfinkel, I. Hoffman), on the other, by psychologists, in particular in the framework of various theories of communication. Another crucial area of psychological research was the development of so-called theories of cognitive correspondence (F. Haider, T. Newcomb, C. Osgood and P. Tannenbaum, R. Abelson and M. Rosenberg, etc.). All of them were focused on recognizing the mechanism of "grinding" the ideas of interacting actors, especially in the framework of sustainable group communication (Filippov, 2008).
Additionally, a large number of studies are devoted to the social conditionality of individual thinking, the influence of social factors on the formation of man and his cognitive processes. The origins of this direction were, in particular, the works of J. Piaget, L. Vygotsky and others on the development of thinking in children. A large number of works are devoted to the impact on the cognitive processes of social attitudes, norms and values.

The results achieved by the representatives of the American ethno-linguistic school (E. Sepir, B. Wharfi), who put forward the so-called hypothesis of linguistic relativity, were also essential for this area of research. In Germany, the problem of cultural conditionality of social ideas is explained in the context of a diffusionist approach based on the concept of "cultural circles" (L. Frobenius, E. Bernehim, B. Ankerman, F. Grebner, W. Schmidt). Finally, in France, a special role was played by the works of L. Levi-Bruhl, who aimed to characterize the relationship between language of individual thinking and social ideas regarding the concept of "mentality". In the USSR, the research of ethnocultural psychology was conducted by A. Luria (Rozhdestvenskaya, 2006).

The study of mass ideas in modern society within the framework of the theory of social ideas suggested by S.Moskovich is of great interest. In his doctoral dissertation "Psychoanalysis: its image and audience" (1961) Moskovich dissolved the formation of social (mass) ideas about psychoanalysis in French society (Moskovich, 2006).

In this regard, it is worth emphasizing the difference between "social" and "group" ideas. Group ideas (group knowledge) - a phenomenon well studied in social philosophy, both at the level of the mechanism of formation and in terms of content. Given the diversity of social groups, the general concept of group ideas is very vague, in particular due to the presence of professional expert groups responsible for the production and maintenance of certain segments of the social stock of knowledge. In turn, ideas in groups that are professionally associated with the production of knowledge are also largely formed by a kind of "experts", relatively speaking - "ideologues" of the group, and only then to some extent assimilated by other members. We in this case are interested only in this last component, namely - usual group representations.

In 1976, D. Robinson introduced the concept of autobiographical memory, which is a mental representation of scenes, categories, etc., which have a personal relationship to the individual. The problem of autobiographical (episodic) memory attracted the attention of experts in the field of social philosophy in the twentieth century. All this was due to the memorial turn, which was already formed in the socio-humanitarian sciences (Robinson, 1976).

A special role in the formation of the 'memorial turn' issue was represented by the French historian P. Nora (Nora, 1999), who continued the ideas of M. Halbwachs on the formation of historical memory along with the collective, and focused largely on special means of social memory ensuring the transmission of meaningful symbols through generations.

According to him, such means might act as naturally or intellectually constructed objects that promote and condition the implementation of commemorative practices. These tools in the works of the French researcher P. Nora were called "places of memory" (Nora, 1999, p. 23). They are remnants, the extreme form in which the commemorative consciousness exists, and which function in geographical, temporal, and symbolic space; they to varying degrees include three components: material, symbolic and functional (Nora, 1999, p.26). The demand for the existence of these numerous places of memory is caused by the continuous process of disappearance of representatives of social groups with memory, which the researcher calls "authentic" and "true".

Mr. Nora pays attention to the relationship between social memory and history, describing their key fundamental differences. Thus, if P. Nora's memory is understood as "always a relevant phenomenon, a connection experienced by the eternal present", then history, on the contrary, acts as "always problematic and incomplete reconstruction of what no longer exists" (Nora, 1999, vol. 2). Accordingly, memory is always symbolic, emotional, and history will act as a kind of critical analysis and discourse.

