

DOI: 10.21847/1728-9343.2021.1(3)242755

**IRINA LOMACHINSKA,**

*Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University (Kyiv, Ukraine)*

*e-mail: i.lomachynska@kubg.edu.ua, ORCID 0000-0003-2537-6322*

**EVGENIY DEINEGA,**

*Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University (Kyiv, Ukraine)*

*e-mail: evgeniydeinega@ukr.net, ORCID 0000-0001-6233-4928*

**OLEKSANDR DONETS,**

*Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University (Kyiv, Ukraine)*

*e-mail: obdonets.iff20@kubg.edu.ua, ORCID 0000-0002-8799-9747*

## **THE RELIGIOUS FACTORS OF THE UKRAINIAN MENTALITY FORMATION**

In the modern global world, a study on mentality as a main characteristic of the nation which defines the unity of the religious and cultural tradition of the society is conditioned with the need to develop an effective international religious and cultural cooperation. The purpose of the analysis is to determine religious factors in shaping the Ukrainian mentality taking into account its historical background and the challenges of modernity. The study methodology is based on the principles of the non-confessional approach and philosophical pluralism, involving a system of methods, namely: historical, dialectical, comparative methods, synthesis, and generalization.

In the conclusions it is emphasized that mentality is one of the forms of the social experience accumulation, the set of historically accepted ideas, viewpoints, stereotypes, forms and behavior which are laid down is the public consciousness by means of education, culture, religion, a language through the years. Every mental formation has its imaginary lines of a friend and foe which were formed by ideologies, beliefs, and religious values. The religious factors in the formation of mentality reflect the role of the Church as the main regulator of the social life. In the social environment of the Ukrainian nation, a temple can be seen as a peculiar archetypical formation, the part of the landmark, symbolic, communicative, and informational religious system which regulates the public consciousness and it is an integral part of the national memory.

The mental archetypes of the national identity stem from the phenomenon of the borderlands, and have shaped in the social context the desire for personal freedom, patriotism, social activity; in the spiritual dimension, it is a willing for the inner world to be protected, sacrifice, mercy, non-violence.

**Key words:** *mentality, mindset, Ukrainian mentality, national identity, religious archetypes, religious symbols, religious and cultural tradition, sacred model of the world.*

### **Introduction**

The relevance of the study stems from the following factors. The modern processes of regeneration of the spiritual foundations in the context of the Ukrainian nation are not possible without the understanding of mentality as a religious and cultural phenomenon and analyzing its influencing mechanisms towards the social processes.

In a broad sense the concept of *mentality* means "the way of thinking", "the combination of intellectual competencies", "the social and psychological guidance", "the mindset", and so forth.

Therefore, mentality is a complex interdisciplinary issue which requires the integration of the scientific approaches in the field of psychology, cultural studies, social philosophy, ethnology, and so forth.

Mentality determines the combination of beliefs that are based on the relevant moral value system and forms the cohesion of religious and cultural tradition, the common spiritual mood which hence impose the need to analyze it within the religious discourse.

The purpose of the analysis is to identify the religious factors of development of the Ukrainian mentality taking into account the historical context and the global challenges of modernity. The given question requires the solution to the following problems: to examine the main areas of analyzing the mentality problem in the modern scientific discourse; to extract the religious factors of mentality formation; to analyze the historical changes of the religious dominants in the development of the Ukrainian mentality taking into account the present realities.

### **Materials and Methods**

The methodology of the study is based on the basic principles and methods of the academic religious studies, namely: the non-confessional method and philosophical pluralism that have been used as the opportunities to analyze different scientific approaches for understanding the correlation of religion and mentality; the use of the historical method has made it possible to review the religious mentality factors in the context of different historical

epochs; the application of the dialect method has contributed to researching the Ukrainian mentality in the context of the spiritual foundations regeneration and the nation's advancement at the different stages of its historical evolution; the comparative method has been used to extract the core characteristic feature of the Ukrainian mentality; the methods of analyzing, synthesis, and generalization.

Scientific discussion on the theory of mentality has the fairly broad historical perspective. The development of the new directions of historical and anthropological approaches which was started by the members of the Annales School – M. Bloch (1974), L. Febvre (1997) J.-L. Goff (1992) and considered the category of mentality in close connection to its historical, social, religious, and cultural formation factors. The psychological factors of the mentality analyzing were first examined by such researchers as W. Wundt (2002), G. Le Bon (1998), E. Fromm (2019), C.-G. Ung (2020). The religious and cultural elements of the Ukrainian mentality are presented in the works of M. Kostomarov (1994) and D. Chyzhevskiy (2005); in the modern scientific discourse are being reflected in the studies of Y. Kalakura (2015), S. Krymskiy (2006), M. Popovich (2006). The social and psychological aspects of the mentality analyzing are presented in the works of A. Gurevich (1993), R. Dodonov (1999), P. Baltadzy, L. Matvieieva (2019), and other researches.

