








Syncretic writings of mythological consciousness in the written medieval monuments

Yerkin B. Zhumatayev ^a , Elmira E. Ibrayeva ^b , Zibagul S. Ilyassova ^c ,
Abay K. Kairzhanov ^{d1} , Raikhan O. Tuxaitova ^e 

^{a,b,c,d} L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Nur-Sultan, Republic of Kazakhstan
^e S. Seifullin Kazakh Agrotechnical University, Nur-Sultan, Republic of Kazakhstan

APA Citation:

Zhumatayev, Y. B., Ibrayeva, E. E., Ilyassova, Z. S., Kairzhanov, A. K., & Tuxaitova, R. O. (2022). Syncretic writings of mythological consciousness in the written medieval monuments. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 18(1), 397-410. Doi: 10.52462/jlls.190
Submission Date: 04/07/2021
Acceptance Date: 13/10/2021

Abstract

This article examines the syncretism of mythological consciousness within the framework of the oldest written monuments. The relevance of the study is determined by the analysis of the main features of this phenomenon: syncretism, anthropomorphism of essence, and syncretic writings. Examples from the texts of the Old Testament, syncretic writings in the Old Turkic, Middle Greek and Old Russian languages are used. The syncretic writings of Old Testament are a creative borrowing from the Sumerian language. The works of both European and Asian scientists dealing with the problems of mythological consciousness are analysed to determine the goals and objectives of this study. When studying the empirical data, the methods and techniques of diachronic linguistics, and the techniques of cognitive description of ancient and medieval texts were used to define the semantics of linguistic units (syncretic writings turned into "frozen metaphors"). In addition, syncretic writings extracted from ancient and medieval texts demonstrate that they stemmed from the phenomenon of syncretism and anthropomorphism of the mythological consciousness of the pre-historic era. These syncretic writings have become part of the vocabulary of modern languages and are preserved in active languages. As a result of the research and a critical review of the sources, the authors identified the main features of mythological consciousness: syncretism and anthropomorphism, which contribute to the creation of myths. Therefore, a hypothesis developed that the Ural-Altai language family, which is agglutinative in nature, may be originating from the Sumerian language of the archaic era.

Keywords: anthropomorphism; syncretism; reflection; criticality; concept

1. Introduction

This study examines medieval texts, which reflect the rudiments of the mythological consciousness of the medieval and ancient era in the first place. The relevance of the research is determined primarily by the fact that mythology is a syncretic form of social consciousness developed in the pre-historic era of humankind. Therefore, it is impossible to base this research on the classification of historical

¹ Corresponding author.

E-mail address: akairzhanov6944@ust-hk.com.cn

development ("socio-economic formation") by the founders of Marxism. Classification of social development related to L. Gumilyov's (2001) passionarity theory is also impossible to apply for this study since it is difficult to define clear boundaries between different periods of the history of society by relying only on one theory of "passionarity shocks". This theory is useful for explaining some particular problems concerning the effects and consequences of the hunting-gathering or agricultural sedentary lifestyle. These boundaries between them are so unstable and elusive that many aspects of the ideas from previous eras can transition to a newly emerging era and be there. These transitions are explained by subjective conjunctural considerations, when some elements aspects of ideas (for example, ideas of chiefdom, or uncritical perception of some sacred views) of the early periods are included in the new industrial era. This form of social mythological consciousness appeared and became a common feature only for the hunter-gathering lifestyle stage in the history of humanity.

Human history can be divided into two major evolutionary epochs, which are the hunter-gathering (possessional – possession domus) lifestyle (here gathering, hunting, fishing prevails) and the agricultural sedentary (productive – production domus) lifestyle, which, in its turn, is divided into three stages: agriculture and cattle breeding, industrial, and post-industrial society (Chernikov, 1997; Portnova, 2015). The main purpose of this study is to analyse the consequences of syncretism and anthropomorphism of mythological consciousness to identify and describe the syncretic aspects of this phenomenon, extracted from the texts in ancient and medieval languages, which have been preserved and exist in modern languages. In addition, the authors attempt to identify the phenomena of reflection and criticality, which destroyed the main features of the mythological consciousness of the ancient period. For this study, the methodology of diachronic linguistics and methods of cognitive description of empirical data are used. Then, the problem of mythological consciousness is discussed and the main features of public mythological consciousness in the diachronic aspect are considered.

Nowadays, after the comprehension of comparative holistic approach, a new perspective has emerged for the study of new problems in the field of philosophical comparative studies. These new studies try to distinguish between the possibilities presented by simple differential possibilities, the oppositions of various philosophical systems of both the East and the West. There is a need to clarify the genesis of the philosophical discourse of a certain era, and how certain philosophical ideas were developed later. In this study, the authors attempt to understand the main features of the mythological consciousness of the pre-historic era, and how syncretic elements appeared within discourse of "Chronicles" by St. George the Monk (Amartola) (Istrin, 1930) and how they were transformed when translated into the Slavic language. A number of works have been published on the specificities of translating the idioms in the discourse from Middle Greek to Old Russian (Kairzhanov, 1995). In addition, there was a unique study dedicated to the translation of the "Chronicles" by George the Monk (Amartola) from Middle Greek to modern Russian (Kairzhanov, 2018; Lapshina & Eshchin, 2020).

1.1 Literature review

This study uses some ideas of cognitive science such as "concept". The idea of concept was first studied in the 1920s by S. Askoldov (1997). He understood it as a mental structure that replaces indefinite number of objects of the same order during thinking. In the 1980s, the Anglophone linguistic literature has developed the idea of a concept as a means that explicates the units of mental phenomena of consciousness and the information structure that reflects the knowledge and experience of a person. In other words, they represented the concept as a meaningful unit of memory, a certain mental vocabulary, reflecting and developing the conceptual system of the language. In addition, they believe that the concept reflects the picture of the human world, reflected in the human psyche and ingrained in the structure of language (Petrov, 1996; Hintikka, 1980; Jung, 1997; Ryspayeva et al., 2021). Thus, there are four approaches to understanding the concept.

