

UDC 130.2 : 13+159.95

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24195/spj1561-1264.2025.1.12>**Stovpets Vasyl Grygorovych**

PhD in Philology, Associate Professor, privat-professor of ONMU,  
 Professor of the National and International Law Department,  
 Director of the Educational Service Centre  
 Odesa National Maritime University  
 34, Mechnikov str., Odesa, Ukraine  
[orcid.org/0000-0002-2354-2852](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2354-2852)

**Stovpets Oleksandr Vasylovych**

Dr.Hab. in Philosophical Sciences, Professor,  
 Professor of the Social and Humanitarian Studies Department  
 Odessa National Maritime University  
 34, Mechnikov str., Odesa, Ukraine  
[orcid.org/0000-0001-8001-4223](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8001-4223)

**Sinkovska Tetiana Viktorivna**

Senior Lecturer of the Social and Humanitarian Studies Department,  
 Director of the Center for Extracurricular Activities  
 Odessa National Maritime University  
 34, Mechnikov str., Odesa, Ukraine

## SOCIAL-PHILOSOPHIC RETHINKING OF THE MAIN THEORIES ON THE ORIGIN OF CONSCIOUSNESS

*The relevance of the article is connected with the fact that the problem of consciousness is one of the key issues in modern philosophy, cognitive, natural and social sciences, since it is directly related to the issues of self-perception, cognition and interaction of a person with the world. The article emphasizes that consciousness is not only a mechanism for human adaptation to the social and natural environment, but also a tool for creativity and rational understanding of reality. Modern concepts of consciousness combine social, cognitive, biological and neurophysiologic aspects, which raises a number of questions about the nature of consciousness and requires a comprehensive analysis. A correct understanding of the mechanisms of consciousness is important for the development of cognitive technologies, artificial intelligence and neural networks, and behavioral sciences. The purpose of the research is to offer a socio-philosophical rethinking of the phenomenon of consciousness. Such an analysis is associated with a thorough study of the most relevant theories on the origin of consciousness, which allows for a better understanding of the main aspects concerning the functioning of consciousness, and helps to clarify its essence. The methodological basis. For this study, the interdisciplinary and systemic approaches, the dialectical method, as well as common scientific logical techniques were used. Research results. Today, it is impossible to affirm the existence of any single universal theory that would explain all the causes of emergence, and development patterns of such a complex phenomenon as consciousness. At the same time, the article examines the main concepts that explain the possible reasons for the origin of human consciousness through the prism of social, cognitive, religious, informational, evolutionary, neurophysiologic, and transcendental aspects. The article analyzes historical approaches to the understanding of consciousness, as well as their evolution within the philosophy of mind. Particular attention is paid to the differences between human consciousness and the behavioral reactions of other living beings. The major theoretical approaches to explaining the phenomenon of consciousness can be reduced to such general methodological attitudes as dualism, physicalism, and panpsychism. Thus, the article contributes to the current discussion on the nature of consciousness by summarizing its theoretical foundations and outlining prospects for further research.*

**Key words:** consciousness, human, intelligence, philosophy of mind, origin of consciousness.

**Introduction.** The problem of consciousness is so relevant to philosophy that even a separate field of research has emerged – the philosophy of mind. The inclusion of a person into the world of ideals and the spiritual culture is realized in human existence through consciousness. It also serves as a prerequisite for rational, intellectual comprehension of reality, thanks to which a person is able to transform and adapt the environment to his or her own needs, goals, interests, desires, or aspirations.

The concept of “consciousness” (in a relatively modern sense) was formulated not so long ago, around the 17th century (and this was already the Modern Age in conventional cultural historiography). Thinking humanity has always wondered what fundamentally distinguishes a human being from other living beings who are also capable of demonstrating behavior, character, and being active in relation to the world around them.

