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Abstract:
The article examines the emergence and development of the concept of neomythologism in the literature. A few definitions of term developed by foreign scientists are given. In this article, an attempt has been made to interpret various concepts available in the modern literature.
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The development of culture throughout the twentieth century is inextricably linked with the scientific and artistic consciousness of the myth. The mythopoetic aspect of the study of a literary work attracts close attention of literary scholars, both theoreticians and literary historians. There is also a new phenomenon in myth-making called neomythologism. Neomythologism is the mythical basis of a modern literary work, where mythical imagination, thought and mythologism are embodied.

The dictionary of literary terms gives the following definition: neomythologism is a concept that considers mythologism (correlation with myth) as the most characteristic form of artistic thinking in the art of the twentieth century. According to this concept, the entire twentieth century appears as a complex system of artfully conjugated and interrelated cultural and aesthetic myths. Neomythologism is a form of artistic thinking specific for the twentieth century, which presupposes a special attitude to mythological plots, images and symbols that are not so much reproduced as they are played or recreated, thereby giving rise to new myths correlated with modernity. Thus, the neo-mythological art of the twentieth century, as it were, constantly refers to the most ancient samples, measures itself against the chosen cultural tradition.
Neomyth is almost unrelated to the ancients. It is not recreated, but created anew under new conditions. The neomyth form is usually characterized by the presence of sleep, hallucinations, a stream of consciousness. Speaking about modern neomythologization, one should not forget about the ambiguity of the myth, which, of course, presupposes a multilateral interpretation of the image. It should be remembered that many of the modern interpretations were laid down in antiquity. It predominantly raises enquiries on the issues of identity, continuity, memory, alienation, assimilation and homecoming.(D’Rozario, et. al. 2020)

Z.G. Mints refers directly to the term "neo-mythologism", analyzing the peculiarities of the poetics of Russian symbolism, and gives the following the definition of the concept: Neo-mythology of the twentieth century, no matter how not to define it, is cultural phenomenon, difficult to correlate with a realistic heritage of the 19th century (it is not accidental that it is connected, first of all, with so basic for the prose of the last century as the novel). Targeting archaic consciousness will certainly unite in "neo-mythological" texts with a problem tic and structure of social romance, novels, etc., and often with polemics with them [5, p.60]. L.N. Ryaguzov, addressing already to the poetics and ontology of V. Nabokov, calls for the possibility of their description and analysis for in terms of neo-mythologism, defining the latter as a phenomenon consisting in the discovery weapons behind every superficial and unitary natural manifestation of the text of deep and universal laws [6, p. 5]. Not resorting directly to the term "neo-mythologism", M.N. Epstein gives a detailed description of the differences, not only mythological logical thinking of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, but also the most myth-generating situation a typological characteristic of mythologism in the culture of the twentieth century (Epstein M.1988).

Thus, there was a paradox greasy position: the term exists, functions in science, but does not attach to some specific conceptual definition. Meanwhile, it is necessary the emergence of the concept is explained by the dial-historical patterns development of the literary process: neo-mythological trends in world literature synchronized with neo-romantic and neoclassical, and in the middle of the twentieth century with the phenomenon of "neo-baroque". It’s obvious that traditional artistic methods, undergoing resemantization in culture of the twentieth century, are recognized, on the one hand, in paradigm of objectively existing and established tradition, on the other hand, presented are its qualitatively new manifest station. So, M. Mikhailova, giving a comparison a thorough analysis of S.N. Sergeeva Tsensky and L.D. Zinovieva-Annibal, on based on the review of G. Chulkov on the collection of stories by the writer "Tragic Menagerie" builds up the totality of features that is characteristic of the
neo-realism of Russian literature at the beginning of the twentieth century (Mikhailova, 1998). The neo-mythologism that arises among the Russian Symbolists, appealing to the forms of archaic, prelogical mythological thinking, strove, according to the conclusion of Z.G. Mintz, overcome the naturalism and causality of later culture, lead to awareness of the basic foundations of human being, and the symbol was interpreted as a stage of ascent to the myth, and the myth as world order formula (Mints, 2004). New reading traditional art methods in Russian culture of the early twentieth century synchronized with the same trends in the world culture. F. Kafka creates new mythology from modern everydayness, and not on the model of the exiting world philosophical pantheon, like W. Blake, or interpreting some mythological plot like German romantics, J. Joyce discovers mythological primary schemes in the fabric of modern reality, not interpreting the myth, and correlating the mythology historical reality and current historical the being of their heroes. In the culture and literature of the early twentieth century, those qualitative features are formed ness of the mythologism of the twentieth century, which allow us to define it as a phenomenon of “neo-mythologism ”. If in the literature of the nineteenth century the distance between archaic myth and its modern interpretation, then the myths of the twentieth century are built are based on modern history, co-temporary being and life, following the general schemes of mythological thinking. Mythological thinking is a priori orientation in the depths of culture, aimed at decoding archaic origins as own phenomena of reality, so and images generated by the imagination of the artist's imagination. Neo-mythologism exists only in context and is generated through conjugation at least two texts, one of which belongs to the archaic culture, and the other to the modern one. The neo-mythologism of the basis based on correlation, comparison, mutual identification chronologically and ethnically distinct phenomena, to the awareness through the paradigm of invariants of the universal version of the cosmic unity of the world and patterns of his creative reflection and re-creation. At the same time, the paradox is neo-mythologism is that the "second", the original text, actually mythological sky prototext is present a priori, then without putting on the form of a specific text myth of creation or myth of initiation. Neo-mythologism appeals to general schemes mythological thinking, to the complex myths that form the sphere of collective unconscious, suggesting correlated new text with an archetype is often not interpreting some archaic myth as such.

