

<https://doi.org/10.15407/socium2025.04.015>
UDC 316.75:321.01:141.72 (477)



Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International

Pazdrii V.A., postgraduate student, Research Institute of Ukrainian Studies, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, 60, Volodymyrska Str., Kyiv, 01033, Ukraine, email: vikapazdrii@gmail.com, ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-5366-6789>

REVIVAL OF THE ARCHETYPE OF “JAPHETH'S STRENGTH” IN THE POSTMODERN UKRAINIAN MYTHOS (ACCORDING TO THE STATE CONCEPT OF V. LYPYNSKII)

The article examines the cultural and historical archetype of “Japheth’s Strength” through the lens of V. Lypynskii’s concept of statehood, analysing its relevance for contemporary Ukraine. The role of historical archetypes in shaping national identity, mythos, and the functioning of political institutions amid postmodern crisis realities – particularly within the context of the Russian–Ukrainian war is investigated. The study employs a historical-hermeneutic and archetypal-mythological methodology, supplemented by a comparative analysis of modern Ukrainian political discourse. The focus is placed on the “Japheth’s Strength” and its counterpart, the “Ham’s Strength” exploring their influence on national consciousness, political culture, and the potential for these archetypes to foster social cohesion and overcome societal fragmentation. The paper reveals that the archetype of “Japheth’s Strength” can serve as a foundation for cultivating new national elite responsible for state-building, moral leadership, and civic solidarity. At the same time, the research underscores the necessity of reinterpreting this archetype within the postmodern context, characterised by fluid hierarchies and plural identities that require innovative approaches to governance and citizen engagement. The study concludes that institutional reforms are essential for integrating the concept of “Japheth’s Strength” into Ukraine’s current political framework – particularly through educational and informational reforms, enhanced civic participation, and support for cultural initiatives aimed at nurturing a renewed and resilient national consciousness.

Keywords: historical archetype, mythos, postmodernity, political institutions, Vyacheslav Lypynskii, “Japheth’s Strength”, history of Ukraine.

Паздрій В.А., аспірантка Науково-дослідного інституту українознавства Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка, вул. Володимирська, 60, Київ, 01033, Україна, email: vikapazdrii@gmail.com, ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-5366-6789>

ВІДРОДЖЕННЯ АРХЕТИПУ “ЯФЕТОВОЇ СИЛИ” У ПОСТМОДЕРНОМУ УКРАЇНСЬКОМУ МІФОСІ (ЗА ДЕРЖАВНИЦЬКОЮ КОНЦЕПЦІЄЮ В. ЛИПІНСЬКОГО)

У статті досліджується культурно-історичний архетип “Яфетової Сили” через призму державницької концепції В. Липинського. Автор аналізує роль історичних архетипів у формуванні національної ідентичності через міфос і функціонування політичних інститутів в умовах постмодерних кризових реалій, зокрема в контексті російсько-української війни. У статті проаналізовано архетип “Яфетової Сили” в контексті постмодерного українського міфоса, інтерпретованого крізь призму державницької концепції В. Липинського. Автором з’ясовано потенціал цього архетипу у процесах суспільної консолідації та формування

© Pazdrii V.A., 2025

ISSN 1681-116X. Ukrainian Society, 2025, № 4 (95): 15–24

15

національної свідомості сучасних українців. Методологія роботи поєднує історико-герменевтичний аналіз з архетипно-міфологічним підходом, а також компаративним аналізом сучасного політичного дискурсу в Україні. Основну увагу приділено вивченню “Яфетової Сили” та її антиподу, “Хамової Сили”, їхнього впливу на національну свідомість і політичну культуру, а також можливості відродження цих архетипів для подолання соціальної фрагментації. У статті показано, що архетип “Яфетової Сили” може стати основою для формування нової вітчизняної еліти, відповідальної за державотворення, моральне лідерство й суспільну солідарність. Водночас наукова розвідка підкреслює важливість переосмислення цього архетипу в умовах постмодерну, де відсутність сталих ієрархій і множинність ідентичностей вимагають нового підходу до політичного управління та взаємодії з громадянами. Зокрема, необхідно враховувати історичні контексти та специфіку українського соціуму, що дозволяє ефективно розкрити національний архетипічний потенціал у реагуванні на виклики постмодерної доби й забезпечити стабільність національного розвитку. Автором обґрунтована необхідність інституційних реформ для реалізації концепту “Яфетової Сили” в сучасному політичному просторі України, зокрема через реформування освітньої й інформаційної політики, підвищення рівня громадянської участі та підтримку культурних ініціатив, що сприяють формуванню нової національної свідомості.

