L.A. Umirzakova[1][**], R.A. Aykenova[1], G.R. Seifullina[2]

[1]Turan-Astana University, Astana, Kazakhstan
[2]Karaganda Buketov University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan
(E-mail: lyazat_aman@mail.ru, ryskeldy.aykenova@mail.ru, galiya-magavina@mail.ru)

Mythological thinking in the cognitive system

Each era's theoretical-cognitive thought forms a new cultural and historical integrity because it is the heir to all of its preceding main directions while evolving at a qualitatively different level, choosing a distinct research topic and range of interests, and creating its own vocabulary for describing and explaining the phenomena of the surrounding reality. In addition to providing a theoretical understanding of the phenomena of understanding the world by our forebears, the modern theory of cognition has an important task in revealing the ontological structures and mechanisms of knowledge, demonstrating the subject volume and pluralism of concepts of cognition and understanding of the world, and adequately and clearly demonstrating some substantive and logical parallels. The article deals with the evolution of the cognitive capabilities of myth. It analyzes various scientific points of view concerning the epistemological function of myth. It also notes that the study of the heuristic role of myth in relation to culture and science requires a philosophical concept capable through the analysis of the universal aspects of myth to synthesize a holistic picture of the mythological way of thinking as the basis for all creative activity immanently inherent in man.

Keywords: myth, mythological thinking, totemism, animism, magic, symbol, truth, cognition.

Introduction

Many scientific viewpoints are being altered, established ideas and theories are being reviewed in new ways, and there are qualitative shifts occurring in the public awareness about the comprehension of the spiritual processes of the modern world. Firstly, it is important to acknowledge the ongoing fascination in philosophy across the whole spectrum of human knowledge.

It was the topic of comparatively limited research until recently, with researchers mostly concentrating on comparative historical and anthropological issues. But things altered drastically in the twenty-first century. The idea that there was "a universal quality of culture, an objectively existing cross-section of any and every socio-historical type of thinking" in mythology has grown notably prevalent. Accordingly, myth came to be viewed as a naturally required shape rather than as "a low, primitive stage of the spiritual development of existence" [1; 13]. The integrity of the worldview that myth offers serves as an explanation for the attraction to mythologization, according to some philosophers who even see contemporary society as a "privileged field of mythological meanings" [2; 522].

The shifting perspectives on the characteristics, meaning, and purposes of myth are telling in this sense. An understanding of myth as the source from which science initially derives its forms and foundations has replaced the previously established widespread approach to myth, which evaluated it exclusively as an attribute of an archaic society, as a subject of narrow historical and ethnographic interest, as a pre-logical, pre-religious, pre-artistic consciousness, incompatible with science. The reason mythological thinking has such a large heuristic component is because it resembles scientific thinking in certain ways as they both represent the same world.

In the last decades of the twentieth century, researchers revealed the diversity of myth, its presence in all spheres of culture (history, language, art, religion, literature, etc.), each of which gives rise to its own myths and is expressed in its own mythological language. We can speak with confidence about the constant modification and transformation of myth in culture, and therefore we are primarily interested in myth as an epistemological phenomenon.

New conceptions of existence are being formed in modern knowledge, especially socio-humanitarian knowledge. The theory of cognitive processes and methodology are also undergoing significant modifications, the search for theories' explanatory potential is ongoing and fruitful, and the "blind-mindedness" of previous epistemological concepts is being overcome. Thus, it is no accident that the comparative-historical

---

[*] Corresponding author's e-mail: *lyazat_aman@mail.ru*

approach to scientific mythology, which underpins both current and ancient mythologies and explains their social roles, is gaining traction.

Even with the abundance of books and articles on different mythological issues that have been written, it is still necessary to examine some elements of myth and the creation of myths. We must acknowledge that mythology is a part of human culture and that they have a particular socio-practical purpose. They are not merely arbitrary "relics" of consciousness that have undergone transformation and change. Therefore, one of the main goals of our research is to understand the cognitive powers of myth and the epistemic foundation of contemporary mythmaking.

The literature devoted to myth and myth making is extensive. There are not such outstanding thinkers who would not address this topic in one way or another. However, with a significant variety of approaches and concepts, all studies can be divided into two groups.

The first group of works reveals the myth "from the outside", in comparison with other forms of social consciousness. These include the works of R. Bultmann, M. Weber, A.J. Toynbee, P. Feyerabend, K. Hübner, as well as research by Russian scientists A.N. Afanasyeva, V.A. Bachinina, I.T. Kasavina, Yu.M. Lotman, N.I. Martishina, E.M. Meletinsky, V.M. Naydysha, V.V. Nalimova, D.V. Olshansky, E.A. Parmona, M.K. Petrova, G.S. Pomerantsa, V.L. Rabinovich, A.A. Yakovleva.

In the aspect of the given research, different kind of works are interesting, those that consider the myth "from the inside", from the position of the mythological subject, aimed at studying the internal structure of the myth and the patterns of its development. These are studies of R. Barth, S. Grof, E. Cassirer, C. Levi-Strauss, B. Malinovsky, Z. Freud, F.V. Shellinga, A.P. Elkina, K. -G. Jung, as well as the works of Russian researchers M.M. Bakhtin, A. Bely, Ya.E. Golosovkera, P.S. Gurevich, A.F. Kosareva, M.A. Lifshitz, A.F. Loseva, A.A. Potebnya, V.Ya. Proppa, V.N. Putilova, V.N. Toporova.

An analysis of the historical transformations of myth is impossible without appealing to works devoted to the archaic myth itself and containing rich ethnographic materials (V. Wundt, V.B. Iordansky, L. Levy-Bruhl, S.A. Tokarev, E. Tylor, J. Fraser, L. Morgan, M. McKie).

