

UDC 316.2:159.954:316.323.72-021.68

[https://doi.org/10.32689/2617-2224-2021-1\(26\)-85-101](https://doi.org/10.32689/2617-2224-2021-1(26)-85-101)

Lakhyzha Mykola Ivanovych,

Doctor of Science in Public Administration, Professor, Professor of the Department of Public Administration and Administration, Institute of Personnel Training of the State Employment Service of Ukraine, 03038, Kyiv, Str. Novovorzhynska, 17; e-mail: lahisha@ukr.net; tel.: +38 (096) 55 21 789, [https // orcid.org / 0000-0001-8676-4578](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8676-4578)



Лахижжа Микола Іванович,

доктор наук з державного управління, професор, професор кафедри публічного управління та адміністрування, Інститут підготовки кадрів державної служби зайнятості України, 03038, м. Київ, вул. Нововокзальна, 17; e-mail: lahisha@ukr.net; тел.: +38 (096) 55 21 789, [https // orcid.org / 0000-0001-8676-4578](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8676-4578)

Лахижжа Николай Иванович,

доктор наук по государственному управлению, профессор, профессор кафедры публичного управления и администрирования, Институт подготовки кадров государственной службы занятости Украины, 03038, г. Киев, ул. Нововокзальная, 17; e-mail: lahisha@ukr.net; тел.: +38 (096) 55 21 789, [https // orcid.org / 0000-0001-8676-4578](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8676-4578)



Yehorycheva Svitlana Borysivna,

Doctor of Economics, Professor, Professor of the Department of Finance, Banking Business and Taxation, National University "Yuri Kondratyuk Poltava Polytechnic", 36011, Poltava, Prosp. Peremohanska, 24; e-mail: yehorycheva.sb@gmail.com; tel.: +38 (067) 378 18 03, [https // orcid.org / 0000-0002-7829-7073](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7829-7073)

Єгоричева Світлана Борисівна,

доктор економічних наук, професор, професор кафедри фінансів, банківського бізнесу та оподаткування, Національний університет "Полтавська політехніка імені Юрія Кондратюка", 36011, м. Полтава, просп. Першотравневий, 24; e-mail: yehorycheva.sb@gmail.com; тел.: +38 (067) 378 18 03, [https // orcid.org / 0000-0002-7829-7073](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7829-7073)

Егорычева Светлана Борисовна,

доктор экономических наук, профессор, профессор кафедры финансов, банковского бизнеса и налогообложения, Национальный университет “Полтавская политехника имени Юрия Кондратюка”, 36011, г. Полтава, ул. Первомайский, 24; e-mail: uehorycheva.sb@gmail.com; тел.: +38 (067) 378 18 03, [https // orcid.org / 0000-0002-7829-7073](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7829-7073)

UNDERSTANDING THE CREATIVITY AND USE OF GILBERT DURAND’S METHODOLOGY IN SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH OF SCIENTISTS OF POST-COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Abstract. The article analyzes the understanding of G. Durand’s work in scientific research of scientists of post-communist countries, primarily from the point of view of its creativity for understanding the processes of post-communist transformation. In particular, attention is focused on the ontological status of G. Durand’s ‘anthropological trajectory’, which implies positioning between subject and object, central and peripheral, rational and emotional, internal and external, and so on. This, according to the article authors’ opinion, makes it possible for scientists of post-communist countries to use the concept of ‘trajectory’ to characterize the transition period between two states of development of society. Psychological features of consciousness are also called significant, which are also used to characterize transformational states of societies.

Identification, systematization and analysis of the works of scientists of post-communist countries, in which G. Durand’s work is characterized or his ideas and scientific methodology are used, allowed us to conclude that there is a difference in approaches and emphasis on certain parts of Durand’s work. This is due to the political, social and cultural characteristics of individual countries and the need to consider and characterize the problems of our time. The best practices of participants of the Ukrainian School of Archetypes, M. Karwowska and S. Jasinowicz (Poland), A. Duhin (Russia) are highlighted and the notable role of Durand’s student M. Maffesoli (France) is noted. However, in the vast majority of post-communist countries, G. Durand’s work is still little known, and his ideas are used primarily by psychologists and mythologists. Common in post-communist countries is the desire to comprehend the ideas of G. Durand and use them to explain the changing present, which leads to interest in Durand’s work sociologists, political scientists and scientists of public administration. Attempts to use the methodology of G. Durand to understand civilizational processes are also noted, in particular, to justify the peculiarities of Russian civilization to contrast it with Western ones or criticize such approaches.

The analysis convincingly demonstrates the expediency of wider application of Durand’s methodological approaches to understanding the managerial, social

and other problems of transit, as well as for the development of psychology, mythology and literary criticism, which leads to increased translation and publication of G. Durand's works.

Keywords: Gilbert Durand, works, methodology, archetypes, post-communist countries.

ОСМИСЛЕННЯ ТВОРЧОСТІ ТА ВИКОРИСТАННЯ МЕТОДОЛОГІЇ ЖІЛЬБЕРА ДЮРАНА У НАУКОВИХ ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯХ УЧЕНИХ ПОСТКОМУНІСТИЧНИХ КРАЇН

Анотація. Проаналізовано осмислення творчості Ж. Дюрана у наукових дослідженнях вчених посткомуністичних країн, насамперед, з точки зору її креативності для усвідомлення процесів посткомуністичної трансформації. Зокрема, акцентується увага на онтологічному статусі “антропологічного траекта” Ж. Дюрана, що має на увазі позиціонування між суб’єктом і об’єктом, центральним і периферійним, раціональним та емоційним, внутрішнім і зовнішнім тощо. Саме це надає можливості науковцям посткомуністичних країн використовувати концепт “траекта” для характеристики перехідного періоду між двома станами розвитку суспільства. Суттєвими зазначено й психологічні особливості свідомості, які застосовуються і для характеристики трансформаційних станів суспільств.