However, most reflections on the phenomenon of consciousness in the past were associated with the categories of “spirit” as something objectively spiritual and “soul” as something subjectively spiritual (associated with the inner world of a particular person). Nevertheless, these concepts have traditionally been saturated with all kinds of mythologies, overloaded with religious layers – sometimes irrational, supra-rational, mystical, esoteric – that is, insufficiently explainable from the positions of scientific logic. Only when philosophy has clearly oriented itself towards science, and began to consider spiritual reality as subject to rational comprehension and structuring, does consciousness as a phenomenon and a specific object of study come into the field of view of philosophy.

The *actuality* of the issue under study is further *enhanced* by the fact that it is becoming particularly relevant to modern civilization as a result of intensive searches for how to create autonomous artificial intelligence, and artificial consciousness. Perhaps the absence (so far) of such a characteristic as “consciousness” in a neural network – is actually the last bastion that distinguishes human intelligence from the artificial one.

**The purpose of the research.** The main objective of this article is to rethink the phenomenon of consciousness in a socio-philosophical way. The authors believe that such an analysis should be associated with a thorough study of the most relevant theories on the origin of consciousness. This will enable a better understanding of the key aspects of the functioning of consciousness, which will help to clarify its essence.

**Research methodology.** The interdisciplinary and systemic approaches, the dialectical method, and common scientific logical techniques were essential for this study.

**Research results.** One of the greatest mysteries of the world is the human ability to realize and understand reality, i.e. human intelligence. It impresses with its capabilities, inexhaustibility and universality. In general, the qualitative features of human intelligence are described by the term “consciousness”, so the question of the essence of consciousness, its emergence and possibilities has been a permanent concern of the best thinkers of mankind for centuries.

The first ideas about consciousness arose in ancient times, when humans came to the conclusion that the processes that occur in their heads were different from those of nature, and that their vision of the world (and thus their place in it) was different from that of animals. These special properties were attributed to the soul as a manifestation of something supernatural. For thousands of years, humanity has been searching for an answer to the question of what the essence of consciousness is, how it arises, and what its capabilities depend on. Nowadays, human conscious activity is studied by neurophysiology, medicine, psychology, cybernetics, behaviorism, structural linguistics, anthropology, epistemology, and some other sciences.

The very first difficulties in understanding and studying consciousness are largely due to the fact that we cannot observe the phenomena of consciousness directly, sensually, cannot measure them, cannot investigate them with the help of various technical equipment. For example, neurophysiologists say that at no level of scientific research of the human brain has what we call “thought” been recorded, although it is generally difficult to study the brain other than on the basis of that it is an “organ of thought and consciousness”. In this regard, a rather radical claim is sometimes made that consciousness as a separate entity does not exist at all, that it can be reduced either to the functions of the brain and the processes of the human body, or to the reactions of the nervous system

of the human body towards external factors. This, in particular, is the focus of behaviorism in psychology and various naturalistic trends. For example, Robert Sapolsky, author of the famous book “Behave: The Biology of Humans at Our Best and Worst” [1] and more recent works [2] – denies the principle of ‘free will’, saying that our actions are *not* determined by our moral values, volition and education, but solely by our biology. In particular, by neurophysiological processes inside the brain, as well as by hormones, amino-acids, neurotransmitters, neurons, synapses, electrochemical reactions in the brain, etc. But if this were the case, then at least the entire institution of legal responsibility would have to be completely rethought.

In the 20th century, a number of works were published to prove that there is nothing that can be called mental phenomena, or consciousness. The interpretation of consciousness as “a special form of reflection of reality” was (and still is) quite common [3]. If consciousness is considered as a reflection, it is deprived of any ontological status, i.e. it is considered to function just as a “mirror” and does not bring anything fundamentally new into reality. Consciousness, as a form of reflection of reality, is endowed with the ability to only reproduce and recombine existing forms of being. Yet, for some sciences (such as biology and psychology), the theory of reflection has proved to be relatively productive.