Ключові слова: історичний архетип, міфос, постмодерн, політичні інститути, В'ячеслав Липинський, “Яфетова Сила”, історія України.

The postmodern era, which began in the 1960s and 1970s, launched a fundamental transformation of the socio-political landscape, putting human communities and political institutions before a number of profound challenges. The rise of radical scepticism towards universal truths, grand narratives, and fixed hierarchies inevitably called into question the effectiveness of government institutions in addressing such epistemological dislocations. The growing importance of social movements and digital democracy, the “blurring” of personal identities (including social, national, and political), the globalisation erosion of territorial, temporal, and subjective boundaries, the hypermediatisation of conflicts, and many other postmodern influences have significantly complicated the functioning of government institutions.

In the absence of a modern era citizen integrated into a coherent national or ideological framework, legitimate political authorities risk becoming aestheticised – transformed into mere “spectacle” rather than functioning as effective instruments of governance. Moreover, crisis conditions, such as those faced by Ukrainian society following the Russia’s invasion on February 24, 2022, tend to intensify postmodern pressures on political institutions, escalating them to an existential level. In such contexts, not only national well-being, but the very survival of the state depends on the degree of consolidation between government and civil society.

Under the threat of physical annihilation, the perception of the state by its own citizens as merely another instrument of violence rather than an organic manifestation of national will – together with the absence of clear boundaries between “native” and “stranger”, “friend” and “foe” and the ongoing fragmentation of society into opposing categories such as “rear” and “front”, “conscious” and “evaders”, “pro-government” and “anti-government” – poses a direct threat to the nation’s survival. Achieving meaningful consolidation between

state and society requires a profound conceptual reconfiguration of political institutions, capable of fostering cohesion and legitimacy amid social disintegration, informational insularity, pluralism, and persistent instability.

However, unilateral improvement of government institutions is not enough for effective interaction with the public in difficult military conditions. In the process of political consolidation, with a significant decline in institutional trust, not only the efficiency of administrative management, but also the ability of the authorities to appeal to the deep structures of collective identity, which are formed through the national mythos, becomes important.

Mythos is traditionally understood as a narrative structure and symbolic system, which, according to E.D. Smith [1; 2], underlies the interpretation of an ethnic community: its existential being; legitimization of its own social institutions, including political ones; historical and political identity of the nation, etc. It shapes the national narrative by transmitting archetypes of the collective consciousness that define shared values, identities, and patterns of historical self-perception.

The mythos, manifesting itself through the archetypes of collective consciousness, provides the national narrative with its emotional and symbolic core: it transforms historical events into signs and historical figures into bearers of timeless meanings. In this way, the symbolic space of the nation is constructed – a system of images, heroes, rituals, and values delineating the boundaries of the “self” and the “other”, shaping an imagined unity, and defining cultural identity. These archetypes underlie what M. Popovych describes as “the general features of the Ukrainian mentality characteristic of all times” [3, p. 23].

The national mythos is based on historical archetypes, which we define, according to the classical Jungian definition, as generalized types of nationally significant figures, historical and political phenomena or models of collective behaviour, typical and repeated for the same ethnic community in similar historical, social, political and cultural conditions at different stages of its development. In this context, the archetype is viewed not as a religious or philosophical mythologeme, but as a sociocultural construct that shapes a system of behavioural models and value orientations. To date, historical archetypes as the basis of the national mythos have been studied only partially in both Ukrainian and foreign humanities [4].

