

15. Tennison M. *Integral Transhumanism: The Holistic Leap Forward*. Winston-Salem, North Carolina, 2010. 85 p.  
16. Wouter J. H. (ed.) *Dictionary of Gnosis & Western Esotericism*-Brill Academic Publishers, 2006. 1228 p.

#### TYPES OF MAGICAL TRANSHUMANISM : FROM SHAMANISM TO TECHNOMAGIC

**Gotz Lyudmila** – Ph.D in Cultural Studies, Associate Professor,  
National Academy of Managerial Staff of Culture and Arts, Kyiv

Contrary to the frequent statements of transhumanists about the absolute rationality and scientific nature of their ideas and ideology, researchers rightly note the mythological, religious and magical roots and components of modern transhumanist teachings. The magical worldview and transhumanism have common archetypal origins and goals. The classification of varieties of magical transhumanism in the synchronic and diachronic dimension of culture made it possible to develop a holistic typology and periodization of magical transhumanism and to develop appropriate definitions. The typology of transhumanism, which is based on the most well-known magical trends, is given in the historical and logical sequence of the emergence of these types: shamanic T., esoteric T., theurgic T., alchemical T., cabalistic T., occult T., technomagic T. All but the last type can be defined as sacred, idealistic transhumanism. Technomagic T. is a new phenomenon that emerges in the 20th century and exists at the intersection of sacred T. and secular, materialistic transhumanism. These varieties can create hybrid forms and coexist in time parallelly.

*Key words:* culture, transhumanism, magic, science, mythotechnoscience, archetype, classification, methodology, definition.

UDC 008:141]:168

#### TYPES OF MAGICAL TRANSHUMANISM : FROM SHAMANISM TO TECHNOMAGIC

**Gotz Lyudmila** – Ph.D in Cultural Studies, Associate Professor,  
National Academy of Managerial Staff of Culture and Arts, Kyiv

*The aim* of this paper is to classify magical transhumanism based on the most well-known magical trends, considering it in a broad cultural and historical context.

*Research methodology* in the field of cultural studies is based on the concepts of magic as the subconscious of technology (E. Davis), the New Magical Age (L. Ionin), and transgressiveness (M. Foucault, M. Blanchot).

*Results.* The typology of transhumanism, which is based on the most well-known magical trends, is given in the historical and logical sequence of the emergence of these types: shamanic T., esoteric T., theurgic T., alchemical T., cabalistic T., occult T., technomagic T. All but the last type can be defined as sacred, idealistic transhumanism. Technomagic T. is a new phenomenon that emerges in the 20 th century and exists at the intersection of sacred T. and secular, materialistic transhumanism. These varieties can create hybrid forms and coexist in time parallelly.

*Novelty* of the work is that for the first time in the culturological discourse a typology of magical transhumanism was produced.

*The practical significance.* The classification of varieties of magical transhumanism in the synchronic and diachronic dimension of culture made it possible to develop a holistic typology and periodization of magical transhumanism and to develop appropriate definitions.

*Key words:* culture, transhumanism, magic, science, mythotechnoscience, archetype, classification, methodology, definition.

Надійшла до редакції 23.02.2022 р.

УДК 375.0.447

#### МІФ ТА МІФОПОЕТИКА ЯК ТИП ЛЮДСЬКОГО СПРИЙНЯТТЯ

**Гоцалюк Алла Анатоліївна** – доктор філософських наук, професор,  
професор кафедри івент-менеджменту та індустрії дозвілля,  
Київський національний університет культури і мистецтв, м. Київ  
<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2120-3232>  
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.35619/ucpmk.vi40.539>  
[goz\\_pravo@ukr.net](mailto:goz_pravo@ukr.net)

*Актуальність теми* пояснюється констатацією латентного вияву міфу в культурі, його атрибутивне й навіть імперативне значення для культури. Тип міфу, що лежить в основі деякої культури чи певного світосприйняття, відповідним чином структурує світ, задаючи специфічну «сітку бачення», фактично обумовлюючи уявлення про принципи причинності, простору, часу, типи класифікації, способи ідентифікації в межах конкретно-історичного світосприйняття. *Встановлено*, що міфопоетичне світосприйняття володіє власною специфікою побудови образів і саме цей тип світосприйняття виявляється найбільш придатним для історичних періодів, коли суспільство перебуває в точках біфуркації. *Визначено*, що міфопоетика як певний тип міфу для свого функціонування потребує певного