The works of Kazakh authors such as M.O. Auezov, Zh.M. Abdildin, K.A. Abishev, S.N. Akataev, A. Akishev, Ch.Ch. Valikhanov, V.Yu Dunaev, N. Dzhetysbaev, B.Zh. Esekeev, Zh.K. Karakuzova, S.A. Kaskabasov, A. Kodar, S.Yu. Kolchigin, A. Margulan, R.M. Mustafina, K.Sh Nurlanova, B.G. Nurzhanov, A.N Nysanbaev, M.S. Orynbekov, M.S. Sabitov, A.A. Khamidov, M.Sh. Khasanov became significant in the theoretical and methodological orientation of the study of this phenomenon.

We would like to highlight the study by B.Zh. Esekeev, dedicated to cultural and historical images of knowledge, where a lot of attention is paid to the analysis of the cognitive capabilities of myth.

Thus, the problem of myth and myth making in all its diversity seems to us most feasible in modern cognitive philosophy of myth, in the study of the mythological invariant, therefore the indicated problematic context of the article is important both in theoretical and practical points of view.

The purpose of the authors' work is to explore myth as an epistemological phenomenon and holistic formation, to consider mythological thinking in the cognitive system, the specifics of mythological truth.

Research methods and materials

The methodological and theoretical basis is the methods of comparative analysis and reconstruction. The research is based on the principles of the unity of historical and logical forms of knowledge development ascent from the abstract to the concrete, negation and continuity.

The proposed aspect of the problem allows us to identify a general field for discussion within the framework of various concepts of modern philosophy of myth, as well as to find common ground between different methodologies. For example, the data of the psychoanalytic school are complemented by the achievements of structural anthropology; the symbolic school is by the functional one. Particular importance for the most complete disclosure of the topic and compliance with the logic of presentation of the main ideas of the work is the structural-genetic method as the most effective in the study of phenomena that have not only long traditions and genesis, but also a complex internal structure and functional intertwining with other adjacent phenomena.

In order to understand myth from inside, we distinguished its structural and genetic basis, the processes of formation, functioning and the result, it is, the myth itself. If in archaic thinking the named components exist in unity and integration with reality, then in modern consciousness their unity is not obvious; they have relative independence.

Results and its discussion

The central problem of any epistemological research is the problem of truth, it is an adequate description and explanation by the subject of the object. But at the same time, it is important to know how well these descriptions and explanations correspond to the reality discussed in the text. In this case, it is necessary to find out what kind of reality is external or internal, to what extent it belongs to the object and to what extent to the subject. In other words, what is being described and explained the external (objective) world or the internal (subjective) state? In the process of cognitive activity the subject cannot clearly distinguish the true state of an object from his own perception of this object: both seem to him to be one continuous and inseparable reality.

The works of oral folk art in particular created over thousands of years. Their peculiarity is explained, firstly, by the fact that the subject of cognition and creativity is not an individual, but a collective of many generations, as a result of which, secondly, the process of cognition and creativity is carried out on an unconscious level. The creators of myths of different tribes and different languages lived at different times, but carried out a single creative process, without putting forward or realizing any common goals and common plans, they did everything spontaneously.

An epistemological question arises: if in mythology the subject is indistinguishable from the object, is it legitimate to raise the question of the origin of the myth? After all, an epistemological problem arises only when the subject clearly opposes himself to the object. If the myth creator himself is completely within the structure of the myth itself, then no epistemological problem exists for him. A similar thing is observed in modern scientific creativity, when mythologemes are present at its core secretly, when they are not specifically reflected by the researcher himself, then an epistemological problem does not arise. It arises not when the process of cognition is carried out, but when it is investigated, or, in other words, when the structure of the cognitive process itself becomes the object of cognition. It is acceptable to dispute the epistemological role of myth if an epistemologist determines that myth is present in the cognitive process.

There is a lot of diversity in these viewpoints. According to A.F. Losev, "it has become a habit" to interpret myth as a primitive man's endeavour to comprehend nature and society. This is untrue since myth, which serves no cognitive purpose at all, differs from any explanation of nature and society — even the most fantastical ones — because rational understanding produces them [3; 457-458].

A myth, in the opinion of O.M. Freudenberg, is unable to explain anything since a typical explanation requires that questions be correctly posed and that logical efforts be made to address them. According to the myth, "primitive man did not ask questions to nature at all and did not answer them at all" since nothing is seen [4; 21].

From the above statement, it is clear that if an explanation is not scientific, it is not an explanation. As if such a thing could only be scientific, abstract and logical. What about art? Doesn't it really know and explain anything? We need to come to the explanation of nature more broadly: as an integral element of consciousness as a whole. Without this, it turns out that before the formation of rational scientific knowledge, explanation had no place in the structure of knowledge at all. The question should probably be posed like this: if primitive people lacked rational thinking, where would it have come from later?

In response to A.F. Losev's above remark, B.Zh. Esekeev, we believe, is correct when he highlights the potential benefits of a historical perspective on proto-scientific archaic civilizations, which enables us to understand the particulars of knowledge existing in these societies. Specifically, the reason for this is that knowledge may function inside the mythical worldview and manifest itself within the context of the mythological attitude towards the world because of the syncretic character of ancient cultures. Knowledge of this kind characterizes mythology as a whole, representing an undivided whole of actions, words, and thoughts [5].

As it is known, ancient people in their time, in their living conditions led and developed economic and social life very successfully, therefore, they simply could not lack rational thinking. They showed the ability to make rather complex generalizations and classifications, to build cause-and-effect relationships (both in industrial and magical activities) and to associative thinking. True, generalizations and classifications, various causes and consequences, as well as the structures of abstraction, association and mediation of ancient man were not furnished with the apparatus of scientific knowledge in its current understanding and therefore did not correspond to the principles of modern formal logic. But this did not make them any less effective either cognitively or technologically. Even current researchers do not always fully monitor their cognitive process from the perspective of the rules of formal or other logic. A.F. Kosarev's perspective can be added to

what has been discussed, albeit it is unlikely that official scientific officials will share his belief that |ancient man felt, knew, and understood nature better than modern man with all his theories and methodologies". Though he was reared by, lived by, and died in nature, he was not aware of the "laws of nature". Because he viewed nature as one with himself and appraised it in a more comprehensive framework than science, he had a deeper understanding of it [6; 78]. If we move away from the excessive categoricalness of this statement, then, in our opinion, the researcher is essentially right when he says that the ancients knew something about nature and man that modern science, having not overcome its objectivist limitations, has not yet come to understand. With the aid of science, mythology has the cognitive benefit of revealing to us bits and pieces of information that European civilization has lost. However, we should talk about this individually. It is important to note that science is not the exclusive means of acquiring and extrapolating information, nor is it a definitive standard for determining its veracity.