1. Cultural studies approach of Yu. Stepanov and V. Telia (2009). They understand the concept as the basic element of culture in the mental world of human society. This approach is related to the studies of N. Arutyunova, T. Bulygina, A. Shmeleva and N. Alefirenko (Maslova, 2005). They believe that the semantics of a linguistic sign is the only means of developing the content of a concept.

2. D. Likhachov, E. Kubryakova (Maslova, 2005) and others believe that the concept does not directly derive from the meaning of the lexeme, but is defined by the result of a special connection of the semantics of the word with the popular experience. In other words, a concept is a certain medium between a linguistic sign and reality.

3. V Kolesov (2002) and M. Kopylenko (1995) understand the concept as meaning – "the grain of the first meaning" (conceptum), "the pre-conceptual meaning" and as conceptus, that is, as the semantic content of a linguistic sign.

4. Within the cognitive paradigm the concept has different definitions and is a mental area or space (G. Lakoff), cognitive context (R. Langacker), frame as the domain of knowledge emphasising the meaning of a linguistic unit (Ch. Fillmore) (Jackendoff, 2002; Langacker, 1999; Fillmore, 1976; Lakoff & Johnson, 2004).

The authors' understanding of the concept is close to the definition by G. Lakoff, R. Langacker, V. Kolesov, and M. Kopylenko.

2. Materials and Methods

In this study, the authors use the methodology from philosophical comparative studies, techniques of hermeneutics, cognitive science, and special methods of diachronic linguistics for semantic analysis of syncretic writings in written monuments. Philosophical comparative studies received have been institutionally recognised in the second half of the 20th century due to the philosophical conferences of Ch. Moore, who founded the international interdisciplinary journal "Philosophy East and West", which is still functions today. In addition, materials on comparative philosophy are published in two other journals "Journal of Comparative Philosophy" and "Comparative Philosophy. International Journal of Constructive Engagement of Distinct Approaches toward World Philosophy". In the 1950s and 1970s comparative holistic approach was at its peak. This approach implies comparing some contrasting features of Eastern and Western mentality: the study of Eastern philosophical views. First of all, this is the opposition between Eastern intuition-based spiritual pragmatism and syncretism of Western rationalism, secularism, scientific thinking, analytic approach, and other problems of philosophy (Shokhin, 1998; Masson-Oursel, 1926; Nakamura, 1992; Bahm, 1995; Gurianov, 2020).

The authors of the study state that diachronic linguistics should be based on logical research procedures. First of all, it is a discovery of the identical and non-identical, the similarity and equipollence of linguistic phenomena in the linguistic structure of the text. In addition, the study uses technique of diachronic extrapolation, emphasising certain aspects in the medieval text that serve to concretise the meanings of the syncretic writings in written monuments of the 11th century, comparing them with the oldest texts (Kryukov, 1994; De Saussure, 1933; Jaspers, 1952). Therefore, this approach to understanding diachrony allowed historians to reconsider the dangerous trend of philosophical and institutional challenge, only reconciling the mutually antithetical concepts of "history" and "structure" due to the F. Braudel's (1986) theory of "long duration", as well as the theory of "fixed history" by Le Roy Ladurie (1978) and, finally, the anthropologisation of historical discourse. Nowadays, it could be argued that the process of returning the diachronic method has begun, which can contribute to exploration of the issues of philosophy using the techniques of diachronic linguistics.

In addition, some techniques of hermeneutics are used since there was a need to interpret the historical "background" of events, which is at the crossroads of the meaning that derives from the internal organisation of the discourse, and the referent that refers to extralinguistic realities (Koselleck, 1997) in the syncretic writings of the discourse of "Chronicles" by George the Monk (Amartola) in particular. However, new theses were proposed about the necessity to study the second-level reflection on the conditionality of the discourse itself in the "Chronicle" as a historical description of certain events associated with certain representers of ideas (Ricoeur, 2000). This approach allows the scholar to use a cognitive empathy based on intellectual processes such as comparison, analogy to restore the real picture of certain events. In this study, this is the history of the origin of the syncretic writings, which were incorporated into Christian philosophy. The authors compare them with the prototypes from the Sumerian Archaic and Classical periods (Cassirer, 1955).

The authors believe that the concept is a pre-conceptual meaning that has no form. Perhaps, there was an ancient form, but it has been extinct. It can be found in meaningful forms such as constructive forms - in an unmotivated and isolated metaphor (image), in a "frozen" symbol-syncretic writing, and structurally - in an idea-conceptum (Frazer, 2003; Kolesov, 2004). This concept reflects a national or folk feature of culture, and this feature is visible through the synergy of language, which allows determining the crystallised consciousness reflected in the structure of the idea. These concepts include the dominant meanings of culture and serve as a means not only for uniting people into communities, but also for them to feel a common identity of worldview and create prerequisites for establishing a common worldview for the entire people. Using the methodology of philosophical comparative studies, the techniques of diachrony, hermeneutics and cognitive science, the main features of mythological consciousness and syncretic writings in the written monuments are described.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 The main features of mythological consciousness

The problem of mythological consciousness started to gain relevance in the first half of the 20th century. First of all, these are the works by E. Cassirer "Philosophy of symbolic forms" (1955) and the by A. Losev "Dialectics of myth" (2014). These works are still relevant. E. Cassirer defined myth as a necessary phase in the history of human thinking, which is to be overcome with the development of science. Due to the scientific progress of modern consciousness, humanity will overcome the myth and free itself from it (Cassirer, 1955). A. Losev (2014) argued that the consciousness of the new and modern times could not overcome the myth. In addition, the consciousness of the modern world is filled with mythological consciousness since the modern consciousness of humanity has developed its mythology. J. Frazer (1963) in "The golden bough" distinguishes himself (a modern person) from mythological consciousness, proposing the thesis that the consciousness of a modern person is free from myths.