Current foreign and domestic studies of the phenomenon of memory in the period of XX-XXI centuries identified a new stage in the formation of a philosophical perception of memory. In the American literature of 2016-2018, this stage is called the "memorial boom", which is characterized by a return to the philosophical traditions of the first and second conceptual stages of understanding the phenomenon of memory. Studies of memory in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries are characterized by the integration of several philosophical traditions that define new approaches to understanding this phenomenon. Thus, the French philosopher P. Ricoeur focuses on the study of memory within the phenomenological and hermeneutic traditions. The scientist believes the possibility of studying the perception of the real nature of the first approach and the analysis of the peculiarities of the text interpretation within the second allows us to determine as meanings that organize the everyday world of man. One of the main functions of memory, according to P. Ricoeur, is "evidence of events that occurred in time" (Ricoeur, 2004), and the structuring of these results in the future occurs in the course of everyday communication.

In his interpretation, P. Ricoeur supports the study of M. Halbwachs on the relationship between historical and collective memory, whose ideas in the 90s of the twentieth century received a "second birth" and caused a significant resonance in the Francophone scientific philosophical and sociological world (Ricoeur, 2004).

In a discussion with M. Halbwachs, the German researcher, historian of religion and culture J. Assman forms his own theory of cultural memory. He emphasizes the importance of researching the form of memory that goes beyond the individual, but emphasizes that the subject of memory is always an individual (Assman, 2004, p.36), while in M. Halbwachs always focuses on the collective object. Assman concludes that what connects a group of individuals, uniting them in "we" and is the same unifying structure of general knowledge and self-image, based, first, on submission to common rules and values and secondly, on a jointly meaningful past (Assman 2004: 15-16).

As the philosophy of the New Age shifted the emphasis in the study of memory from the temporal dimension to the cognitive, the mechanicist idea of the functioning of memory...
has become inherent in the empirical direction, which considers memory as a "treasury" to which move the impressions and information lack of time or opportunities cannot be relevantly analyzed. The rationalist approach examines memory as a mechanism for organizing mental acts of consciousness, and hence the very possibility of sequential cognition. Considering cultural memory, J. Assman rejects the idea of E. Durkheim about the existence of a collective consciousness that functions outside the individual. However, Assman coincides with the theory of the functioning of the "social framework" of memory suggested by M. Halbwachs. According to J. Assman, social memory, in particular, it cannot be something amorphous that exists "unknown where", and in itself. Personality in its full sense does not hold social memory, it remembers only individual biography and situations that were associated with it.

Conceptual problems of identity formation in the context of self-consciousness and analysis of people's memory are considered in the works of domestic sociologists: in comparative all-Ukrainian studies by I. Kononov, A.S.Lobanova and others, aimed at revealing the complex, multilevel nature of ethnic identification (Kononov); in the study of the identity of the social group of A. Ivanova (Ivanova, 2001), the complex of personality identities and features of their formation N. Chernysh, A. Malanchuk (Chernysh, 2003).

In the memorial boom, if the first sub-stage can be distinguished "memorial turn", the second sub-stage can be defined as the differentiation and fractal distribution of memorial concepts in the field of various socio-humanitarian studies. A separate area in the XXI century was the issue of social memory, as "groups remember together." In particular, there are two different directions in the literature: a) about small groups and b) about large groups.

The first area has been studied mainly in the field of psychology, as exemplified by the study of memory in married couples (Harris, Barnier, Sutton, & Keil 2014) or in the dyads of mother and child (Reese, Haden & Fivush 1993). The latter has been studied mainly in the social sciences and history, which has been called the "memory boom" (Blight 2009), since in recent years with "there was a huge layer of scientific work on how nations remember their past. One of the issues of philosophical interest in this general area is the relationship between memory in small groups and memory in large groups.