Виявлення, систематизація та аналіз праць науковців посткомуністичних країн, в яких характеризується творчість Ж. Дюрана чи використовуються його ідеї і наукова методологія, дозволили дійти висновку про різницю у підходах та акцентуванні уваги на певних частинах творчості Дюрана. Це зумовлюється політичними, соціальними та культурними особливостями окремих країн і необхідністю враховувати й характеризувати проблеми сьогодення. Виділено напрацювання учасників Української школи архетипіки, М. Карвовської та С. Ясиновича (Польща), О. Дугіна (Росія) та відзначено помітну роль учня Дюрана М. Маффесолі (Франція). Втім, у переважній більшості посткомуністичних країн творчість Ж. Дюрана досі залишається маловідомою, а його ідеї використовуються, насамперед, психологами та міфознавцями. Спільним у посткомуністичних країнах є прагнення осмислити ідеї Ж. Дюрана та використати їх для пояснення мінливого сьогодення, що й призводить до зацікавлення творчістю Дюрана соціологів, політологів та представників науки державного управління. Зазначено також і спроби використати методологію Ж. Дюрана для усвідомлення цивілізаційних процесів, зокрема, обґрунтування особливостей російської цивілізації для її протиставлення західній, чи критики таких підходів.

Проведений аналіз переконливо свідчить про доцільність ширшого застосування методологічних підходів Дюрана для осмислення управлінських, соціальних та інших проблем транзиту, а також для розвитку психології, міфознавства та літературної критики, що обумовлює активізацію перекладу та видання творів Ж. Дюрана.

Ключові слова: Жільбер Дюран, творчість, методологія, архетипіка, посткомуністичні країни.

**ОСМЫСЛЕНИЕ ТВОРЧЕСТВА И ИСПОЛЬЗОВАНИЕ
МЕТОДОЛОГИИ ЖИЛЬБЕРА ДЮРАНА
В НАУЧНЫХ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯХ
УЧЕНЫХ ПОСТКОММУНИСТИЧЕСКИХ СТРАН**

Аннотация. Осуществлен анализ осмысления творчества Ж. Дюрана в научных исследованиях ученых посткоммунистических стран, прежде всего, с точки зрения ее креативности для осознания процессов посткоммунистической трансформации. В частности, акцентируется внимание на онтологическом статусе “антропологического траекта” Ж. Дюрана, что подразумевает позиционирование между субъектом и объектом, центральным и периферийным, рациональным и эмоциональным, внутренним и внешним т. п. Именно это, по мнению авторов статьи, дает возможность ученым посткоммунистических стран использовать концепт “траекта” для характеристики переходного периода между двумя состояниями развития общества. Существенными названы и психологические особенности сознания, которые применяются и для характеристики трансформационных состояний обществ.

Выявление, систематизация и анализ работ ученых посткоммунистических стран, в которых характеризуется творчество Ж. Дюрана или используются его идеи и научная методология, позволили сделать вывод о разнице в подходах и акцентировании внимания на определенных частях творчества Дюрана. Это обусловлено политическими, социальными и культурными особенностями отдельных стран и необходимостью учитывать и характеризовать проблемы современности. Выделено наработки участников Украинской школы архетипики, М. Карвовской и С. Ясиновича (Польша), А. Дугина (Россия), отмечено заметную роль ученика Дюрана М. Маффесоли (Франция). Впрочем, в большинстве посткоммунистических стран творчество Ж. Дюрана до сих пор остается малоизвестным, а его идеи используются, прежде всего, психологами и мифоведами. Общим в посткоммунистических странах является стремление осмыслить идеи Ж. Дюрана и использовать их для объяснения изменяющегося настоящего, что и приводит к заинтересованности творчеством Дюрана социологов, политологов и представителей науки государственного управления. Отмечено также попытки использовать методологию Ж. Дюрана для осознания цивилизационных процессов, в частности, обоснования особенностей российской цивилизации для ее противопоставление западной, или критики таких подходов.

Проведенный анализ убедительно свидетельствует о целесообразности широкого применения методологических подходов Дюрана для осмысления управленческих, социальных и других проблем транзита, а также для развития психологии, мифоведения и литературной критики, что обуславливает активизацию перевода и издания произведений Ж. Дюрана.

Ключевые слова: Жильбер Дюран, творчество, методология, архетипика, посткоммунистические страны.

Problem statement. The Manifesto of the Ukrainian School of Archetypes notes the transitional nature of our era: from inverted modern and postmodern development to the metamodern phase of the spirit and, concerning one of the French luminaries of Gilbert Durand's archetypes, characterizes alternative ways of human development, defined 'to offer new ideas and concepts to solve problems of public administration and to show on what archetypes these decisions are based' [1].

In modern science, the direction of scientific research proposed by G. Durand and his followers is dynamically developing, which went down in the history of humanistics under the New Anthropology name. It seems expedient to trace the comprehension of Durand's work in post-communist countries, considering, from our point of view, the expediency of using his work in the process of post-communist transformation. Preliminary analysis shows the difference in approaches and emphasis on certain parts of Durand's work, given the political and social needs of today, which is especially noticeable in Russia and is associated with the emphasis on its civilizational features.

Given that post-communist transit is a transition from socialism to democracy and a market economy, first of all, it is worth understanding the term 'anthropological trajectory' introduced by G. Durand (from the Latin, *tras* — 'through', 'between', and *jacere* — 'throw'), 'throw', i.e. 'thrown between'). The anthropological trajectory is the

granting of an independent ontological status to what is between subject and object, central and peripheral, rational and emotional, internal and external, nature and culture, past and future, etc. It seems to us that this term can also be used to characterize post-communist transformation as a transition period between two states of society, the previous and the desired. Therefore, we get an additional important tool to identify the features and general features of this process. Psychological characteristics of consciousness, which are already used to determine the state of societies, are also significant.

The study of these issues in Ukraine, Poland and Russia was carried out by us in the following areas: publication of G. Durand's works; appeal to G. Durand's work; and using the ideas of G. Durand to substantiate approaches to the analysis of transformation processes. A review of the internet resources of European post-communist countries showed that in the vast majority of them, G. Durand's work is little known, and his ideas are not used, which can be explained by several factors, the main ones of which seem to us to be the complexity of the issue, language problems and the lack of translations of the scientist's works.

Analysis of recent researches and published papers. The analysis of scientific publications of scientists of post-communist countries, which highlight G. Durand's work and use his proposed research methodology, shows a gradual increase in the number of such works

in psychology, culturology, mythology, philology, social sciences and public administration. However, the generalization of these studies has not yet been conducted.