The first sign of consciousness is a special type of human behavior. It can be called “non-biological” because a person acts not only on the basis of instincts and reflexes, not only under the pressure of vital needs, and not only in search of ways to meet them. Unlike most animals, humans do not act according to the stimulus-response scheme, and often contrary to biological expediency and self-preservation (for example, in cases of self-sacrifice, or when they take risks to fulfill their professional duty: military, police, rescuers, doctors, reporters, emergency workers operating in combat zones). In some other circumstances, a person may also act anti-biologically in the case of suicide for one reason or another. Human consciousness brings a person into a fundamentally different type of behavior compared to standard biological behavior.

The non-biological type of human behavior is evidenced by both the direction and content of human actions: they are carried out on the basis of socio-cultural processes with the use of artificial tools and means of life created by human civilization. All these facilities and technologies become an alternative and very important environment for human life. They seem to complement the living space and enhance the natural abilities of a person.

With the help of the mind, a person is able to see something that does not yet exist in nature in its present form. For example, a sculptor or a mason sees a future product (or even a work of art) in a stone; an author, filmmaker, or scriptwriter sees a future story, painting, or artistic work, etc. When we hold a text in front of us, we see not just a light background with symbols, but we see something fundamentally different behind it: we see a certain content filled with meanings, information, ideas. Whereas, for example, a caterpillar or insect crawling on the surface of a painting is unlikely to be excited by what is behind the colors and canvas; only a being gifted with a high level of consciousness can perceive this content. The functioning of consciousness is associated with a special substantive content of reality, which may not be sensually available to us (primarily, this applies to ideas, abstract concepts, theoretical constructs), but this content is developed on the basis of experience, in the course of certain mental and practical activities, in a long historical process, in the context of social and cultural life.

Hence, there is a purposeful nature of conscious activity: the ability of consciousness to create images of future results (necessary or proper), and subsequently direct its actions towards something that does not yet exist in a ready-made form, in nature. And often we are talking about something that does not exist not only here and now, but also in general – something that we have invented ourselves and agreed to consider true: money, rights, duties, religion, morality, traditions, laws, numbers, and so on. Thus, the principle of human activity is that it is conditioned not only by what acts on a person from the outside, but what is developed by our consciousness (including the collective consciousness). Therefore, when assessing human activity, it is important to take into account not only its result, but also its intentions, motives, purpose, and mental concept. This, in particular, shows the creative nature of human consciousness.

When considering the signs of consciousness, we cannot avoid the question: how can a person actually testify to the presence in his or her consciousness of something that does not exist in nature? First of all, we can do so by our practical actions, by actually creating new things: when a master teaches a disciple, he often does not so much tell him the “theory” of his own actions as simply engage him in practical activities, demonstrating his experience through his own actions.

However, this can be done only in the case of relatively simple processes of activity. In other cases, it is necessary to have special means of idealization, i.e. means for conveying the substantive content of consciousness that cannot be directly demonstrated by actions. Such means of idealization are signs (symbolic activity), among which the most important role belongs to language and speech. Language is the very first and most obvious sign of consciousness; it was on the basis of language that ancient people distinguished man from animal, and “native” people from “strangers”.

Thus, the need for language is associated with the imperative to capture the content that cannot be conveyed by simply demonstrating things. Hence, it obviously follows that language becomes the main carrier of historical experience, records and summarizes the successes and failures in the process of activity of an individual, community, society, a certain nation, and an entire culture.

The great miracle of consciousness is that, although it is not recorded by any devices or sensors, it is able to record itself. This unique ability is called “self-awareness” or self-reflection of human consciousness (it is self-evident to itself). As René Descartes aptly put it, human is a thinking substance that is capable of questioning the existence of everything except his own consciousness [4].

We can even say that no instruments are needed – it is enough to pay conscious attention to what is happening inside our mental processes in order to be convinced of the real existence of consciousness. However, to do so, one must be a human being, and has to be in the human mode of being. Alternatively, we can say that for a human being (adult one, developed and formed) the question of the existence or non-existence of consciousness appears as a question of his or her self-identification. Conversely, an entity that is not in the human mode of being is not capable of such self-identification (such internal fixation of consciousness) – at least, this is what conventional science believes today.

