

Conceptual Foundations of Modern Mythology

Tetiana Oleksandrivna Tsepka¹

¹Vinnitsia Mykhailo Kotsiubynskyi State Pedagogical University, Ukraine.

Abstract

The objective of the article is to analyze theoretical and applied myth studies, to establish the role of myth in the process of mythopoeia, to identify the artistic work's mythopoetic peculiarities that combine imaginative and emotional thinking, subconscious achievements of general culture, auteur worldviews, mythological schemes, structures, motives, symbols, means of poetic speech, etc.

Investigation of mythological structures in the poet's artistic worldview system is the key to deciphering the in-depth meanings of the author's myth-thinking. This includes both broader worldwide and more specific ethnic-national cultural achievements along with the individual worldview features, which are formed on rational experience and integrate both actual and imagined reality. All components of the mythic consciousness at the sensory level are most frequently implemented in the works of literature. The universe is explained through ancient ideas and beliefs reflecting ontological and axiological concepts at the mental-verbal level. The mythopoetic analysis of the artistic text allows a more profound understanding and interpretation of the author's worldview. It deals with immersing into the dimension of poetic allusions, deciphering the implicit code of the poet's speech, identification of objective and subjective reasons to appeal to ethnocultural sources.

The results obtained can be practically employed in teaching such disciplines as: "Theory of Literature", "History of Literature of the 20th Century", "Mythological and Neo-Mythological Schools in Literary Science", as well as in the development of manuals and textbooks, in the study of the mythopoeics of an artistic work.

The scientific novelty of this work lies in an improved scientific approach to the interpreting paradigm of myth, archetype, archetypal image, and mythology. The said approach promotes analysis of the methods of implementing the myth in the art of the twentieth century, its impact on the formation of the artist's narrative, and transforming it into literature mythologism.

Key-words: Myth, Mythology, Archetype, Mythological Thinking.

1. Introduction

Introduce the Problem

The application of the myth-critical approach to literature works necessitates the comprehension of the primary sources of collective aesthetic consciousness and the analysis of individual-author mythopoeia. The reception of the mythopoetic process results in a profound awareness of the cultural and philosophical origins of the spiritual tradition, which are founded on the principles of the pagan and Christian worldview. The work of art, as a subjective reflection of the universe, embodies the author's concept of the world, which, being re-interpreted, brings the reader to an understanding of the writer's individuality. Both the author's own worldview and cultural motives are reflected indirectly through imaginative constructions. The latter embody myth in fiction and are significant for the auteur's creative act.

Explore the Importance of the Problem

The preeminent function of myth in the literature has been proved by J. Holosovker (1987), O. Losev (2008), Y. Lotman (1996), V. Toporov (1995), F.W.J Schelling (1998), et al. Folklore-mythological connections in the literature have been confirmed by M. Bakhtin (1975), O. Veselovsky (1959), V. Davydiuk (1997), E. Meletynsky (1995), O. Potebnya (1989), V. Propp (1976), O. Freidenberg (1998) et al. The implementation of mythopoetic thinking in the works of some Ukrainian writers was studied by N. Anisimova (2012), O. Buryak (2001), Y. Hanoshenko (2006), H. Hrabovich (1991), T. Hrebenuk (Sayapina) (2000), V. Kopytsia (2006), N. Korobkova (2008), T. Meizerska (1997), J. Polishchuk (2002), O. Turhan (1995), I. Chernova (1999), T. Shestopalova (2001) and many others.

Describe Relevant Scholarship

The methodology of scientific study is based upon in-depth analyses of archetypal theory and mythological criticism by H. Bashliar (1998), M. Eliade (1996), K. Levi-Strauss (2000), N. Fry (2007), C.G. Jung (1991); scientific works on conceptual foundations of mythology and mythopoetics by O. Veselovsky (1959), J. Holosovker (1987), O. Losev (2008), Y. Lotman (1996), O. Potebnya (1989), V. Toporov (1995) et al. The fundamental studies of modern Ukrainian literary critics in the field of myth analysis and theory of the mythopoetics, such as T. Meizerska (1997), V. Kuievda (2007), R. Markiv (2008), A. Neamtsu (2008), O. Polysaiev (2008), Y. Polishchuk (2002), O. Turhan (1995) et al., were used in this work.

2. Results and Discussion

Modern myth criticism has absorbed an extensive experience in studying the connections between literature and mythology, so it has a marked tendency to combine different conceptual foundations and research methods.

F.W.J. von Schelling, the founder of the theistic concept, in his later Historical-Critical Introduction to the Philosophy of Mythology attempted to justify the reasons why artists of different periods appealed to mythology. According to him, mythological narratives are

[...] neither invented, imaginary nor arbitrarily accepted. They are generated independently of the thinking and will, and differ for consciousness as an ambiguous and ineradicable reality. Peoples and individuals are just tools in the process that is beyond their reach, which they serve without understanding it. It does not depend on them to avoid these ideas, whether to absorb them or not, because they do not come to them from the outside, they are inside, although no one realizes how they emerged in there, because they come from the bowels of the consciousness itself (Schelling, 1998, p. 323).

That is, according to this concept, myth-thinking is effected unconsciously and independently of external factors.

I. Franko (1969, p. 96) singled out in the writing creativity one of the most important features of the unconscious – eruptiveness, that is, the ability “to occasionally raise entire complex systems of long-buried impressions and memories, combined, again and again unconsciously, one by one in the daylight of the upper consciousness”. Thus, despite his positivist orientation, he approached the psychoanalytic concept of the “collective unconscious” as a source of individual creativity, which made part of the Jungian theory of archetypes.

