

G.R. Seifullina^{1*}, A.E. Kabduyev², E.A. Mussayeva³

¹*Buketov Karaganda National Research University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan,*

²*Karaganda University of Kazpotrebsouz, Karaganda, Kazakhstan*

³*Karaganda Medical University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan*

(E-mail: Galiya-magavina@mail.ru, akabduyev@mail.ru, elvira.musaeva.75@mail.ru)

Formation of personality in the context of the mythological form of spiritual communication from the archetype to mass culture

The formation of personality in the historical process is closely connected with the evolution of forms of spiritual communication, among which myth occupies a special place. The mythological form of conveying meanings is not only an archaic means of symbolic mastering of reality, but also an active mechanism of socialization, identification and formation of the individual's worldview in modern socio-cultural conditions. The article examines the key theoretical interpretations of myth (C. Levi-Strauss, R. Barthes, C.G. Jung, M. Eliade), focusing on its structural, cognitive and ideological functions. Particular attention is paid to the role of archetypes and their impact on the unconscious levels of consciousness, ensuring the continuity of cultural models. Modern forms of mythological thinking are analyzed, especially in popular culture, including TV series, cinema and literature, where myth acts as a form of symbolic order that allows individuals to structure their reality and find meaning in conditions of fragmentation. The thesis is substantiated that mythology remains an active element of spiritual life, capable of adapting to new media environments and cultural contexts. Myth is not just a relic, but a universal language of meanings that ensures the integration of personal experience into collective consciousness.

Keywords: myth, spiritual communication, personality, archetype, socialization, identity, mass culture, unconsciousness, structure of myth, symbolic thinking.

Introduction

The problem of personality formation in humanitarian knowledge is traditionally considered in close connection with the mechanisms of spiritual communication, which form not only individual consciousness, but also its relationship with collective cultural structures. One of the most stable and universal forms of such communication is the myth. Myth has not only accompanied the history of mankind since the deepest archaic times, it also forms a special symbolic language with which a person makes sense of the surrounding reality, builds personal and social identities, structures the moral and existential space of his being. In this context, mythological thinking acts as one of the fundamental ways of organizing human experience.

Modern researchers emphasize that mythology does not disappear with the development of rationality, but is transformed by adapting to new media formats and cultural codes. The myth does not just tell about the past, but serves as a model and justification for all human actions, endowing them with eternal meaning. "Myth is the initial phase of cultural development, and therefore it is least familiar to modern people in the sense that in modern times we often deal with its "transformed" forms. The world of direct experience of modern man, the world of everyday practices, has many mythological features... In the case of "transformed" forms, on the contrary, myth becomes the main product of communication, myth-making becomes an end in itself, myth usurps the cultural form (media), introduces its own code and "fills" it with its own content" [1]. This allows myth to function not only as a form of memory, but also as a way for individuals to participate in a collective, sacralized reality.

A.F. Losev, in turn, emphasized the ontological character of mythological reality: "... Myth is the most necessary... category of thought and life; there is absolutely nothing accidental, unnecessary, arbitrary, fictional or fantastic in it. This is a genuine and maximally concrete reality" [2; 37]. A myth, according to Losev, is not just a story, but an expression of the true essence of being, capable of influencing consciousness and guiding the process of personality formation.

This article is devoted to the analysis of myth as a universal mechanism of spiritual communication, which has a profound impact on the processes of socialization, identification and self-determination of the individual—from archaic archetypes to the structures of modern mass culture.

* Corresponding author's e-mail: Galiya-magavina@mail.ru

Materials and methods

The methodological basis of the study is interdisciplinary approaches, including elements of cultural studies, philosophy, psychoanalysis, semiotics and social psychology. The work analyzes the theoretical concepts of C. Levi-Strauss, C.G. Jung, R. Barthes, M. Eliade, as well as modern ideas about myth in mass culture. The methods of hermeneutic analysis of texts, comparative analysis of cultural narratives, semiotic and structuralist approaches are used.

Results

The study showed that mythological consciousness is a stable and flexible form of interpreting reality, built into the deep levels of the human psyche. It does not disappear with the development of rational thinking, but is transformed, penetrating into mass culture and modern media. The archetypes underlying myths continue to influence the individual, acting as intermediaries between the individual and the collective. In the conditions of the modern world, mythological structures perform the function of ordering moral and symbolic reality, ensuring personal adaptation and self-identification.