### Results and Discussion

The mentalities are based on the underlying anthropological historical formation that can be identified as a characteristic of the individual or collective intelligence, moral or spirit.

The mentality is one of the forms of the social experience accumulation which is connected with the symbolic way of thinking; it retains the most typical characteristics in the psychology and behavior of the nation, which was laid into the people's consciousness by means of education, culture, religion, language over the years.

Mentality is not inherited genetically; it is transmitted to individuals in the process of their socialization. The mentality content is set by the established forms and ways of expressing intellectual reactions and behavior stereotypes.

The important characteristic of the folk mentality is the feeling of the group solidarity with the formed "friend and foe" archetype, according to the confessional, national, and regional criteria. The notion of the *archetype* correlates with non-linear cyclical attitude to life. According to C.-G. Jung, the archetype is the unprecedented inherited unconscious form or image, the collective unconscious, which implements the most ancient universal images that exists from the dawn of time.

Later the archetypical perception of the early tribes turned into the conscious formulas which traditionally transmitted in the form of the secret teachings (Jung, 2020: 7). This strand of the mental structure can spontaneously manifest itself at any time, but as the form that makes sense only in conditions of the filling it with the personal experiential material. To be more precise, the archetype itself is the formulated capacity, the form possibility.

*Mentality* is a specific style of life perception which is only inherent in the particular human community, the life perception style that reflects the extended period of the human common existence in the similar natural regions, social and cultural conditions. This determines the indi-

vidual's behavioral experience, the rhythm of his life being kind of the formula that is filled by the certain historical content (Dodonov, 1999: 64).

The notion of the *mentality* is often used as a synonym of the *mindset*, however, their relation is often a matter of dispute because of the attempts to research the mental phenomenon only in the psychological context. G. Le Bon, as one of the first collective consciousness researchers, says about the unconscious social beliefs which in the times of all the epochs was guided by the religious feeling regardless of their focus towards to the unseen God, the wooden idol, the hero, or the political idea – the crowd always unconsciously personifies the political formula or the invincible leader with the secret power which leads to the fanaticism (Lebon, 1998: 42).

From the perspective of psychology, mentality is characterized as spontaneously active system which does not have the tendency to the simple storing the principle of the common balance according to the feedback from the environmental reality, but tends to the synergistic balance.

At the meta-level, *mentality* can be identified as "dynamically functionally, historically, socially, and culturally driving and qualitative certainty of the nervous and psychical organization of the individual, the community". (Vasylieva, Ochirov, 2017: 39)

In fact, the *mentality* is presented as the conscious and unconscious duality, and in its structure two main elements can be assumed that are closely linked – the first indicates the characteristics which are a manifestation of naturally occurring phenomenon and can be expressed as psychology, mental capacities, mental instrumentation, the manner of thinking, a priori form of cognition, and so forth; the second includes the social and cultural characteristics – ethical codices, symbols, and so forth.

The synthesis of all the structural mentality components, their acquisition takes place on a subconscious level and defines the community way of living. This is a deep level of the consciousness which shapes the world perception and is characterized by the dynamism and relation to the concrete historical conditions of the social being. "Own thinking, in turn, it is a complex of the historically accepted ideas, viewpoints, stereotypes, forms, and behavior. It is a genetic code of the nation, its historical memory." (Baltadzy, Matvieieva, 2019: 78).

At the national level, mentality actualizes its culturally creative element which is the integral part of the characteristics of the people living in the particular culture, thus, there is a possibility to describe the unique features of that how these people see the world around them and to explain the particularities of their reaction to it (Dubov, 1995).

In the social philosophy there is the term *national mentality*, and also the such terms as *the nation's soul*, *the national spirit*: they are synonyms and are used to describe the homogeneous spiritual and social aspects of the ethnic groups and nation's life in their inner world (Kuznetsova, 2017).

The mentality content includes the cultural elements which are rooted in the social consciousness and are able to function independently from outer ideological poles of the social consciousness. The social mentality somehow reflects the historical experience of the nation, the process of its formation and development. It can be said that mentality is a peculiar nation's memory about the past, the psychological dominant of the people's behavior

who follow their historical mental “code” under all conditions including catastrophic (Tulenkov et al., 2021: 397).

A. Gurevich describes *mentality* as a complex of the understandings, viewpoints, feelings of the community in the particular epoch, geographic area and social environment, the special social psychological mindset which impacts on the historical processes (Gurevich, 1993: 4).

Thus, *mentality* is not identical to the social consciousness, and characterizes only the specificity of this consciousness within the other groups of people and their social consciousness, typically when it comes to the big groups like the ethos, the nation, or the society.

*Mentality* has a historical and transitional character. The deepest mentality layer is connected with the timeless history; the middle layer is the part of the history which flows at the slow rhythm; the upper layer is connected with the traditional or the event-related.