Despite some vague terminology, Jung's theory of archetypes of the collective unconscious served as the basis for the creation of whole lines schools of theology (ritual-mythological, anagogic metaliteration Fry's), although attempts to concrete the concept itself,
give it terminological clarity of enterprise were taken repeatedly (Eliade,1987). Results of the audit terminology proposed by Jung, and the reasons for this revision are analyzed by S. Senderovich on the pages of the magazine Logos” [8, No. 6]. The conclusions of the researcher are go to the following position: ... the main point of revision of the concept of archetype is that the phenomenon, meaningful by this concept, has a two-level neural, complex character: it fixes is at the level of myth, individual figures are which get their certainty, hacharacter is only in its context and cannot gut be regarded as independent and self valuable phenomena” [Ryaguzova,2000]. Together with themes, archetypes remain prerequisites for times, their cause, moments of the first initial concretization on the way from unconscious the conscious to the conscious " anticipation and creativity human experience. Thus, archetype, lacking concreteness, appears constant of creative imagination, both creating and reproducing, in the role preceding conscious experience intuition modeling psychological and, in particular, creative activity and external social behavior. Region archetype is pre-individual, it is universal and undifferentiated. Jung’s archetypal images are fluid and vague? Their number is variable. "It (Jung) emphasized the plurality of archaeological types that make up the scope of the collective unconscious. The reader is numerous of Jung's works gets the impression of their incalculability, "- says S. Senderovich, 1995. Undifferentiated the incalculability of the archetype of the corresponding blows the prepersonalities of the mythological the hero, his fluidity and uncertainty, in this aspect, we can talk about identical archetype and myth established in neo-mythological space.

The fundamental principle of research text in the aspect of decoding it archaic foundations formulated by V.V. Ivanov as follows: Every text contains in your own story. She can come to life in the depending on its application (Ivanov,1988). The integrity of the world of modern neo-mythological the text is read as in the context combining the text and metatext of the artist, the text and metatext of the previous and synchronously existing literary tradition, the text and its archaic prototexts. An appeal to the archaic prototext "indicates the restoration of some some components of the mythological mouse laziness as schemes, preconditions of images or events of the plot, to the mythological reflexis of the author's artistic thinking.

Modern category concept myth combines two modifications of the last her:
1. Archaic, primitive, worn out an initial myth that is not plotted, kretén and is realized as a cyclical, constantly reproducing mechanism; his characters are pre-personal, principled but proteistic, interchangeable in their functions.
2. Myth, as a secondary semiological system that reproduces individual laws and structures of mythological thinking in individual elements of a holistic artistic structure, dating back to primary archaic myth. The myth fluctuates between the sequential plot and the cyclical continuous narration: with one hand, myth and ritual recreate a successive succession of events, on the other hand, this closed loop without end and beginning, continuous narration. This fundamental ambivalence of the archaic myth and allows it to be extrapolated to the modern verbal art. R. Barth comes to the conclusion that the modern myth "can be built on the basis of any meaning" (Barth, 1989) since the general laws of mythological thinking are objective, which can be reconstructed in the literature of modern times, acquiring the status myth-generating model. The principle of mythological analogy at a qualitatively new level of continuation keeps the traditions of 19th century mythology, suggesting, if not an interpretation of the archaic prototext, then an indication of some a specific myth or a complex of myths, which, in turn, are not subject to a new reading, but outline the trend of interpretation and understanding of the modern text. The values of ethics and usage of skills make us professionally strong when it comes to choice and decision making (Mishra, S.K. & Mishra, P. 2020). Thus, it is not a mythological times or the plot is subject to interpretation, and modern reality and its hero interpreted through the prism of archaic sky myth.

Thus, neo-mythologiz is a new edition of mythologism XIX century, caused by the new awareness of the place of myth in the system of modern culture. It can be noted that "neo-mythologism" actualizes the parallel presence of myth in that situation modern reality, which is recreated in the text. The term exists, functions in science, but is not attached to some specific conceptual definition. Meanwhile, the very need for the emergence of a concept is explained by stage-historical laws. development of the literary process: neomythological trends in world literature synchronized with neo-romantic and neoclassical, and in the middle of the twentieth century with the phenomenon of "neo-baroque".
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