T. Adorno (2005) believes that it is necessary to condemn the myth as a form of social consciousness, that such consciousness suppresses individual reflection and criticality of a person. He is an ardent supporter and follower of the ideas of the Enlightenment. R. Barthes (1972) considers this problem from the standpoint of semiotics, and L. Althusser (1969) and Adorno discuss it from the Marxist perspective. These authors are representatives of the so-called "critical" consciousness and study myth and mythological consciousness as a false phenomenon that leads to the enslavement of human consciousness in rigid ideological schemes imposed on society by the ruling classes of official culture. In the middle of the 20th century, this problem was developed by M. Eliade (1971; 1994), who argued that the antagonism between the mythical consciousness and modern culture comes from the desacralisation of human thinking and activity influenced by the progress, which empties human

experience, and even one's life. The teaching of M. Eliade is a reaction to the enlightened criticism of the mythological consciousness. J. Campbell (1988), when developing the ideas of C. Jung, believes that in the modern world there is a myth in all cultures and has developed the so-called universalist doctrine of myth. In his opinion, the inner world of a person remains unchanged, that is, modern culture includes a mythological consciousness.

Thus, the authors tried to briefly present the views of the most famous scholars who dealt with the problem of the relationship between mythological and modern consciousness. At present, it is possible to discuss the basic features of mythological consciousness. The main feature of mythological consciousness is syncretism. In addition, there is no reflection in the full sense of the word, even though the beginnings of this process were already there. When the Homo Erectus were replaced by Neanderthals, both of them were already intelligent people and could have reflective consciousness and thinking. According to V. Ranov (1988): "It remains to assume that during the period of slow movement of pre-historic human on the Middle Eastern bridge about 1.5-1 million years ago with millennia-long stops, there was a division of the directions of movement and one group got to the Caucasus, another moved to Eastern Europe through the Balkans, and the third moved to the east". At this time the everyday life was stabilised, associated with the stability of ritual collectives and with the development of consciousness, and the latter must be associated with the appearance of free time during the late Acheulean period. The archaeological findings indicated a more detailed handling of the surface of the tool (Alekseev, 1986; Clark, 1977). However, the supreme leader-priest tried to veto criticality, but essential anthropomorphism was beyond the control of either the leader or the priest.

Here, the term "syncretism" should be defined. This is a certain unity and indivisible phenomenon, where structurally independent, differentiated parts are not distinguished. Syncretism is a process, and the syncretic saying, which is a phenomenon that appeared in the human language first, is a fixed form that people sometimes do not comprehend but use in speech as fixed means of expression in an unchangeable frozen form during speaking. Thus, the Turkic syncretic saying *qut-bereke* is predicated by a symbolic appeal to a person with the wish of happiness, wealth, prosperity and a happy fortune. In the ancient era, the word "qut" had several levels of semantics – "soul; life force, spirit; happiness, good, grace, well-being; luck, success; dignity, greatness"; rel. "the state of true being, beatitude"; "the state of God"; "the divinity-ward" (Nadelyayev et al., 1969). At the same time, there is an example of the forgotten syncretic saying of the Old Turkic language *büzdan sw tamar* (lit. "water drips from the ice" (M. Kashgari, 2005)), there was a semantic shift: the son is similar in character to his father like two drops of water). There is another syncretic saying from the epic poem "Kozy-Korpesh and Bayan-sulu" (of more than 2500 years old): *qara torgaj* (lark), which brings misfortune if this bird lands on a person (Kairzhanov, 2018). Thus, the ancient turks did not know the concepts of "universe", "cosmos" and believed that before the creation of the world there were Tengri (TeñRi) and Umai (Umai) ("Heaven and Earth") (Zholdasbekov, & Sartkozha, 2006; Gurianov, 2016).

The same idea is found in the texts, where to denote the integrity of the world, the compound word AN-KI [+] ("Heaven-Earth") was used (Labat, & Malbran-Labat, 2002). According to Sumer, before the creation of the world, Heaven and Earth were a single body, from which the surrounding world appeared (Yemelyanov, 2001). First of all, this understanding reflects the past state, when the dominant meanings of the social mythological consciousness were transferred from the gathering-hunting lifestyle to agricultural sedentary lifestyle, which is reflected in the Sumerian texts of the archaic era, or similar phenomena are observed in the runic texts of Orkhon (Zholdasbekov, & Sartkozha, 2006). In addition, the Sumerian magic of the tree can be compared with shamanism: in the ancient Turk mythology, the universe is divided into three vertical spheres ("tikelej"): upper world (Kök Ulgen), middle world (Kök Umai), and underworld (Irlik-chan). As well as in Sumerian mythology (the sky, the middle world, the underworld), in Ancient Turk language, the violation of

order in any of these spheres could lead to a disorder of the collective structure of life (Alekseev, 1986; Yemelyanov, 2001; Polyakova & Balanyuk, 2018). In addition, both Sumerian and Proto-Turkic mythology distinguish between guardian spirits, hostile spirits, and ancestral spirits, to whom sacrifices were offered to propitiate them, which allowed people to live safely in a prosperous and vast landscape. These ideas are undoubtedly attributes of the public mythological consciousness of the ancient times.

Thus, the syncretism of mythological consciousness is presented in two aspects. First, there is the inseparability of the spheres: objective and subjective (for example, the interpretation of prophetic dreams); natural and supernatural (for example, the explanation of the appearance of "manna from heaven"); real and artificial (various paraphrases language, so-called euphemisms such as the owner of the forest is a bear). Secondly, the lack of differential forms of social consciousness (philosophy, religion, art, law, morality, and some others). If there are some rudiments of such forms of social consciousness, they exist only in the undeveloped rudimentary state.

Lack of reflection. Reflection is understood as the focusing on the subject of thinking and on the actual process of thinking. There are two types of thinking: 1) practical thinking, when an object is defined by an external situation; 2) reflection, when the object involves the process of thinking. Here are some simple everyday life examples: a road sign, signs on buildings, etc. Mythological thinking is defined by a lack of reflection, which is a consequence of the lack of criticality.