The purpose of the article is to identify, generalize and systematize the information about the use of ideas and methodology of G. Durand in scientific research of scientists of post-communist countries.

Presentation of the main material.

The study confirmed the hypothesis that G. Durand's work in post-communist countries is gradually becoming a general scientific asset. In Ukraine, the appeal to the theoretical heritage of G. Durand is carried out in two directions. The first of them was started in 2009 and is connected with the development of the school of mythology, the research of which involves the relevant cultural phenomena concerning the latest scientific interpretations of the myth by famous foreign scientists. The explorations of philologist H. Dranenko are among such studies. She considers the problem of connecting the mythocritical concept of reading a work of art with receptive aesthetics and receptive history, based on G. Durand's work and using his proposed terminology [2].

Symbol and myth in the theoretical thought of G. Durand are revealed in the article of the same name by H. Dranenko in 2009 based on the analysis of the monograph 'Mythological Images and Faces of the Work: From Mythocriticism to Mythanalysis' in the following areas: the content of the concept of 'symbol', archetypal images, genetic and mythological dimensions of the symbol problem, the con-

cept of myth, and so on. It is noted that 'G. Durand, like K. Levi-Strauss, considers myth as a metalanguage. According to the French anthropologist, the myth is a unique discourse, a narrative of the origin, where a fundamental antagonistic tension arises, which leads to the development of meanings' [3, p. 53].

H. Dranenko devotes her next article directly to the study of the concept of 'mythological background' in the Durand's anthropological theory of the imaginary. The author tries to comprehend the meaning of the concept introduced for scientific use in the work 'Mythological Background of the Parma Monastery: To the Issue of the Aesthetics of the Novel' (1961), and to give an example of its methodological use for the hermeneutic reading of literary texts. H. Dranenko also analyzes the interpretation of other concepts of the scientific toolkit of the French scientist (schemes, constellations of images, symbol, archetype, myth, structure, anthropological trajectory, and mode of the Imaginary). It is noted that the main provisions of Durand's theoretical concept presented in the work 'Anthropological Structures of the Imaginary' embody its main purpose: to 'rehabilitate the subjective' and justify the ontological significance of imagination. According to H. Dranenko, the French anthropologist seeks to prove the prospects of studying the world with the help of concepts created by imagination ('images' from the French. *image*), in other words, concepts that do not coincide with what is generally considered objective reality [4].

H. Dranenko's articles are quite actively cited in scientific works on philology, and the name of G. Durand is

indicated along with other well-known representatives of the French school of mythology (E. Durkheim, L. Levy-Bruhl, K. Levi-Strauss, R. Barthes, J. Burgos, P. Ricoeur, W.-L. Tremblay) [5, p. 172]. L. Bondarchuk connects Durand's prominent place among French mythologists, first of all, with the publication of the monograph 'Anthropological Structures of the Imaginary' in 1960 and the introduction of the concept of 'imaginary' as the basis of mental life, a component of fantastic space that cannot be avoided in real life. The author notes that from the middle of the twentieth century the interest in mythological criticism and mythopoetic interpretation is renewed, which confirms the opinion of G. Durand that the rational, whatever it may be, is developed in the imaginary, manifesting itself in various forms in art. G. Durand is mentioned in the article as the founder of the Center for the Study of the Imaginary, established in 1996, and, accordingly, as a representative of the third direction of French mythocriticism. The universalism and applied significance of French concepts, in particular, the opposition of Day/Night Mode by Durand, is also noted [6].

The popularization of G. Durand's ideas in our country was actively promoted by the formation of the Ukrainian School of Archetypes and the growth of attention to psychological problems in public administration. During the existence of the school, its participants have published more than 450 scientific articles in domestic periodicals, prepared monographs, and defended a number of PhD theses and doctoral theses. It was within this School that Ukrainian-language translations of the

works of iconic followers of K. Jung and G. Durand, in particular, M. Maffesoli, were initiated [7]. A Ukrainian translation of G. Durand's *Anthropological Structures of the Imaginary* thesis is being prepared [8, p. 290]. Cooperation with French scientists is also essential. In particular, in Ukraine, the active role of Honorary Professor of the Sorbonne Michel Maffesoli is noticeable in explaining his vision of the problems of the postmodern era: the phenomenon of global mass, the transformation of politics and the political sphere, the area of everyday life and the transformation of the sacred, festive into everyday life, the phenomena of submission and violence, the phenomena of nomadism and the new nature of identity in the modern world [9], as well as in spreading the heritage of G. Durand.

In particular, it should be noted the participation of M. Maffesoli in the activities of the Ukrainian School of Archetypes (USArch) and membership in the editorial boards of professional collections: 'Public Government' and 'Ukrainian Society'. According to the Scientific Secretary of USArch A. Sushyi, acquaintance with G. Durand's work took place in 2016, and the lectures delivered in 2017–2018 by Professor M. Maffesoli in Kyiv the Neotraibalism and Modern Decentralization Policy lecture and Transformation of the Political into the Ethical lecture formed a reliable perspective for new ideas [10, p. 351].

Both Ukrainian (L. Serdechna, L. Ponomarenko) and Russian scientists (V. Mykhailov) turned to G. Durand's work in their publications in the Public Administration professional journal, whose articles were based on Russian

translations of Durand's works and the characteristics of his work in Russian A. Duhin's work.

L. Serdechna's article reflects the points of Durand's theory of the imaginary 'imager' and attempts to describe it to understand the processes taking place in 'transitional' Ukrainian society, and the context of practical application to certain sociological structures as theoretical foundations of public administration [11]. L. Ponomarenko notes the prominent place of G. Durand among the students of K.G. Jung, applying his theoretical developments in the field of imagination and myths to study the archetypal nature of the national symbol [12].

In V. Mykhailov's publications, the propositions of G. Durand's works is used to form the author's position and develop tools of social management, to determine the role of elites and ideas of modern philosophy for public administration, etc. The scientist emphasizes that acquaintance with the 'sociology of imagination' of G. Durand prompted him to develop a new, based on his ideas, philosophy and theory of management [13; 14].