M. Eliade revealed how ancient societies experienced real historical events through mythological archetypes and explained the mechanisms of constant reproduction of the archetypal order through rituals [5]. J. Campbell analysed mythical archetypes that were reflected in historical ethno-cultural processes (in particular, messiahs and saviours as subjects of the heroic narrative) [6]. P. Nora explained how archetypal images are fixed in the historical collective consciousness through the concept of “places of memory” [7].

M. Morden considers the archetypal component of the national myth in the concept of the narrative of nationalist behavior [8]. J. McNamara defines the archetypes of the “fathers-founders” and heroes of the nation as the ideological basis of nationalism, symbolisation of ethnic identity and ensuring the permanent preservation of the national ideal [4]. M. Bruce focused on the Jungian archetypes of historical leaders from different countries

and eras, refuting the widespread stereotype that the self-awareness of military leaders and rulers is mostly limited to the Warrior archetype [9].

E. Afonin and A. Martynov studied archetypes as a source of the innovation process [10]. O. Hordiichuk conducted a socio-philosophical analysis of the archetypes of Ukrainian mentality [11]. N. Semerhei analysed the historiographical discourse on the role of archetypes in stabilising the conflicted development of the national identity of Ukrainians in the imperial era [12]. Archetypes and mentality through the prism of history are also the subject of a study by M. Yurii and L. Aleksiiivets [13].

We conclude that, despite a considerable body of research on archetypal consciousness and national mythos, the impact of historical archetypes on political institutions – particularly under the crisis conditions of the postmodern era – remains an open question. In light of the urgent need to consolidate governmental institutions and civil society in response to Russian aggression, this issue gains particular relevance.

The purpose of the article is to study the archetype of “Japheth's Strength” in the postmodern Ukrainian mythos (according to V. Lypynskii's concept of statehood) to determine its potential to consolidate Ukrainian society and develop Ukrainian national consciousness further.

Achieving the research objective entails the completion of the following objectives:

1. To reveal the essence of “Japheth's Strength” and “Ham's Strength” as cultural and historical archetypes within the national mythos;
2. To characterise the influence of the “Japhethian” and “Hamian” cultural-historical archetypes on ethnic consciousness;
3. To explain the principal differences between the “Japhethian” and “Hamian” worldviews in the context of war realities;
4. To justify the relevance of and identify pathways for reviving the archetype of “Japheth's Strength” in the postmodern Ukrainian mythos.

The research methodology is based on a methodological framework that integrates historical-hermeneutic analysis of the writings of V. Lypynskii with an archetypal-mythological approach to interpreting political consciousness. Selected elements of comparative analysis are also applied. The archetypes of “Ham” and “Japheth” are conceptualised as models of collective behaviour that find expression in contemporary forms of political culture. To assess the ongoing relevance of these archetypes in recent Ukrainian history, the research further employs qualitative methods of political discourse analysis, particularly in relation to empirical data on collaboration and draft evasion, as well as comparative projections of historical archetypes onto present-day manifestations of anti-state tendencies within Ukrainian society.

V. Lypynskii's pamphlet “Ham and Japheth: On the Tenth Anniversary of 16/29 April 1918” (1928), like many other works by the leader of the statehood school of Ukrainian historiography, marked the beginning of a new understanding of the national mythos and historical archetypes. Using classical biblical archetypes, V. Lypynskii substantiates holistic models of political behaviour and civilisational choice: “Ham's” as a symbol of an anarchic, destructive element that destroys statehood from within, and “Japheth's” as an embodiment

of an organised, hierarchical principle capable of consolidating and creating legitimate power.

Even before the term archetype was introduced into scholarly discourse by C. Jung, V. Lypynskii intuitively employed its functional meaning in historiographical practice, demonstrating that without a metahistorical – and essentially mythological – framework, a political nation is unable to construct its own identity. The study of the archetypal figure of the Japheth as the founder of Ukrainian statehood makes it possible to explain the underlying causes of various contentious phenomena in Ukrainian history, ranging from early princely feuds to contemporary separatism in Donbas.