The central question concerning memory in small groups may be whether such groups exhibit persistently collective forms of memory. A number of opinions on this subject are available (Barnier, Sutton, Harris, & Wilson 2008; Wilson 2005), but the conservative view, of course, is that, although memorialization may be influenced by the social context in which it occurs, it itself is always a process of a strictly individual level. A conservative point of view is a natural starting point, but for a radical point of view there is a surprising rationale: memorialization is sometimes a group-level process. Systems with transactional memory are a promising place to find reliable collective forms of memory. (Wegner 1987); stable, permanent groups characterized by a division of responsibilities for memorialization, and general metacognitive awareness of this division. (Kirchhoff 2016; Theiner, Allen, & Goldstone 2010; Tollefsen, Dale, & Paxton 2013).

Alluring on the idea of Wimsatt (Wimsatt 1986), Turner (Theiner 2013) made a strong argument that transactional memory systems exhibit a form of emergent memory, in the sense that the group has its memory beyond those of its participants. Based on a slightly different theoretical basis, Huebner (Huebner 2013) developed an additional approach.

The central question about memory in large groups is whether such groups can remember something similar to what they can remember in the group. The meaning of concepts acquired in the field of individual memory to the field of small-scale collective memory may already be problematic; their application in the field of large-scale collective memory may be even more unsettled. However, this field of research is promising in the XXI century, especially in terms of understanding the formation of interaction at the level of resolving the contradiction "individual-society", "person-group", as well as in solving pedagogical and methodological problems related to training of experts and acquisition of skills (individually and in a group).

Social and philosophical schemes also drew attention to the issue of "collective memory". For example, the research on "collective intentionality" may clarify the effect of shared memory, which represents a form of close attention to the past (Hoerl & McCormack 2005). By providing a new test case, collective memory can also shed light on general concepts and theories in social ontology. For example, Smith (2014) pointed out that while many social objects (institutions, contracts, etc.) are "continuous" (in the sense that they transfer their meaning over time), language acts, which in many respects substantiate their existence, are events and, therefore, exist only at a given moment in time.

Russian researchers A. Rozhdestvenskaya and V. Semenova argue a fundamental difference between public memory and collective. Thus, public memory is a "social product that arises in society as a result of selection, interpretation, and some distortion of the facts of the past in the minds of the majority of the population" (Rozhdestvenskaya, 2011). Since the subjects of public memory are the vast majority of the population, it may act as a resource and a manipulation product.

An essential area of study of social memory is the analysis of the interaction and interpenetration of memory and experience. In this regard, the concept of the Kharkiv researcher O.M. Laktionov is significant, who analyzes the specifics of the functioning of individual experience of the individual, noting that "... experience is a psychological reality that always refers to a particular person, i.e. he is individual in nature» (Laktionov, 2010) O. Laktionov in some ways contrasts personality and experience. Thus, "personality as an active principle creates life, thereby destabilizing the conditions of their existence; experience, on the contrary, provides stabilization of the unstable, using the information "accumulated in memory", knowledge, abilities and skills of the individual" (Laktionov, 2010, p. 57).

Interpreting the individual experience of the individual through the prism of historical psychology, Kharkiv scientist O.M. Laktionov points to the existence of historical experience, which is included in the structure of the experience of a modern individual. Since people as a
generation carry out succession in the form of mastering the experience of others, previous, the human experience from the beginning is historical. The historical experience of human exists in two respects: as a historical fact and as a moment of his individual experience (phenomena and incarnations) (Lakhtinov, 2010).

The problem of identity crisis in the context of memory comprehension is fixed and manifested in the field of view of researchers as domestic: Yu. Shinkarenko (Shinkarenko, 2002), G. Shulga (Shulga, 1993), as well as foreign one, i.e. M.A. Tremblay (1988). M.-A. Tremblay, for example, having studied the formation and development of the identity of the Canadian French-speaking territorial community, confirms the cultural identity crisis in Quebec. Agrarian Quebec, having grown industrial after World War II, is among the countries catching up with modernization. It has converted the Quebec leadership can resolutely reject old values and adopt new ideas. Such ideological transformations without recognizing that society is "alive" have caused significant difficulties in the cultural identification of Quebeckers (Tremblay, 1988).