Thus, today in Ukraine scientists declare and realize the desire to evaluate and explain modernity using the results of G. Durand's work.

The work of the French scientist is better known in the Republic of Poland, which, in particular, was facilitated by the publication in 1986 of the translation of his book *'Imagination of the Symbolic'* (1964), which became a kind of brief introduction to the essence and ways of functioning of symbols in culture. It is in this area that we find most references to G. Durand's work

or the use of fragments of his works in Poland.

Already with the beginning of the post-communist transformation in Poland, attention to symbolism increased, which was accompanied by the emergence of scientific institutions based on interests. Thus, on the initiative of B. Sosen in 1995 a Department for the Study of Symbolic Imagination was established at the Institute of Romance Philology of the Jagiellonian University (Krakow), whose scientists used Durandian methodology; in 2004, a scientific circle of mythocritics started working at the Institute of Polish Philology of the University of Lodz, etc.

The first known Polish study of G. Durand's views, which concerned culture, was published in 1999 in Krakow in the Scientific Publishing House of the Pedagogical Academy named after the Commission on Public Education [15]. A monograph by S. Jasinowicz, devoted to highlighting the views of R. Barthes and G. Durand on the pluralism of culture. The first part of the study presents the intellectual profiles of Barthes and Durand in the chronological context of the formation of their concepts, noted their common interest in the phenomenon of meaning as a link between the cultural sphere, the human subject and the real world. The second part of the work is devoted to the consideration of some aspects of modern literature against the background of the methods of its criticism presented by Barthes and Durand, and, in particular, to the study of the relationships that may exist between critical methods and the 'cultural moment' of Western civilization in which these methods are used. The bibliography of R. Barthes's works

and G. Durand's works, as well as the works of other authors devoted to their activities, placed in the publication is important for studying the theoretical basis on these issues.

The publication of G. Durand's collection of works with a bibliography of his works in 2002, which gave an impetus to the development of relevant research and is often cited by Polish authors [16], was a significant contribution to the development of Durand studies in Poland.

Mastering of the methodology of G. Durand became important for the scientific community. In this context, a number of publications by Professor Marzena Karwowska, who has repeatedly completed research internships at foreign universities and centers, including in Grenoble and Paris, deserve attention. In particular, the following books were published under her pen: a book with an analysis of Bolesław Leśmian's ideas (2008) [17]; an article devoted to the analysis of the archetypes of day and night on the example of B. Leśmian's work (2017) [18] and an article on the analysis of the work of this Polish poet, which can be called a model of Durandian research methodology (2014). The analysis of B. Leśmian's plays in this article was methodologically based on the anthropological theory of G. Durand, and the symbolic meaning hidden in the poet's texts was analyzed from the point of view of mythocritical interpretation [19].

In 2015, the Publishing House of the University of Lodz published M. Karwowska's monograph 'Anthropology of Creative Imagination in Literary Research. Imaginary World of Bruno Schultz'. In it, in addition to

the brilliant use of the methodology of G. Durand, the presentation of the theory of anthropological structures of the imaginary, concepts and relevant areas of research, the characteristics of the Polish school of 'postdurandism' are important [20, p. 71–82].

M. Karwowska also refers to G. Durand's work in the publications of the following years. Thus, in the collective monograph of 2016 'Constant Presence of Myth in Literature and Culture', the article 'Myth in Modern Literary Research' [21, p. 12–22] is in the forefront, in which G. Durand is called the initiator of modern research on myth in Europe. The author analyzed the works of Polish authors on mythology, in particular the works of novelists B. Sosen, S. Jasionowicz, K. Falitska, M. Klik; theorist of literature J. Śłosarska; Polonists W. Sturtz and M. Dybizbanowski, gave grounds to conclude that Durandian methodology and post-Durandian hermeneutics are widely used in Poland. In M. Karwowska's monograph of 2020 [22], a significant part of the study on the anthropology of literature is based on the use of G. Durand's methodology (theory of anthropological structures of imaginary and the concept of cultural pluralism) and is also devoted to characterizing his work and revealing its influence on Polish culture.

The series of publications '*Imaginarium*' (published in 2016 [23] and in 2017 [24]), united by Editor S. Jasionowicz by a theme 'New Man' and available to researchers on the website of the Polish Theological Society, is rather interesting. The task of the *Imaginarium* series is to provide a comprehensive description of the motives and problems of Western culture. The authors of

the study, by comparing modern critical idioms, try to understand what it means to be human and seek to revive the discussion about concepts and visions of transformation or reinterpretation of human history. It is worth noting the publication of M. Karwowska 'Vision of a New Man in the Works of Miron Białoszewski' [24, p. 241–251] among the chapters of the book of 2017, as a significant part of it is based on the use of creative heritage and methodology of G. Durand. In particular, the article adopts the Durand's concept of the symbol as a mythical figure (*figure mythique*), expressed at the level of the language of the archetypal image (*image archétype*). In addition to G. Durand's work, the publications of his followers were also used.

From the point of view of generalizing the experience of using Durand's work, it is worth paying attention to M. Lubelska-Renuf's article 'The Structure of the Imaginary Czesław Miłosz and Gilbert Durand', which analyzes the theory of the imaginary and the practice of its implementation. The article argues the Polish poet and novelist Cz. Miłosz's works, in which images 'form real magnetic fields that gravitate around a number of central poetic symbols', can be perceived as a practical implementation of Durand's theory [25].

In Russia, the heritage of G. Durand is used in several areas, primarily in sociology, psychology and philology. The lectures of F. Walter, head of the Grenoble Center for Imaginary Studies, given in 2005 at Moscow State University and the Russian State University for the Humanities, and the published article based on them, were a certain impetus for disseminating information

about the school of mythology and, in particular, G. Durand. The detailed preface of the translator Yu. Pukhlii provided brief information about G. Durand and his main works and noted that 'there is still no complete and systematic idea of the origin, development and current 'sprouts' of the French mythological tradition' in Russia [26].