C.G. Jung (1991, p. 273) argued that the sources of creative acts are subconscious and beyond our understanding, as any attempt to decode them would be only assumptions, while the author’s personality is not capable of fully determining the specifics of the work of art since art is universal, “suprapersonal”.

M. Eliade (1996, p. 12), who adhered to the anthropocentric mythological concept, argued that myth

[...] recounts sacred history, tells about events that occurred in the past <...>. It is always a narration of a ‘something’ that was created, where we are told how something had happened, whereas with the myth we stand at the origins of the existence of this ‘something’.

This researcher emphasized that mythology introduces us to the “primordial, fundamental” narrations “that affirm a human existentially, and everything related to their existence and way of being in this world is directly related to it” (Eliade, 1996, p. 22). The artist’s work is similar to the “creation of the world” and, naturally, is associated with the desire to affirm the human existentially. Perhaps, this can explain the reason why the writers appeal to mythology, especially in such unstable times as the twentieth century.

The influence of mythology on literature has been studied by M. Bakhtin, O. Veselovsky, E. Meletynsky, O. Potebnia, V. Propp, O. Freudenberg and others. The creative function of myth in literary creativity was analyzed by J. Holosovker, A. Hurduz, I. Zvarych, O. Losev, Y. Lotman, A. Neamtsu, V. Toporov, and others. N. Anisimova, O. Buryak, Y. Hanoshenko, L. Holomb, H. Hrabovich, T. Hrebenuk (Sayapina), I. Keivan, V. Kopytsia, N. Korobkova, T. Meizerska, Y. Polishchuk, O. Turhan, I. Chernova, T. Shestopalova and others studied the implementation of mythopoetic thinking in the works of some Ukrainian writers. Their research proves the existence of a mythological component in many Ukrainian writings.

The fact that myth is functionally active in contemporary culture motivates us to rethink its traditional concepts. For example, J. Polishchuk (2002, p. 6) accurately points out that myth is

[...] a universal cultural phenomenon, the meaning of which goes beyond specific temporal dimensions (however, in every age, it is fixed within spiritual time coordinates) as the primordial code of symbols, meanings, worldviews, or, in terms of science, archetypes.

World mythology is a complex system of mythological images and plots, folk beliefs and imaginations, customs and rituals. J. Holosovker notes that the plot of any myth comprises layers of different eras and tribes, echoes of different religious and moral beliefs, residues of cults, etc. He indicates that “the story of the myth is a complex conglomerate in all sections of its plot’s body” (Holosovker, 1987, p. 48).

Archaic beliefs, permanent mythological constructions were formed and polished following historical changes. They were refined and transformed in the process of the mankind’s cultural development. M. Lifshitz (1979, p. 51) emphasizes the cognitive significance of mythology, recognizes the reflection of historical events in myths, notes the geographical and temporal factors affecting the formation of myth worldview:

Myths are historical idioms, formed in one way or another due to a certain semi-occasional coincidence of circumstances, in different regions individually, which made more or less general, sustainable sense only in the course of their century-long processing.

Thus, mythology becomes a means of expression of human existence and gains personal character. According to A. Losev (2008, p. 108), “myth implies personal existence, personal form, an image of personality”, which reproduces the integrity of worldview, an individual experience combined with cultural heritage, archetypal constants, understanding of reality based on sensory reflection. A. Losev (2008, p. 64) argues that myth is “a reality that is created actually, substantively, and sensually”, albeit mostly on the subconscious level.

Sensual images, empirical experience, apriori knowledge are implemented in myth-consciousness and are conveyed through mythopoeia. The reality in the structure of a mythological text is described, explained and transformed into an individual mythological paradigm. The work of art absorbs all the metamorphoses of the real and imaginary world, representing a complex system of mythological elements, schemes, images, and motifs.

It should be emphasized that the mythopoeia of each writer is marked by their personality, various psychological factors, due to external social and personal aspects. Obviously, the artist’s individuality will always remain only a semi-fathomed mystery. However, according to T. Meizerska, the work of art is a subjective explanation of the universe communicated through the prism of the author's worldview. After all,

[...] artistic creativity is nothing but a manifestation of the artist's intentions of spirit, his worldview, intelligence, and feelings. In his works, the artist seemingly multiplies himself, his spirituality, which is implicitly manifested in the integrity of his ideas, dissolved in specific forms. Thus, his worldview is transformed into the subjective author-creator idea, and hence - in the existence of the text (Meizerska, 1997, p. 22).

Accordingly, the artistic text reflects the author’s worldview and, at the same time, the cultural experience of humanity including mythology. Olha Turhan (1995, p. 3) emphasizes that “two layers of artistic culture are organically combined in each work: the folk-mythological consciousness and the author's social-artistic consciousness”.

This correlates with the concept of V. Toporov (1995, p. 4), according to which the author's appeal to mythological schemes is effected unconsciously, and the literary texts doubly relate to “mythological, symbolic, archetypal as the highest class of universal sign modi”: first, the presence of these modi is traced in passive-source texts; second, artistic texts can also perform an “active” function when they “form” and “play out "the mythological and symbolic and open the archetypal path from the dark depths of the subconscious to the light of consciousness”.