типу соціальності. Надзвичайно важливими є адаптивна та творча функції міфу. Інші функції міфу (пізнавальна, комунікативна, координаційна, інтегративна) фактично є похідними від двох основних функцій. Зроблено висновок, що і міфопоетика і аналітика, як різні типи людського світосприйняття, однаково необхідні людині, бо функцією аналітичного світосприйняття є підтримання людського буття як такого, натомість функцією міфопоетики є потреба зробити це буття власне людським. Міфопоетика обґрунтовує і підтримує людське буття, відповідаючи за все коло питань, пов'язаних із прагненням людини до смислу і з можливістю його суміщення з прагненням до реальності. Специфікою міфу є його здатність передавати суспільно значущу інформацію персоніфікованим чином, пристосовуючи й уточнюючи її значеннями та смислами конкретно-чуттєвого рівня побутової свідомості людини, пов'язаної з її повсякденною життєдіяльністю.

*Ключові слова:* міф, міфопоетка, свідомість людини, життєдіяльність, культура, світосприйняття.

*Actuality of the research theme.* The value of cultural renewal for a certain historical period lies in the predominance of innovations over traditions. At the same time, for the ontological aspect of the status renewal of values, modernity is formed primarily under the influence of spiritual phenomena, phenomena of mainly intangible nature. However, for postmodern psychology, the boundary, the difference between new and old traditions becomes absolute, independent of changes in a number of ontological concepts denoting traditions and innovations. In a situation of radical pluralism, the understanding of the degree of culture is lost, but the sense of myth is sharpened.

As the basic collective idea underlying culture, myth is inherent in every culture as its main element. In its epistemological essence, the myth in this interpretation is coherent with the concept of Kantian «transcendental scheme». It appears as a sensory-intellectual formation, which refers us both to the realm of empirical (which, however, is not its basis, which once again confirms the absolute insensitivity of myth to facts) and the realm of pure speculation (as indicated by our ability to productive imagination, expressed in the myth most fully). Myth combines the understanding of reality and the production of value meanings.

Myth is analyzed from a variety of positions: linguistics and paleoreligious studies (V.V. Ivanov, V. Toporov), philosophy and sociology (O. Kirsanova, M. Lifshits, P. Gurevich, A. Guliga); ethnography and folklore (S. Paramov, N. Krynychna; in particular, in ethnography the idea of mythology as a «primitive religion» is very popular – V. Wundt), psychology (A. Pyatigorsky), literary criticism and art history (N. Vetrova, E. Yakovlev). There are obviously many works on the theory of myth in the framework of philology, ethnology, culturology and philosophy. A detailed analysis of most of these theories can be found in Ye. Meletinsky's book «Poetics of Myth», as well as in the works of V. Pivoyev «Mythological Consciousness as a Way of Exploring the World» and K. Hübner's «Truth of Myth».

Concerning the myth, the modern theoretical-conceptual compendium is united in one thing: «Whether the myth was understood as an allegory or as a symbol, as poetry or as a science, as an archetype or as a structure, in fact the myth always found only what the researcher saw. Meanwhile, for those who created myths, it was an objective reality and therefore could not be an allegory, a symbol, poetry, science, archetype or structure. Accordingly, it is wrong to study myths in terms of their «hidden meaning», which is allegorical or symbolic, euhemeric, naturalistic, archetypal or structural, either to clarify the nature of the myth itself or to identify its cognitive role. However, it is possible and necessary to study myths from another point of view which is anthropological, or socio-psychological, namely: if a person creates myths, then he/her needs it for some reason; when researching myths, it is necessary to take into account the important fact that it was not just a text that belongs to a certain culture, but «interpretation and explanation of the world, explanation of the world, which came into force the law governing human life» [1; 88].

The pantheistic sense of nature, the sacred perception of the Universe and human existence in it was the main feature of proto-Ukrainian archaism and Ukrainian cultural tradition. The mythology of things, according to S. Krymsky, forms the Sophian symbols of existence [3]. Mythologizing objectivity, O. Losev believed, is one of the important functions of art in general. In its formation, the art form transforms any object in the mode of myth, endowing it with infinite richness and diversity of life [5]. The origins of the mythology of things M. Eliade saw in cosmology. According to J. Campbell, the peculiarities of its development in Buddhist culture are connected with the main idea of Eastern spirituality which is the experience of personal identity with the Divine Absolute. Transferred to any subject form, separated from the rest of the world, it gives unexpected aesthetic and artistic results, which, in fact, convinces the aesthetics of European modernism [2].