It is worth noting the research of sociologist O. Duhin, who in 2010 published the monograph 'Logos and Mythos: Sociology of Depths' [27] and the manual 'Sociology of Imagination. Introduction to Structural Sociology' [28], and in 2011 he defended his doctoral thesis 'Transformation of the Social Structure of Society in the Context of the Sociology of Imagination' [29]. Among the objectives of the study identified by the author, we should highlight those related to the discovery of the possibilities of 'sociology of imagination' for the study of archaic and traditional societies, as well as modern and postmodern eras. It is also important for the scientist to show the possibilities of the 'sociology of imagination' in studying the specifics of the transformation of the social structure of Russian society.

In the following years, a number of monographs by O. Duhin were published ('In Search of the Dark Logos' (2013); 'Noomakhia. Wars of the Mind. Three Logos: Apollo, Dionysus, Cybele' (2014); and others), which are based on G. Durand's work and are actively used in scientific research by Russian scientists. The activities of the Centre for Conservative Studies sociological school, founded in 2008 on the initiative of Professor A. Duhin and Dean of the Faculty of Sociology of M. V. Lo-

monosov Moscow State University V. Dobrenkov, and the Laboratory for Imagination Research founded in 2011, are also notable [30; 31]. Popular explanations of the essence of G. Durand's work are also important, an example of which is a video film created based on Duhin's texts [32].

It should be noted the statement of O. Duhin that G. Durand is based in his typology on the achievements of the Russian School of Physiology, in particular, on V. M. Bekhtieriev's work and O.O. Ukhtomskyi's work. The same idea is found in the works of modern Russian psychologists, for example, V. Slabinskii, who suggests integrating Durand's research into the theory of relations of V. Miasyshchev, considering that the two modes and three groups of myths identified by Durand in *imaginaire* are realized in the cluster of personality relations proposed by Myasishchev [33].

O. Duhin's scientific work has a significant resonance in Russia and is highly valued. In particular, I. Poltoraki notes that Europe in the person of G. Durand began to overcome dualism (the basic paradigm of the diurnal regime of Modernism), but later slipped into postmodern nihilism. O. Duhin, however, picked up the fallen flag, and now almost in a single person develops the 'sociology of imagination' [34]. This is emphasized by S. Semenov, who writes: 'Duhin, following Durand, considers death and time as negative categories' [35].

Noting the significant role of A. Duhin's research in popularizing G. Durand's ideas and works, as well as M. Maffesoli's works not only in Russia but also in other post-communist

countries, at the same time, it is worth noting the reactivity of many of his geopolitical theses based on archetypes, especially those concerning Poland and Ukraine, which has repeatedly been the subject of criticism of Polish scientists (M. Bała, M. Broda, P. Ebengard, J. Ignaszczak, A. Krasowski, K. Surowiec and others).

It is also worth mentioning other Russian authors who are actively working on the provisions of the school of archetypes and, in particular, the ideas of G. Durand, based on O. Duhin's work. Thus, V. Mykhailov, already mentioned by us, comprehends the theory of management in the style of 'nocturne' as a new philosophy of management, popularizing it in the Ukrainian professional publication [14]. In other publications by this author, known to us, the myth is considered as a tool or matrix of government, religious tradition and so on.

A more independent position is taken by V. Lebedko, who in his lectures in 2010 analyzed the views of G. Durand in terms of understanding the femininity of the soul, emphasizing that the imaginer is a strategy of anthropological trajectory in the face of death. The author notes that Jung's student and friend G. Durand 'gathered all the streams of the then Eranos in one stream and created the so-called deep sociology or sociology of imagination. And this is something that has not yet taken its place in science, because it, in fact, puts all modern science upside down' [36].

Analytical psychologist, Jungian psychotherapist L. Surin in a number of articles examines K. G. Jung's work and his followers, focusing, in particular, on

the analysis of the intellectual community of Eranos. It is important to note the author's opinion that 'archetypal psychology begins with K. G. Jung, A. Corben and G. Durand' [37], and citing the Durandian characteristics of the Eranos Society.

Several versions of the translation of G. Durand's works into Russian should be noted; in particular, a translation of G. Durand's *Anthropological Structures of the Imaginary* that is available via electronic access [38]. Publication of translated works and the popularization of Durand's ideas by O. Duhin contribute to their wider use, in particular, in fiction (E. Zaslavskaya and others). However, researchers noted the complexity and duration of work on translations.

It is worth noting the attempts to use G. Durand's work in political interests to justify a certain position, which is observed in both Ukraine and Russia. Thus, political scientist V. Hulevych in a 2009 article warned Ukraine against the 'diurnal' USA, pointing out that Ukraine and Russia are 'nocturne' countries: 'Hence the subconscious comparison of Russia and Ukraine as 'the older and the younger sisters'. It is known that the older sisters replace the parents, in whom the younger ones seek solace and security' [39]. In 2014, this author moved from Ukraine to Russia, declaring the struggle against Ukrainian nationalism. In the publication with the eloquent title 'Ukraine and Russia-Mother' (dated 30.08.2014), V. Hulevych resorts to ethnopsychological analysis concerning G. Durand and claims that 'Russia for Ukrainians is not an enemy, but a mother' [40]. This view seems politicized.

Conclusions and prospects for further researches. The conducted research shows that only in recent years G. Durand's work has become the subject of understanding by scientists of post-communist countries, which is largely explained by the lack of widely available publications of works in the original language, the lack of translations and the complexity of the problem.

In Ukraine, the School of Archetypes (E. Afonin and others), considering the approaches of G. Durand, made the first publications on philology and public administration and is preparing a translation of his works, which will contribute to their comprehensive study. In Poland, G. Durand's work is used from a methodological point of view, mainly for the study of literary processes. Contacts with French followers of G. Durand are noticeable. In Russia, using elements of G. Durand's work, a theory is built that justifies the features of Russian civilization, contrasting it with the Western one. What is common in post-communist countries is the desire to comprehend the ideas of G. Durand and use them to explain the present.

The analysis of practice shows the need to translate and publish G. Durand's work, which will facilitate the use of his ideas in post-communist countries. It is advisable to use its methodological approaches to analyze the essence of post-communist transformations, understand managerial, social and other transit problems, as well as to develop mythological studies and literary criticism. The popularization of G. Durand's work in the scientific community also seems useful.