Now, there is an anthropomorphism. Anthropomorphism is a system of beliefs, where nature is endowed with human features, is likened to a person, and its laws are understood through human behaviour. What determines the anthropomorphism within the framework of mythological consciousness? It does not know the laws of nature since this type of thinking is possible only in the gathering-hunting lifestyle, when a person seeks to explain the world with the help of something that simply transfers human features to the external world. The main element of mythological consciousness is the myth. A myth is a subjective entity that has the status of an objective reality for a person (the bearer of the myth). It can be compared with a dream and its interpretation in the dream books of ancient written monuments. C. Jung (1971) wrote that the dream and the myth are a fact of subjective education. For example, there is an ancient Turkic written monument of the 10th century discovered in Dunhuang in the citadel of Miran A. Stein, "İrq bitig", which contains 65 parables, which are a divination book (Kairzhanov, 2018). As soon as a person begins reflect on and critically look at the myth, one loses familiar reality. The intention of the ancient myth can be summed up in such logical model as CHAOS>order. If this transition occurs at the level of the cosmos, the cosmogonic myths appear, if it happens at the level of ritual, then the calendar-ritual myths emerge, etc. The main character of any myth is subjected to mythologisation, but reflection reveals the main reason for some of the events of a particular myth. For example, in the myth of Prometheus, Zeus chained him to a rock not because he gave people fire, but because he knew the secret of Zeus' death.

Now, it is needed to understand what time represents for the mythological consciousness of the ancient period. Time is a state of mythological consciousness but it represents a sacred, special time-state, where gods and cultural hero's function. They create the archetypes of everything that exists on earth, transferring the community of people from CHAOS to order. The term itself consists of two parts "arche" (primacy, dominance and exemplary) and "type" (gr. typos imprint, form, sample). For example, the chieftom appeared as an archetype, representing itself as a prototype, acting as a model, a standard for all subsequent actions of the same type and unquestionable imitation. At this time, there is an increase in mimesis, when the majority of the stable collective of the tribe begins to voluntarily imitate the actions of one or another leader, who is presented as a certain indisputable authority (Kairzhanov, 2018; Molchanova et al., 2018). However, for the mythological consciousness, there is

also such a time as profane one (Latin profanes uninitiated; unenlightened, dark), that is, ordinary time-the state, where ordinary people live and act in the structure of the ritual collective.

3.2 Syncretic writings in written medieval monuments

Some of the biblical symbols-syncretics from the Old Testament were borrowed from the Utnapishti language (archaic Sumerian period) (Frazer, 2003; Labat & Malbran-Labat, 2002). First of all, this is the story of Eden, the fall, the flood, or, for example, the story of a baby in a basket thrown by a priestess into the waters of the Euphrates. Some priestesses who gave birth to a child outside the temple from a mere mortal did this. Only those who were conceived in the temple by ensi [ENSI] were considered legitimate, and such a priestess became entum, that is "the priestess of the sacred marriage". Subsequently, the biblical syncretic writings became popular in the chronographs of Byzantium, Syria, in the Western and Eastern Turkestan, in the chronicles, apocrypha of Kyivan Rus and the Moscow Kingdom. Notably, some Biblical syncretic writings were viewed only in the semantic aspect in the works of well-known scholars (Kolesov, 2002; Ulukhanov, 1972).

Sun (λλιοσ), light (φωσ), heat (θερμότησ), spring (έαρ), water source (πηγή ύδωροσ) – "Christianity, book teaching". Kyril of Turov uses this sacred symbol in his "Word in the New Week": "We will see the righteous sun of Christ from the tomb, and all the faithful will be saved" (Ivanov et al., 1990). For example, in Sumerian, this word has a variety of meanings: [UTU (UD), DINGIR] "sun; light; day; time; weather; storm, tempest (demon), sun as a deity" (Labat & Malbran-Labat, 2002; Gudava, 2021).

Darkness (μυρίων), cold (δρόσων), winter (χειμών) – "heresy, deviation from the Orthodox faith". This example is extracted from I. I. Sreznevsky's (1903) dictionary: "Rejoice, warriors of Christ, defeat the darkness". Here is another sentence from "The Word" by Kyril of Turov: "this winter sinful repentance stopped and the ice of unbelief in God's wisdom melted" (Ivanov et al., 1990). For defining "darkness, gloom; hell" the Sumerian language uses a word with the agglutinative affix of negation-sis: ansis [AN] "sky, heaven; god AN".

Storm (ζάλη), waves (κυμα) – "disaster". This symbol in the "May service minei" of the 11th century and in the "Izbornik of 1076": "The sinful tempest is storming" (Sreznevsky, 1863); "when in everyday life waves, the sea storm will bring misfortune" (Golysenko & Dubrovina, 1965; Sreznevsky, 1867). [UD] "storm, tempest (demon)" (Gudava, 2021).

Sea (θάλασσα) – "life". For example, there is the paremia of the Attic dialect θαλαπτω κοπέω, which literally means: "to beat the sea", that is "to loaf, to waste one's life". Equipolent Russian saying is to pound water in a mortar, which has undergone a semantic shift and today has a slightly different meaning. There is a semantic calculus in the Bible from the Sumerian language: [A.AB.BA] "sea; life". The thinking of the Sumerian priest is connected with the desire to free oneself from the power of the external world of the community, and the way of thinking is the sea, the abyss of waters that carry away the traces of the former life and give rise to new life (Yemelyanov, 2001).

Sprouted seed (σπέρμα) – "good thoughts". In Sumerian language [NUMUN] "family; to perform a good deed during a sacrifice" (Gudava, 2021). A translation is from the Pandect of Antiochus of the 11th century: "The seed of our holy Father Sheba is the light of the sun". Thorns, tares (άκανθαι, ζιζάνια) – "evil thoughts". In the Gospel of Luke, this sacred Byzantine symbol is used as such: "Grow thorns and suppress it". In the Gospel of Matthew, the lexeme tares is used as a symbol. "Did you not sow a good seed in your village, where the tares can come from" (New Testament, 2021), that is, the reader feels an interrogative intonation: you sow good thoughts, where do evil thoughts come from?