If, as the aforementioned writers assert, prehistoric humans were fully devoid of logical activity and could not possibly know or explain anything, then what could they possibly have expressed and shown in myths? These writers respond that myths were how ancient people expressed their inner selves. One is forced to concur with this. But even as primitive man expressed himself, he also understood the outside world, since, as has been mentioned many times before, he was not very good at differentiating between subject and object, word and thing, fiction, reality and illusion, and reality. In addition, not only for this reason. In this way of displaying reality, there is also a general epistemological basis, since if the thesis is true that by cognizing and transforming nature, a person thereby cognizes and transforms his own "I", then the opposite thesis is no less true: cognizing his inner world, a person thereby cognizes the external world. Both these are equal.

By analyzing the structure of myths, mythology provides insight into how deeply ancient humans were able to delve into their feelings, dreams, and fantasies about the outside world. This understanding then leads to an understanding of how much of their knowledge and experience they were able to extract and apply to their daily lives. A person in a myth does not set out to accomplish logically verifiable goals or articulate explicit cognitive tasks. He looks for answers to questions in himself in his feelings. His worldview is aimed not at a rational, but an emotional one. It is feelings that emotionally incite creativity, and dreams that stimulate it. Fantasizing, a person constructs, models, classifies, but most often selects a single solution model. All this happens individually, but one thing is undeniable: feelings dominate in the creative act, but not logic, it is turned off. This, by the way, happens in all spheres of human activity, including in science. It is created by living people, and science does not exist without myth, which actually acts as a kind of primary language of description, drawing its initial intuitions from it. Since the time of Plato and even earlier, thinkers concluded that truth is known not by the head, but by the heart, by intuitive thinking.

A.F. Kosarev says, you can try to take it by force, but it will be an insincere, one-sided, ugly truth, a truth without reciprocity. It will only bring us closer to solving the problems that have arisen and will put aside difficulties for a while. But over time, they will fall upon a person with even greater power and force him to submit to forceful pressure. And that time seems to be approaching. Science and civilization with its current global problems turned out to be in a situation of severe crisis. In the fundamental sciences, experiments are becoming more complex and costly, and the results are becoming less justifiable. Individual states, even the most developed are no longer able to carry them out on their own.

Science is experiencing an increasing need for fruitful ideas. The old ones exhaust themselves or need significant replenishment, and this requires enormous material costs. Official science opposes the search for non-forceful opportunities to understand the world, sharply criticizing those researchers who despite pressure, move away from established attitudes and stereotypes.

Logic is the only means available to formalization that allows controlling a scientist for competence and integrity. If the author comes up with "crazy" ideas, he is obliged to justify them logically. However, logic does not provide any guarantees for distinguishing science from pseudoscience, if desired, one can logically justify anything, and there would be a choice of initial facts and premises. Moreover, their choice is dictated not by the rules of logic, but by attitudes, prejudices and even superstitions that are quite common in the scientific community. This means that we need the special instinct of a scientist who in the act of creativity breaks free from the power of formal logic and no longer acts according to its rules, but unconsciously, intuitively, and involuntarily. When an idea suddenly came to him, and his thought was illuminated by a solution to the problem, the scientist again returns to the soil of science and begins to substantiate the idea logically, connect it with previous concepts and, finally, introduces it into scientific circulation, making it an asset to the social life of science. In essence, this is a long-tested mechanism of scientific creativity, known since an-

cient times and confirmed by various scientists' right up to the present day. Major names in world science indicate that for new ideas, human thought, as a rule, turns to the most archaic layers of its own cons consciousness.

Thus, myth serves as a sort of mechanism for the transmission of information to later generations as well as for the collection and preservation of knowledge gathered by ancient people. This is myth's primary epistemic purpose. It also functions as one of the most significant ways to fully immerse a person in their subconscious, which leads to increased creativity.

The mythical mode of thought appears to have exceptionally broad cognitive potential. We have been left with universal principles, methods, tactics, and laws of cognitive activity by the ancient mythmakers. These were utilized subconsciously, spontaneously, and were never seen as cognitive. In the meantime, the wealth and depth of the information amassed by ancient cultures astounds us with its extraordinary scope.

The deep penetration into the essence of the world is explained by the fact that ancient man did not separate himself from nature, which he perceived as the Universe, as an absolute and eternal principle that dictated to individuals the forms and methods of their existence. He considered various phenomena of the external world not separately from himself and from each other, but in a single context with himself, that his thinking was syncretic, and in essence, dialectical. It might be said that technology was methodology for the ancient people if we accept J. Golosovker's view that mythology served as their epistemology [7].

A method, methodology, or approach for acquiring, storing, and transferring information was one of the many epistemological functions carried out by the important aspects of mythology, such as anthropomorphism, symbolism, traditionalism, etc. However, it is important to emphasize that neither these characteristics nor the roles they played were distinguished from one another or acknowledged as unique structures in any way. Their indivisible totality was created by their syncretic intertwining.

How were the cognitive functions of myth manifested? Anthropomorphism, which manifests in three ways — totemism, animism, and magic — is one way to illustrate this. All social, natural, and cosmic order phenomena were modelled and explained with the aid of the endowment of human properties with the surrounding world, which put man in the role of both an object and a principle (as we see, the syncretism of object and subject, part and whole, property and principle). Man established himself as the world's "first principle" (the principle of the world's unity), connected everything to everything (the principle of universal connection), and was necessary and sufficient for all changes that took place in the world.