REFERENCES

1. Manifest *Ukrainskoi shkoly arkhetypiky* [*Manifesto of the Ukrainian School of Archetypes*]. Retrieved from: <https://usarch.org> [in Ukrainian].
2. Dranenko H. (2009). Mifokrytyka ta retseptyvna teoriia: produktyvnyi dialoh [Mythocriticism and receptive theory: productive dialogue]. *Pytannia literaturoznavstva – Questions of literary criticism*, 78, 243–251 [in Ukrainian].
3. Dranenko H. (2009). Symvol ta mif u teoretychnii dumtsi Zh. Diurana [Symbol and myth in the theoretical thought of J. Durand]. *Bibliia i kultura – Bible and culture*, 11, 51–53 [in Ukrainian].
4. Dranenko H. (2010). Poniattia “mifolohichnoho tla” v antropolohichnii teorii uiavnoho Zh. Diurana [The concept of “mythological background” in the anthropological theory of the imaginary J. Durand]. *Pytannia literaturoznavstva – Questions of literary criticism*, 79, 114–123 [in Ukrainian].
5. Bondarchuk L. V. (2019). Retseptsiia mifolohii v khudozhnii tvorchosti: literaturno-istorychnyi aspekt [Reception of mythology in art: literary-historical aspect]. *Zakarpatski filolohichni studii – Transcarpathian philological studies*, 7(2), 172–176 [in Ukrainian].
6. Bondarchuk L. V. (2019). Frantsuzka mifokrytyka v literaturoznavchomu aspekti [French mythocriticism in the literary aspect]. *Pivdennyi arkhiv (filolohichni nauky) – Southern Archive (philological sciences)*, 78, 94–97 [in Ukrainian].
7. Maffesoli M. (2018). *Chas plemen. Zanepad indyvidualizmu v masovykh suspilstvakh* [Time of the tribes. Decline of individualism in mass societies]. Kyiv: Vydavnychi dim “Kyievo-Mohylianska akademiia” [in Ukrainian].
8. Afonin E. & Martynov A. (2019). *Ukrainske dyvo: vid depresii do sotsialnoho optymizmu* [Ukrainian miracle: from depression to social optimism]. Kyiv: Vydavnychi dim “Kyievo-Mohylianska akademiia” [in Ukrainian].
9. *Neotraibalizm i suchasna polityka decentralizatsii (2017). Vidkryta leksiia Mishelia Maffesoli. 29 travnia 2017 r.* [Neo-tribalism and modern decentralization policy. Open lecture by Michel Maffesoli. May 29, 2017]. Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
10. Sushyi O. V. (2018). Sotsialna arkhetypika u problemnomu poli publicnoho upravlinnia: suchasnyi stan i perspektyvy rozvytku [Social archetype in the problem field of public administration: current state and prospects of development]. *Publichne uriaduvannia – Public governance*, 4, 340–354 [in Ukrainian].
11. Serdechna L. (2016). Imazhyner Zh. Diurana yak arkhetypne pidhruntia rehuliuвання reklamnoi diialnosti [Imaginer of J. Durand as an archetypal basis for the regulation of advertising]. *Publichne uriaduvannia – Public governance*, 2, 226–236 [in Ukrainian].
12. Ponomarenko L. (2016). Imazhyner Zh. Diurana yak teoretychna osnova doslidzhennia arkhetypnoi pryrody natsionalnoho symvolu [Imaginer of J. Durand as a theoretical basis for the study of the archetypal nature of the national symbol]. *Arkhetypika i derzhavne upravlinnia: vyklyky ta ryzyky suspilnoi transformatsii – Archetypes and public administration: challenges and risks of social transformation* (p. 57–63). Kyiv-Tbilisi: NTTs “Psikhieia” [in Ukrainian].
13. Mykhailov V. (2012). Mif yak instrument sotsialnoho upravlinnia [Myth as a tool of social management]. *Publichne upravlinnia: teoriia ta praktyka – Public administration: theory*

- and practice*, Special Issue, 66–76 [in Ukrainian].
14. Mykhailov V. (2013). Teorija upravljenja v stile “noktjern” kak novaja filosofija upravljenja Management theory in the style of “nocturne” as a new philosophy of management. *Publichne upravlinnia – Public administration*, 3, 5–9 [in Russian].
 15. Jasionowicz S. (1999). *Roland Barthes – Gilbert Durand. Wize pluralizmu kultury*. Krakow: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Akademii Pedagogicznej [in Polish].
 16. *Potęga świata wyobrażeń czyli Archetypologia według Gilberta Duranda / pod red. Krystyny Falickiej* (2002). Lublin: Wydaw. Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej [in Polish].
 17. Karwowska M. (2008). *Prapamięć uśpiona. Świat wyobrażeń Bolesława Lesmiana*. Warszawa [in Polish].
 18. Karwowska M. (2010). Archetyp dnia, archetyp nocy. Ikonograficzne ukształtowanie świata przedstawionego w “Basni o rycerzu panskim” Bolesława Lesmiana. *Prace polonistyczne. Pory dnia, pory roku*, LXV, 51–70 [in Polish].
 19. Karwowska, M. (2014). “Coś go spętało i zmroczyło... nie może grać...”. Repartycja mityczna w dramatach mimicznych Bolesława Leśmiana. *Prace Polonistyczne*, 69, 103–115 [in Polish].
 20. Karwowska M. (2015). *Antropologia wyobraźni twórczej w badaniach literackich. Świat wyobrazony Brunona Schulza*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo uniwersytetu Łódzkiego [in Polish].
 21. Karwowska M. (2016). *Mit we współczesnych badaniach literackich. Trwała obecność mitu w literaturze i kulturze; pod. red. M. Karwowskiej, M. Grabowskiej, K. Zukowskiej* (p. 11–22). Łódź [in Polish].
 22. Karwowska M. (2020). *Świadomość rodzaja obrazu. Studia z antropologii literatury*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo uniwersytetu Łódzkiego [in Polish].
 23. *Obrazy świata, przestrzenie dzieła Literatura – sztuki plastyczne; pod redakcją Stanisława Jasionowicza* (Imaginarium, 1) (2016). Kraków: Wydawnictwo UNUM [in Polish].
 24. *Nowy Człowiek: wizje, projekty, języki; pod red. Stanisława Jasionowicza* (Imaginarium, 2) (2017). Kraków: Wydawnictwo UNUM [in Polish].
 25. Lubelska-Renouf M. (2019). Struktury wyobraźni Czesława Miłosza i Gilberta Duranda. *Prace Polonistyczne*, LXXIV, 29–51 [in Polish].
 26. Val’ter F. & Puhlij Ju. (2007). Segodnjashnij den’ francuzskoj shkoly sravnitel’noj mifologii (Na materiale romanov o korole Arture XII–XIII vekov) [The present day of the French school of comparative mythology (Based on the novels about King Arthur of the XII–XIII centuries)]. *Voprosy literatury – Literature issues*, 2, 164–188 [in Russian].
 27. Dugin A. G. (2010). *Logos i mifos: sociologija glubin [Logos and Mythos: Sociology of the Depths]*. Moskva: Akademicheskij Proekt; TRISTA [in Russian].
 28. Dugin A. G. (2010). *Sociologija voobrazhenija. Vvedenie v strukturnuju sociologiju [Sociology of imagination. Introduction to Structural Sociology]* Moskva: Akademicheskij Proekt; TRISTA [in Russian].
 29. Dugin A. G. (2011). *Transformacija social’noj struktury obshhestva v kontekste sociologii voobrazhenija [Transformation of the social structure of society in the context of the sociology of imagination]*. Doctor’s thesis. Rostovna-Donu [in Russian].
 30. *Centr konservacionnyh issledovanij [Center for Conservative Research]*. Retrieved from <http://konservatizm.org/> [in Russian].
 31. *IMAGINAIRE. Laboratorija issledovanij voobrazhenija [IMAGINAIRE. Imagination Research Laboratory]*. Re-