The ontology of things was specially studied by M. Heidegger («The Thing», 1950). In his opinion, the subject and the thing are not identical. Objects are recognized on the basis of functionality, they do not have an additional aura of memory. Things surround a person and create him/her much earlier than they become objects. The bowl was not «designed» by a potter, but was found in a «lake bowl» in the palms of his hands. Unlike the object (that is, in the primary philosophical sense, what stands before the subject and is what we imagine) the thing «stands» in itself, it, according to M. Heidegger, is not a symbol but the very presence of the world, which is its essence. It embodies the four which is an inseparable union of the four principles, which is

objectified in the «World Tree», Paradise, the four elements, the four parts of the world and allows it to happen, returning to humanity the experience of «closeness» of Being, for which it is necessary to change the concept of attitude to the world as a whole [9].

The proposition that myth is a phenomenon that underlies culture and worldview, and – accordingly – inherent in every culture, is naturally derived from the very definition of myth. In fact, each culture appears as a unity of diversity of numerous phenomena and processes, a kind of fractions with different denominators, which only a myth can reduce to a common denominator in the initial stages.

Myth is a necessary and inevitable basis of any culture and any worldview, as well as one of the necessary elements of knowledge. It forms what philosophers and culturologists call the universals of culture. Despite the richness of the palette of judgments about myth, many theories of myth are contradictory and they can be called mythological or even mythical. Others, at first glance much more balanced, leave behind not so much answers as questions for which new theories need to be created. Uncertainty of the subject of study and many misinterpretations contribute to the search and discovery of myth in various spheres of human activity, which leads not only to the mythologizing of the myth itself, but also to the mythologizing of culture in general. This begs the question: what is a myth after all? What is the reason for the established interest in it over the centuries and the special aggravation of this interest in recent times?

Considering that the myth itself is «undoubtedly a phenomenon of ancient culture, the authors of numerous works on this concept, however, boldly transfer it to the literature and the everyday consciousness of other times to the present day, usually without reservation about the correctness of such a transfer and not embarrassed by the existing contradiction. Even in the most thorough monographs on the theory of myth as, for example, in the classic work of Ye. Meletinsky «Poetics of Myth» there is no single definition of «myth». As a result, in the modern research environment it is perceived as self-evident that the verbal sign «myth» in our time correlates with mutually exclusive meanings and is used not only as something ambiguous, but also as essentially uncertain» [6; 262]. However, one of the key concepts of social theory can't remain uncertain for a long time, so the relevance of this aspect is beyond doubt.

Another significant trend of the modern world, which also clearly shows the urgency of the outlined problem, is related to the expansion of the mythological in the modern consciousness and in modern society, which began in the middle of the XX century and continues to this day. The study of various manifestations and aspects of mythopoetic and analytical types of worldview, analysis of their social and psychological foundations and preconditions, various sociocultural characteristics helps to highlight key issues of modern culture and worldview, which are characterized by increasing importance of mythopoetic component. In addition, if we study the myth as the basis of culture and as one of the most important factors of human worldview, the relevance of research in this area becomes obvious to philosophy, based on the need to clarify its subject base.

In fact, both for understanding a human being (what philosophical anthropology actually does), and for self-understanding (what is necessary for each person and what psychology, philosophy and art are aimed at in their targets), and for generating rules and strategies of practical activity critically-reflective attitude to the basics of worldview is a key and essential condition.

Myth is not only a phenomenon of culture and not even a special type of culture, but one of the foundations of culture itself and one of the essential components of human worldview as a whole, while mythopoetic worldview is a kind of worldview that structures both culture and society according to laws, dominates in certain types of culture and society, is reflected in cultural artefacts and ideas that form the ontological foundation of mythopoetics.

Researchers unanimously state the latent manifestation of myth in culture, its attributive and even imperative significance for culture. The type of myth that underlies a culture or worldview appropriately structures the world, setting a specific «vision grid», in fact determining the idea of causality, space, time, types of classification, methods of identification within a particular historical worldview. Different myths specifically structure the world according to the type of sociality in which they exist, adapting it to the person of a given society and determining the specifics of worldview, corresponding to this type of sociality.