"Analysis (separating the giant's body into parts) and synthesis (constructing space from them); induction (transferring human properties to space) and deduction (deriving the structure of generic, social, and sacred relations from the cosmic structure); abstraction (separation of elements and properties from objects) and generalization (personification of abstract properties); comparison of properties abstracted from different objects and their classification (combination into classes)" are just a few examples of the basic universal methods of cognition even when the universe was viewed by ancient man as the various parts of a dead giant's body [6; 86]. The ancients, however, did not identify these techniques as such; instead, they were used haphazardly in accordance with unidentified mental principles [8; 191].

Totemism is the understanding of one's unity and kinship with the natural world, particularly with the animal and plant kingdom. It greatly increased the cognitive activity of prehistoric people, sped up the development of production activities, and helped people realize how important it was to regulate the number of commercial animals and plants as well as the size of clan groups. These realizations gave rise to a variety of regulatory mechanisms, including ceremonial ones.

For example, the basis of the art of the ancient Saks, who lived mainly in Southern Kazakhstan, was the animal style, which was quite widespread throughout Central Asia and Southern Siberia. The essence of this style, as shown by its researcher M. Orynbekov was that war totem animals from which the tribe or clan descended were glorified. These were wolves with images of which the Saks nomads usually decorated swords, daggers, horse harnesses, quivers, and banners. A wide range of tribal signals were represented by the depictions of wolves, tigers, wild boars, eagles, and even non-fighting animals like hares, deer, and saiga.

As though descended from the wolf, the tribes donned wolf-skin clothing, adopted its hunting techniques and fighting styles, wore amulets adorned with wolf teeth, and displayed fearless behavior.

As the nomadic way of life spread, the horse received special deification, in addition to the wolf. It was perceived as an animal related to the sun, light, sky and at the same time related to the underworld, since it was buried with its owner. The horse became a creature that inspired fear along with its rider [9; 28–30]. His deification assumed impressive proportions not only among nomads, but also among the nations of the West.

Rituals passed on to generations carried knowledge about the habitats and methods of reproduction of animals, their habits, the time of prohibitions and permission to hunt, the vegetative period in the life of plants, and methods of preparing food from them.

In Kazakh life, a system of prohibitions or taboos is connected with totemism. Many of them are explained by the veneration of animals or fear of the formidable forces of nature. It was believed, for example, that one should not kill a white snake or an owl, otherwise there would be misfortune; You cannot call a wolf by name, lest he attack the herd; You can't shoot swans because they are the king of birds; Do not step on animal bones, etc.

Classification was necessary because totemism moved the focus from the description of the world to its causal explanation. Totemic categories have become global, including all visible natural occurrences and facets of human existence; nonetheless, they would not be feasible in the absence of consciousness's abstracting activity, which is always developing. Totemism established the basis for object computation and elementary arithmetic operations.

The introduction of animism increased the cognitive capacities of prehistoric humans even more. A person's worldview underwent a true revolution when they gained an insight of their inner selves. Man perceived a vast world, made up of unique spiritual entities he refers to as spirits, inside himself. Every organ of the human body, every state of mind or mental function is endowed with this all-pervading spirituality; it acquires independence, an existence independent of humans. Spirits of forests, mountains, lakes, rivers and other natural phenomena appear. All of them are endowed with a human appearance, consciousness, creative or destructive activity. Life and death, good and evil are also spirits. They tirelessly fight among themselves for possession of the soul and body of a person. The further course of the life, earthly and posthumous fate depend on which spirits prevail.

Kazakhs at an ordinary level of consciousness have retained the belief that any object like a person has its own soul, capable of living separately; and it flies out of a person in the form of a fly. The famous Kazakh folklorist and literary critic Seit Kaskabasov, exploring the relics of pre-Islamic reality in Kazakh life and in fairy tales tells a story about such a soul. "A fly flew out of a sleeping man. Someone who noticed it put it in a bottle and capped it. A day later, he began to wake up the sleeping man, but could not wake him up. Then he uncorked the bottle with the fly, the fly quickly flew into the sleeper's nose, and he woke up". According to S. Kaskabassov, in the idea of a soul-fly one should look for the etymology of the expression in the Kazakh language "shybyn zhan" (literally "soul-fly"), meaning "poor soul" [10; 73-74]. In Kazakh folk art, there is also an animistic idea that the soul can replace a person and may live separately from the owner, and he does not suffer from it.

Echoes of such a worldview have survived to this day. Expressions as "a person has been possessed by an evil spirit", "a spirit of contradiction, violence or destruction has taken possession of him" are nothing more than the rudiments of animistic ideas (A.F. Kosarev). For example, Kazakh folklore like the folklore of many nations of the world has preserved to this day the features of the ancient reality that gave birth to it, conveying traces of primitive thinking with its inherent animistic and totemistic worldview. Today, these motives are used only as an artistic device, usually in sayings, beginnings and endings (S. Kaskabasov), emphasizing antiquity.

It is generally accepted that awareness of the causal interdependence of phenomena came with the emergence of magic. Magical activity is associated with developed ideas about the sequence of causes and effects. Initially, a person grasped causal connections unconsciously, recorded chains of events, foresaw their occurrence, and then connected together the most vivid impressions that struck him. And gradually, in the process of social and industrial activity, this innate ability turned into a need.

The need to explain why objects are connected in one way and not another and whether it is possible to change the causal relationship is caused by a person's desire to somehow influence the course of his life. Over the course of thousands of years, people experimentally changed the conditions of their existence and this gradually convinced them to overcome any difficulties through the efforts of reason and will. The natural consequence of this belief was magic. In the early stages, magical activity was associated mainly with satisfaction of everyday needs, hence various types of industrial, meteorological and healing magic, both beneficial (white magic) and harmful (black magic).