- rieved from <http://www.imaginaire.ru/> [in Russian].
32. *l'imaginaire Zhil'bera Djurana*. Fil'm Dmitrija Efremova [l'imaginaire of Gilbert Durand. Film by Dmitry Efremov]. Retrieved from <https://vimeo.com/68985202> [in Russian].
 33. Slabinskij V. Ju. (2016). Pozitivnaja dinamičeskaja psihoterapija: analiz snovidenij v rusle psihologii ot-noshenij V. N. Mjasishheva [Positive dynamic psychotherapy: analysis of dreams in line with the psychology of relationships V. N. Myasishchev]. *Medicinskaja psihologija v Rossii – Medical psychology in Russia*, 6 (41). Retrieved from http://www.mprj.ru/archiv_global/2016_6_41/nomer05.php [in Russian].
 34. Poltoraki I. (2014). *Čto nasha zhizn'?* *Traekt!* [What is our life? Traject!] Retrieved from <https://maxpark.com/user/4294967877/content/2591473> [in Russian].
 35. Semenov S. A. (2013). *Dugin i Zh. Djuran o vremeni i smerti* [Dugin and J. Durand about time and death]. Retrieved from http://samlib.ru/s/semenow_sergej_aleksandrowich/aduginijduranovremeniismerti.shtml [in Russian].
 36. Lebed'ko V. (2010). *Fenomenologija Dushi. Lekcija 10. 21.08.2010* [Phenomenology of the Soul. Lecture 10. 21.08.2010]. Retrieved from <http://www.lebedko.su/nedavnie-stati/fenomenologiya-dushi-lekczija-10> [in Russian].
 37. Surina L. A. (2018). “Jeranos” K. G. Junga: vzaimootrazhenie Cheloveka i kosmosa [“Eranos” K. G. Jung: the relationship between Man and the cosmos]. *Psihoterapija – Psychotherapy*, 5, 24–31 [in Russian].
 38. Djuran Zh. (2015). *Antropologičeskie struktury voobrazhaemogo; perevod B. Nosenok* [Anthropological structures of the imaginary; translated by B. Nosenok]. Retrieved from <https://castalia.ru/translations/zhilber-dyuran-antropologičeskie-struktury-yi-voobrazhaemogo-vvedenie-bes-poleznyie-obrazyi> [in Russian].
 39. Gulevich V. (2009). *Zhil'ber Djuran protiv Viktora Jushhenko* [Gilbert Durand vs. Viktor Yushchenko]. Retrieved from <https://odnarydyna.org/content/zhilber-dyuran-protiv-viktora-yushchenko> [in Russian].
 40. Gulevich V. (2014). *Ukraina i Rossija-matushka* [Ukraine and Mother Russia]. Retrieved from <https://ukraina.ru/opinions/20140830/1010329859.html> [in Russian].

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. Маніфест Української школи архетипіки. URL: <https://usarch.org> (дата звернення: 15.10.2020).
2. Драненко Г. Міфокритика та рецептивна теорія: продуктивний діалог // Питання літературознавства. 2009. Вип. 78. С. 243–251.
3. Драненко Г. Символ та міф у теоретичній думці Ж. Дюрана // Біблія і культура. 2009. Вип. 11. С. 51–53.
4. Драненко Г. Поняття “міфологічного тла” в антропологічній теорії уявного Ж. Дюрана // Питання літературознавства. 2010. Вип. 79. С. 114–123.
5. Бондарчук Л. В. Рецепція міфології в художній творчості: літературно-історичний аспект // Закарпатські філологічні студії. 2019. Вип. 7. Т. 2. С. 172–176.
6. Бондарчук Л. Французька міфокритика в літературознавчому аспекті // Південний архів (філологічні науки). 2019. № 78. С. 94–97.
7. Маффесолі М. Час племен. Занепад індивідуалізму в масових суспільствах: пер. з фр. Київ: Вид. дім “Києво-Могилянська академія”, 2018. 264 с.