In particular, V. Lypynskii sees the prerequisites for the enslavement of Ukrainians, first by the Tatars and then by Lithuania, in “the first of our historical rudeness” of the appanage princes and the lack of Japhethian strength among the senior princes (“great Kyiv and Galician princes”) [14, p. 7]. The Tatars and Lithuania managed to retain power over the Ukrainians of that time because the “Ham’s rebellion” of the local principalities did not meet with sufficient resistance from the Japhethian rulers.

The rebellion against the legitimate Ukrainian government and the will of the people by the ideologues of the so-called “DPR” and “LPR” from among ethnic Ukrainians followed a similar scenario. As Y. Matsievskyi and T. Borodavko rightly observe, in 2014, neither of the natural prerequisites for a separatist movement were present in the Donbas – namely, discrimination against a specific ethnic group and the existence of a political elite capable of mobilising it. Furthermore, the claim that residents of the Donbas feared the new government in Kyiv is not adequately supported [15, p. 2].

Instead, the most plausible explanation for pro-Russian separatism among ethnic Ukrainians lies in the concept of the boorish consciousness (“hamstvo”) described by V. Lypynskii. At the time, this boorish consciousness was not counterbalanced by the Japhethic qualities within the Ukrainian leadership. According to Matsievskyi and Borodavko, this failure was due to “the fragmentation of the state, violent regime change, and the loss of control over the means of coercion” [15, p. 4].

The flight of V. Yanukovich posed a direct challenge to what Lypynskii termed “Ham's Strength”, whose worldview he characterised in the following way: “The source of power is me and those like me. In life, only power matters. Ukraine needs not statism, nor legality, nor tradition, but weapons and elemental force. We are girded with ammunition to the teeth” [14, p. 9].

This way, the historical portraits of the Bolshevik revolutionaries of the early twentieth century, as described by Lypynskii, and the modern Hirkins, Motorolas, and Zakharchenkos are almost identical. And understanding what the “Ham's Strength” is and how it can be opposed to the “Japheth's Strength” is very important for the Ukrainian nation to find enough strength to resist the invader.

The concept of “Ham All-Russian in Ukraine”, formulated by V. Lypynskii in 1928, properly explains how separatist movements are gradually forming and why the number of

collaborators in Ukraine is so high. As of November 2022, almost 1,800 criminal cases had been opened against collaborators who had agreed to cooperate with the Russian invaders¹.

The “Ham's Strength” is characterised by a total devaluation of the Ukrainian Japhethian aristocracy, the “fathers of the people”. Its proponents see these “fathers” as enemies, in the words of V. Lypynskii, and do not understand that “...the supreme power must be higher than my sovereign appetites” [14, p. 23]. The carriers of “Ham's” anti-ethnic consciousness do not have a clear idea of who the real enemy is and why. There is only a vision that the surrounding territory is “the monopoly property of me and my gang” [14, p. 23]. This inevitably leads to collaboration with the enemies of the nation and separatism.

In our opinion, the “Ham's” consciousness of a significant part of ethnic Ukrainians is one of the reasons for evasion, unwillingness to participate in the defence of the state or fulfil other civic duties. For instance, in January 2024 alone, the number of court sentences for evaders (120) amounted to 54% of the total number of such court decisions in 2022².

In the mindset of an individual who embodies the evader's consciousness, the state is not perceived as an integral political “organism” that demands contributions to its well-being, but rather as an external, alienated structure to be exploited or circumvented. Such an individual lacks orientation towards loyalty, solidarity, or selfless service to the common good, and instead displays a utilitarian attitude toward the political community, marked by tendencies towards escapism and disengagement.

Instead, the Japhethianism of Ukrainians – in contrast to “national rudeness” – is grounded primarily in internal cohesion, rather than in unity against an external enemy. As V. Lypynskii notes, such unity “...cannot be brought together by hatred of something outside itself, as communists or fascists are united by it” [14, p. 25]. Otherwise, in place of “Japheth's Strength”, the national psychology will assume boorish, destructive, and ultimately self-destructive traits. The contemporary relevance of Lypynskii's ideas is illustrated by the case of Russia: a society once united by legitimate hatred toward German fascism eventually cultivated its own form of national fascism – a development that has harmed Ukrainians unjustly.