Self-reflection of consciousness manifests the moment of the so-called “substantiality” of consciousness, i.e. the moment when consciousness does not need any external legitimization, reinforcement, or evidence for its existence: it finds its “first” and “last” obviousness in itself. This ultimately allows a person to become a subject of cognition and activity, in other words, enables to produce his or her personal activity on his or her own behalf. This is also related to the ability of consciousness to critically evaluate reality, to judge it from certain perspectives.

Thus, consciousness has unique properties that disables to examine and measure it directly, at least for now. However, the initial features of consciousness (which we have discussed above) permit us to assert its real existence, but in special qualities and characteristics.

The feature of the philosophical analysis of consciousness is the disclosure of its existential roots, most important attributes, properties, and functions. All of these questions are often dependent on the historical analysis of consciousness, and the latter implies the recognition that consciousness once *emerges*, and then undergoes certain changes in the process of society's development. Therefore, the philosophical problems of consciousness include, first of all, *the problem of its origin*.

The question of the origin of consciousness should be highlighted and understood at least in general terms because we often look for its roots when trying to understand something, i.e. we turn to the question of its genesis and developmental patterns. Like any question about the “beginning”, the question of the consciousness origin has an ontological essence.

Modern philosophy and science cannot provide a final and definitive solution to this problem, but the currently available authoritative concepts of the origin of consciousness help to illuminate this problem and understand much on the way to its solution. These concepts include: theological (or religious), dualistic, evolutionary, labor, the theory of a unified information space, and substantial concept. In the following part of this research, we will consider their main theses, emphasizing the advantages and disadvantages of each of these concepts.



*The religious (theological) concept of the origin of consciousness* states that human mind is a gift from God, a manifestation of the “spark of God” put into man by God Himself during the creation of the world; when creating man, “God breathed the living spirit into human”, thus endowing man with a part of divine light – the soul. However, what theologians call the “soul” is called “psyche” by scientists (in fact, “psyche” is translated from Greek as “soul”). On the other hand, human consciousness with its very first properties appears as a controversial result of the so-called “fall of Adam” known from the Holy Scriptures: it is inevitable consequence of the human acquaintance with the symbolic “fruit of knowledge”. After that, a person gains consciousness and begins to distinguish good and evil. We can take it as a metaphor of the critical thinking, when first humans begin to perceive reality not holistically but partially, fragmentarily. Moreover, the presence of a part of the “divine” in the depths of soul (or consciousness) necessarily determines the human desire for the highest truth, the ability to cognize the reality, or at least to strive for its cognition.

An undoubtedly positive aspect of the theological concept is that it connects human consciousness with a transcendent principle, with a certain God's plan, with something absolute, something that goes beyond the physical world. In other words, the nature of consciousness is not limited to aspects of human existence as a biological being, does not reduce human life to survival, but raises it to the levels of creativity, cognition, thinking, culture, and spirituality.

Nevertheless, the religious concept disregards the connection between consciousness and the human body (in particular, it does not consider the neurophysiological features of the human brain), and ignores the factors of social history, information and noospheric factors. In addition, it explains not so much the origin of consciousness as the metaphysical aspects, i.e. why consciousness can be inherent in humans (as beings similar to God).

*The dualistic conception of the origin of consciousness* emphasizes the moments of radical difference between consciousness and the material-sensory reality that is available to humans, and therefore concludes that there are two kinds of phenomena (or two “substances”) in the world: material and ideal. They exist in close intertwining with each other, and all phenomena of reality finally appear only as different degrees of their unity [5].