The thesis according to which «a patchwork quilt of myth can be perceived only in a broad social context has convincing features. Myth is not a self-significant spiritual reality, which is, for example, literature, but a spiritual reality, which with the help of certain rituals serves the social order: authorizes some and prohibits other ways of human relations, as well as ways of human relations with the world around us» [4; 278].

Myth is often interpreted as an «archetype of social experience». Although this statement does not exhaust all the specifics of the myth, but, nevertheless, it reflects one of its most important, attributive features. In fact, «there is nothing more or less significant in the world around us that is not reflected and rooted in mythology. Any skills and abilities, any abilities of the human race – everything is reflected in the myth» [4; 279]. However, the myth not only translates experience, but also organizes it, setting a certain

«grid of vision» due to its inherent function of combining the desire for meaning and reality, as well as on the basis of canonization of meaning as a centering element of any experience.

Mythopoetic worldview has its own specifics of image construction and special types of patterns. The type of sociality, coherent mythopoetic worldview, has a number of significant features. Despite the apparent tradition and principled opposition to innovation, this type of worldview is most suitable for historical periods when society is at a bifurcation point.

Mythopoetics as a certain type of myth requires a certain type of sociality in order to function. It is no coincidence that the social environment of primitive people is significantly different from ours, and the perception of the outside world by primitive people is strikingly different from our perception.

The adaptive and creative functions of the myth are extremely important. If the first ensures the stability of culture, society and the individual, the second is the basis of change itself, the permanent spread of human interest beyond the existing worldview, which contributes to the flexibility of the worldview of society. Other functions of myth (cognitive, communicative, coordination, integrative) are actually derived from two main functions.

Exploring the aspect of «objectivity and necessity of myth», V. Polosin identifies three reasons that allow, in his view, the existence of myth «even in the heyday of rationalism». The first is the psychological function of myth - in fact, it is one of the variants of the main socio-psychological function of the myth which is adaptive, and is directly related to its second main socio-psychological function which is creative (the function of justification by reason). Each of these functions is based on the basic needs of a human being and the specifics of human worldview in general, so the presence of myth is essential for human worldview, regardless of the type of it.

According to V. Polosin, the manifestation of this function can be traced, in particular, in the fact that «while a person with all his/her depth in the actual problems of life has a desire to go beyond their own relevance – the desire for some constant and even absolute stability of life, eternity – even the most consistent rationalist retains, at least in the subconscious, elements of mythological consciousness: irrational, figurative, sensory ideas about the general semantic integrity of being as a condition of absolute stability. The desire for eternity is inextricably linked with the answer to the question of the meaning of one's own existence, and this constant inner need, amplified by each reminder of one's own mortality, gives birth to subconscious images-symbols that allegorically answer or interpret the main question» [8; 41]. Thus, the inherent human need for meaning and stability finds in the myth the possibility of its realization, its permanent reproduction, a kind of reincarnation, confirming the inevitability of the myth, its significance for almost any individual.

Performing an adaptive function, creating comfort and acceptability of the environment, the myth at the same time and humanizes it, because this movement of living is the only possible way of psychological adaptation, so the adaptive function of the myth is inextricably linked with the creative function that is with movement to meaning. Myth is one of the main ways to form the semantic field of culture.

The position of inclusivity and complicity inherent in the myth is a prerequisite for the possibility of human identification and preservation of the integrity of the human person, so the myth serves to connect not only the world but more specifically – with a society in which it can gain recognition, support and justification of one's own values.

Another function of the myth singled out by V. Polosin is ontological:

«Rational cognition focuses all efforts on the study of the present in the projection on the future, but very simplistic interpretation of the past, seeing in it always a set of imperfections, underdevelopment, errors and nonsense. Meanwhile, the past as such no longer exists in itself, outside of actual consciousness; its existence – in the (sub) consciousness of a person and society, it is a component of the present, which contains the interpretation of vital experience, built on the scheme of «if – then». The collective experience of mankind is a necessary component of the integrity of the worldview. Myth is a unique means of synthesis in the field of cognition, without it the results of the analysis lose their final value» [8; 40].

Regardless of whether any type of worldview is dominated by a focus on the past or future, it is the myth that is responsible for maintaining the integrity of our worldview, combining our views of causality and the type of collective memory on the principle of additionality so that they do not contradict each other. This preserves not only the possibility of psychological adaptation of a person to any situation – both stable and unstable, but also the integrity of ideas about the world.