In the process of writing, the author subconsciously employs archetypal images, ancient beliefs, and common cultural mythological constructs, which testifies to the productivity of mythological

thinking. Although each artist shapes his own reality in his text and reflects his own worldview, at the same time, he employs already created models of reality that are embedded in our subconscious. E. Avetyan (1989, p. 231) states that “the nature of thinking per se, including the artistic one, may not be described clearly. Numerous acts of creativity are realized in the subconscious, and the creator, thus, acts as nature itself, moreover, as a sentient nature”. Consequently, the mythopoeia develops regardless of the author's will, but is not entirely unconscious since the latter is the “sentient nature”.

Therefore, the person's empirical experience, social and historical life conditions, material standing, personal development, the individual ambitions affect his ability to reproduce mythological modi only to a certain extent. The author's personality does not necessarily affect his mythological thinking, and the myth consciousness does not appeal to the empirical, antecedent human experience. The artist's thinking goes far beyond his consciousness. O. Veselovsky (1959, p. 117) adhered to this view, arguing that “the process effected in the mind of an individual who created myths is identical to that effected in the contemporary poet's mind”. However, this does not mean that the modern writer merely reproduces ancient ideas and ancient mythology. Mythopoeia is a continuous process, regardless of a historical period, social conditions and level of self-consciousness, as evidenced by literary samples of different eras. The mythologism of the literary text is always rooted in the traditional beliefs of our ancestors to become the reason for the auteur's myth-making.

The basis of mythologism in the literary tradition is mythological thinking. This view is substantiated by R. Markiv, who suggested that the level of primordial consciousness (archetypes) is recreated in a literary work by plotting a holistic structure of myth or a ritual-mythological model.

In such a case, the newly created figurative structure involves archaic mechanisms of mythological thinking to show the worldview specifics together with artistic and poetic reproduction of the foundations of the primordial, mythological worldview and thinking of the literary character (Markiv, 2008, p. 35).

Myth-thinking, combined with certain mythological schemes, structures, motives, images, means of poetic narration, is the foundation of mythopoetics. E. Meletynsky (1995, p. 295) supplements the concept of mythopoetics with a “worldview existing beyond this concept”. I. Diakonov (1990, p. 35) emphasizes that mythopoetic thinking is “tropical thinking, which accommodates inseparability of rational-logical and figuratively-emotional onsets”. V. Toporov (1995, p. 5) also accentuates the “ectropic orientation” of the mythopoetic, whereas O. Kychenko (2002, p. 168) perceives the concept of mythopoetics both as “the form (internal structure) of the poetic text organization and a text's functional-semantic unit based on the interpretation of the myth's communicative features via poetic

narrative”. This implies that the mythopoetics of the literary text is formed by the tropical system, the imagery, the individual author’s style modifications, and the mythological viewpoint.

Exploring the mythopoetic paradigm in Ukrainian and Western European prose, A. Hurduz identified two main representation variants of the mythopoetic system: 1)

[...] when a work is saturated with mythological elements or references to them (allusions, reminiscences, etc.) without forming associative-symbolic subtext, so the mythopoetic system formed in the text does not have an ordered eventful core, kernel, or a number of such cores, kernels (Hurduz, 2008, p. 26);

2) “if the mythopoetic component of the work both is structural and (being subjacent or dominant in a certain text fragment) can be considered as a mythopoetic motive, a plot” (Hurduz, 2008, p. 27). Thus, the mythopoetic organization of the text is formed by means of poetic narrative, figurative constructions, mythological schemes, subtext, metanarrative, mythopoetic motives, plots, images, etc.

T. Hrebenyuk (Sayapina) defines the mythological poetry as a set of creative means of content and form that help understand the mythological meaning of the work. This content emerging, at the reader’s conscious or subconscious perception level, “through the layering of subject-logical thinking in brilliant or highly talented artistic text, may contain a concept of the mythological model of the world, schemes of primordial mythological thinking, primary images and motives of human culture” (Sayapina, 2000, p. 34).

Figurative constructions as a means to incorporate myth in fiction are important for the creative act of a writer, who uses them somehow to reflect both their own worldview and cultural motives. All these constructions are the core of the literary work’s poetics and make the basis for mythopoeia, which we perceive as logical, implicit, and sometimes deliberately concealed elements and structures. This allows us to speak about the meta-language of artistic text, which also unfolds the myth. K. Stein pays considerable attention to this phenomenon and considers meta-language to be a special and indispensable element of mythopoeia.

In the process of writing, the author constantly reflects on creativity. The author’s code is most fully contained in the meta-language of the poetic text and manifests itself in the course of self-interpretation, which is carried out throughout the poet’s work, not always consciously. Hence the important “vertical” reading of the text, which contributes to the systematization of “non-structural” in the structure (of marginalities) – pronunciations, preteritions, semantic gestures relating to creativity, language, poetics (Stein, 2007, p. 41).

In this way, the author manages to convey the hidden content embedded in his work for the purpose of reducing proto-plots, rethinking traditional motifs, revealing the ambiguity of images-

symbols, assimilating universal cultural dominants, etc. To that end, the writer uses other non-linguistic means of expression, such as irony, or allegorism allowing the creation of additional validation components in the text's structure, as well as allusion as a means of non-literal communicating of content, etc.

All of these elements are the result and content modus of mythopoeia. The monograph by N. Boyko and A. Kaidash (2010, p. 9), “Mythologems in the Ukrainian Romanticism Space” states, “Myth-making should be considered not only the oldest form of human thought development but also as a kind of symbolic “meta-language”. Symbols are another extra-linguistic way to express myth in the artistic text, so they make up a sui generis mythological worldview system. R. Barthes (1989) referred to meta-language as a special mythological discourse formed in the mind of the author as a result of a certain system of values. All these values realize the mythological content that can be read by the interaction of all mythological elements. This allows referring to myth in the artistic text as a product of mythopoeia.