Gradually in the main areas, magical knowledge began to differ little from rational knowledge. If science indirectly through technology makes qualitative changes in the subject or phenomenon being studied, then magic also indirectly, but through ritual affects a person's worldview. Auezkhan Kodar presented ritual as the most general concept that traditional thinking is capable of it, a cosmic law, and an order that governs

the world. In this context, the Kazakh intellectual tradition represents ritual and magical knowledge, on the basis of which a disordered state is transformed into an ordered one and the preservation of the basic conditions for the existence of the universe and the earth as the cradle of humanity is ensured [11].

The works of the researchers of Kazakhstan P. Pallas, A. Levshin, Ch. Valikhanov, G. Potanin and others contain descriptions of magical rituals among the Kazakhs. For example, G. Potanin writes about how the Kazakhs "sew seven black stones inside their tumars (amulets); their purpose is to protect against the evil eye" [12; 99-100]. In Ch. Valikhanov [13] and R. Karutz we read about how "during difficult childbirth, the woman's hair is burned in front of the mother" [14; 122, 126-127], as well as what supernatural power animal bones, fire have.

According to S. Kaskabasov, Kazakhs consider the most dangerous magic that affects objects in direct contact with a person — hair, clothes, nails, etc. Since hair has a magical power, according to the Kazakhs, hairy people are marked to be fearless, brave and rich. Therefore, hair should be treated very carefully [15; 79-80].

Magical activity is becoming more abstract in nature and the most important tool of cognition. The discovery by man of his own spiritual world, no less rich and colorful than the physical world and its spread to the entire universe had important epistemological consequences. A person draws knowledge about the world not only from his practical experience, but also from spiritual experience, from himself, from his subconscious in the form of symbols and images of meaning.

At first glance, magical technologies do not explain anything. They represent a certain set and sequence of motor and verbal procedures as ritual actions, spells that must be performed or pronounced in the right place and at the right time in order to achieve the desired effect on the object. However, any of the magical technologies contains some kind of mystical teaching that presumably has a deep meaning and captures some energy flows and cosmic connections inaccessible to scientific knowledge. These technologies have a thousand-year history, although throughout it they experienced constant persecution from world religions, and then from science. In those few cases when science recognizes magical (paranormal) influences, it explains them by the presence of special bioenergy and bioinformation fields that create the necessary effect. The meaning of mystical procedures can only be read by trained people initiated into their secret. The media sometimes report on successful developments in the field of psychotronics, a special "secret" science that seeks to use the connection and channeling of fields for parapsychological effects on people. If such messages contain even a grain of truth, then it only confirms the epistemological possibilities of magic, which suddenly acquire a scientifically based and practically feasible reality.

Magic developed not only purely mystical ways of understanding the world, but also ordinary ones, used every day in cognitive and practical activities. It served as a kind of experimental base for testing new economic and social technologies and in its own way performed many of the functions of science: "theoretical", "methodological", technological, and social.

During the transfer of magical technologies from generation to generation, their mystical meaning was gradually lost for various reasons, although the procedural side was preserved by tradition quite accurately. This is explained by the fact that the procedure unlike the meaning does not require understanding for its reproduction. Over time, ceremonial procedures having lost the remnants of mystical meaning turned into an empty formality, an element of ordinary etiquette. As we know, cultures give preference to procedure but not the meaning, the letter, the spirit of the ritual are sooner or later doomed to die, which is confirmed by many facts from researchers Ya.E. Golosovker, A.F. Kosarev and others.

At the same time, each new reading of the meanings contained in the structure of a ceremony or rite can give impetus to the development of a new mystical teaching and new magical technologies. But this will happen, firstly, only if there is someone to "read" it, and, secondly, we will be talking about a completely different culture with its special myths.

Thus, the semantic content of knowledge is typical for all archaic culture and is present in all its elements, including magical actions. Therefore, magic can be defined as a form of knowledge, emphasizing its features, expressed, in particular, in ritual and symbolic activity. At the same time, magic must also be understood as a creative process in which the result is not always known in advance and even more so, its achievement cannot be guaranteed, where chance reigns, there is a great possibility of making a mistake.

In the life of archaic cultures, symbols are of great importance. What are they? What are their epistemological capabilities? A symbol is first and foremost an indivisible union of the sensory and rational: an image appears in it as an idea, and an idea appears in it as an image. Because the symbol vanishes when it is broken down into a picture and an idea, it is very challenging to pinpoint certain approaches, strategies, and guiding

principles of symbolic action. From an epistemological perspective, a symbol has just one interpretive and generalizing function.

A particular thing appears to become "greater than itself" when it turns out to be a sign, may take on several meanings, and becomes a symbol of other objects. This is how the generalization is represented. A.F. Kosarev uses a shamanic tambourine as an example, which is a tool for introducing the shaman into a mystical state through rhythmic drumming; additionally, he shows a model of the universe with three interconnected worlds depicted; a guide map with shamanic routes and landmarks; a means of communicating with spirits (a shaman cannot fully connect with spirits without a tambourine); and a method of dividing the shaman's soul among the three realities.

In one way or another, all cultures use the meanings indicated for the shamanic sign. We can discuss a Central Asian shamanic culture in this context. Its roots are found in the "Vedas" and "Avesta", in the religion of Mithra. However, later, on a different linguistic plane, the shamanistic culture gave rise to the Turkic Tengri cult, the Mongol "black faith", Siberian shamanism, Russian paganism, and the restorative and ecstatic practices of the Kazakh bucks (A Kodar). Moreover, bucks are just one of several types of shamans among the Kazakhs. Various fortunetellers were known, zhaurynshy, kumalakshy, yrymshi, duana, etc. Nevertheless, all researchers of Kazakhstan confirm bucks stood out that in the 18th — 19th centuries. And more often than all other shamans, they are present in Kazakh fairy tales as predictors, advisers, and healers. Moreover, apparently, the healing activities of the bucks brought them especially wide popularity in the Kazakh steppes. None of the Russian researchers who visited Kazakhstan in the past ignored these colorful people and their extraordinary capabilities.

