

THE RE-MYTHOLOGIZATION AND THE ROLE OF RE-MYTHOLOGIZATION IN SOCIETY

Usmanov Muxriddin Abdimuratovich

National University of Uzbekistan

Department of Basics of Philosophy and Spirituality

Doctoral Researcher

ANNOTATION

The article analyzes the factors associated with the emergence of myth in today's society, and the formation of the mythological worldview. Also it discussed aspects of myths related to social life, focusing on myths that reflect reality. Mechanisms of re-mythologization are explained on the basis of ontological and epistemological knowledge.

Keywords: myth, worldview, modern myth, functions of myth, mythologization re-mythologization, nature, man, mythological worldview, pseudo-myths.

INTRODUCTION

Myths are as products of human thinking can be classified as one of the social phenomena that many researchers focus on as knowledge formed at a time when humanity was trying to think. It should be noted here that according to one of the popular ideas of the time, the myth, in the process of human development, if it does not disappear, it will certainly reappear. In general, the victory of the mind over the myth itself can be called a modified version of the myth, and according to this theory, the myths that occur in our daily lives are not literally myths, but some kind of "pseudo-myths", myths-mutants, and simulacra; and real myths are a thing of the past.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Truths do not always appear in the form of myths and help a person to strive for the truth. Commenting on this phenomenon, R. Marle writes: "Myths are corrupted, symbols are secularized, but they never disappear, they did not disappear even in the age of rationalism, as in the nineteenth century. Symbols and myths have their roots in the distant past: they are part of human existence, and there is no sphere of human activity that they do not penetrate." [Марле Р., 1986: pp. 53-61] Mythological thought existed long before scientific thought emerged, and it continues to do so today. Levi-Strauss argues that these two types of thinking can not only coexist, but also blend and intertwine with each other. The validity of this view can be justified by the "existence of areas of wild knowledge that exist as wild species." Examples include the arts, as well as areas of social life where "wild observation has not developed due to incompetence, neutrality, or unknown reasons." [Левин-Стросс К., p. 286]

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Methodologically, the myths were analyzed using methods such as general interdependence, historical, systematic principles of scientific knowledge, content, synergetic, hermeneutic analysis.

Of course, such an interpretation did not criticize the mind, one of the aspects of which pleased the human mind was that modern myths are not literal myths, but some distorted myths, ghosts of myths, shadows, real myths that have no place in the modern world that are interpreted as echoes. However, in addition to Marle's statement that "the roots of symbols and myths go back to the ancient past," we object to his view that "myths become obsolete, corrupted," and "symbols become secular." Such views are also close to M. Mueller's idea that the myth is a "language disease" or that the myth becomes obsolete.

Furthermore, M. Mueller's interpretation of many criticized myths as a language disease is profound and is close to an extended interpretation of the myth. The comparison of myth here to "disease" is like the comparison of love to disease. After all, we do not consider a person in love to be sick or defective. Conversely, it is this pain that allows him to live a more meaningful life, to look at the world and the people in it differently, to achieve spiritual perfection.

Levi-Strauss uses the bricolage model as well as the totemic classification model in his study of mythological thinking, and through this model he examines the relationship between the order of nature and the order of culture, arguing that they are based on a "homology of differences".

Of course, the poverty of myth is basically its simplification in essence, its complete intelligibility, immutability, and ineffectiveness. However, in our opinion, behind this lies not the ineffectiveness of the myth, but the ineffectiveness of the assumptions that seek to interpret it. Because in order to adapt to the reality it describes, the myth transforms under its influence, and fills its source with new myths, including myths about the obsolescence of myths.

On the other hand, the idea that emblems are becoming secular is incapable of fully disclosing the essence of these processes, for simplicity here indicates limited possibilities of cognition, and we cannot express the myth in its entirety. However, it should be noted that the secularization of the emblem does not invalidate its original divinity or sacredness, since events such as myth and emblem serve people living in different societies at different times at both the sacred and profane levels, and the secret is the same regardless of their sacredness or profanity. It is enough if there is a social need for them.