By the same token, O. Potebnya (1989, p. 260) attributed mythological thinking to every member of an ethnic culture and considered it absolute and all-encompassing:

Mythological thinking at a certain level of development is the only possible, necessary, reasonable; it is peculiar not to a certain historical period but belongs to people of all times, who reached a certain level of thought development; it is formal, that is, it does not rule out any content: neither religious nor philosophical and scientific.

The versatility of mythological thinking provides literary work with understanding and perception of different recipients, regardless of their age, gender, nationality or era.

J. Holosovker (1987, p. 11) interprets traditional myth-thinking as “ancient and primitive thinking, whereas the imagination itself is reduced to infantile thinking. It is conferred, perhaps, to art, poetry as a domain that operates images, i.e., means of the same mythological thinking”, and thus it substantiates consistency between artistic creativity and mythology.

The world heritage of mythology is global and common for essentially different ethnic groups. To this extent, mythological thinking implies not only the nativist reproduction of ancient ideas but also the formation of individual worldview through expanded culture and self-knowledge. V. Kuieva recognizes psychological and sensual factors in this and clarifies the causes of myth-thinking: in the process of mental activity, human accumulate a complex system of ideas in their memory and consciousness, reflect the complex inner human world, acquired through the world perception, in combination with the real and imaginary reality. The scientist asserts that significant cognitive

attainments are displaced to the periphery of mental activity due to situational or stage-life priority ranking through actualizing values and certain phenomena.

Such an objective reality, which is usually deemed a part of the picture of the world, exists beyond the person's will, rather the individual is “admitted” to its comprehension, perception, reflection. The concept of the “picture of the world” is close to the “image of the world”, which means the forms of reflection of reality in the human mind. It is essential to note that, at the sensual level of cognition, feelings, perceptions and representations become images, and at the level of thinking, judgments, concepts, theories are images, too (Kuievda, 2007, p. 12).

Sensual images, as a result of productive imagination, provide the connection between the human and the environment and, in their interaction, reproduce the worldview positions of the individuals, their spiritual orientations, specifics of self-regulation, etc. The worldview depends on personal impressions and on personal empirical experience, which consists in forming views, convictions, beliefs, attitudes to the world, personal ideals, life positions, whatsoever. Each worldview in its structure consists of a picture of the world, a social model, the individual's ideals and personal life position, and, therefore, directly refers to mythological thinking, since it encompasses all facets of the inner world, understanding of the environment and the ability to coexist with the external world.

The connection between the human and the world stems from the individual's self-cognition and the animation of the environment, through the desire to integrate with nature and to self-improve. V. Kuievda (2007, p. 17-18) in such interaction points out the idea of nature consonance, which

[...] is the leading life-setting, the motivator of Harmony, objectified mental urge, the assembly of ideas, the image based on the man's desire to achieve the highest order with Nature, trying to build up one's own model of the world, to form one's own behavior upon organic unity with Nature. Such a directive basis for the organization of a human's life activities provides them with the highest level of self-realization, and, consequently, a happy life.

Note that in the imagination of our ancestors, a man identified himself with nature or acted directly as its integral, and, therefore, such a unity of a man and nature is an important mythological concept. The love for nature remains the core of the ancient worldview, while myth is an attempt to explain its laws and phenomena. This is systematically reflected in the mythological consciousness, manifestations of which are exposed in fiction on the contemporary historical stage of development. This is quite natural because artistic creativity has the ability to capture all possible states of the human psyche. Thus, V. Kuievda (2007, p. 12) emphasizes the accommodation of individual psychic reactions within myth-consciousness:

Myth, mythological consciousness, which are so actively used in all genres of verbal creativity as something naive, ephemeral, archaic, still remains a fact of our mental life, powerfully declaring itself, particularly in extreme human conditions - the loss of proper mind control is compensated by the resource potential of intuition, of a reckless belief in the incomprehensible, the infallible.

All components of the myth-consciousness at the sensual level are fully implemented in artistic creativity. As noted in *Mythologems in the Ukrainian Romanticism Space*, the monograph by N. Boiko and A. Kaidash (2010, p. 20), “mythology, as a means of global comprehension of the world, is the result of creative cognitive act of mythological consciousness, serving as the basis of mythological worldview and a kind of mental-verbal model”. In other words, the mythologism of artistic work is determined by the peculiarities of the artist's worldview, the unconscious reflection of the mythological picture of the world, the appeal to folk traditions, customs and ideas.

R. Markiv (2008, p. 35-36) emphasizes the integrity of mythological thinking and its ability to generalize and defines the concept of mythologism as

[...] ideas, images, motives transformed into the verbal-artistic system that originate from myth and affect the ideological and symbolic content of literary work; as a way of poetic organization of material in a literary work through the use of a system of images close to constructed by mythological thinking or semantically transformed in the bowels of verbal poetical creativity (mythological folklore), which, in the work, acts as an artistic means of expressing certain aboriginal, steady spiritual national constants, for the sake of deepening the logical levels of the work.

Therefore, the figurative system of the work is only one of the components of its mythopoetics. Nonetheless, it should be taken into account that the mythological image is capable of specifically affecting the consciousness of the reader, revealing the mysteries of the world, explaining the ontological categories and reflecting the people's worldview. Ancient beliefs were transformed into a conventional image system with an ontological orientation, as is emphasized by O. Bilokobylsky, who indicated that a primitive man perceived reality through images which were formed by an ontological system.