Sower (σπείρων), shepherd (ποιμήν) – "Christian teacher, mentor"; flock (ποιμνιον) – "believers". In the Gospel of Matthew (New Testament, 2021): there is no fear to come and to eat the hay in its

place (το εσπαρμένον) (Sreznevsky, 1903). Now, the evangelical symbol of the shepherd is played out in the Pandect of Antiochus (11th century.) in this way: Follow the shepherd of all beings (New Testament, 2021). In the Gospel of John (New Testament, 2021), these symbols have sacred meanings: "and there will be one flock and one shepherd (μία ποίμνη και εις ποιμήν)" (Sreznevsky, 1903). Notably, there are semantic calculus of this syncretic writing from the social life of Sumer: [SIPA] "shepherd; watchman". The word SIPA ("sheep shepherd") has become an epithet of the ruler. This was the name given to all the kings of Sumer and the gods. In addition, in Sumerian texts, the constant epithet of the king SIPA-ZID [ZI(D)] "righteous, true sheep shepherd" appears (Yemelyanov, 2001; (Golyschenko, & Dubrovina, 1965). For example, there is the passage on the clay inscription "Cylinder A" during the reign of Gudea of Lagash (late 23rd century BC): To the ruler, his mother Nanshe answers: My Shepherd! I'll explain your dream to you! (Yemelyanov, 2001).

Wolf (λύκος) – "false teacher". Kyril of Turov denounces the false teaching of Fyodor, who was installed by the bishop of Rostov by Prince Andrey Bogolyubsky without the sanction of the Metropolitan of Kyiv. He based his argument on Byzantine patristic models. Thus, when denouncing heretics, he used the history of the struggle against Arianism: Arias priest lies (...) a wolf in the sheep's closes (Oldenburg, 1926). Dissipative phenomena in language are primarily associated with extra-linguistic processes. The subject of Arianism will be given a brief reference. In fact, this struggle was peculiar in Byzantium and proceeded with varying success of the opponents of Arianism and its supporters. At the beginning of the 4th century, the well-known Presbyter Arius presented a doctrine that only God the Father has an eternal status in the trinity. He created God the Son (the Logos), and the creation of the Logos was the Holy Spirit. Arius believed that Jesus was only a likeness of God the Father. In other words, Arianism was an attempt at a discursive interpretation of the main Christian dogma, which was condemned by the bishop of Alexandria, and then by the local council. Arius preached to the people. Everywhere, in the markets and squares, there were fierce disputes accompanied by violent clashes. In 325, the Ecumenical Council of Nicaea adopted the statement of the main dogmas of Christianity – the Nicene Creed (the attributes of God the Father and God the Son, the immaculate conception of Jesus Christ by the Holy Spirit, the death of Jesus on the cross, the resurrection, ascension, and faith in the second coming). Arianism was condemned but the controversy continued until 381, when Arianism was condemned again and the persecution against the false teachers of Arius began (Mashkin, 1949). Thus, the analysed symbol became popular in the works of theologians of Kyivan Rus in the fight against heretical tendencies that undermine the symbol of faith adopted in 381 by the second Ecumenical Council in Constantinople. Although Arianism had already spread into continental Europe, their ideas were adopted by the Visigoths in particular.

Leo (λεο) – "a brave, strong person". In Ancient Rus, this symbol was very popular. It is used in the "Tale of Bygone Years" according to the Ipatiev list in this way: (Roman), rushed at pagans as a lion, Polovtsi were scaring children with him. In Sumerian, the word lion is used as a diaphora ("strong person") in a poetic context: [PIRIG] (Barthes, 1972).

Cup (ποτήριον) – "fate, lot". In the Gospel of Luke (New Testament, 2021): "Father, if you are full, take this cup from me" (Sreznevsky, 1903). The Sumerians sought to match their essence (ME-TE-NA) as closely as possible, "close to their essence", and only then can they receive a favourable fate (NAM-DU) (Labat, & Malbran-Labat, 2002). [NAM + DU] "fate, lot, sign (to be completed, finished)" (Gudava, 2021) (Table 1).

Table 1. Biblical symbols-syncretics

Symbols	Original form of word	Meaning
Sun, light, heat,	λλιοσ, φωσ, θερμότησ,	"Christianity, book teaching".

spring, water source;	ἕαρ, πηγή ὕδωρος;	
Darkness, cold, winter;	μυρίων, δρόσον, χειμών;	“Heresy, deviation from the Orthodox faith”.
Storm, waves;	ζάλη, κυμα;	“Disaster”.
Sea;	θάλασσα;	“Life”
Sprouted seed;	σπέρμα;	“Good thoughts”.
Sower, shepherd;	σπείρων, ποιμήν;	“Christian teacher, mentor”.
Wolf;	λύκος;	“False teacher”.
Leo;	λεο;	“A brave, strong person”.
Cup;	ποτήριον;	“Fate, lot. In the Gospel of Luke”.

Now, the conceptum can be defined and biblical syncretic writings can be analysed.

The concept of "sun", apparently, its primary meaning was “elephant, a body with a huge size and force of attraction” (Dal, 1998). The pre-conceptual meaning of "light" is defined as the ability to see or the state opposite to the darkness. The "grain of the first meaning" of the lexeme heat can be defined as the state of a natural phenomenon, or a certain body, which gives off heat, and is accessible to the sense of a living being. The concept of "spring" is represented by the word whole, which reflects the following pre-conceptual meaning – "to increase completely without a trace, to grow". The primary understanding of the concept of source (water) is as follows. This concept reflects the meaning of “drain”. Thus, conceptum can be detected only at the deep level of the semantics of words. Considering the concrete and iconic images, they are on the surface of semantics. The only source for defining conceptum is the one-of-a-kind cognitive dictionary by V. Dal (1988). Thus, the conceptum in the analysed symbols shows that the Byzantine authors were apparently aware of their global and dominant importance in promoting sacred ideas beyond the borders of the Roman empire. For the analysis, along with other translated works, the authors of the study incorporated some texts from the "Ostromirovo Gospel" published by A. Vostokov (1843). In addition, they were forced to comment on a number of extralinguistic factors that explicate a particular meaning of the concept.