Consciousness and the unconscious play a compensatory role in relation to each other: if the notions of causality are based on notions of order, as in analytics, then collective memory, respectively, involves primarily fixing exceptions and requires the development of writing. If the notion of causality is related to the concept of exclusivity (which is characteristic of mythopoetics), then collective memory, on the contrary, will involve the fixation of homogeneous (temporal cycles, spatial organization, types and archetypes of behavior etc.) and based on oral tradition.

According to V. Polosin, the social function of myth is also important, which is expressed, in particular, in the fact that «myth is a necessary, objective and unique means of preserving and using collective social experience, becomes a subconscious of public consciousness, on the one hand, then on the other hand, it turns out that different types of worldview and, in particular, different understandings of rationality, different ideas about causality and spatio-temporal organization not only structure the world differently, but also significantly affect the formulation of socio-political ideals and ideas about opportunities and means of their implementation and in general on the possibility of existence in society of certain social forms» [8; 42].

The question of the peculiarities of the mythological picture of the world and the problems of its reconstruction has been considered by many researchers. This aspect is operated by most philosophical concepts of myth (for example, R. Bart, J. Golosovker, E. Cassirer, K. Levi-Strauss, M. Lifshitz, O. Losev, B. Malinowski, M. Pyatigorsky, K. Hübner, M. Eliade, K.G. Jung). Under the influence of R. Bart with the help of myth studies of everyday life and ideology. Myth is used to analyze many partial phenomena of culture (articles by A. Meshcheryakov, A. Rapoport, A. Etkind). In the culturologist J. Amery, the myth appears as a «national idea», which determines the worldview of society and the peculiarities of the culture of a particular historical period.

Accordingly, it is worth exploring what epistemological resources and socio-psychological functions of the myth are. In other words, what is the epistemology, sociology and psychology of myth, what is its internal structure not as a text, but as an anthropological guideline that regulates and regulates human life.

It is important theoretical and methodological importance to identify lines of kinship and the principles of demarcation of myth, science and religion. The demarcation line between myth, science and religion lies in the plane of their attitude to the relationship between faith and knowledge. As for the relationship between myth and common sense, as well as myth and axiom, the dividing line will be even more obvious, because myth will always refer us to the ability of imagination and, accordingly, expressed in the image, but common sense and axiom are always judgments and depend on a certain cognitive ability, namely the ability to judge. Accordingly, neither the axioms, nor the provisions of common sense, nor any unproblematic constructs that underlie a particular theoretical knowledge, are myths.

Non-problematization is only one of the features of the myth and the property of the secondary grade, ie a direct consequence of its deep properties, qualities and characteristics, and therefore attribute something to the realm of myth on the basis of non-problematization is not entirely correct. Another thing is that the very presence of unproblematic components in the areas of knowledge and perception prone to problematization and analysis may be a consequence of the fact that behind them is a myth, although they themselves are not myths.

Since myth as a specific phenomenon forms the foundation of every culture and underlies any type of worldview, to define the specificity of what was traditionally called «ancient myths», or simply «myths», obviously requires the introduction of a new term. The term «mythopoetics» can serve as such a term.

«Mythopoetic worldview», which suggests that, despite the basicity of the myth for personal worldview and for any culture and society as a whole, the worldview, however, can be not only mythopoetic but also some other. Otherwise a phrase «mythopoetic worldview» would have clear signs of a tautology, counterproductive doubling of meaning.

Mythopoetics is by no means synonymous with myth, although it is directly related to it. In a nutshell, mythopoetics can be defined as a reflection of the dominance of mythopoetic worldview, ie worldview based on the traditional type of myth, which becomes apparent in a comparative analysis of the principles of causality, space and time, methods of classification and identification which exist in the analytical and mythopoetic worldview. In terms of subject mythopoetics can be represented by ancient myths and folklore texts of later times.

Why does the mythopoetic type of worldview dominate in the «mythopoetic» types of societies and what are the features of its dominance? If the «logical» myth on which culture is based gives humanity the opportunity to structure, the possibility of science and systematic research, the possibility of advanced social stratification and social mobility, then what does the «traditional» myth that underlies the culture and structure of mythopoetic society give?

The main essential features of the mythopoetic worldview are as follows: probability and variability (a partial manifestation of which is the polypostasy of the heroes of mythopoetics). At the linguistic level, this manifests itself as metaphorical and symbolic, the plurality of names and titles, the variability of the story (both myth and fairy tale always differ in each new story for each new listener).