Actualizing the objects of this reality with the use of various classifications and rituals, the myth imparts a certain meaning and, thus, distinguishes them for the mythical subject. Associated with the ontological myth, spatial and temporal “benchmarks”, the object is fixed in the general order of existence and acquires ontological status. Consequently, a new element of reality is constructed within the mythical ontology and, as such, exists only within the given ontology (Bilokobylsky, 2004, p. 97).

Mythological images, while reproducing the ancient worldview, are important both for literary myth-making and for understanding the real world. A. Polysaiev (1976, p. 12) notes that

[...] mythical images are aimed primarily at establishing a harmonious relationship with the world, overcoming its foreignness and anxiety, the fear it emanates and overwhelms the human consciousness with the horror of the miscomprehension; at the arrangement of coexistence. The latter is possible not only by explaining the established order but also by creating, using a mythical image, a behavioral pattern that is fixed as a norm through the implementation of mythical narratives or rituals that, through virtual collective activity, mentally unite people in certain communities.

Hence, we can conclude that the mythological image is a product of the people's creation and a part of the ethnic consciousness. M. Steblin-Kamensky (1976, p. 87) also emphasized this, arguing that “<...> myth is not just images that arose in the mind of an individual, but images that are entrenched in word and become a product of the whole collective”.

The achievements of world literature are clear proof that myth embodies the common cultural heritage which means that different peoples may have shared mythological subjects and many ontological concepts and spiritual constants are common to all nations. Thus, myth is a universal, common cultural, all-encompassing mode of being that has preserved its functionality for many centuries and continues to exist in modern variations. Repeatedly, scholars of mythology in literature have stated the commonality or similarity of plots, images, motives, symbols of different peoples and in different historical periods. A. Neamtsu argues that such event-semantic and axiological dominants of traditional material are easily perceived, understood, and re-interpreted by readers of different historical eras.

The patterns of functioning of traditional plot-shaped material in the literature indicate that many legendary-mythological structures have retained their potential relevance for centuries and are constantly “taken out” from the cultural memory to make sense of both the general and, most importantly, the specific national-historical (Neamtsu, 2009, p .8).

This ensures the consistency and succession of the spiritual evolution of civilization and to outline certain universals of human behavior according to its ontological and axiological purpose.

A. Neamtsu (2009) distinguishes the special integral features of traditional plot in a literary work, such as the breadth of the interpretation range, the broad number of forms and methods of transformation, the potential ambiguity of traditionally-structured semantics, the active combination of national and international aspects, the presence of functionally significant common culture leitmotifs (archetypes, mythologems, etc.), the popularity (recognition) of the plot as the initial premise of ideological and aesthetic activity of traditional material in the new literary variation, the versatile all time-nature of the problematic, the metaphorical nature of traditional structures and their ability to

transform into symbols, emblems, concepts, as well as the multidimensional nature of narration process, and more.

In view of such diverse and broad functionality of myth, it is safe to say that a creative act reproduces, interprets, transforms and organically assimilates myth. Myth manifests itself in the work in different ways: independently, implicitly, indirectly or in the form of metamorphoses, but it is always there. Any artistic text may contain elements of myth, since the latter is distinct, as Yu. Hanoshenko notes, by the extra-temporal (anti-historical) nature of its deployment, the cross-cultural potential of organizing semantic and compositional models of gender, political-ideological, interpersonal relations.

Consequently, the myth may be considered a universal culture metatext. One of the basic features of myth is its immanent rooting in the structures of the human psyche at the level of the collective unconscious. It absorbs social and individual experience and is embodied in texts and cultural signs through creative impetus. The universal structural-semiotic scheme of myth is based on the psychological phenomenon of archetype, which is a general formal principle (pattern) of the organization of unconscious meanings and is projected into the text. This projection is revealed implicitly through concrete-sensory images and imagery structures (symbols, metaphors, traditional images, and plots), each of which is a homogeneous embodiment of the whole macrostructure of the myth, yet, in a collapsed form (Hanoshenko, 2006, p. 6).

A. Hurduz (2008, p. 19) links the literary use of myth-structures to “the desire to implement a new interpretation of mythological narrative, to affirm myth (its elements) in the modern world, to fit “contemporary realities into mythological context and to universalize them”. A. Neamtsu (2008, p. 113) elaborates on the functions of mythopoeia, arguing that the author’s appeal to legendary mythological material is

[...] rather an attempt to re-experience in a modern way, i.e. to comprehend this past in a qualitatively different spiritual context, to find and separate the deep connections and interdependence of distant eras, to model the difference of ethical potentials formed by the contradictory dynamics of social progress.

Functions of myth, such as the world representation, normalizing social behavior, developing own spiritual values on the basis of the common moral code, explaining supernatural phenomena, etc., indicate that myth serves as one of the components of national identity. A. Polysaiev (2008, p. 15) refers to it as a factor of ethnic consolidation:

Myth unites the community in principle with identical worldviews, shared cultural meanings and collective actions that have a ritual form and social and practical consequences. In this sense, myths are folk-originated, because they not only reveal the specificity of the cultural existence of certain

ethnic communities but also demonstrate the ability to unite people into communities with well-defined social and cultural specificity.

Regardless of the function that the myth performs in a particular literary work, its presence and influence on the subconscious of the reader are indisputable, especially when it comes to the reproduction of ethnological spiritual landmarks that pertain to every carrier of this mentality. In this case, people's ideas become the basis for explaining the universe within this particular ethnic group. This idea is confirmed in V. Kuievda's: "Myth and its derivative sensoforms in the system of human perception and worldview constitute, in some sense, the basic matrix of the overall picture of the world in ethnic-mental reality" (Kuievda, 2007, p. 12).