According to V. Lypynskii, the Ukrainian (and any other national) “Ham” cannot be destroyed, and the very desire to do so is destructive from the point of view of historiosophy. A situation when “...Japheth's Ukrainian-creating Strength will give free rein to the Ukrainian Ham within the framework of the Ukrainian state law” [14, p. 25] can be constructive for Ukrainian state-building [14, p. 25]. It is about managing separatist sentiments, which are present in any society to varying degrees at different stages of its historical genesis. At the same time, “...for atamanic encroachments on the Supreme Power,

¹ Nearly 1,800 criminal cases were initiated against collaborators. (2022, November 26). Ukrinform. URL: <https://www.ukrinform.ua/rubric-ato/3601178-proti-kolaborantiv-porusili-majze-18-tisaci-kriminalnih-sprav.html> [in Ukrainian]

² Bohdanok, O. (2024). How many conscripts were prosecuted for service evasion – Opendatabot. *Suspilne*. URL: <https://suspilne.media/703130-skilki-vijskovo-zobovazanih-pritagnuli-do-vidpovidalnosti-za-uhilenna-vid-sluzbi-opendatabot/> [in Ukrainian]

for the destruction of the Ukrainian Land and for the destruction of the Church, the Army, the Family and the Class, Ham must go to the cage” [14, p. 25].

V. Lypynskii outlines the key attributes of the archetypal consciousness of the Ukrainian Japhethite as follows:

- taking as a standard the ideal patriot, exemplified by what he describes as “an old type of English public servant from the time of power” [14, p. 26];
- a strong emphasis on family values, viewed as the foundation for civic engagement and national ethics;
- devotion to honour, loyalty, and personal attachment to national leaders who are regarded as creators and moral exemplars [14, p. 26];
- an elevated religious awareness and a deep respect for spiritual and folk traditions;
- an unyielding internal moral code, characterised by its firmness and non-negotiability;
- self-identification as a noble elite, involving a conscious choice in favour of gentlemanly conduct and aristocratic self-discipline;
- affirmation of moral and spiritual superiority over crude physical or coercive strength.

From our standpoint, V. Lypynskii's concept of “Japhethic authority” may be viewed as a prototype of what N. Zborovska defines as “the code of statehood inherent to the national European world” [16, p. 58]. Undoubtedly, the literal embodiment of V. Lypynskii's ideals within a postmodern society is improbable, given the fundamental shift in the anthropological paradigm, the erosion of stable authority, and the multiplicity and fluidity of identities. Nevertheless, the concept of “Japheth's Strength” – as a historical archetype rooted in political responsibility, a strong moral core, and state-building maturity – can still be meaningfully interpreted within a postmodern framework. In a discursive context characterised by individualism, scepticism toward meta-narratives, and the relativisation of truth, what becomes relevant is not the replication of traits associated with the traditional elite, but rather the articulation of principles of value-driven leadership, moral subjectivity, and civic solidarity. Under the conditions of war and global competition of identities, the archetype of “Japheth's Strength” acquires the significance of a moral and integrative resource for society.

Thus, the idea of the civil servant is being reconfigured within the paradigm of the ethical public manager – someone accountable to society rather than subordinated to a vertical of power. The concept of aristocracy or elite in twenty-first-century Ukraine differs significantly from the notion of nobility that existed over a century ago, when “Ham and Japheth” was written. As V. Tomazov notes, “...today, we can speak of various elites – cultural, scientific, military, etc. – and this status is no longer legally inherited by their descendants”³. On the one hand, this complicates the task of defining who qualifies as the modern Ukrainian aristocracy and by what criteria. On the other hand, the absence of rigid class structures grants the nation a nearly unlimited opportunity to shape a new elite on its own terms. In this context, nobility and gentility, as behavioural principles in the public

³ Tomazov, V. (2018, October 3). Ukrainian aristocracy: From Kyivan Rus to the Hetmanate. National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. URL: <https://www.nas.gov.ua/EN/Messages/News/Pages/View.aspx?MessageID=4293> [in Ukrainian]

sphere, can be reframed within the idea of a “new elite of responsibility” – defined not by lineage, but by ethical and civic conduct. The priority of family values can be expressed by focusing on micro-communities of trust as the cells of civil society.