The dominance of the mythopoetic worldview arises at certain historical moments, which can be called peculiar points of bifurcation of human society, namely: in the period preceding the emergence of complex and hierarchical social system (so-called «primitive» or «mythological» societies), and in the moment of breaking this system (a transitional period in the life of society). Providing psychological comfort in the «chaotic» periods of social development – the main specific role of mythopoetic worldview.

«The myth is not based on what is, but on what can be. This means that the structure of the myth can be described as probabilistic. In myth, a person does not proceed from the logic of fact, but from the logic according to which everything can be. This is the logic that allows to maintain a principled openness to the future –even openness to any future» [4; 127].

The myth-making reality connects the whole history of mankind with its eternal desire to comprehend the world around us and human nature. The myth is an archaic story, a legend about spirits and gods (and later – heroes), a fantastic reflection of reality, which arises as a result of spiritualization of human consciousness of natural phenomena and the world. However, despite its fantasy, the myth combines phenomena with human needs and interests. The specificity of the myth is its ability to convey socially significant information in a personalized way, adapting and refining it with the meanings and meanings of the specific sensory level of human consciousness associated with his/her daily life. These features can explain the persistence that accompanies scientific thought in the study of myth theory.

As M. Piren rightly remarked, «at one time the 'modern age' promised individual happiness based on material well-being; today we are witnessing the frustration caused by this false hope. We live in a society full of things, but people are frustrated and unhappy. Moreover, boredom is a very common feeling, because modern society is rationalist and technocratic, gave life to a refined culture of things, and all the most typical human sphere, which lies in the dimension of relationships and love, was blocked, deprived of the possibility of realization. Since happiness belongs to this sphere, we are witnessing a paradoxical phenomenon: people are satisfied with certain things and achievements, but unhappy» [7; 59].

However, despite the variety of works on the mythology, none of them considered the myth as the most general category at the same time with the isolation of a particular type of myth – mythopoetics, as well as the study of it as a specific type of human worldview inherent in any human worldview.

*Conclusions.* Both mythopoetics and analytics as different types of human worldview are equally necessary for a person, because the function of analytical worldview is to maintain human existence itself, while the function of mythopoetics is the need to make this being human. To paraphrase and clarify this position, we can say that analytics deals with human existence (and is its basis), it is responsible for issues related to human desire for reality, while mythopoetics substantiates and supports human existence, responsible for the whole circle issues related to the human desire for meaning and the possibility of combining it with the desire for reality.

Myth has been the subject of many disciplines. It often became the subject of special philosophical consideration, but interdisciplinary study of myth, and even more – the study of various aspects of mythopoetic and analytical worldviews as dominant types of human worldview in general in their relation to the principles of causality, space and time, social and anthropoprinciples conducted at the interdisciplinary level with data from psychology, hermeneutics, philosophy of science, sociology, culturology, philosophical anthropology and social philosophy, as well as philosophical analysis of the social functions of myth in the existing works hasn't been done.

Thus, it can be stated that there is no consensual definition of myth, which would allow to interpret the phenomenon of myth inconsistently and to assert the existence of specific features and principles of functioning of mythopoetic worldview. There is an urgent need to formulate such a definition, a huge amount of theoretical and practical material has been accumulated, which allows bringing research not only the myth itself, many aspects of human worldview in general to a fundamentally new level.

#### Список використаної літератури

1. Дэвидсон Б. Африканцы. Введение в историю культуры. Москва : Наука, 1975. 280 с.
2. Кэмпбелл Дж. Мифический образ. Москва : ООО «Изд-во АСТ», 2004. 683 с.
3. Крымский С. Б. Запиту філософських смислів Київ : Вид. ПАРАПАН, 2003. 240 с.
4. Лобок А. М. Антропология мифа. Екатеринбург : Банк культурной информации, 1997. 688 с.
5. Лосев А. Ф. История античной эстетики. Итоги тысячелетнего развития. В 2-х кн. Кн. 1. Москва : Искусство, 1992. 432 с.
6. Мелетинский Е. М. Поэтика мифа. Москва : Наука, 1976. 407 с.
7. Пірен М. І. Політико-владна еліта України (соціо-психологічна модель) : монографія. Кіровоград : Імекс-ЛТД, 2013. 136 с.
8. Полосин В. Миф. Религия. Государство. Москва : Ладомир, 1999. 440 с.
9. Хайдеггер М. Время и бытие: статьи и выступления / Пер. с нем.; Сост., пер., вступ. ст., коммент. и указ. В. В. Библина. СПб. : Наука, 2007. 621 с.