Of course, the ethnological factor of national mythology is fundamental, but one should not forget about the common world values and mythological borrowings from other cultures, which are often found in fiction. As A. Neamtsu (2009, p. 3) emphasizes, such intercultural interaction is of great importance for the spiritual revival of society and its liberation from the stereotypes and dogmas of the past, for the development of individual and collective experience, etc.,

Each literature, referring to the cultural traditions of other peoples, deepens and enriches its national spirituality, becomes an organic part of the human continuum, it absorbs foreign and concurrently affects the spiritual worlds of other nations. The prospect of such intercultural interaction does not need proof, especially in the age of globalization, when peoples seek ways to overcome their tragic past and try to revive the best national traditions.

Indeed, the achievements of world literature have a significant influence on the development of Ukrainian writing, but the literature work of each individual artist is always distinguished by their specific characteristics. The same is true for the level of mythopoetics. In particular, the Ukrainian writing tradition of the twentieth century is marked by a rootedness in Slavic beliefs and Christian traditions. In our opinion, this is quite natural, since Slavic mythology is closely connected with the nature and life of people, which formed the basis of their life in the pre-Christian period, that is, the myth used to embrace the main areas of life. In the era of technical and spiritual development, the man not only exhausts himself with ontological ideas but becomes the creator of a new mythology that is able of illuminating and explaining the worldview of modern man. Thus, we become witnesses of individual-auteurmythopoeia. F.W.J. Schelling (1966, p. 146) further emphasized that this is precisely the purpose of the artist and that "any great poet is called to transform the part of the world that he has discovered into a whole, and, to create his own mythology therefrom".

Mental processes of a personality affect the manner of writing, the idea of a work, its artistic means and the ways of expressing their thought. Accordingly, T. Meizerska (1997, p. 22) notes that

[...] creativity is a concrete subjective modality of being, the implementation of certain ideal forms, strictly enclosed with the limits of individual capabilities, where, first and foremost, the own system of thinking of the artist, his idea act as the main spiritual determinant of his creativity.

In most artists, mythology is not limited to the reflection and reconstruction of the ancient worldview, but also involves the creation of a new mythology, which, in its semantic load, can be layered on traditional components of myth-making or carry an entirely new semantic meaning and new concepts that can combine with both local and global myth-structures. O. Potebnya (1989, p. 266) also ruled out the leveling of conventional mythological elements in the process of authorial mythopoeia: “The creation of a new myth consists in the formation of a new word, but not in forgetting the meaning of the previous one”. Therefore, the content of the author's myth carries a new mythological code, which in no way affects the traditional and conventional mythological constructs, but - on the contrary – interacts with them.

Thus, the mythologism of a literary work encompasses the verbalization of the ethnic-cultural beliefs, elements of world mythology and individual-author myth. The individual specifics of the worldview in the monograph *Mythologems in the Ukrainian Romanticism Space* by N. Boyko and A. Kaidash is interpreted as a system of codified values of national myth poetics that is based on ethnic-cultural tradition and leads to the creation of a specific model of mythological existence. Meanwhile, “the author’s vision of the world is based on a deep system of pre-contextual knowledge that shapes the integral poetic structure of artistic creativity” (Boyko; Kaidash, 2010, p. 7). The researchers point to the indispensable connection of the author’s worldview with national specificity, excluding the creation of a fundamentally new, independent myth.

Each literary work bears the imprint of the author’s individuality, his unique artistic thinking, worldview and, consequently, the author’s myth creation. The author's myth reflects the very picture of the world and ontological representations that have formed in the subconscious of the artist on a sensual level in the process of self-discovery and connection with nature. The formation of sensual images in the artist's subconscious becomes the first step on the path to mythopoeia, in as much as, according to V. Kuievda (2007, p. 69), “sensual information, as a prerequisite for conceptual thinking, can be seen as a “conscious reflection” which, with the emergence of consciousness, is stored in the subconscious to the extent that it goes beyond the realm of consciousness for a given period of time”. Conceptual thinking becomes the basis of worldview and self-awareness, and, therefore, is conveyed into the plane of the artistic text and determines the specifics of the author's myth creation.

The process of individual mythopoeia involves changes in the author’s positions. As noted by A. Zabuzhko (2006, p. 23), “the creator of the author's myth literally “pays” with his own life, with all

his sensual and semantic authenticity in its entirety, for the metaphysical truth of his quasi-literary universalist message". That is, the writer builds and reproduces his own artistic world and the author's myth poetic paradigm, which manifests in his work on a sensual and subconscious level.

Exploring the problems of individual mythology, T. Meizerska considers creativity as a live, functional phenomenon, as a coherent text with certain conceptual settings, which is implemented and understood in absolute relation with the author's myth.

The very concept of individual mythology requires some abstraction, explication of some abstract text – a law that defines the limits of authorial intentions at different levels: imaginative, compositional, rhetorical and suggestive. It should always be borne in mind that the meaning, the concept of creativity is much richer than its individual explications. It is part of the conceptual field that virtually, existentially strains it. To understand the structure of the author's individual mythology means to comprehend his creativity in a certain spliced totality. To do this, one must firstly identify a certain invariant of value as an individual mental entity, secondly, validate creativity within its internal criteria, and thirdly, determine, subsequently, a living mobile structure of creativity, its individual dialectical logic of meaning flowing into forms and vice versa (Meizerska, 1997, p. 15).