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

The diversity of the modern mythological space serves as clear evidence that myth is not just a remnant of archaic cultures. Modern social mythology is a completely independent and dynamic phenomenon. However, in order to get to its essence, we need to highlight its origins, its basic mechanisms of formation and transformation. At this stage, the myth shows that it is in stark contrast to logic, explanation, and interpretation.

In essence, the tradition of philosophical observation is based on rational research programs. To unravel the essence of a particular phenomenon, it is necessary to determine its origin, and to examine its development, to determine how it came to be in its present form. The study of this movement from the beginning to the end always requires intellectual perseverance and diligence. Identifying the signs of a new one among the various social tendencies in many ways determines the independence and importance of the philosophical position of the observer. However, the opposite can be said about mythology. It is not difficult to study its history from the point of view of the current state of research on mythology. Identifying irrational elements

that have the hallmarks of myth in our lives today is also not a difficult task. The complicated thing is that it is much more difficult to answer the question of how the myth that once existed has now come to its present form.

Mythological worlds disintegrate quickly, but new worlds are created from their remnants and fragments, and "the newly known meaning may become a new sign in the next evolution, or the opposite may happen." [Силичев Д.А., p. 320] The logic here is reminiscent of a kaleidoscope, which contains various elements that are used to carry out structural reconstruction.

The philosophical foundations of the social theory of myth are still in the formative stages, and this can also be learned from its categorical apparatus. Surprisingly, the evolutionary-stage approach to mythology is based on seeing it only as a unit inherent in traditional society. That is, this approach denies the possibility that myth can develop in other social systems. As a result of the development of globalization, the emergence of transnational territories, changes in institutional order, disruption of social norms, and the unity of social or individual consciousness, the penetration of technology into all spheres of human activity create sharp contradictions in social reality. symbolic elements dominate the natural elements. The peculiarities of these processes are given in the works of J. Baudrillard, D. V. Ivanov, V. A. Kutirev, J. Ellyul. The works of B. Ustyantsev, O. Y. Ribakov draw attention to the spatial aspects of the new social order.

Mythologisms are figurative units of myth [Торчинов, Е. А., 1998: p. 35] that are "common ground, idea" [Лобок, А. М., 1997: p. 147]; "Any image that serves as a primary systematization of real-life material" [Касавин, И. Т., 1990: p. 8]; "An idea that allows the human body, which underlies our worldview and is not directly present in the mind itself, directs the human body, emotions, activities, consciousness, self-description to man, description of his feelings and changes in himself" [Мастеров, Б. М., 1995: p. 31].

CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATIONS

To conclude, we can say that the technique of creating a myth, the principles of the introduction of the myth and the laws of its purpose remain unchanged, only the forms of its transmission, and its idea and the characterization of the demonstration has changed. The only problem is that a change in appearance always leads to a change in the means of existence and the means by which its essence is manifested.

However, the increase in the level of socio-philosophical observation in the works under consideration is accompanied by the exclusion of the problems of social mythology, and in them the problems of mythology are excluded from the field of study of today's social being. Emphasis on the socio-ontological status of social mythology in the social order of today's society is impossible without understanding the mechanisms of the dynamics of mythological processes evolving in conjunction with a developing society. The solution to this problem can be achieved through the development of a comprehensive systematic approach based on the synthesis of theories, principles and methods of the above directions, which provides both the enrichment of socio-philosophical knowledge and the utilitarian efficiency of managing and creating mythological processes.

REFERENCES

1. Марле Р. Миф и историко-критический метод / Р. Марле // Символ, – №15, 1986. – С. 53-61.
2. Леви-Стросс К. Первобытное мышление. С. 286.
3. Силичев Д.А. Концепция мифа К. Леви-Строса // Миф и художественное сознание XX века. М.: Государственный институт искусствознания «КАНОН-ПЛЮС» С. 320.
4. Торчинов, Е. А. Религии мира: Опыт запредельного. Психотехника и трансперсональные состояния. – СПб., 1998. – с. 35
5. Лобок, А. М. Антропология мифа. – Екатеринбург, 1997. – с. 147.
6. Касавин, И. Т. Постигая многообразия разума // Заблуждающийся разум? Многообразие вненаучного знания. – М., 1990. – с. 8.
7. Мастеров, Б. М. Психология саморазвития: психотехника риска и правила безопасности. – Рига, 1995. – с. 31.