8. *Афонін Е., Мартинов А.* Українське диво: від депресії до соціального оптимізму. Київ: Вид. дім “Києво-Могилянська академія”, 2019. 296 с.
9. Неотрайбалізм і сучасна політика децентралізації. Відкрита лекція Мішеля Маффесолі. 29 травня 2017 р. Київ, 2017. 6 с.
10. *Сушій О. В.* Соціальна архетипіка у проблемному полі публічного управління: сучасний стан і перспективи розвитку // Публічне урядування. 2018. № 4(14). С. 340–354.
11. *Сердечна Л.* Імажинер Ж. Дюрана як архетипне підґрунтя регулювання рекламної діяльності // Публічне урядування. 2016. № 2(3). С. 226–236.
12. *Пономаренко Л.* Імажинер Ж. Дюрана як теоретична основа дослідження архетипної природи національного символу. Архетипіка і державне управління: виклики та ризики суспільної трансформації. Київ-Тбілісі: НТЦ “Псіхея”, 2016. С. 57–63.
13. *Михайлов В.* Міф як інструмент соціального управління // Публічне управління: теорія та практика. 2012. Спец. вип. С. 66–76.
14. *Михайлов В.* Теорія управління в стилі “ноктюрн” как новая философия управления // Публічне управління. 2013. № 3. С. 5–9.
15. *Jasionowicz S.* Roland Barthes – Gilbert Durand. Wizje pluralizmu kultury. Krakow: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Akademii Pedagogicznej, 1999. 154 s.
16. *Potęga świata wyobrażeń czyli Archetypologia według Gilberta Duranda / pod red. Krystyny Falickiej.* Lublin: Wydaw. Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, 2002. 282 s.
17. *Karwowska M.* Prapamięć uśpiona. Świat wyobrażeń Bolesława Lesmiana. Warszawa, 2008. 194 s.
18. *Karwowska M.* Archetyp dnia, archetyp nocy. Ikonograficzne ukszaltowanie świata przedstawionego w “Basni o rycerzu panskim” Bolesława Lesminana. Prace polonistyczne. Pory dnia, pory roku. 2010. Seria LXV. S. 51–70.
19. *Karwowska M.* “Coś go spędzało i zmroczyło... nie może grać...”. Repartycja mityczna w dramatach mimicznych Bolesława Leśmiana // Prace Polonistyczne. 2014. № 69. S. 103–115.
20. *Karwowska M.* Antropologia wyobraźni twórczej w badaniach literackich. Świat wyobraźni Brunona Schulza. Lodz: Wydawnictwo uniwersytetu Lodzkiego, 2015. 352 s.
21. *Karwowska M.* Mit we współczesnych badaniach literackich. Trwała obecność mitu w literaturze i kulturze; pod red. M. Karwowskiej, M. Grabowskiego, K. Zukowskiej. Lodz, 2016. S. 11–22.
22. *Karwowska M.* Świadomość rodzaju obrazu. Studia z antropologii literatury. Lodz: Wydawnictwo uniwersytetu Lodzkiego, 2020. 190 s.
23. *Obrazy świata, przestrzenie dzieła Literatura – sztuki plastyczne; pod redakcją Stanisława Jasionowicza (Imaginarium, 1).* Kraków: Wydawnictwo UNUM, 2016. 144 s.
24. *Nowy Człowiek: wizje, projekty, języki; pod red. Stanisława Jasionowicza (Imaginarium, 2).* Kraków: Wydawnictwo UNUM, 2017. 292 s.
25. *Lubelska-Renouf M.* Struktury wyobraźni Czesława Miłosza i Gilberta Duranda. Prace Polonistyczne. 2019. Seria LXXIV. S. 29–51.
26. *Вальтер Ф., Пухлий Ю.* Сегодняшний день французской школы сравнительной мифологии (На материале романов о короле Артуре XII–XIII веков). Перевод с французского, вступительная статья и примечания Ю. Пухлий // Вопросы литературы. 2007. № 2. С. 164–188.
27. *Дугин А Г.* Логос и мифос: социология глубин. Москва: Академический Проект; ТРИСТА, 2010. 364 с.

28. *Дугин А. Г.* Трансформация социальной структуры общества в контексте социологии воображения: дис. ... д-ра социол. наук. Ростов-н/Д, 2011. 453 с.
29. *Дугин А. Г.* Социология воображения. Введение в структурную социологию. Москва: Академический Проект; ТРИСТА, 2010. 564 с.
30. Центр консервативных исследований. URL: <http://konservatizm.org/> (дата звернения: 28.10.2020).
31. IMAGINAIRE. Лаборатория исследований воображения. URL: <http://www.imaginaire.ru/> (дата звернения: 28.10.2020).
32. l'imaginaire Жильбера Дюрана. Фильм Дмитрия Ефремова. URL: <https://vimeo.com/68985202> (дата звернения: 02.11.2020).
33. *Слабинский В. Ю.* Позитивная динамическая психотерапия: анализ сновидений в русле психологии отношений В. Н. Мясищева // Медицинская психология в России. 2016. № 6 (41). URL: http://www.mprj.ru/archiv_global/2016_6_41/nomer05.php (дата звернения: 06.11.2020).
34. *Полтораки И.* Что наша жизнь? Траект! URL: <https://maxpark.com/user/4294967877/content/2591473> (дата звернения: 06.11.2020).
35. *Семенов С. А.* Дугин и Ж. Дюран о времени и смерти. URL: http://samlib.ru/s/semenow_sergej_aleksandrowich/aduginijduranovremeniismerti.shtml (дата звернения: 10.11.2020).
36. *Лебедько В.* Феноменология Души. Лекция 10. 21.08.2010. URL: <http://www.lebedko.su/nedavnie-stati/fenomenologiya-dushi-lekcziya-10> (дата звернения: 10.11.2020).
37. *Сурина Л. А.* “Эранос” К. Г. Юнга: взаимоотражение Человека и космоса // Психотерапия. 2018. № 5. С. 24–31.
38. *Дюран Ж.* Антропологические структуры воображаемого; перевод Б. Носенок. URL: <https://castalia.ru/translations/zhilber-dyuran-antropologicheskie-strukturyi-voobrazhaemogo-vvedenie-bespoleznye-obrazyi> (дата звернения: 14.11.2020).
39. *Гулевич В.* Жильбер Дюран против Виктора Ющенко. URL: <https://odnarodyna.org/content/zhilberdyuran-protiv-viktora-yushchenko> (дата звернения: 14.11.2020).
40. *Гулевич В.* Украина и Россия-матушка. URL: <https://ukraina.ru/opinions/20140830/1010329859.html> (дата звернения: 14.11.2020).