Respect for authority – not as a hereditary elite, but as a moral, intellectual and professional reputation – can be realised within the framework of democratic social capital. Religious consciousness takes the form of open traditionalism or worldview fundamentalism, which is not confessionally limited but contributes to the formation of a stable ethical system.

In general, adapting the Japhethid archetype to the postmodern paradigm is not about restoring historical forms, but reinterpreting functions: shifting from the figure of the aristocratic statesman to that of the citizen-agent – capable of acting within a landscape of multiple identities, moral ambivalence, and political instability. Political institutions in contemporary Ukraine must work to restore public trust in the state as a bearer of responsibility and moral authority. This need is underscored by the findings of a survey conducted by the Kyiv International Institute of Sociology in December 2024: 68% of Ukrainians expressed distrust in the Verkhovna Rada, 53% did not trust the government, and 63% lacked confidence in the judiciary⁴.

In this context, the archetypal figure of the Japhethian Ukrainian, who prioritises moral responsibility over coercion and rejects destructive opportunism in favour of conscious engagement in the construction of the common good, serves as a symbolic foundation for national consolidation. This ethical orientation contributes to maintaining the coherence of the political space, reinforcing both horizontal bonds among citizens and vertical trust in institutions, particularly at a time when the traditional system of public governance is under severe strain due to the ongoing war.

The concepts of “Japheth's Strength” and “Japheth's Ideal” developed by V. Lypynskii help to reveal the historical potential of Ukrainians as a nation grounded in law, order, and a profound cultural and spiritual tradition. This tradition, as K. Nastoishcha defines it, is “a trans-temporal, multilinear, flexible, and creative process that maintains the inner coherence of culture (as a system or organism) through the constant self-reproduction of its adaptive and protective functions” [17, p. 55].

The Ukrainian ethno-cultural tradition has suffered significantly from the imperial chauvinism of foreign powers and from the choices of Ukrainians themselves, who “...create the iron authority of Lenin, which curb their own rudeness – the “eros and fury” of the atamans” [14, p. 13]. However, the study of the potential of the Japhethian archetype of the Ukrainian will allow us to find more democratic and effective historical authorities that, unlike Leninism, will promote the free development of ethnic consciousness and ethnic culture.

Outlining further pathways for the self-realisation and development of Ukrainians' Japhethian national consciousness may also contribute to reducing manifestations of “rudeness” within society. This negative phenomenon, which continues to surface in

⁴ Matiash, T. (2025). Ukrainians trust volunteers the most, while trust in state authorities declines – Survey. *Lb.ua*. URL: https://lb.ua/society/2025/01/12/654977_naybilshe_ukraintsi_doviryayut.html [in Ukrainian]

Ukraine's modern history, can hardly be eradicated through coercive means. However, the conscious embrace of Japhethian ideals may help to neutralise the figure of the “Ukrainian Ham”, thereby significantly advancing national cohesion in the context of European integration.

Conclusions. Thus, the historical archetype of “Japheth's Strength” as a sociocultural model of elite responsibility and civic engagement can be reinterpreted in the contemporary cultural code as a foundation for a normative model of patriotic civic ethics. It emerges not only as a historical-mythological constant but also as a practical instrument for shaping the value orientations of contemporary civic culture.

Accordingly, political institutions should actively facilitate the reintegration of this archetype into contemporary civic consciousness. This task can be achieved through three interrelated strategies:

1. Reforming educational and information policies to promote a coherent national narrative in which state-builders, military personnel, volunteers, and community leaders exemplify the behavioural attributes associated with the “Japhethian Ideal”.

2. Further institutionalising mechanisms of civic participation, enabling citizens to take part in decisions of national significance not merely as service recipients, but as co-responsible civic actors – via public advisory councils attached to government institutions, electronic petitions, participatory budgeting, and similar instruments.

3. Providing state support for cultural production – in literature, cinema, and the arts – that reflects and disseminates the values and symbolic logic embedded in the Japhethian archetype.