Discussion

The formation of personality in the historical process is inextricably linked with the evolution of forms of spiritual communication, each of which reflected and, at the same time, shaped the changing worldview of man. These forms developed in parallel with the increasing complexity of the methods of mastering reality—from the sensory-figurative to the conceptual-rational level—and became an expression of a different type of consciousness inherent in the corresponding eras. The sensory-figurative level of comprehension of the world, closely associated with myth, art and religion, served as the initial matrix of the symbolic mastering of reality. It was at this level that archetypal structures were formed, reflecting the experience of mankind accumulated before rational comprehension. The conceptual level, represented by philosophy and science, comes to replace it as a means of conceptualization and systematization of this experience. However, it does not displace sensory-figurative perception, but, on the contrary, relies on it and develops in interaction with it, forming a more complex model of human consciousness. Myth, having an ontological status, retains its importance in culture even under the domination of rationalistic paradigms [3].

The mythological form of spiritual communication is one of the most ancient one. It played a key role in the processes of socialization and the formation of individual identity. Myth, unlike rational discourse, does not so much explain the world as it gives it existential meaning, creating a primary ontological and value structure. It defines the boundaries of the permissible and unacceptable, sets ritual, moral and behavioral models through which the individual is included in the social space. O.G. Arapov emphasizes that myth forms an “ontological framework of thinking” within which realities become fundamentally significant, lived as reality, even in the absence of empirical evidence of their objectivity [4]. In the model of mythological communication proposed by C. Levi-Strauss, myth is considered as a structure subordinated to the deep universals of human thinking [5]. Myth is not just a narrative, but a way of organizing experience into stable binary oppositions that underlie cognitive activity. In Levi-Strauss’s interpretation, myth acts as a universal linguistic mechanism by means of which human consciousness seeks to organize the chaos of reality, endowing it with stable semantic coordinates. The structure of myth organizes human experience not in logical categories, but in oppositional symbols—life and death, light and darkness, nature and culture—which allows the individual to intuitively navigate socio-cultural reality. This structural stability of myth makes it a powerful means of integrating the individual into collective forms of consciousness, ensuring the continuity of values and norms within traditional cultures. R. Barthes complements this idea, focusing on the social function of myth, which, in his opinion, acts as a mechanism for the ideological consolidation of the existing order, performing the function of a “mythology of conservation” [6]. In his interpretation, myth is a secondary semiological level, where an existing sign (concept, image, event) is transformed into a bearer of a certain ideological meaning. Myth, thus, naturalizes historically conditioned phenomena, presenting them as self-evident, natural and beyond doubt. It turns culture into nature, hiding deep power relations and social attitudes under the surface of everyday meanings. In this context, myth acts not simply as a form of symbolic transmission, but as a means of structurally reinforcing social roles, hierarchies and models of behavior, forming a stable sense of belonging and identity in the individual, often imperceptibly replacing reflection with ready-made meanings.

C.G. Jung, developing analytical psychology, introduces the concept of an archetype—an innate mental structure that is an expression of the collective unconsciousness. He wrote: “All the most effective ideals are always more or less frank variants of the archetype” [7; 83]. According to Jung, archetypes embody prototypes that are activated in culture and individual experience, guiding internal processes of identification. They “speak” with the voice of millennia, exerting a profound influence on the psyche, since they penetrate into the deep layers of subjectivity. This makes the mythological form of communication especially powerful: it does not require rational understanding to be effective. “Any relationship to an archetype, experienced or simply named, “touches” us; it is effective because it awakens in us a voice louder than our own. The speaker of prototypes speaks as if with a thousand voices, he captivates and conquers, he raises what he describes from the singular and temporal to the sphere of the eternally existing” [7; 284]. Jung emphasizes that archetypal images act as unconscious regulators of behavior and perception, structuring not only the content of dreams, myths and fairy tales, but also the basic models of experiencing one’s own “I”. Due to their universality and emotional richness, archetypes play the role of a kind of symbolic intermediaries between individual consciousness and the collective experience of humanity. They provide a person with a sense of rootedness in a broader, suprapersonal reality, which is especially important in conditions of identity crises or cultural fragmentation.