The pre-conceptual meaning of the concept "darkness" is in the cognitive semantic elements: “abyss, void”. The concepts "cold" and "winter" have a common semantic element "frost". This semantic element reflects the physiological state of a person (Dal, 1998). The deep implicit meanings of these symbols served to denote specific phenomena in the system of Christian dogma.

The concepts of "storm" and "waves" combine common cognitive meanings such as “flinching, floundering; boiling, bubbling”. These meanings express a specific meaning in a sacred context.

The sea is “void, abyss, immensity”. Ship is “box”. Helmsman is “angle, top” (Dal, 1998). Thus, the concepts of syncretic writings: the sea, the ship and the helmsman, and others allow restoring the oldest motivation of symbols. Thus, for example, the word helmsman takes on the meaning, where it can be a person who is the bearer of the highest sacred consciousness and under whose leadership a person can realise the unity of the ethnic group.

Seed (sprouted) – “germ, root, beginning, base” (Dal, 1998).

Sower from sow, meaning a physical action. The word shepherd is formed as follows: flock < gise – “to protect, guard, protect” (Dal, 1998).

Wolf – “cunning, devious, deceptive” (Dal, 1998).

Leo – “Felis leo” (Dal, 1998).

Cup – “part, fate” (Dal, 1998). This sacred symbol is used in the Sinai Psalter (a Glagolitic monument of the 11th century) in the following way: "if everything is be repaid to me, I will take the

cup of salvation" (Frazer, 1963) - *διά πασν ων ανταπδδωκὲ μοι ποτήριον σωτηρίου λήψομαι* (Severyanov, 1922).

These syncretic writings are sometimes referred to in some studies as mythologems that reflect the most ancient ideas of a person, which are essentially pantheistic ideas and beliefs of ancient people. Thus, the rudiments of pantheism can be found in ancient Turkic texts of the 8th century such as in the "Monument in Honor of Kul-Tegin": "When the blue Tengri arch appeared above, /and the brown Umai bosom was created below, /between them the human race was born and lived" (Kairzhanov, 2019).

Thus, F. Hommel (1926) proposed a thesis that Tengrism, which appeared in 5th-1st thousand BC, is an early monotheistic idea of the ancient nomads. For example, Tengri-Umai-Yer-Sub are not a single divinity and, at the same time, they are triune deities. Here, Tengri is not a personified celestial deity of the male principle, Umai is the goddess of fertility, the patroness of the home, the protector of children, protecting, for example, qut of the child ("mind, will, fate, luck, happiness and health"), so qut is a syncretic element. This word is usually used in a stable combination qutty bolsyn. Yer-Sub is a deity of earth and water. In addition, there is the god of the underworld Erklig and aruahi, who are the spirits of the dead and the patrons of the family as well. Thus, Tengrism is a certain Turkic pantheism in the broadest sense of the word, deifying and humanising the external world.

The authors believe that the Proto-Turkic pantheism is somewhat equivalent to the stoicism of late Hellenism, even though it has its significant differences. The founder of Stoicism was Zeno of Crete (332-262 BC). For the sake of explication, an ontological model of Stoicism is presented, which is to a certain extent close to the ancient Turkic pantheistic conception and understanding. The world is a number of natural processes rigidly controlled by the Logos. Logos-ratio, logic, divine thinking is pantheism (universal-pan + god-teo + system of views (The One). The Divine Logos permeates the entire universe. For example, for one's pleasure it is important to not deviate from the fate. Zeno's favourite expression: The submissive people are led by the fate, and the disobedient ones are dragged by it. Stoic is a person who stoically and courageously overcomes the challenges of fate. The Stoics distinguish two beginnings in a person: 1) the physical, which experiences all the challenges of fate stoically. 2) Spiritual, when a person should strive to be in a state of apathy. Thus, the soul of the Stoic is free from passions and feelings. A person must reach this state and only then a moral way of life in this mortal world will be possible (Stolyarov, 2010).

As a result of the study and a critical review of the sources, the authors identified the main features of mythological consciousness: syncretism and anthropomorphism due to which myths emerge. Mythological consciousness emerges in the structure of the hunting-gathering lifestyle. However, when there was a situation of transition from this type of lifestyle to the agricultural sedentary one, a person had free time for reflection and critical assessment of the external world, which allowed humanity to overcome the mythological consciousness in and, eventually, destroy the myth. Syncretic writings from ancient and medieval texts in Ancient Turkic, Middle Greek, Old Rus and Sumerian languages, which were the result and consequence of syncretism and anthropomorphism of the mythological consciousness of the most ancient time, are analysed. These syncretic writings became an integral part of the lexical composition of medieval and modern languages. They are preserved in modern functioning languages. In addition, overcoming the mythological consciousness allowed humanity to lay the foundation for the development of the original principles of the sciences and humanities.

5. Conclusions

Thus, the authors of the study came to the following conclusion:

1. The person in the collective began to focus on the archetypes, had to adore them, and respect them without subjecting criticism, to live in an orderly ritual world. In this society, people were freed from CHAOS because a person is in an externally ordered society and strictly follows the ritual, and, thus, learns the archetypes through rituals. The functional role of myths was defined. Myths provided a single system of values, a single system of ideological coordinates without critical perception, which ensures the unity and solidarity of people around the leader, the hero in the mythological society. As soon as there is a need to rethink the myths by using reflection, the sacredness of the leader is annihilated. This cohesion and solidarity are features of hunting-gathering lifestyle. However, it is possible to transfer this sacredness in a metaphysical way to the agricultural sedentary lifestyle, but such a transfer will be ephemeral, it will collapse and disappear in the near future. The main thing is that the crisis of mythological consciousness emerges during the transition from the gathering-hunting to the agricultural sedentary lifestyle, since this requires an objective reflection of reality, which is possible if a person has free time for reflection. The crisis can continue for a long time. For example, there is the myth of the fall of Adam and Eve. As soon as reflection and criticality emerge, the destruction of the syncretic elements of the mythological consciousness begins. At this time, the beginnings of true science are developed, when the critical opposition of the natural to the supernatural phenomenon takes place, only the initial form of philosophy is developed, the opposition of the real to the artificial, the first signs of fine art appear. For example, a person begins to understand petroglyphs or ornaments as the property of art and not as an implicit magical meaning encoded in them. However, these forms can still serve the pragmatic purposes for ritual society for a long time.