To advance a more nuanced understanding of the problem, further inquiry should focus on several interrelated directions:

1) the extent to which manifestations of “Japhethian” and “Hamian” consciousness persist in contemporary Ukrainian society;

2) the archetypal framing of the state, authority, and elites within national media discourse (as explored through content analysis);

3) the expression of the “Japheth” archetype across other national cultures (a comparative perspective); and the mechanisms of symbolic integration – namely, the regulated inclusion of the “Hamian” archetype into the legitimate symbolic space of the nation.

References

1. Smith, A.D. (2004). *Chosen peoples: Sacred sources of national identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
2. Smith, A.D. (1991). *The ethnic origins of nation*. Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell.
3. Popovych, M.V., Kysliakovska, I.V., Viatkina, N.B., Navrotskyi, V.V., Vasylchenko, A.A., Kokhan, Ya.O. (2006). *Problems of mentality theory*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka [in Ukrainian]
4. McNamara, J. (2019). “Of the people”: A brief anatomy of an archetypal nationalism. *Irish Journal of Sociology*, 27 (1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0791603519827206>
5. Eliade, M. (2018). *The myth of the eternal return: Cosmos and history*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780691238326>
6. Campbell, J. (2008). *The hero with a thousand faces*. Novato: New World Library.

7. Nora, P. (2014). Present, Nation, Memory. Kyiv: Klio, 2014 [in Ukrainian]
8. Morden, M. (2016). Anatomy of the national myth: Archetypes and narrative in the study of nationalism. *Nations and Nationalism*, 22 (3), 447-464. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nana.12167>
9. Bruce, M. (2014). Jungian archetypes and historical leaders. *PennState*. URL: <https://sites.psu.edu/leadership/2014/09/13/jungian-archetypes-and-historical-leaders/>
10. Afonin, E., Martynov, A. (2019). Archetype as a source of innovation process. *Publichne uriaduvannia – Public Management*, 3 (18), 29-43. <https://doi.org/10.32689/2617-2224-2019-18-3-29-43> [in Ukrainian]
11. Hordiychuk, O.O. (2018). The Archetypes of the Ukrainian Mentality: a Socio-Philosophical Analysis. *Visnyk Zhytomyrskoho derzhavnoho universytetu imeni Ivana Franka. Filosofski nauky – Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University Journal. Philosophical Sciences*, 1 (84), 15-19. [https://doi.org/10.35433/PhilosophicalSciences.1\(84\).2018.15-19](https://doi.org/10.35433/PhilosophicalSciences.1(84).2018.15-19) [in Ukrainian]
12. Semerhei, N.V. (2019). Historiographical discourse on the role of archetypes in stabilization of the conflict development of Ukrainians' national identity in the emperial age. *Ukrainoznavchyi almanakh – Almanac of Ukrainian Studies*, 24, 17-22. <https://doi.org/10.17721/2520-2626/2019.24.3> [in Ukrainian]
13. Yurii, M., Aleksiiievets, L. (2018). Archetype and mentality through the prism of history. *Ukraina – Yevropa – Svit: Mizhnarodnyi zbirnyk naukovykh prats. Serii: Istorii, mizhnarodni vidnosyny*, 17, 16-24 [in Ukrainian]
14. Lypynskyi, V.K. (1928). Ham and Japheth: On the tenth anniversary of April 16/29, 1918. Lviv: Postup [in Ukrainian]
15. Matsiievskiy, Yu., Borodavko, T. (2016). Causes of separatism in Donbas: External and internal factors. The National University of Ostroh Academy [in Ukrainian]
16. Zborovska, N. (2007). The code of national literature as a psychohistorical problem. *Slovo i Chas*, 1, 58-63 [in Ukrainian]
17. Nastoyashcha, K.V. (2016). The ideology of nationalism – a solid foundation of a state or ethnic defensive reaction of the body? *Grani*, 19 (5), 53-60. <https://doi.org/10.15421/171609> [in Ukrainian]

Received on October 10, 2025

Reviewed on October 20, 2025

Revised on November 03, 2025

Signed for printing after revision on December 16, 2025

Published on December 30, 2025