However, the individual myth of a particular artist will, in any case, have ethnological features, since the author subconsciously refers to those archetypes and meta-symbols that are antecedently inherent in the ethnosocium to which the author belongs. As Olena Kolesnyk (2002, p. 7) points out, "unique ethnic-national characteristics enhance the aesthetic picture of mythopoesis".

As for the definition of the concept of mythology, basic for our research, we are oriented on the definition proposed by Y. Vyshnytska (2016, p. 25):

[...] mythologems conceal archetypes, they identify, manifest the collective trans-conscious (unconscious), acting as compressed language ethno-codes, which, when decoding, undergo the process of creative reproduction of embedded cultural information: the transformation of the culture's language into individual auteur's artistic narrative. Being components of the adaptation mechanism in artistic text and in society, mythologems reproduce complementary paradigms, reflect precedent meanings and simulate new, unique characteristics, peculiarities of the author's individual style.

Thus, the mythologem unfolds through the archetype and makes part of it. Nonetheless, it does not duplicate its semantic core but expresses a part of its meaning. Vi. Kopytsia (2006, p. 28) elaborated on the correlation of these two categories:

1) archetype is a simpler and more primitive integral part of mythopoetic than mythology; for the most part, it concerns a single image (archetypes of the prophet, wise old man, child), a single action (archetype of creation) or a particular time-space model (archetype of forest, city); 2) each mythologem

is based on a specific archetype or interaction of several archetypes (for example, the mythology of the world tree is based on the archetype of creation; the mythology of the road is the archetype of the traveler).

In these terms, a mythologem may express the meaning of several archetypes, but the same archetype may comprise in its structure both one and several mythologems. In literary processing, these categories frequently do not have any distinct delimitations and can be equated, as they both carry the imprint of the worldview of different times and peoples. T. Shestopalova (2001, p. 45) notes,

The scope of mythology is intermediate. As an archetypal image, it retains the ability to exist in multiple variabilities, which provides ample opportunity for interpretation. As a structural component of myth, it is capable of creating a spiritually visible universe.

The mythologem "is closely related to the archetype, expresses its detailed meaning and is a mandatory component of the myth, and, therefore, is distinguished by its myth-structure, internal architectonics, variability in decoding worldview origins and the possibility of artistic objectification in individual-auteurmythopoeia.

3. Conclusions

The manifestation of the primitive symbolism and spiritual constants of humanity synthesizes a myth. The presence of common images, plots and archaic representations in different mythologies confirms the phenomenon of intercultural interaction. An important factor in the implementation of myth analysis is the author's personal position in modeling the artistic picture of the world. At the heart of mythopoeics is myth-thinking, the realization of which, in a literary work, is provided by imaginative means, mythological schemes, images, motives, as well as allusions, overtones, meta-linguistic constructions, etc.

The archaic worldview and mythological consciousness are implemented through archetypes that concentrate the collective memory of the people. The same archetype can combine several archetypal images, figures, motifs that are implemented in mythopoeia. Mythologem is the structural unit of mythological text at the sentence level. It should be perceived as a myth image or a universal image-concept, which is based on a particular archetype and can express the meaning of several different archetypes. The smallest unit of myth - the mythologem - is identified with the image, metaphor, motif that is associated with the archetype through internal architectonics.

Thus, it can be argued that the mythologism of artistic thinking consists of two elements: 1) the reproduction of primitive popular ideas and 2) the new semantic satiation of established mythological

schemes. These two factors should be taken into account when analyzing the mythopoetics of the artistic text.

Myth penetrates all realms of our existence, completes and organizes human life, while remaining only a sensual image or metastructure that, in one way or another, manifests itself in fiction, which combines the intentions of myth thinking, the features of worldview and self-projection.

References

- Anisimova, N. (2012). *At the Change of Cultural Epochs: Poetry of the 80s of the Twentieth Century in the System of Late Ukrainian Modernism*. Berdyansk: Publishing house O.V. Tkachuk.
- Avetyan, E. (1989). *Semiotics and linguistics*. Yerevan: Publishing house of the University of Yerevan.
- Bakhtin, M. (1975). *Literature and Aesthetics Issues. Studies of Different Years*. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya literature.
- Barthes, R. (1989). *Selected Works: Semiotics. Poetics*. Moscow: Progress, 1989.
- Bashliar, H. (1998). *Water and Dreams. Experience with the Imagination of Matter*. Moscow: Publishing House of Humanitarian Literature, 1998.
- Bilokobylsky, O. (2004). *From Science to Myth: Ontological Studies*. Donetsk: Apex.
- Boyko, N.; Kaidash, A. (2010). *Mythologems in Ukrainian Romanticism Space: Monograph*. Nizhyn: Publishing house of NDU named after M. Gogol.
- Buryak, O. (2001). *Mythologism of Artistic Thinking of Bohdan-Ihor Antonych and Ihor Kalynets*. PhD in Linguistics dissertation. Kirovohrad, 2001.
- Chernova, I. (1999). *Mythopoetics of Oleksandr Oles' Creativity*. PhD in Linguistics dissertation. Zaporizhia.
- Davydiuk, V. (1997). *Primal Mythology of Ukrainian Folklore*. Lutsk: Vezha, 1997.
- Diakonov, I. (1990). *Archaic Myths of East and West*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Eliade, M. (1996). *Aspects of a Myth*. Translation from French by V. Bolshakov. Moscow: Invest - PPP, STPPP.
- Franco, I. (1969). *From the Secrets of Poetic Creativity*. Kiev: Soviet Writer.
- Freidenberg, O. (1998). *Myth and Literature of Antiquity*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Fry, N. (2007). *Anatomy of Criticism*. Moscow: Direct Media.
- Hanoshenko, Yu. (2006). *Myth, Archetype, Traditional Image in Ukrainian Intellectual Novel of 20-30's. of the 21st Century: author's abstract*. PhD in Linguistics dissertation. Kharkiv.
- Holosovker, Ya. (1987). *The Logic of Myth*. Moscow: The main editorial office of oriental literature of the Nauka publishing house.
- Hrabovich, G. (1991). *Shevchenko as a Mythographer: The Semantics of Symbols in the Poet's Work*. Kyiv: Soviet Writer.
- Hurdz, A. (2008). *The Mythopoetic Paradigm in Ukrainian and Western European Prose about the Land of the Late 19th - the First Third of the 20th Century: Monograph*. Mykolaiv: The MSU edition n.a. P. Mohyly.