Myth can thus be considered as a kind of grammar of symbolic life, prescribing a certain style of existence for a person. It does not simply explain the world, but regulates behavior in it, determines emotional reactions, a system of values and norms of social adaptation. This is its main strength as a mechanism of socialization: myth creates cognitive and moral patterns into which the individual “fits in”, forming himself in accordance with the collective cultural code. M. Eliade emphasized: “being real and sacred, myth becomes typical, and, consequently, repetitive, since it is a model and, to some extent, a justification for all human actions” [8; 22]. Myth, according to him, does not simply describe an event, but serves as its ontological justification—due to its timelessness and sacredness. This gives myth the ability to be actualized at any historical time, including in the conditions of the modern information society. Even popular culture, as Eliade rightly noted, constantly reproduces mythological patterns: popular novels, films, comics and television series feature stable archetypes such as the struggle between good and evil, the hero’s journey, sacrifice and redemption. These narrative structures perform the function of meaning generation and serve as the basis for the moral orientation of the individual, especially in the context of a fragmented and rapidly changing socio-cultural environment. “Every popular novel must present the typical struggle between Good and Evil, the hero and the villain (the modern incarnation of the devil) and repeat one of the universal motifs of folklore—the persecuted young woman, saved love, the unknown benefactor, and the like. Even detective novels are full of mythological themes” [8; 36]. These plot constants do not simply reflect the tastes of the mass audience—they demonstrate the persistent need of the human consciousness for a mythological structure that gives meaning to events, organizes moral reality and guides the process of personal identification.

The need for myth is not an anachronism, but an expression of a fundamental property of human nature: the desire for integrity, orderliness and significance of one’s own existence. The mythological structure of consciousness allows a person not only to fit into a cultural tradition, but also to experience involvement in the “eternal”, as Eliade argues. “At the slightest touch of its contents, a person experiences “an experience of the eternal”, and it is precisely the reactivation of this content that is felt as a complete revival of mental life” [8; 135]. According to Eliade, myth functions as a sacralizing mediator between a person and the world, returning the subject to the archetypal time of the “beginning”, to the era of the first creation, when everything had sacred meaning and purpose. In this context, myth is not just a story about the past, but a way to go beyond the profane, fragmented time to experience the fullness of being. The act of turning to myth becomes a kind of ritual of inner rebirth, giving the individual a sense of being rooted in a transcendental order that gives meaning to his everyday life. Mythological consciousness, in Eliade’s interpretation, is not eliminated with the advent of rationality, but continues to exist in transformed forms—in symbolism, rituals, collective narratives and personal strategies of self-understanding. Even in a secular society, a person intuitively strives to restore the connection with the sacred, to touch the myth as a source of meaning, identity and inner balance. Myth, in essence, performs an integrative function, connecting individual experience with universal patterns of human existence.

Supplementing this idea, G.A. Levinton points to one of the fundamental characteristics of myth—its constant recoding, the ability to transform and reproduce itself in new forms: in rituals, texts, visual images, social practices [9]. It is due to this recoding that myth turns out to be a living, dynamic element of spiritual communication, capable of adapting to changing cultural contexts and at the same time maintaining its es-

sential function—to be a tool for navigation in the world of meanings, moral guidelines and existential choices. R.A. Migurenko also shows in his research that myth in the context of personal socialization and identification is not an archaic relic of the past, but a powerful mechanism of meaning formation that continues to function in modern forms of mass culture, media and individual spiritual search [10]. Its role is to ensure a connection between the personal and collective, temporal and timeless, superficial and deep levels of human existence.

Thus, myth, possessing a high degree of symbolic plasticity, continues to perform an integrative and guiding function in the process of forming personal identity. Its images and structures, being inscribed in artistic narratives, advertising, mass consciousness or religious symbols, do not lose their power, but on the contrary, receive new content, remaining recognizable and emotionally charged. By studying the artistic functions of myth in Kazakh prose, researchers demonstrate how mythical figurative constructions in modern prose continue to perform semantic and emotional functions, encode personal experience and provide a link with collective cultural memory [11]. Modern media technologies do not abolish myth, but only modify the forms of its existence: it can “speak” through cinema and literature, fashion and brands, political slogans and cultural memes, while maintaining its main function—to structure experience and give meaning to human existence. In this context, personal socialization and identification are impossible without an internal “language of myth”, since it allows the subject not only to assimilate social norms, but also to existentially correlate them with his own inner world. Mythology, reworked by modern consciousness, becomes a kind of universal code through which the individual masters the cultural space and finds his place in it. This makes myth not just a historical and cultural phenomenon, but a necessary condition for spiritual communication, capable of connecting individual experience with a collective system of meanings, opening up space for dialogue between the past and the present, the rational and the symbolic, the social and the transcendental.

