



## THE ORIGIN OF THE CONCEPT OF NEOMYTHOLOGY

*Sharapova Anastasiya Zamirovna*

*2nd year student of the Master's program in "Literary studies (Russian literature)" Bukhara State University*

[anastasiya9sharapova9@gmail.com](mailto:anastasiya9sharapova9@gmail.com)

**Abstract.** *The article highlights the ambiguity of interpretations and approaches to identifying the semantic fields of the concept of 'neomythology' in the general field of the philosophy of mythology. The authors of the study suggest that the ambiguity is due to numerous controversial and polemical judgements related to the interpretation of neomythology in contemporary scientific theory. According to the authors, there is no conceptual approach to defining this phenomenon. This situation can be explained by the long period of study of myth theory. The work conducts a comparative analysis and identifies the distinctive characteristics of myth and neomyth.*

**Keywords:** *myth, neomyth, neomythology, romanticism, mythology, philosophical phenomenon, concept, comparative analysis*

**Introduction.** In modern science, myth is a complex phenomenon consisting of elements of philosophy, sociology, cultural studies, anthropology, and art. It is this complexity and multidimensionality that determines its timeless nature, endowing it with universality that demonstrates the needs of culture and the historical experience of humanity.

The term "neomythology" was introduced by researcher E.M. Meletinsky to describe the process of remythologisation of culture and literature of the past century.

According to his concept, the main category of 20th-century neomythology is transposition, which focuses on rewriting mythological characteristics and transferring them to new time periods. Neomythology is a set of characteristics that



reveal the peculiarities of neomyth semantics. In literature, this manifests itself as conditionally new stylistic techniques.

**Methods and literature review.** The phenomenon of neomythology is studied by researchers such as E.V. Galanina, E.M. Meletinsky, Ya.V. Pogrebnaya, V.P. Rudnev, and L.V. Yaroshenko. The general approach of scholars to the interpretation of this category can be traced in the designation of neomythology as a means of structuring the artistic space of the text field by borrowing ancient mythological motifs and plots, as well as by likening artistic language to the mythological proto-language. Therefore, writers and poets, taking advantage of the opportunity to create their own mythological worlds and images, have created and continue to create unique works.

The main works on neomyth are the works of A.F. Losev (Dialectics of Myth) and R. Barthes (Mythologies). For example, A.F. Losev notes in his work Dialectics of Myth: "There is no mythical image in itself, just as there is no thing that is beautiful in itself. A mythical image is mythical to the extent of its form, i.e., to the extent of its representation, to the extent of its understanding by others. It is the way a thing is represented that is mythical, not the thing itself" (2014).

In the Dictionary of Literary Terms, the concept of 'neomythology' is presented 'as a concept that considers mythologicalism (correlation with myth) to be the most characteristic form of artistic thinking in 20th-century art.' However, when we turn to the Romantics, we see that they are characterised by their correlation with myth. Consequently, when considering this phenomenon in relation to classical archaic myth, it is necessary to interpret Romantic myth in the same way.

In his work Philosophy of Art, F. Schelling in the 18th century predicts the emergence of the phenomenon of neomythology, which will only develop in the 20th century. He notes that the main feature of this phenomenon is that the functions of mythologems will be used as originally 'remelted' images of ancient and biblical mythology. Consequently, already in the Romantic era, world literature was enriched with a number of neomythological images, which became the fruit of the individual, independent myth-making of poets and writers. Mythological plots,



motifs, and images, deliberately and consciously used in the process of creating works of art, are associated with neo-mythological trends, in other words, with neo-mythology. When considering the concept of 'neomythology,' we note that the prefix 'neo-' means 'new,' i.e., the new mythology, the creation of which was called for by the young ambitious German Romantics F. Schelling and F. Hegel, is in essence neomythology.