The dualistic concept can be justified by the fact that there are indeed quite obvious boundaries between consciousness and bodily existence, and it is almost impossible to reduce them to each other, to completely identify them. In the 17th century, Descartes developed in detail the theory that there are two kinds of substances: “mind, consciousness” (*res cogitans*) and “physical objects” (*res extensa*). Later, in the 18th century, Kant wrote that there are two main pillars of human knowledge – a priori (intuitive) and a posteriori (as a result of experience), which grow, perhaps, from a single, common, but unknown root [6]. In addition, being a representative of transcendental idealism in German classical philosophy, Kant spoke about the existence of different types of perception and comprehension of reality: sensual and mental (thinking, logical).

Thus, the dualistic concept suggests that all world processes are based on two principles – material and spiritual, while consciousness is a manifestation of the spiritual principle of human existence. Though this statement does not deny the material features of a human being, but complements them, showing a person as a thinking, intelligent being capable of analysis and self-reflection.

*The concept of a single informational field*, in an attempt to explain the origin of human consciousness, emphasizes a thesis that is not seriously contested: all processes in the world are accompanied by the exchange of information. Therefore, it is logical to assume (according to its supporters) that there is a single field of information for all world processes and phenomena. Human consciousness is one of the manifestations of information processes, perhaps one of the most striking. And although human consciousness cannot be simply reduced to information, it is undoubtedly related to it directly (because consciousness analyzes information fluxes and operates with information arrays using brain functions).

This concept records the existence of such a relationship, and it explains the connection between consciousness and the human brain in its own convincing way, with references to the latest scientific data. It argues that the human brain can be likened to a complex receiver: its “parts” are necessary for receiving all the incoming “radio waves”. But the direct connection of brain structures with

the determination of the content of these information flows cannot be considered proven yet. In other words, modern neurophysiology and cognitive science have not yet been able to show that “thought” is produced by brain structures, not by consciousness, just as it has not been proven that human consciousness and the brain are identical substances. The social environment and social activities serve to “tune” the brain to the necessary parameters of action; that is why consciousness does not arise outside of them. This is argued, among others, in the works of the American neurophysiologist Karl Pribram [7; 8], and the famous Australian neurophysiologist, Nobel Prize winner in Physiology and Medicine John Eccles [9; 10].

This concept is certainly justified, but it can hardly explain all the complexities and nuances of the actual functioning of human consciousness, including, for example, the unity of consciousness and human feelings, experiences, emotions, beliefs, and human aspirations for higher and better things. Otherwise, how can we explain that, in addition to rational, logically justified actions, people are also characterized by irrational, emotional, idealistic, and moral actions? Some of these issues were reconsidered in our recent scientific research [11].

If we briefly formulate the concept explaining the nature of consciousness through the phenomenon of information exchange, we can say that consciousness is one of the acting manifestations within a single global informational field, and a necessary condition for the formation of the so-called noosphere, in the terms of Vernadsky and Teilhard de Chardin [12]. However, such an explanation of the nature of consciousness will not be exhaustive, like all the previous ones.

*The concept of evolution* (as the basis for the development of consciousness phenomenon) can be presented in different ways. The most well-known version of Darwin's theory of “natural selection and evolution of species” states that as a result of the struggle for existence and adaptation to environmental conditions, different types of living organisms are improving, and this is probably how the psyche and human consciousness eventually emerge. However, modern genetics denies the possibility of such fundamental changes in organisms only through the mechanisms of adaptation; these changes must be determined at the genetic level. In addition, the concept of evolutionary adaptation is not entirely applicable to humans, because humans often do not adapt to external environmental conditions so much as change them for themselves, varying the means of activity, their knowledge, skills and abilities.

Finally, the study of the evolution of living organisms does not explain the informational capabilities of the human brain and the direction of evolution itself in its projections on man, thinking, and knowledge. On the other hand, it would be unjustified to deny the obvious connection of the human body with the processes of life in general, as well as the connection of human consciousness with certain features of the human body structure, with all the peculiarities of gender and age development.