An interesting analysis of the reasons for the popularity of bucks among the Kazakhs was given by Chokan Valikhanov. He wrote: "... All diseases and misfortunes are the influence and corruption of spirits; and the bucks, their favorites, can beg their patrons to leave the person he takes under his protection. However, there are still many who unconditionally believe in the supernaturalism and divinity of the Bucks. These spirits are... great, medium and small, which is why bucks... and their powers are different. The great ones heal all the sick... The signs of a big buksy are the following: during the game he puts a saber in the stomach, puts it down to the hilt in the throat, licks a red-hot iron, hits himself in the chest with all his might with an ax, and all this is accompanied by playing the kobyz, an instrument that belonged to the auliya Korkyt, and singing, which is called sarn. The game is the calling of spirits, their nickname. During the game [Bucks] becomes more and more stupid, becomes more frantic and falls. After a while he gets up and says what his spirit told him during this fainting spell... This is a prophecy" [16; 208–216]. For instance, as documented by Chokan Valikhanov, oral folk art from Kazakhstan reflects the shamanistic notion of three realms as follows: "There are human inhabitants in the sky". They wear girdles beneath their throats; we are earthbound and have belts around our bodies; the subterranean people, who have their own sun, moon, and stars, have belts around their legs.

It is clear that the symbol, which unites the sensuous (picture) and intellectual (concept) in an inseparable whole, catches the object in all of its vivid figurative integrity, and this proves to be more than enough for an understanding of mythology. The concept must be presented in its pure or abstract form, separated from the visual, as science is compelled to split the universe in order to obtain categorical clarity. However, without clarity and sensory representation, no notion can ever be fully comprehended. Mythology does not have this kind of issue. Given the nature of the sign, the meaning is symbolic, and mythology clearly has the upper hand over science in this instance. The symbol connects the physical, metaphysical, and transcendental worlds, "creating a powerful force field of creative tension and encouraging the thinker to give birth to an idea by fertilizing human thought with meaning". For a little period, the tension is released, only to return with a new sign and force against the victim. Furthermore, none of this can be explained by rationalistic thought. Suddenly, in an unforeseen way, a thought appears out of nowhere and shines the light of truth on this or that aspect of reality. Sometimes a person can see, even for a little moment, the meaning of existence (the universe, mankind, culture, society, personality), as well as the significance of the cognitive process itself, thanks to a symbol [6; 126].

Thus, we can quite confidently summarize that the main components of mythological thinking have extremely broad epistemological capabilities. And although science never properly recognized them, nevertheless, mythological thinking laid the foundation for all universal methods and principles of cognition that are now known and quite widespread in science. It is mythology that contains the diverse ways of purposefully immersing a person in a state of creativity, which modern science has not yet comprehended and is unlikely to comprehend if it invariably adheres to a strict rationalistic approach. Based on symbolic information ex-

tracted from the subconscious, mythological thinking created various mystical teachings, which laid the foundation for the first philosophical systems and the first scientific schools, which had a pronounced mystical character. The cognitive activity of ancient people undoubtedly had its own special logic and peculiar epistemology.

It is known that any cognitive activity — mythological, artistic or scientific — has as its ultimate goal the comprehension of truth, although it may be objected that this is not always the case and will refer to mythological thinking, which is supposedly incapable of knowing or explaining anything. Adherents of this position are right when they mean the scientific opposition of "true" and "apparent," "imagined" and "real," "essential" and "insignificant." In myth there is no scientific opposition of these categories, because myth directly reflects reality. However, he also has his own criteria of truth and reliability and can successfully distinguish the true from the apparent and the imagined from the real. But all this happens not in a rational, but in a purely mythical way, using its own laws and characteristics.

A comprehensive analysis by P.A. Florensky, shows that the concept of "truth" bears a clear imprint of subjectivity — linguistic, cultural, national, personal, which is also evidenced by the theory of linguistic relativity, which became widespread in the mid-twentieth century, according to which our worldview and understanding of the world are determined to a large extent historically established architectonics of the language. And this moment of human subjectivity cannot be eliminated in principle even when we are talking about purely scientific truth [17].

According to A.F. Kosarev, in order to turn cognitive activity into scientific to some extent it had to break away from practice and become purely speculative. The achievements of science ultimately find practical application, but these achievements are stimulated not by the needs of practice, but by the internal needs of science itself, the logic of its development. Truth is considered the highest value, the selfless service of which should not be hindered by any personal sympathies, antipathies or considerations of benefit [6; 235].

The main means of obtaining new knowledge is now becoming theoretical analysis based on certain rules of derivation and transformation, on a strictly conditioned system of evidence. The logical-deductive method becomes the leading way of obtaining scientific knowledge. However, any construction according to this method begins with the choice of axioms that is known as accepted without proof. Since all axioms bear the stamp of agreement, it follows that at the basis of all theoretical constructions lies knowledge, the truth of which can always be questioned.

Based on the foregoing, we note that the types of cognitive activity are immense, and truth is knowledge that contains meaning within the framework of one or another form of human activity, in which it finds its justification and its criteria.

Conclusion

Specifying the theoretical results of this study, the following conclusions can be formulated:

1. Myth is a necessary and natural step in the reflection of consciousness. The cognitive functions of myth are realized, as a rule, through ancient forms of human consciousness (totemism, animism, magic), reinforced and mastered by the experience of collectivity. Relics of this understanding of myth have survived to this day;

2. Myth has always performed and continues to perform important epistemological functions (method, technique, method of obtaining, storing, transmitting knowledge). All these methods and techniques are not structured, but are intertwined, syncretic and form an indivisible whole;

3. The concept of "truth" bears a clear imprint of subjectivity — linguistic, cultural, national, personal, etc.;

4. The goal of mythological like any other type of knowledge is to comprehend the truth, but mythological truth is distinguished from all others by the specificity of the experience contained in it, namely:

- mythological thinking is syncretic. All its components are interconnected and represent an indivisible integrity;

- in mystical experience, the deepest meanings are revealed to a person in the form of images of meaning, or symbols.