- Jung, (1991). C.-G. Archetype and Symbol. Moscow: Renaissance.
- Kolesnyk, O. (2002). Mythopoetic Reproduction of the Archetype: abstract. PhD in Philosophy dissertation. Kyiv.
- Kopytsia, V. (2006). The Mythopoetic Model of the World in the Poetry of Vasyl Gerasimyuk. PhD in Linguistics dissertation. Kyiv.
- Korobkova, N. (2008). Mythologism of Creative Thinking of the Novelist Yu. Yanovsky. PhD in Linguistics dissertation. Odesa.
- Kuievda, V. (2007). Mythological Sources of Ukrainian Ethnocultural Model: Psychological Aspect: monograph. Donetsk: Ukrainian Cultural Center, Donetsk Branch of NTS.
- Kychenko, A. (2002). Mythopoetic Interpretation of Artistic Text: Functional-Typological and Methodological Aspect. *Issues of Literary Studies*, 9(66), 166-169.
- Levi-Strauss, K. (2000). *Structural Anthropology*. Kyiv: Osnovy.
- Lifshitz, M. (1979). *Ancient and Modern Mythology*. Moscow: Iskusstvo.
- Losev, A. (2008). *The Dialectics of Myth*. Moscow: Academic Project.
- Lotman, Yu. (1996). *Inside Thinking Worlds. Man – Text – Semiosphere - History*. Moscow: Languages of Russian Culture.
- Markiv, R. (2008). *Mythological Folklore in Early Twentieth-Century Ukrainian Literature (based on the works of Olha Kobylyanska, Mykhailo Kotsyubynsky, Lesia Ukrainka)*. PhD in Linguistics dissertation. Lviv.
- Meizerska, T. (1997). *Problems of Individual Mythology: Myth-making of T. Shevchenko*. Odesa: Astroprint.
- Meletynsky, E. (1995). *Poetics of Myth*. Moscow: Oriental Literature, Russian Academy of Sciences.
- Neamtsu, A. (2008). The Transformational Context of the Legendary-Mythological Tradition. *Bulletin of Odessa National University. Philology: Literary Studies*, 13(7), 112-126.
- Neamtsu, A. (2009). On the Problem of Functioning of "Literary Archetypes" in the European Cultural Context. *Word and Time*, 2, 3-13.
- Polishchuk, Y. (2002). *The Mythological Horizon of Ukrainian Modernism*. Ivano-Frankivsk: Lilyea-NV.
- Polysaiev, O. (2008). *Architecture of Modern Myth: monograph*. Ternopil: Aston.
- Potebnya, A. (1989). *Word and Myth*. Moscow: Pravda.
- Propp, V. (1976). *Folklore and Reality. Featured Articles*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Sayapina, T. (2000). *Mythopoetics of Creativity of M.M. Kotsiubynsky*. PhD in Linguistics dissertation. Zaporizhzhia.
- Dewayani, J., Udin, U., Djastuti, I., Investigating the effect of employee motivation and top management support on knowledge sharing, (2020) *Quality - Access to Success*, 21 (179), pp. 22-26.
- Schelling, F.W.J. (1998). *Historical-critical introduction to the philosophy of mythology: Works in 2 vols*. Moscow: Mysl'.
- Shestopalova, T. (2001). *Mythologems of Paul Tychyna's poetry: an attempt of interpretation*. PhD in Linguistics dissertation. Luhansk.

Steblyn-Kamensky, M. (1976). *Myth*. Leningrad: Nauka, LO.

Stein, K. (2007). Metapoetics - a "Blurred" paradigm. *Philology*, 6, 41-50.

Toporov, V. (1995). *Myth. Ritual. Image. Symbol: Research in the Field of Mythopoetic*. Moscow: Progress – Culture.

Turhan, O. (1995). *Ukrainian Literature of the late 19th - early 20th Centuries and Antiquity (Ways of Perception and Assimilation)*. PhD in Linguistics dissertation. Kyiv.

Veselovsky, A. (1959). An Unpublished Chapter from Historical Poetics of A.N. Veselovsky. Preface and Commentary by V.M. Zhirmunsky. *Russian literature*, 3, 89-123.

Vyshnytska, Yu. (2016). *Mythological Scenarios in Contemporary Artistic and Journalistic Discourses*. PhD in Linguistics dissertation. Kyiv.

Zabuzhko, O. (2006). *Shevchenko's Myth of Ukraine: an Attempt of Philosophical Analysis*. Kyiv: Fact.