*The labor concept*, or the theory on the origin of consciousness as a result of the development of labor, is taken into account by archaeology and anthropology, and this concept supposedly has numerous confirmations from these sciences. But much remains unclear. For example, the earliest stone tools are 2.5 million years old. But the really noticeable manifestations of human consciousness, associated with the ability to creativity (cave paintings), with spirituality (as evidenced by special burials of people, the first religious buildings), appear in the interval from 100 to 35 thousand years ago. Thus, we can assume that the anthropological species *homo habilis* (i.e. “handy man”), whose emergence is associated with labor skills, appeared more than 2 million years earlier than our modern species *homo sapiens* (“intelligent man”, “knowledgeable man”). The level of consciousness development (including intelligence) is what fundamentally distinguishes the previous hominids – “*habilis*” and “*erectus*” – from “*sapiens*”, i.e. us, with our developed consciousness. Our species “*sapiens sapiens*”, which belongs to the genus *Homo*, from the Hominid family of primates, has emerged not so long ago by the measures of evolutionary history – in the Upper Paleolithic period, about 40 thousand years ago.

Hence, the “labor theory” does not explain why, in the presence of the phenomenon of labor, with the use of tools, the evolutionary and historical process of consciousness formation in hominids of previous species was actually either absent or slowed down for a very long time.

It is also fair to say that the manufacture of tools in itself required a fairly developed intellect. On the other hand, the relationship between thinking, cognition and human labor technologies is quite obvious. So, there *is* a certain connection, but is it *decisive* on the part of labor – in relation to consciousness? It is probably much more complex, multifactorial, and ambiguous. To this day, all attempts to involve developed animals in stable actions with elementary tools have not yielded positive results; and most importantly, animals do not acquire abstract thinking. This suggests that in order for activity with tools to lead to the formation of developed consciousness and to launch a cultural and historical process, it is necessary to have a sufficient highly developed intellect, or at least the beginnings of consciousness. It turns out that consciousness must precede its own emergence (which is a paradox). That is why the labor concept, even in logical terms, remains not sufficiently correct.

Finally, *the concept of active self-generation of human consciousness*, or the so-called *substantial concept*, tries to present consciousness as a specific, human-level, individual manifestation of the original foundation of the world – spirit, or intellect, or idea (eidos), or universal mind (or any other ontological principle). This concept explains, for example, the direction of evolutionary processes as a movement toward the fullest manifestation of the qualities of the world's substance. To a certain extent, the substantial concept aims to explain the dynamism of the processes of being (since spirit is often identified with movement, with energy), which is associated with the relevant characteristics of consciousness: the ability of human mind to self-awareness, self-reflection, as well as the transcendental vector of consciousness – eternal attraction to the ideal, to higher intelligence, to spirituality, to certain standards (ethical, rational, aesthetic).

However, this concept of the “active self-generation” of consciousness also burdens us with a series of difficult questions. For example, individual human consciousness is based on a constant internal effort, and in addition to the state of consciousness, a person is also influenced by his or her own subconscious. An equally complicated question is: if consciousness is initially ideal, then why does it happen that for its manifestation a person needs rather imperfect material reality, i.e. our physical world? What role does human suffering, phobias, the awareness of one's own finitude (physical death), and the search for ways to immortality play in the substantial process of consciousness? Does consciousness die with the death of a person? If consciousness finally ceases with the death of a person, then this is completely inconsistent with religious dogmas such as the “immortality of the soul”.

Thus, we have shown the imperfection of each of the main theories on the origin of consciousness. At the same time, their analysis is still useful at least to think more profoundly about the complicated nature of consciousness, and many aspects of its manifestation and functioning.

**Conclusions.** The socio-philosophical analysis of the problem of consciousness and the main theories of its origin, provided in this article, allows us to outline several important points that contribute to a better understanding of this complex phenomenon.

From a *general scientific* perspective, consciousness can be defined as the ability of a person to be aware of himself, the world around him, and his activities, including perception, thinking, emotions, memory, and free will. Consciousness is the highest form of mental activity that provides reflection, self-knowledge, and purposeful behavior. In the *philosophical sense*, consciousness is an integrative property of the psyche characterized by the subject's ability to reflection, intentionality, and subjective experience. Within the framework of philosophy of mind, it is viewed as a phenomenon that combines cognitive, phenomenal, and neurophysiological aspects.