5. Myth making is a special type of spiritual production, the main function of which is value-oriented. It has a spontaneous character; its product is myths, they are capacious, energetically saturated and stable images of reality that exist in the facts of consciousness. The results of myth making form a special layer or level of the sociocultural system of knowledge, which on the subjective side is focused on worldview, and on the objective side is on knowledge of the surrounding world.

Recommendations

The article's analysis, which focusses on reconsidering the assumptions underlying the cognitive attitude towards myth, is significant for the advancement of the theory of knowledge and should have a favourable effect on a methodological level. An invariant study of the problem of myth allows to reveal the rational and conceptual structure of the existence of modern mythology and leads to an understanding of the universal cultural context of myth. These materials can be used for educational courses and scientific research.

References

1 Алпеева Т.М. Теоретико-методологический анализ проблемы социального мифа: автореф. дис. ... д-ра филос. наук. Спец. 09.00.11 — «Социальная философия» / Т.М. Алпеева. — Минск, 1992. — 37 с.

2 Леви-Стросс К. Структурная антропология / К. Леви-Стросс; пер. с фр. В. Иванов. — М.: Наука, 1983. — 536 с.

3 Лосев А.Ф. Мифология: философская энциклопедия: [В 5-и т.]. — Т. 3. / А.Ф. Лосев; гл. ред. Ф.В. Константинов. — М.: Сов. энцикл., 1964. — 584 с.

4 Фрейденберг О.М. Миф и литература древности / О.М. Фрейденберг. — М.: Наука, 1978. — 605 с.

5 Есекеев Б.Ж. Культурно-исторические образы познания / Б.Ж. Есекеев. — Алматы: Ақыл кітабы, 1999. — 240 с.

6 Косарев А.Ф. Философия мифа / А.Ф. Косарев. — М.: ПЕР СЭ; СПб.: Университетская книга, 2000. — 304 с.

7 Голосовкер Я.Э. Логика мифа / Я.Э. Голосовкер. — М.: Наука, 1987. — 218 с.

8 Прибрам К. Языки мозга. Экспериментальные парадоксы и принципы нейропсихологии / К. Прибрам; пер. с англ. Н.Н. Данилова, Е.Д. Хомская. — М. : Прогресс, 1975. — 464 с.

9 Орынбеков М.С. Предфилософия протоказахов / М.С. Орынбеков. — Алматы: Өнер, 1994. — 208 с.

10 Каскабасов С.А. Золотая жила. Истоки духовной культуры: [В 2-х ч.]. — Ч. 1 / С.А. Каскабасов. — Астана : Елорда, 2000. — 752 с.

11 Кодар А.А. Казахская философия как диалог с традицией: автореф. дис. ... канд. филос. наук. Спец. 09.00.03 — «История философии» / А.А. Кодар. — Алматы, 1999. — 31 с.

12 Потанин Г.Н. Очерки Северо-Западной Монголии. — Вып. 2 / Г.Н. Потанин. — СПб.: Типогр. В. Киршбаума, 1881. — 181 с.

13 Валиханов Ч. Следы шаманства у киргизов: Собрание сочинений Ч.Ч. Валиханова: [В 5-ти т.]. — Т. 4 / Ч. Валиханов. — Алма-Ата: Гл. ред. Казах. Сов. энцикл., 1985. — С. 48–70.

14 Карутц Р. Среди киргизов и туркменов на Мангышлаке: этногр. очерки / Р. Карутц; пер. Е. Петри. — СПб.: А.Ф. Девриен, 1911. — 188 с.

15 Каскабасов С.А. Золотая жила. Истоки духовной культуры: [В 2-х ч.]. — Ч. 1 / С.А. Каскабасов. — Астана : Елорда, 2000. — 752 с.

16 Валиханов Ч. Тенкри (Бог): Собрание сочинений Ч.Ч. Валиханова: [В 5-ти т.]. — Т. 1 / Ч. Валиханов. — Алма-Ата: Гл. ред. Казах. Сов. энцикл., 1985. — С. 208–216.

17 Флоренский П.А. Столп и утверждение Истины: Собрание сочинений П.А. Флоренского: [В 2-х т.]. — Т. 1. / П.А. Флоренский. — М.: Правда, 1990. — 839 с.

Л.А. Өмірзақова, Р.А. Айкенова, Г.Р. Сейфуллина

Таным жүйесіндегі мифологиялық ойлау

Әр дәуірдің теориялық және танымдық ойы, барлық алдыңғы негізгі бағыттарының жалғасы бола отырып, сапалы түрде әр түрлі деңгейде даму үстінде болады, өзінің зерттеу тақырыбын, басқа да қызығушылық шеңберін анықтап, қоршаған шындық құбылыстарды сипаттау мен түсіндірудің өзіндік жолын қарастырады, осылайша жаңа мәдени және тарихи тұтастықты қалыптастырады. Осыған байланысты қазіргі білім теориясының өзекті міндеті — әлемді түсіну құбылыстарын теориялық тұрғыдан түсіну ғана емес, сонымен бірге кейбір мазмұнды және логикалық параллельдерді барабар және анық көрсету, білімнің онтологиялық құрылымдары мен механизмдерін ашу, таным мен әлемді түсіну тұжырымдамаларының объективті көлемі мен плюрализмін көрсету. Мақалада мифтің

танымдық мүмкіндіктерінің эволюциясы қарастырылған, мифтің гносеологиялық қызметіне қатысты әртүрлі ғылыми көзқарастар талданған, мифтің мәдениетке қатысты эвристикалық рөлін зерттеу мен ғылымға мифтің әмбебап аспектілерін саралау арқылы мифологиялық ойлау тәсілінің тұтас бейнесін синтездеуге қабілетті философиялық тұжырымдама кез келген шығармашылық қызметтің имманентті негізі болып табылатындығы айтылған.

Кілт сөздер: миф, мифологиялық ойлау, тотемизм, анимизм, сиқыр, символ, шындық, таным.