2. The authors discovered that during the transition from the hunting-gathering to the agricultural sedentary lifestyle, the dominant meanings of the mythological consciousness served the pragmatic goals for Sumerian society for a long time. The temples continued to compile lists of legends about Sumerian heroes, create sacred hymns and new spells for the gods. Thus, a developed Sumerian civilisation appeared and established, when surrounded by hostile nomadic tribes. This continued until the Akkadians, having conquered the southern borders of Mesopotamia, began to study the culture and language of Sumer. In the tablet schools, Sumerian teachers created bilingual dictionaries and manuals, and trained scribes to translate Sumerian into Akkadian. They learned the Sumerian agglutinative language well and adapted the Sumerian cuneiform script for their household needs. In addition, they began to study Sumerian mythology. However, they treated Sumerians in way like Romans did to the Hellenes later in the ancient era, they adopted the culture and gave the Sumerian deities and mythical heroes their Semitic names. Thus, Sumerian mythology and its syncretic elements were borrowed by the Semitic peoples and incorporated into the Old Testament of the Bible.

Therefore, a hypothesis was developed that the Ural-Altai language family, which is agglutinative in nature, may be originating from the Sumerian language of the archaic era. This is evidenced by studies in the field of equipollent comparisons of lexical correspondences between the Turkic and Sumerian languages.

References

- Adorno, T. (2005). *In Search of Wagner*. London; New York: Verso.
- Alekseev, V. (1986). Science is alive with doubts, but it is confirmed by discoveries. *Knowledge is Power*, 3, 35-38.
- Althusser, L. (1969). *On materialistic dialectics*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Askoldov, S.A. (1997). Concept and word. In: V.N. Neroznak (Ed.), *Russian literature* (pp. 267-279). Moscow: Academia.

- Bahm, A.J. (1995). *Comparative philosophy: Western, Indian and Chinese philosophies compared*. Albuquerque: Universal Publications.
- Barthes, R. (1972). *Mythologies*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Braudel, F. (1986). *The structures of everyday life: the limits of the possible*. Moscow: Progress.
- Campbell, J. (1988). *The power of myth with Bill Moyers*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Cassirer, E. (1955). *Philosophy of symbolic forms*. New Haven; London: Yale University Press.
- Chernikov, M.V. (1997). *Principles of thinking*. Voronezh: Institute of Management, Marketing and Finance.
- Clark, D. (1977). *Prehistoric Africa*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Dal, V.I. (1998). *Explanatory Dictionary of the Living Great Russian Language*. Moscow: Russian Language.
- De Saussure, F. (1933). *Course in general linguistics*. Moscow: SOTSEKGIZ.
- Eliade, M. (1971). *The Myth of the eternal return: cosmos and history*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Eliade, M. (1994). *Sacred and secular*. Moscow: Moscow State University Press.
- Fillmore, Ch. (1976). Frame semantics and the nature of language. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences: Conference on the Origin and Development of Language and Speech*, 280, 20-32.
- Frazer, J.G. (1963). *The golden bough: A study in magic and religion*. New York: Macmillan Publishers.
- Frazer, J.G. (2003). *Folk-lore in the Old Testament*. Moscow: AST.
- Golyshenko, V.S., & Dubrovina, V.F. (1965). *Izbornik 1076*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Gudava, T. (2021). *Before and after the Bible. Sumerian-Russian dictionary*. <http://www.netslova.ru>
- Gumilyov, L.N. (2001). *Ethnogenesis and the Earth's Biosphere*. St. Petersburg: Kristall.
- Gurianov, P.A. (2016). Causes of ransom private railways in the Russian Empire during the reign of Alexander III. *Bylye Gody*, 39(1), 173-182.
- Gurianov, P.A. (2020). Ransom of private railways in the Russian Empire during the era of Emperor Alexander III. *Voprosy Istorii*, 2020(9), 17-34.
- Hintikka, J. (1980). *Logical-epistemological studies*. Moscow: Progress.
- Hommel, F. (1926). *Ethnologies und Geography des alten Orients*. München: C.H. Beck.
- Istrin, V.M. (1930). *Chronicle of George Amartol in the ancient Slavic-Russian translation*. St. Petersburg: Printing house of the Imperial Academy of Sciences.
- Ivanov, V.V., Sumnikova, T.A., & Pankratova, N.P. (1990). *Reader on the history of the Russian language*. Moscow: Prosveshcheniye.
- Jackendoff, R. (2002). *Foundations of language: brain, meaning, grammar, evolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jaspers, K. (1952). *Vom Ursprung und Ziel der Geschichte*. München: Piper.
- Jung, C. (1971). *The Portable Jung*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Jung, C. (1997). *Soul and myth: six archetypes*. Moscow: Port Royal.