A study of the main concepts of the origin of consciousness allows us to conclude that none of them can explain all the complexities of consciousness as a phenomenon (and perhaps a key condition) of human existence, but each of them highlights and emphasizes very important features of consciousness. That is why we ought to take them all into account, understanding and evaluating them as peculiar fragments of a single complex mosaic picture. And although the whole picture does not come together at once, its individual fragments give us a decent opportunity to imagine it quite fully and comprehensibly. Philosophy, psychology, cognitive, natural, medical, and other sciences are actively pursuing scientific investigations and penetrating deeper into the nature of consciousness, but the potential for further research into this complex phenomenon is far from being exhausted.

## СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. Sapolsky R.M. *Behave : the biology of humans at our best and worst*. New York: Penguin Books, 2017. 800 pages.
2. Sapolsky R.M. *Determined : a science of life without free will*. New York: Penguin Books, 2023. 515 pages.
3. Berent, I. *The blind storyteller : how we reason about human nature*. Oxford University Press, 2020. 288 pages.
4. Hatfield G.C. *The Routledge guidebook to Descartes' Meditations*. New York: Routledge, 2014. 364 pages.
5. Gaudemard L. *Rethinking Descartes's substance dualism*. Cham: Springer, 2021. 152 pages.
6. Hanna R. *Cognition, content, and the a priori : a study in the philosophy of mind and knowledge* (First edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015. 477 pages.
7. Pribram K.H. The cognitive revolution and mind / brain issues. *American Psychologist*. Vol. 41, Issue 5. 1986. Pages 507–520. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.41.5.507>
8. Pribram K.H. Consciousness reassessed. *Mind and Matter*. Vol. 2(1). 2004. Pages 7–35. URL: <https://philpapers.org/rec/PRICR>
9. Eccles J.C. *The Neurophysiological basis of Mind : the principles of neurophysiology*. Oxford: Clarendon press, 1960. 314 pages.
10. Eccles J.C. *Mind and brain : the many-faceted problems* (2nd edition). New York: Paragon House, 1985. 349 pages.
11. Stovpets O., Borinshtein Y., Yershova-Babenko I., Kozobrodova D., Madi H., Honcharova O. Digital technologies and human rights: challenges and opportunities. *Amazonia Investiga*. Vol. 12(72). 2023. Pages 17–30. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.34069/AI/2023.72.12.2>
12. Teilhard de Chardin P. *The Phenomenon of Man*. New York: Harper, 1959. 318 pages.

## REFERENCES

1. Sapolsky, R.M. (2017). *Behave : the biology of humans at our best and worst*. New York: Penguin Books. 800 pages. [in English].
2. Sapolsky, R.M. (2023). *Determined : a science of life without free will*. New York: Penguin Books. 515 pages. [in English].
3. Berent, I. (2020). *The blind storyteller : how we reason about human nature*. Oxford University Press. 288 pages. [in English].
4. Hatfield, G.C. (2014). *The Routledge guidebook to Descartes' Meditations*. New York: Routledge. 364 pages. [in English].
5. Gaudemard, L. (2021). *Rethinking Descartes's substance dualism*. Cham: Springer. 152 pages. [in English].
6. Hanna, R. (2015). *Cognition, content, and the a priori : a study in the philosophy of mind and knowledge*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 477 pages. [in English].
7. Pribram, K.H. (1986). The cognitive revolution and mind/brain issues. *American Psychologist*, 41(5), pp. 507–520. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.41.5.507> [in English].
8. Pribram, K.H. (2004). Consciousness reassessed. *Mind and Matter*, 2(1), pp. 7–35. URL: <https://philpapers.org/rec/PRICR> [in English].
9. Eccles, J.C. (1960). *The Neurophysiological basis of Mind : the principles of neurophysiology*. Oxford: Clarendon press. 314 pages. [in English].
10. Eccles, J.C. (1985). *Mind and brain : the many-faceted problems*. New York: Paragon House. 349 pages. [in English].
11. Stovpets, O., Borinshtein, Y., Yershova-Babenko, I., Kozobrodova, D., Madi, H., & Honcharova, O. (2023). Digital technologies and human rights: challenges and opportunities. *Amazonia Investiga*, 12(72), pp. 17–30. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.34069/AI/2023.72.12.2> [in English].
12. Teilhard de Chardin, P. (1959). *The Phenomenon of Man*. New York: Harper. 318 pages. [in English].