In the context of modern culture, the functions of myths are largely taken over by mass narrative forms, primarily novels and TV series. In the post-Soviet space, a special role in this process is played by the so-called “soap operas”—long serial stories built on recognizable plot canons close to mythological structures. These works do not simply satisfy the need for entertainment; they perform an important socio-psychological function: they provide a sense of community, involvement and emotional unity. Joint viewing and then discussion of such series in everyday communication act as a modern analogue of ritual as a space for collective participation in cultural action. In this regard, mythology, as a form of spiritual communication, acquires a new media space. A modern myth is not only history, but also a format of interaction, a means of symbolic unity of society in the moment. Like an archaic myth, a “soap opera” offers simple, emotionally charged answers to questions of an existential, moral and social nature. Myth remains a psychologically accessible way of explaining and ordering the world. Myth “saves and protects”, helps to maintain faith in the predictability and logic of what is happening, forming a kind of island of stability in the conditions of uncertainty. In this context, R. Barthes’s idea of the role of “common sense”, which he considers as a modern form of mythological thinking, is especially relevant. By common sense, Barthes understands not so much rationality or empirical evidence, as an ideological construct designed to legitimize the existing order of things. This is a mechanism for maintaining the simplest equivalences between the visible and the real, between the surface and the essence, that is, an attempt to exclude any internal tension between the phenomenon and its foundation. Common sense, in his words, “is the watchdog of petty-bourgeois equations: never missing the dialectic, it creates a homogeneous world where a person is comfortably protected from the worries and risky temptations of the “dream”” [6; 96]. This extremely precise definition represents the deep function of myth in popular culture—the function of normalizing, smoothing and simplifying reality.

Mythological thinking is inherently opposed to dialectical thinking; it rejects the possibility of contradictions, change, and development, preferring stable, closed structures. This is precisely its psychological appeal. Myth frees a person from the burden of choice, existential anxiety, and uncertainty. It constructs a world in which everything has its place, each phenomenon is explainable in terms of already known patterns, and the new is not a discovery, but a repetition of the familiar. In this context, two structural features of mythological texts are especially indicative. First, it is non-verifiability, since stories about miracles, saints, heroes, or fateful events are fundamentally not subject to verification in the scientific sense. They cannot be refuted, they can only be supplemented, expanded, enriched with new examples. Such a narrative exists outside the logic of refutation; it is verified not by facts, but by emotional persuasiveness, collective intuition, and cultural tradition. Secondly, it is recognizability, which implies following stable models and schemes. Myth does not bring radically new information, it rather confirms existing knowledge, appealing to archetypal ideas. A person, perceiving a myth, does not learn, but remembers, recognizes, “agrees”. This makes

mythological consciousness especially susceptible to symbolic constructs that reconstruct reality under pre-determined frames. Thus, a tragedy associated, for example, with a train crash, is easily interpreted in the mass consciousness as a feat, for example, of a driver, a rescue team, doctors, etc., and becomes an element of a heroic myth, where a real event is replaced by a symbolically acceptable interpretation.