- Kairzhanov, A.K. (1995). *Research in the field of phraseology of monuments of ancient Russian writing of the XI-early XII centuries*: thesis of the Doctor of Philology. Almaty: Al-Farabi Kazakh National University.
- Kairzhanov, A.K. (2018). *Palaeoturcica: sign and semantics. Myth and culture*. Rostov-on-Don: Altair.
- Kairzhanov, A.K. (2018). Precession of the Byzantine mentality in the language of the monuments of ancient Russian writing. In: *Palaeoslavica: Byzantism and Slavism* (pp. 100-133). Rostov-on-Don: Altair.
- Kairzhanov, A.K. (2019). *Palaeoturcica: Manichaeism. Buddhism. Christianity. Essays on linguistics. Criticism. Translations*. Moscow: Hotline-Telecom.
- Kashgari, M. (2005). *Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk*. Almaty: Dayk-Press.
- Kolesov, V.V. (2002). *Philosophy of the Russian word*. St. Petersburg: JNA.
- Kolesov, V.V. (2004). *Language and mentality*. St. Petersburg: Petersburg Oriental Studies.
- Kopylenko, M.M. (1995). *Fundamentals of ethnolinguistics*. Almaty: Eurasia.
- Koselleck, R. (1997). *L'expérience de l'histoire*. Paris: Seuil, L'ordre hilosophique.
- Kryukov, V.V. (1994). *Dialectical thinking from the standpoint of diachronic analysis*. Novosibirsk: Siberian State University of Geosystems and Technologies.
- Labat, R., & Malbran-Labat, F. (2002). *Manuel D'épigraphie Akkadienne (Signes, Syllabaire, Idéogrammes)*. Paris: Geuthner Manuels.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2004). *Metaphors we live by*. Moscow: Editorial URSS.
- Langacker, R. (1999). *Grammar and conceptualisation*. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Grouter.
- Lapshina, E.G., & Eshchin, D.V. (2020). Wooden houses of Penza Town of the 19th – Early 20th centuries and the problem of heritage preservation. *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering*, 775(1), 012068.
- Le Roy Ladurie, E. (1978). *Le Territoire de l'historien*. Paris: Editions Gallimard.
- Losev, A.F. (2014). *Dialectics of myth*. Moscow: Azbuka.
- Mashkin, N.A. (1949). *History of Ancient Rome*. Moscow: Publishing House of Political Literature.
- Maslova, V.A. (2005). *Cognitive linguistics*. Minsk: Tetra Sistens.
- Masson-Oursel, P. (1926). *Comparative Philosophy*. London: Trench, Trubner & Co.
- Molchanova, V.S., Artemova, S.F., & Balaniuk, L.L. (2018). Teaching singing in the Russian empire educational institutions: Importance and results. *European Journal of Contemporary Education*, 7(1), 220-225.
- Nadelyayev, V.M., Nasilov, D.M., Tenishev, E.R., & Shcherbak, A.M. (1969). *Ancient Türkic dictionary*. St. Petersburg: Nauka.
- Nakamura, H. (1992). *Comparative history of ideas*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishing House.
- New Testament. (2021). <http://bibliya-online.ru/novyy-zavet/>
- Oldenburg, S. (1926). *Primary Chronicle. Laurentian Codex*. St. Petersburg: Publishing House of the Archaeographic Commission.
- Petrov, V.V. (1996). Language and artificial intelligence: the turn of the 90s. In: *Language and Intelligence* (pp. 5-13). Moscow: Progress.

- Polyakova, L.G., & Balanyuk, L.L. (2018). The black sea province in the first world war: A historiographical review. *Bylye Gody*, 48(2), 838-849.
- Portnova, T. (2015). Giants against Gods (regarding the plastic nature of sculpture and theater by the example of the exhibition and installation of the Pergamon altar in the Pushkin state museum of fine arts). *European Research Studies Journal*, 18(4), 189-196.
- Ranov, V.A. (1988). *The most ancient pages of the history of mankind*. Moscow: Prosveshcheniye.
- Ricoeur, P. (2000). *La memoire, l'histoire, l'oubli*. Paris: Seuil, L'ordre hilosophique.
- Ryspayeva, D., Zhukenova, A., Ismagulova, A., Kulakhmetova, M., & Fadeeva, L. (2021). National and cultural variation of the concept. *Astra Salvensis*, 2021, 13-25.
- Severyanov, S. (1922). *Sinai Psalter: A Glagolic Monument of the XI century*. St. Petersburg: Publication of the Department of Russian Language and Literature of the Russian Academy of Sciences.
- Shokhin, V.K. (1998). *F.I. Shcherbatsky and his comparative philosophy*. Moscow: Institute of Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences.
- Sreznevsky, I.I. (1863). *Ancient monuments of Russian writing and language*. St. Petersburg: Printing House of the Imperial Academy of Sciences.
- Sreznevsky, I.I. (1867). *Information and notes about little-known and unknown monuments*. St. Petersburg: Printing House of the Imperial Academy of Sciences.
- Sreznevsky, I.I. (1903). *Materials for the dictionary of the Old Russian language on written monuments*. St. Petersburg: Department of Russian Language and Literature of the Imperial Academy of Sciences.
- Stepanov, Yu. S. (2009). *Methods and principles of modern linguistics*. Moscow: LIBROKOM Book House.
- Stolyarov, A.A. (2010). *New philosophical encyclopedia in 4 volumes*. Moscow: Mysl.
- Ulukhanov, I.S. (1972). *About the language of Ancient Russia*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Vostokov, A. Kh. (1843). *Ostromir Gospels 1056-1057*. St. Petersburg: Printing House of the Imperial Academy of Sciences.
- Yemelyanov, V.V. (2001). *Ancient Sumer. Essays on culture*. St. Petersburg: Petersburg Oriental Studies.
- Zholdasbekov, M., & Sartkozha, K. (2006). *Atlas of Orkhon monuments*. Astana: Kul Tegin.

AUTHOR BIODATA

Yerkin B. Zhumatayev is a doctoral Student at the Department of Teleradio and Public Relations, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Nur-Sultan, Republic of Kazakhstan.

Elmira E. Ibrayeva is a PhD, Associate Professor at the Department of Teleradio and Public Relations, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Nur-Sultan, Republic of Kazakhstan.

Zibagul S. Ilyassova is a PhD, Professor at the Department of Oriental Studies, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Nur-Sultan, Republic of Kazakhstan.

Abay K. Kairzhanov is a Full Doctor in Philology, Professor at the Department of Turkology, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Nur-Sultan, Republic of Kazakhstan.

Raikhan O. Tuxaitova is a Full Doctor in Philology, Professor at the Department of Kazakh and Russian Linguistics, S. Seifullin Kazakh Agrotechnical University, Nur-Sultan, Republic of Kazakhstan.