A significant contribution to the study of the relationship between memory and identity was made by the Ukrainian researcher Y. Zerniy, who pointed out the fundamental importance of historical memory in the formation of national identity. Y. Zerniy emphasizes the definition of historical memory, may get coordinated by the state policy of memory, as it is an important component of national security of Ukraine (Zerniy 2009). However, in this context, we consider it highly appropriate to comment on the need for on behalf of objective control by the state in this matter, which excludes any possibility of coercion or forcible imposition of "the only correct" perception of history.

Since the formation of historical memory is characterized by the impossibility of forcibly 'squeezing out' the constructed image of the past, In this context, it is relevant to pay attention to the research conclusions of V.V. Sereda on the coexistence in modern Ukrainian society of several models of the national past (Ukrainian, Soviet, etc.), and their regional features. To this end, the researcher advances the concept of "historical identity", which is based on discursive theory and is described as "structured circle of connections between the dominant paradigms of understanding and explaining the past" and "personal" memory of individuals.

**Conclusions**

In the represented scientific investigation we have identified the following stages of the memory phenomenon genesis in the history of world philosophy:

1. The latent stage of understanding the approaches to the study of memory processes that raise the question of what is "memory", characterized by the formation of philosophical thought in antiquity and the Middle Ages;
2. The first conceptual stage in the study of memory, characterized by a systematic understanding of memory, its structure, as well as a representative representation of the model of memory, called "Theater of Memory", for the first time in history embodied by Giallo Camillus; the basis of the direction "science of memory" and the category "Art of Memory" by Giorgadno Bruno and other thinkers.
3. The period of regression and stagnation, which chronologically falls on the period of the New Age. During this period, there is a simplification and return to the approach to the study of memory processes instead of the study of memory as a systemic phenomenon.
4. The second conceptual stage in the study of memory, characterized by a return to the approach in the study of memory as a single system that is subject to logic, order; in this period, key advances in the representation of the memory model, the delimitation of memory blocks, the description of the contents of memory and its mechanisms; logic of memory mechanisms is a period of contribution to the knowledge of memory and application of practical concepts of memory of representatives of deep psychology (S. Freud, K. Jung), the founder of the pre-analytical school L. Szondi, as well as the Soviet scientist G. Popov, who independently of L. Szondi and other researchers developed a memory model, presented methodological and tactical recommendations for working with this model and mastering the practice of managing memory mechanisms in the context of the activity approach.
5. The modern period, referred to since 2016 in American literature as the "Memorial Boom". With two sub-stages:

   Memorial turn as the first sub-stage of the memorial boom. At this stage, intuitive philosophy has defined the understanding of memory as an event characterized by place and time. These findings have identified fundamentally new directions in the study of memory as an element of social consciousness, as events may be common to a certain group of people. Later in the study of external, collective memory, the definition of promising areas of study of historical and social memory, we owe the work of such thinkers as E. Durkheim, M. Halbwachs, P. Nora, and others.

   In the 'memorial boom', the second substage is defined as the differentiation and fractal spread of memorial concepts in the field of various socio-humanitarian studies. This stage really has a place to be, in our opinion, because there is an appeal to unresolved issues raised during the first and second conceptual stages of memory genesis (comprehensive classification of memory mechanisms, data storage and classification of memory content, management mechanisms of memory in the context of activity and its successful implementation in a changing environment, etc.). More and more often the subject field of research is not only the model of memory as a single holistic system, which is responsible for the skills, strength, potential of man, his inclinations, etc., but also those approaches to system memory management.

Returning to the problems of the memory philosophy uncovers another unsolved issue of studying the phenomenon of memory in activity, in its historical stages of formation, which determines the direction of actual subsequent study.
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