Myth shapes not only individual perception, but also the entire cultural and social space, defining acceptable forms of behavior, emotional reactions, and interpretations of events. They act as hidden structures that define the normative foundations of collective life, the representation of “one’s own” and “another’s”, “the sacred” and “the profane”. The myth-generating mechanism functions continuously in both traditional and modernized societies, transforming depending on the historical context, but retaining its key function—to explain the world and set behavior patterns. Modern researchers distinguish mythological communication as a special type of semantic transmission based on the epistemological principle, which allows it to be included in various spheres of public consciousness (artistic, political, cognitive, religious). In this sense, myth becomes a universal mediator between the individual and society, between the personal and the collective, the rational and the symbolic. It penetrates into various forms of social practice, including media, literature, cinema, religious rhetoric and political propaganda, acting as a semantic framework that structures the perception of reality. Myth acquires special significance in artistic communication, exerting a powerful influence on the formation and development of personality, especially in adolescence. As M. Eliade noted, “real and imaginary heroes play an important role in the formation of youth: characters in adventure stories, war heroes, screen favorites, and so on. This mythology is constantly enriched over time. We encounter one after another role models thrown at us by fickle fashion, and we try to be like them. Writers often show modern versions of, for example, Don Juan, the political or military hero, the hapless lover, the cynic, the nihilist, the melancholic poet, and so on—all these models continue to carry mythological traditions, which their topical forms reveal in mythical behavior” [8; 305].

The mythological form of spiritual communication retains its relevance in the process of personality development, acting not only as a legacy of archaic mentality, but also as an effective mechanism for understanding reality in the context of modern culture. From the archetype, as a universal symbol of the collective unconscious, to the characters of mass culture; myth continues to function as a mediator between the internal experience of the subject and the external socio-cultural environment. In a transformed form, it is reproduced in narratives offering ready-made models of identification, adaptation, resistance or transcendence. Mass culture, using mythologemes in the form of recognizable plots, symbols and characters, performs the function of a cultural intermediary through which spiritual structures are transmitted, adapted and preserved. At the same time, the development of personality, especially during the period of active formation of worldview, inevitably occurs in a dialogue with mythological codes hidden in cultural texts. This process is not limited to the simple consumption of images. It includes the interiorization of meanings, the choice of behavior models, the formation of ethical guidelines and the experience of existential situations through the symbolic field of culture. Myth continues to play a key role in spiritual communication, structuring the processes of self-identification of the individual, as well as ensuring the continuity of meanings in cultural dynamics from the archaic tradition to the digital media space. Its stability and universality testify to the deep need of human consciousness for a symbolic interpretation of the world, without which the full formation of the subject in socio-cultural reality is impossible.

Conclusion

The mythological form of spiritual communication remains the most important mechanism of socialization of the individual even in the conditions of postmodernism and media society. Its universality, symbolic richness and ability to adapt to new cultural contexts provide stability and relevance to the myth. Myth, structuring not only the collective consciousness, but also the inner world of the individual, ensures its rootedness in culture and the continuity of spiritual values. Despite the external secularization of myth, the modification of forms of mythological thinking from religious and epic to media texts, artistic narratives and mass images, myth continues to perform the functions of orientation, identification and interpretation, thereby implementing a dialogue between the personal and the collective, the rational and the symbolic, between individual experience and universal cultural structures. Myth should be considered as an integral part of the spiritual life of man and as a fundamental basis of cultural communication, retaining its significance in the changing conditions of modernity.

References

- 1 Стрельник О.Н. Проблема демаркации мифологических сообщений в коммуникативном пространстве современной культуры: междисциплинарный подход / О.Н. Стрельник // Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: Социология. — 2021. — Т. 21, № 4. — С. 711–721.
- 2 Лосев А.Ф. Диалектика мифа / А.Ф. Лосев; сост., подг. текста, общ. ред. А.А. Тахо-Годи, В.П. Троицкого. — М.: Мысль, 2001. — 558 с.
- 3 Раздьяконова Е.В. Онтологическая функция мифа: миф как бытийная связь между «мифосом» и «логосом» / Е.В. Раздьяконова // Известия Томского политехнического университета. Серия: Экономика. Философия, социология и культурология. — 2010. — Т. 317, № 6. — С. 153–156.
- 4 Арапов О.Г. Онтологические основания мифа и мифотворчества: дис... канд. филос. наук: 09.00.01 / О. Г. Арапов. — М., 2008. — 272 с.
- 5 Леви-Стросс К. Структурная антропология / К. Леви-Стросс; пер. с фр. В.В. Иванова. — М.: Изд-во ЭКСМО-Пресс, 2001. — 512 с.
- 6 Барт Р. Мифология / Р. Барт; пер. с фр., вступ. ст. и коммент. С.Н. Зенкина. — М.: Изд-во им. Сабашниковых, 1996. — 312 с.
- 7 Юнг К.Г. Архетип и символ / К.Г. Юнг — М.: Прогресс-Академия, 1991. — 420 с.
- 8 Элиаде М. Мифы, сновидения, мистерии / М. Элиаде. — Москва: Раритет — Киев: Ника-Центр, 1996. — 496 с.
- 9 Левинтон Г.А. К проблеме изучения повествовательного фольклора / Г.А. Левинтон // Типологические исследования по фольклору. — М.: Политиздат, 1975. — С. 314.
- 10 Мигуренко Р.А. Мифичность сознания: Онтологические основания и способы проявления: дис... канд. филос. наук: 09.00.01 / Р.А. Мигуренко. — Томск, 2001. — 167 с.
- 11 Танжарыкова А. Художественная функция мифа в казахской прозе / А. Танжарыкова, Д. Сатемирова, Б. Келгембаева // Вестник КазНПУ имени Абая. Серия: Филологические науки. — 2021. — Т. 2, № 2 (72). — С. 356–361

