

UDC 1:001 (043.2)

Lukyanenko M.

National Aviation University, Kyiv

THE PROBLEM OF ESSENCE OF TIME IN MODERN PHILOSOPHICAL TEACHINGS

We live in a world that human eyes perceive very vague, its true essence, features, hidden from view by a veil of prejudice, lack of interest, and of course the natural cipher code. Many of the truths of this world cannot be seen with the naked eye but can be discovered through observation and experience, such as time. To begin with, one of definitions of time states, that Time is a dimension in which events can be ordered from the past through the present into the future, and also the measure of durations of events and the intervals between them.

There exists the modern typology of time, like: real, perceptive, conceptual, metrical and topological. Philosophers of time tend to be divided into two broad camps on some of the key philosophical issues, although many philosophers do not fit into these pigeonholes. Members of the A camp say that McTaggart's A-series is the fundamental way to view time; the now is objectively real and so is time's flow; ontologically we should accept either presentism or the growing-past theory and the ontologically fundamental entities are 3-dimensional objects. Members of the B camp say that McTaggart's B-series is the fundamental way to view time; the now is subjective and so is time's flow; ontologically we should accept eternalism or the block universe theory and the fundamental entities are 4-dimensional events. To speak further, before the creation of Einstein's special theory of relativity, it might have been said that time must provide these four things: (1) For any event, it specifies when it occurs. (2) For any event, it specifies its duration – how long it lasts. (3) For any event, it specifies what other events are simultaneous with it. (4) For any pair of events that are not simultaneous, it specifies which happens first. However, the first advocate of a relational theory of time was Aristotle. He said, «neither does time exist without change.» The battle lines were most clearly drawn in the early 18 th century when Leibniz argued for the relational position against Newton, who had adopted a substantival theory of time. Suppose Newton's space and time existed. But one could then imagine a universe just like ours except with everything shifted five kilometers east and five minutes earlier. However, there would be no reason why this shifted universe does not exist and ours does. Now we have arrived at a contradiction because, if there is no reason for there to be our universe rather than the shifted universe, then we have violated Leibniz's Principle of Sufficient Reason: that there is an understandable reason for everything being the way it is. On the other hand, there is a scientific view of time. Einstein's theory of relativity has had the biggest impact on our understanding of time. But Einstein was not the first physicist to appreciate the relativity of motion. Galileo and Newton would have said speed is relative to reference frame. Let's briefly explore other answers that have been given throughout history to our question, «What is time?» Aristotle claimed that «time is the measure of change». René Descartes had a very different answer to «What is time?» He argued that a material body has the property of