#### References

1. Devydson B. Afrykantsu. Vvedeniye v ystoryiu kulturu. Moskva : Nauka, 1975. 280 s.
2. Kempbell Dzh. Myficheskyi obraz. Moskva : ООО «Yzd-vo AST», 2004. 683 s.
3. Krymskyi S. B. Zapyty filosofskykh smysliv Kyiv : Vyd. PARAPAN, 2003. 240 s.
4. Lobok A. M. Antropohyia myfa. Ekaterynburh : Bank kulturnoi ynformatsyy, 1997. 688 s.

5. Losev A. F. Ystoryia antychnoi estetyky. Ytohy tysiacheletneho razvytyia. V 2-kh kn. Kn. 1. Moskva : Yskusstvo, 1992. 432 s.
6. Meletynskiy E. M. Poztyka myfa. Moskva : Nauka, 1976. 407 s.
7. Piren M. I. Polityko-vladna elita Ukrainy (sotsio-psykholohichna model) : monohrafiia. Kirovohrad : Imeks-LTD, 2013. 136 s.
8. Polosyn V. Myf. Relyhiya. Hosudarstvo. Moskva : Ladomyr, 1999. 440 s.
9. Khaidehher M. Vremia y bytye: staty y vustupleniya / Per. s nem.; Sost., per., vstup. st., komment. y ukaz. V. V. Bybykhyna. SPb. : Nauka,

#### MYTH AND MYTHOPOETICS AS A TYPE OF HUMAN PERCEPTION

**Hotsalyuk Alla** – Doctor of Philosophy,  
Professor of the Department of Event Management and the leisure industry  
of the Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts (Ukraine)

*Actuality of the research theme* is explained by the statement of the latent manifestation of myth in culture, its attributive and even imperative significance for culture. The type of myth that underlies a culture or worldview structures the world accordingly, defining a specific «grid of vision», in fact determining the ideas of causality, space, time, types of classification, methods of identification within a particular historical worldview. The article establishes that the mythopoetic worldview has its own specifics of image construction and special types of patterns. It is concluded that both mythopoetics and analytics as different types of human worldview are equally necessary for a person, because the function of analytical worldview is to maintain human existence itself, while the function of mythopoetics is the need to make this being human.

*Key words:* myth, mythopoetic, human consciousness, vital activity, culture, world perception

**UDC 375.0.447**

#### MYTH AND MYTHOPOETICS AS A TYPE OF HUMAN PERCEPTION

**Hotsalyuk Alla** – Doctor of Philosophy,  
Professor of the Department of Event Management and the leisure industry  
of the Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts (Ukraine)

*Actuality of the research theme* is explained by the statement of the latent manifestation of myth in culture, its attributive and even imperative significance for culture. The type of myth that underlies a culture or worldview structures the world accordingly, defining a specific «grid of vision», in fact determining the ideas of causality, space, time, types of classification, methods of identification within a particular historical worldview. The article establishes that the mythopoetic worldview has its own specifics of image construction and special types of patterns. The type of sociality, coherent mythopoetic worldview, has a number of significant features. Despite the apparent tradition and principled opposition to innovation, this type of worldview is most suitable for historical periods when society is at a bifurcation point. It is determined that mythopoetics as a certain type of myth requires a certain type of sociality in order to function. The adaptive and creative functions of the myth are extremely important. Other functions of myth (cognitive, communicative, coordination, integrative) are actually derived from two main functions. It is concluded that both mythopoetics and analytics as different types of human worldview are equally necessary for a person, because the function of analytical worldview is to maintain human existence itself, while the function of mythopoetics is the need to make this being human. Mythopoetics substantiates and supports human existence by answering a whole range of questions related to man's desire for meaning and the possibility of combining it with the desire for reality. The specificity of the myth is its ability to convey socially significant information in a personalized way, adapting and clarifying it with the meanings and meanings of the specific sensory level of human consciousness associated with his daily life.

*Key words:* myth, mythopoetic, human consciousness, vital activity, culture, world perception.

Надійшла до редакції 7.02.2022 р.