Г.Р. Сейфуллина, А.Е. Кабдуев, Э.А. Мусаева

Жеке тұлғаның қалыптасуы рухани коммуникацияның мифологиялық формасы аясында архетиптен бұқаралық мәдениетке дейін

Жеке тұлғаның тарихи үдерістегі қалыптасуы рухани коммуникация түрлерінің эволюциясымен тығыз байланысты, бұл қатарда мифтің алатын орны ерекше. Мағыналарды жеткізудің мифологиялық формасы — тек шынайылықты символдық тұрғыда игерудің архаикалық құралы ғана емес, сонымен қатар қазіргі социомәдени жағдайларда индивидтің әлеуметтенуі, идентификациясы және дүниетанымының қалыптасуындағы белсенді механизм. Мақалада мифке қатысты негізгі теориялық интерпретациялар (К. Леви-Стросс, Р. Барт, К.Г. Юнг, М. Элиаде) қарастырылып, оның құрылымдық, когнитивтік және идеологиялық функцияларына назар аударылған. Архетиптердің рөліне және олардың мәдени модельдердің сабақтастығын қамтамасыз ететін сананың бейсаналық деңгейлеріне әсеріне ерекше назар аударылады. Қазіргі заманғы мифологиялық ойлау формалары, әсіресе телесериалдарда, кинода және әдебиетте көрініс табатын бұқаралық мәдениеттегі көріністері талданған. Бұл жерде миф символдық тәртіп формасы ретінде индивидтерге өз шындығын құрылымдауға және фрагментация жағдайында мағына табуға мүмкіндік береді. Мифология — жаңа медиа және мәдени контекстерге бейімделе алатын, рухани өмірдің белсенді элементі болып қала береді деген тұжырым негізделді. Миф — бұл жай ғана өткеннің қалдығы емес, жеке тәжірибені ұжымдық санаға біріктіруге мүмкіндік беретін мағыналардың әмбебап тілі.

Кілт сөздер: миф, рухани коммуникация, жеке тұлға, архетип, әлеуметтену, сәйкестілік, бұқаралық мәдениет, бейсаналық, миф құрылымы, символдық ойлау.

Г.Р. Сейфуллина, А.Е. Кабдуев, Э.А. Мусаева

Становление личности в контексте мифологической формы духовной коммуникации от архетипа к массовой культуре

Становление личности в историческом процессе тесно связано с эволюцией форм духовной коммуникации, среди которых миф занимает особое место. Мифологическая форма передачи смыслов представляет собой не только архаичное средство символического освоения действительности, но и активный механизм социализации, идентификации и формирования мировоззрения индивида в современных социокультурных условиях. В статье рассматриваются ключевые теоретические

интерпретации мифа (К. Леви-Стросс, Р. Барт, К.Г. Юнг, М. Элиаде), акцентируется внимание на его структурной, когнитивной и идеологической функциях. Особое внимание уделяется роли архетипов и их воздействию на бессознательные уровни сознания, обеспечивая преемственность культурных моделей. Анализируются современные формы мифологического мышления, особенно в массовой культуре, включая телесериалы, кино и литературу, где миф выступает как форма символического порядка, позволяющая индивидам структурировать свою реальность и находить смысл в условиях фрагментации. Обосновывается тезис о том, что мифология остаётся активным элементом духовной жизни, способным адаптироваться к новым медиасредам и культурным контекстам. Миф — это не просто пережиток, а универсальный язык смыслов, обеспечивающий интеграцию личного опыта в коллективное сознание.

