

New paradigm of the science of mythology in S. Kondybay's work

One can define the theme of the given article as follows: "Why should not Kazakhs rely on the quick recognition of Serikbol Kondybay's work in Russia and in the West?" Because in the Russian language three books by Kondybay were issued – two authentic ones: "Kazakh mythology. Concise dictionary" and "Aesthetics of the Mangystau landscapes", and one more being translated – "Kazakh steppe and Germanic gods". But, even though the translations of S.Kondybay's works would be available for the scientific community to the west of Kazakhstan, one should hardly await the rave reviews. The answer for many years, most probably, will be boycott, deafening silence or arrogant scientific rebuke to the "dilettante".

In the philosophy of science there is such a phenomenon as "scientific paradigm". In 70s it became widely known after extremely popular book by Thomas Kuhn "Structure of scientific revolutions". The author showed that the science does not move gradually and steadily and that the development occurs in spurts, revolutionary. At the usual time in any scientific discipline a certain system of views, concepts and methodologies dominates. This is what we call paradigm. The statements put forward within the paradigm are to be proved to make the scientific community, adhering to the given paradigm, recognize their scientific nature.

In the course of time the amount of facts (phenomena), not fitting the paradigm begins to accumulate. When this number reaches its critical point the science occurs in the crisis. The way of the solving this crisis is the attempt of the reformers of science to go beyond the current system, create a wider system based on new basics. If previous paradigm was scientific, than there is no full refusal of

it. The new paradigm comprises an old one as its part explaining any fragment of reality.

Unfortunately, the transition from one paradigm to the other, as T.Kuhn bitterly joked, occurs not because the followers of the old paradigm are able to change their mind, but because they die over time. In their place comes a new generation brought up in the new paradigm. That happens in the natural sciences. Now, imagine this situation of the paradigm change in the humanities, which are tied to the ideology, national and race identity and other subjective factors. The given excursion into philosophy is necessary in order to understand correctly the meaning of S.Kondybay's work and possible reaction to this work on the part of the world (western, European) scientific community.

In fact, S.Kondybay suggests the new paradigm of methodology, linguistics and history, that entails the revision of results and other humanitarian sciences. Methodology, which he uses herewith, is not completely new. The scientist himself as his closest predecessor using mythological reconstruction in historical research, names the historian of Kazakhstan Yu.Zuev.

Revolutionary meaning of S.Kondybay's work lies elsewhere. We are all formed in the bosom of the Soviet (Russian, wider, European, Western) humanity. And do not notice how this science in all diversity and richness of disciplines, concepts, methodologies is determined by its history and origin. The main body frame of this science was formed in XIX century, when the European colonialism flourished, belief in the scientific progress, rational thinking and the only scientific truth was boundless. This science was formed as the discourse of the European colonialism, and the orientalism, as it is known, represented the scientific apparatus, servicing the interests of metropolitan countries. People-colonialists built the conception of

the world history, “explaining” their rise, their “right and duty” to control world resources. The feeling of unity and brotherhood manifested in the creation of the paradigm on the Indo-European language family, a kind of special Indo-European history, mythology and culture.

All this may seem a long history, Aryan theory, and was branded as fascism . But this is not so. Indo-European paradigm continues to dominate in science and ideology, continues to influence the decision of the political and social problems. In order to realize it, it is sufficient, for instance, to turn to the research of the “singers” of the Iranian “will to culture” of Shukurovs brothers, who rather “sympathetically” write about the fact that at in early XX century, “...Turks, by getting out of the bed of foreign civilizations, made the first independent step in the creation of their own world... . For Turks, putting forward a claim to the originality of their spiritual life in XX century – and in the world of adjusted and happened hierarchy of civilized systems, in the world, which became the product of millenary accumulation of the spiritual experience by the dozen of the people-creators – only ethnicity could be the concentration and main basis of their newest cultural self-identification.”

Olzhas Suleymenov noted repeatedly the anti-historical nature of similar opinions based on political and cultural situation of XIX-XX centuries. Serikbol Kondybay in his works does not only criticize, but also indicates weak points of science guided by such views, indicates to the necessity systematically, at paradigm level to counterpart various Aryan theories, and by himself makes a decisive step to the creation of this new paradigm. It is quite possible that with the development of science several of certain S.Kondybay’s opinions would be rejected and improved.

That is not the point. The main task of our science and education is to educate in the new paradigm the following generation of researchers who will develop it on

the basis of newest scientific information, access to the scientific literature in different world languages.