Л.А. Умирзакова, Р.А. Айкенова, Г.Р. Сейфуллина

Мифологическое мышление в системе познания

Теоретико-познавательная мысль каждой эпохи, будучи преемницей всех предыдущих основных ее направлений, но развиваясь на качественно ином уровне, определяет свой предмет исследования, другой круг интересов, вырабатывает собственный язык описания и объяснения явлений окружающей действительности, образуя тем самым новую культурно-историческую целостность. В этой связи актуальная задача современной теории познания заключается не только в теоретическом осмыслении феноменов понимания мира нашими предшественниками, но и в том, чтобы адекватно и ясно показать некоторые содержательные и логические параллели, раскрыть онтологические структуры и механизмы знания, продемонстрировать предметную объемность и плюрализм концепций познания и осмысления мира. В статье рассмотрена эволюция познавательных возможностей мифа, проанализированы различные научные точки зрения относительно гносеологической функции мифа, отмечено, что изучение эвристической роли мифа по отношению к культуре, да и к науке нуждается в философской концепции, способной посредством анализа универсальных аспектов мифа синтезировать целостную картину мифологического способа мышления как имманентно присущей человеку основы всякой творческой деятельности.

Ключевые слова: миф, мифологическое мышление, тотемизм, анимизм, магия, символ, истина, познание.

References

1   Alpeeva, T.M. (1992). Teoretiko-metodologicheskii analiz problemy sotsialnogo mifa [Theoretical and methodological analysis of the problem of social myth]. *Extended abstract of Doctor's thesis.* Minsk [in Russian].

2   Lévi-Strauss, C. (1983). *Strukturnaia antropologiia* [*Structural anthropology*]. (B. Ivanov, Trans). Moscow: Nauka [in Russian].

3   Losev, A.F. (1964). *Mifologiia [Mythology]*. Filosofskaia entsiklopediia. Vol. 1–5. Moscow: Sovetskaia entsiklopediia, 3 [in Russian].

4   Freidenberg, O.M. (1978). *Mif i literatura drevnosti [Myth and literature of antiquity]*. Moscow: Nauka [in Russian].

5   Esekeev, B.Zh. (1999). *Kulturno-istoricheskie obrazy poznaniia [Cultural and historical images of knowledge]*. Almaty: Aqyl kitaby [in Russian].

6   Kosarev, A.F. (2000). *Filosofiia mifa [Philosophy of myth]*. Moscow: PER SE; Saint Petersburg: Universitetskaia kniga [in Russian].

7   Golosovker, Ya.E. (1987). *Logika mifa [The logic of myth]*. Moscow: Nauka [in Russian].

8   Pribram, K. (1975). *Yazyki mozga. Eksperimentalnye paradoksy i printsipy neiropsikhologii [Languages of the brain. Experimental paradoxes and principles of neuropsychology]*. (N.N. Danilova, E.D. Khomskaia, Trans). Moscow: Progress [in Russian].

9   Orynbekov, M.S. (1994). *Predfilosofiia protokazakhov [Pre-philosophy of the proto-Kazakhs]*. Almaty: Oner [in Russian].

10   Kaskabasov, S.A. (2000). *Zolotaia zhila. Istoki dukhovnoi kultury [Goldmine. Origins of spiritual culture]*. Parts. 1–2. Astana: Elorda, 1 [in Russian].

11   Kodar, A.A. (1999). Kazakhskaia filosofiia kak dialog s traditsiei [Kazakh philosophy as a dialogue with tradition]. *Extended abstract of candidate's thesis.* Almaty [in Russian].

12   Potanin, G.N. (1881). *Ocherki Severo-Zapadnoi Mongolii [Essays on Northwestern Mongolia. Issue II]*. Saint Petersburg, 2 [in Russian].

13   Valikhanov, Ch. (1985). *Sledy shamanstva u kirgizov: Sobranie sochinenii Ch.Ch. Valikhanova [Traces of shamanism among the Kirghiz: collected works of Ch.Ch. Valikhanov]*. Vols. 1–5. Alma-Ata: Glavnaia redaktsiia Kazakhskoi Sovetskoi entsiklopedii, 4 [in Russian].

14   Karutz, R. (1912). Sredi kirgizov i turkmen na Mangyshlake [Among the Kyrgyz and Turkmens in Mangyshlak]. Saint Petersburg [in Russian].

15   Kaskabasov, S.A. (2000). *Zolotaia zhila. Istoki dukhovnoi kultury [Goldmine. Origins of spiritual culture]*. Parts. 1–2. Astana: Elorda, 1 [in Russian].

16   Valikhanov, Ch. (1985). *Tenkri (Bog):* Sobranie sochinenii Ch.Ch. Valikhanova *[Tenkri (god): collected works of Ch.Ch. Valikhanov]*. Vols. 1–5. Alma-Ata: Glavnaia redaktsiia Kazakhskoi Sovetskoi entsiklopedii, 1 [in Russian].

17 Florensky, P.A. *Stolp i utverzhdenie Istiny: Sobranie sochinenii P.A. Florenskogo [Pillar and statement of Truth: collected works of P.A. Florensky]*. Vols. 1–2. Moscow: Pravda, 1 [in Russian].

Information about the authors

Umirzakova Lyazzat — Assistant professor, Candidate of philosophical sciences, Professor of the Department of Social and Humanitarian Sciences and Linguistic Disciplines, Turan-Astana University, School of Humanities and Law, Astana, Kazakhstan; https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7525-4625

Aykenova Ryskeldy — Doctor of philological sciences, Professor of the Department of Social and Humanitarian Sciences and Linguistic Disciplines, Turan-Astana University, School of Humanities and Law, Astana, Kazakhstan; https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7204-3315

Seifullina Galiya — Candidate of philosophical sciences, Associate professor of the Department of Philosophy and Theory of Culture, Karaganda Buketov University, Karaganda, Kazakhstan; http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3220-6233