Ключевые слова: миф, духовная коммуникация, личность, архетип, социализация, идентичность, массовая культура, бессознательное, структура мифа, символическое мышление.

References

- 1 Strel'nik, O.N. (2021). Problema demarkatsii mifologicheskikh soobshchenii v kommunikativnom prostranstve sovremennoi kultury: mezhdistsiplinarnyi podkhod [The problem of demarcation of mythological messages in the communicative space of modern culture: An interdisciplinary approach]. *Vestnik Rossiiskogo universiteta druzhby narodov. Seriya: Sotsiologiya — Bulletin of the Peoples' Friendship University of Russia. Journal of Sociology*, 21(4), 711–721. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2272-2021-21-4-711-721> [in Russian].
- 2 Losev, A.F. (2001). *Dialektika mifa* [Dialectics of myth]. A.A. Takho-Godi & V.P. Troitskii (Ed.). Moscow: Mysl [in Russian].
- 3 Razdiakonova, E.V. (2010). Ontologicheskaya funktsiia mifa: mif kak bytiinaia svyaz mezhdu “mifosom” i “logosom” [The ontological function of myth: myth as an existential connection between “mythos” and “logos”]. *Izvestiia Tomskogo politekhnicheskogo universiteta. Seriya: Ekonomika. Filosofiya, sotsiologiya i kulturologiya — Bulletin of the Tomsk Polytechnic University. Series: Economics, Philosophy, Sociology & Culturology*, 317(6), 153–156 [in Russian].
- 4 Arapov, O.G. (2008). Ontologicheskie osnovaniia mifa i mifotvorchestva [Ontological foundations of myth and myth-making]. *Candidate's thesis*. Moscow [in Russian].
- 5 Levi-Strauss, C. (2001). *Strukturnaia antropologiya* [Structural Anthropology]. (V.V. Ivanov, Trans.). Moscow: Izdatelstvo EKSMO-Press [in Russian].
- 6 Barthes, R. (1996). *Mifologiya* [Mythologies]. (S.N. Zenkin, Trans., Intro. & Commentary). Moscow: Izdatelstvo imeni Sabashnikovykh [in Russian].
- 7 Jung, C.G. (1991). *Arkhetip i simvol* [Archetype and symbol]. Moscow: Progress-Akademii [in Russian].
- 8 Eliade, M. (1996). *Mify, snovideniia, misterii* [Myths, dreams, and mysteries]. Moscow: Raritet; Kyiv: Nika-Tsentr [in Russian].
- 9 Levinton, G.A. (1975). K probleme izucheniia povestvovatel'nogo folklora [On the problem of studying narrative folklore]. *Tipologicheskie issledovaniia po folkloru — Typological studies of folklore*. Moscow: Politizdat [in Russian].
- 10 Migurenko, R.A. (2001). Mifichnost' soznaniia: Ontologicheskie osnovaniia i sposoby proiavleniia [Mythical nature of consciousness: Ontological foundations and forms of manifestation]. *Candidate's thesis*. Tomsk [in Russian].
- 11 Tanzharykova, A., Satemirova, D., & Kelgembayeva, B. (2021). Khudozhestvennaia funktsiia mifa v kazakhskoi proze [Artistic function of myth in Kazakh prose]. *Vestnik Kazakhskogo natsional'nogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta imeni Abai. Seriya: Filologicheskie nauki — Bulletin of Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University. Series: Philological Sciences*, 2(2), 356–361 [in Russian].

Information about the authors

Seifullina Galiya — Candidate of Philosophical Sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of Philosophy and Theory of Culture, Karaganda National Research University named after academician Ye.A. Buketov, Karaganda, Kazakhstan, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3220-6233>

Kabduyev Akan — Candidate of Philosophical Sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of Social and Political Disciplines and the Assembly of the People of Kazakhstan, Karaganda University of Kazpotreboysuz, Karaganda, Kazakhstan, <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-8178-2786>

Mussayeva Elvira — PhD, Associate Professor, Karaganda Medical University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9006-6518>