**Discussion.** S.Y. Neklyudov notes: 'It is wrong to assume that mass consciousness... has only become mythologised in recent times – it is mythological in nature' (2000). As R. Barthes pointed out, anything can be a myth, since 'our world is infinitely suggestive' (2008). Therefore, in any period, old myths are recreated in society in new social and national guises based on archaic models dating back centuries. Such a reproduction of the most ancient myth was undertaken as early as the Romantic era. The revival and study of national mythology and national antiquities that began at that time contained arbitrary "additions to the reconstructed system to a certain speculatively understood "completeness", guided by a model sanctified by tradition (as a rule, ancient mythology with its extensive pantheon of gods and rich plot) (Neklyudov, 2000). S.Y. Neklyudov believes that already in the 18th-19th centuries, the Romantic myth was a reconstructable system, therefore, the Romantic myth is neomythology.

Ya.V. Pogrebnaya, speaking about neomythology, notes that it "exists only in context and is generated through the combination of at least two texts, one of which belongs to archaic culture and the other to modern culture. Neomythology is based on the correlation, comparison, and mutual identification of chronologically and ethnically distant phenomena, on the awareness, through the paradigm of invariants, of the universal variant of cosmic unity of the world and the laws of its creative reflection and recreation (2011). The author distinguishes between the concepts of 'myth' and 'neomyth' in terms of content, as he considers them from a literary perspective. At the same time, in accordance with semantics, the most ancient (archaic) myth is associated with eternity, its roots go back to ancient times,



while a neomyth is a new myth that did not exist before, filled with new content, retaining all the characteristics of a myth (structural, artistic).

In turn, L.V. Yaroshenko highlights the differences between traditional (archaic) myths and neomyths from a philosophical point of view (2004).

**Results.** The following are the characteristics that distinguish myths from neomyths. Myth is a collective creation that carries absolute, cosmogonic knowledge about the creation of the universe and man, explaining the existence of everything around, pointing out that nothing depends on man, fate decides for him, therefore the hero is the keeper of knowledge, goods and order as a messenger. A neomyth is an author's vision of civilisation, which uses mythological images to represent everyday life, describing contemporary events in which the cultural hero acts as a trickster or antagonist. Thus, another characteristic difference is that a neomyth appeals to the present day.

**Conclusion.** Neomythology is characterised by its use of mythological images (mythologems) and is secondary to archaic myth. The neomyth created by the author provides an understanding of reality by interpreting human-created civilisation through images. By referring to mythological images, but not being an archaic myth, it appeals to myth. It follows that romanticism is neo-mythological. Neomyth has a structure because it ensures the existence of the primemyth (primemyth - according to J. Gores) - the basis presented in the form of an archaic narrative, historical event, or modern reality. Thus, we should speak of a single structural component of the concept of neomythology.

## REFERENCE

1. Barthes, R. Mythologies / trans. from French by S. Zenkin. Moscow, 2008. 351 p.
2. Losev, A.F. The Dialectics of Myth. Saint Petersburg, 2014. 316 p.
3. Meletinsky, E.M. The Poetics of Myth. St. Petersburg, 2018. 478 p.
4. Neklyudov S.Y. Structure and Function of Myth // Myths and Mythology in Contemporary Russia / edited by K. Aimermacher, F. Bomsdorf, G.A. Bordyukov. Moscow, 2000. P. 17-38.



5. Pogrebnaya, Y.V. Aspects of V.V. Nabokov's Neomythology. Author, Hero, Image: Monograph. Saarbrücken, Germany, 2011. 512 p.
6. Schelling F.W.I. Philosophy of Art / trans. by P.S. Popov. Moscow, 1966. 498 pp.
7. Schlegel F. Aesthetics. Philosophy. Criticism / Translated from German by Yu.M. Popov: in 2 vols. Vol. 1. Moscow, 1983. 479 pp.
8. Yaroshenko L.V. The Genre of the Mythical Novel in the Works of A. Platonov: Monograph. Grodno, 2004. 137 pp.