**Стовпець Василь Григорович**

кандидат філологічних наук, доцент,  
професор кафедри національного та міжнародного права,  
директор Центру освітніх послуг  
Одеського національного морського університету  
вул. Мечникова, 34, Одеса, Україна  
orcid.org/0000-0002-3761-6330

**Стовпець Олександр Васильович**

доктор філософських наук, професор,  
професор кафедри соціальних і гуманітарних дисциплін  
Одеського національного морського університету  
вул. Мечникова, 34, Одеса, Україна  
orcid.org/0000-0001-8001-4223

**Сіньковська Тетяна Вікторівна**

старша викладачка кафедри соціальних і гуманітарних дисциплін,  
директорка Центру позанавчальної діяльності  
Одеського національного морського університету  
вул. Мечникова, 34, Одеса, Україна

## СОЦІАЛЬНО-ФІЛОСОФСЬКЕ ПЕРЕОСМИСЛЕННЯ ОСНОВНИХ ТЕОРІЙ ПОХОДЖЕННЯ СВІДОМОСТІ

***Актуальність** статті обґрунтовується тим, що проблема свідомості є однією з ключових у сучасній філософії, когнітивних, природничих та соціальних науках, оскільки вона безпосередньо пов'язана з питаннями самосприйняття, пізнання та взаємодії людини зі світом. У статті наголошується на тому, що свідомість є не лише механізмом адаптації людини до соціального та природного середовища, а й інструментом творчості та раціонального осмислення реальності. Сучасні концепції свідомості поєднують соціальні, когнітивні та нейрофізіологічні аспекти, що підіймає ряд питань про природу свідомості та вимагає комплексного аналізу. Коректне розуміння механізмів свідомості є важливим для розвитку когнітивних технологій, штучного інтелекту і нейромереж, та поведінкових наук. **Мета дослідження** полягає у спробі соціально-філософського переосмислення феномену свідомості. Такий аналіз пов'язаний із ґрунтовним вивченням найбільш релевантних теорій походження свідомості, що дає змогу краще зрозуміти найважливіші аспекти функціонування свідомості, та сприяє проясненню її сутності. **Теоретико-методологічний базис.** Для даного дослідження основоположними стали міждисциплінарний і системний підходи, діалектичний метод, а також загальнонаукові логічні прийоми. **Результати дослідження.** На сьогодні неможливо констатувати існування якоїсь єдиної універсальної теорії, яка б пояснювала всі причини виникнення та закономірності розвитку такого складного явища, як свідомість. Водночас, у статті досліджено основні концепції, що пояснюють можливі причини походження людської свідомості крізь призму соціальних, когнітивних, інформаційних, еволюційних, нейрофізіологічних, трансцендентних аспектів. Проаналізовано історичні підходи до розуміння свідомості, а також їх еволюцію в межах філософії свідомості. Окрему увагу приділено відмінностям людської свідомості від поведінкових реакцій інших живих істот. Основні теоретичні підходи до пояснення феномена свідомості можна звести до таких загальнометодологічних установок, як дуалізм, фізикалізм та панпсихізм. Таким чином, стаття робить внесок у сучасну дискусію про природу свідомості, узагальнюючи її теоретичні основи та окреслюючи перспективи подальших досліджень.*

***Ключові слова:** свідомість, людина, інтелект, філософія свідомості, походження свідомості.*