It can be assumed that the deepest layer is focused on the natural and social at the level of archetypes; the middle layer specifies the archetypal formations and relates them to the cultural dominant of the particular historical time; the upper layer adds the specific feature to the mentality according to the belonging to the particular socialist type. The three layers are present in the individual’s mind at the same time and testify to the specificity of the human existence.

Taking into account the given pattern, it can be concluded that *mentality* is a cultural anthropological universalia the same as the language, the value, the norm, and so forth. Mentality expresses the relation of the adaptive possibilities and evolutionary imperatives (*Anthropological code ...*, 2020: 111).

E. Fromm uses the notion *mentality* as a synonym to the notion social character, admitting that the repressive society is characterized by the consciousness manipulations and displacement of the undesirable willingness to the unconsciousness. In this respect he says about *conscious unconsciousness* which is a result of the “social filter”, and which includes the language that are typical of a particular society and mentality, and the social taboo (Fromm, 2019: 87).

*Mentality* is a feature that is formed historically, but it can be changed constructively, according to the density of the social time.

The acknowledgement in the speed of the changes fixes the difference between the inner process that is taking place throughout the long time period and the outer influence which is related to the adding new human communities and reflects their organizational processes.

The members of the different ethnic communities from generation to generation were under the influence of the particular natural factors and the social environment; in the process of the social inheritance the special way of fixation and information processing is formed that provides the optimal functioning of the community in general in the context of the conditions of this environment. “*The Universe* is not a bigger absolute than *the Spirit* or the *Personality*, that it changes all the time along with the inventions, the civilizations; it is generated by the human societies”. That is why following the scientific research of mentality which was provided by the Annales School, in particular by M. Bloch and L. L. Febvre, it is necessary at first that “the inventory should be done, and then regenerate the spiritual base which had the people of the epoch that is being examined; through the use of the erudition and also the imagination to reshape in its entirety physi-

cal, intellectual, and moral image of the epoch” (Febvre, 1991: 108).

The mentality of the particular society is closely connected with the historical peculiarities of its existence, thus, in order to do the adequate research, it is necessary to examine the language, the cultural artifacts, the religious symbols and rituals of the particular epoch. However, the way of the world perception, the lifestyle, the speech culture are the things which are connected with the mentality which is typical for the human community and they are not dependent on the social groups or the individuals, and formed at the level of the archetypes.

“Subjectively humans feel themselves free, however, objectively they are under control”. Being under control is, however, not total and absolute, thus, staying within the cultural sphere, the human is capable to change the mentality and the behavior little by little (Gurevich, 1993, 50).

The mental formation has its borders which differentiate it from everything else, but these borders have the conditional nature as they only not allow to blend in with everything else.

This influence might have the shape of the idea, the ideology, the religious values, and so forth, the bearers of which are the other human communities or individuals.

The social behavior of the individuals and the groups is determined by their economic, political, religious life. These determinants do not determine the people’s actions – they go through the complicated mental filters of their consciousness, gaining the symbolic sense. The world perception and the cultural tradition, the religion and psychology are the environment where the humans’ reactions to the stimulus of their behavior are realized.

The religious dominants of the mental formation in the Christian dimension originated in the Middle Ages. At that time, the mental model included the simplified dualism, the opposition of the two opposites. The people’s entire spiritual life in the Middle Ages was concentrated around the opposition of the good and evil, strengths and weaknesses, the body and the soul.

The medieval man did not see the point in freedom in the modern sense. For such a man, the freedom was a privilege, and there was not any freedom without the community; at that time, the citizen could fulfill himself only by being dependent on others when the privileged man guaranteed the philistine respect to his rights. The main regulator of the social life was the Church (not only as the organizational religious structure, but also as the center of the entire social life at that time). According to J.-L. Goff’s definition, under the influence of the church propaganda, the mentality and the manner of feeling of the parishioners were formed, however, the Church was not only the center of the spiritual life, but also the place for communication. The gatherings were held there, the bells convened the citizens to the church in case of danger, for instance, during the fire. The talks, the games, and the financial deals were held in the church as well.

Despite the efforts of the clergy and the cathedrals aimed at turning the Church into the purely the house of God, it remained the social center with a variety of functions (Le-Goff, 1992: 181).

For the medieval mentality, as noted by Le Goff, the arguments were the power of the authority and not the truth, which linked the folk mentality to the mentality of the naive archaic cultures.

In the definition of the religious dominants of the Western European society, M. Bloch uses the eschatological context: the expectation of the global catastrophe

which was inevitable for “those who believe”, thus, the personal was excluded. “In this Christian society the most needed function for the entire community was the function of the spiritual institutions” (Bloch, 1973: 140).

The *mentality* is the common thing for the entire society at the same time (the language and religion typically serve as the backbone for the mentality) and it is differentiated depending on its social class and the state structure, the education level and belonging to the groups which have the access to the book and education, or are deprived of the access and live in the situation of the oral culture domination, gender and religious difference (Gurevich, 1993: 28), which is the reason for the multiple character of mentality.

The new mental element that united the medieval society was the book which defined the friends and foe not only according to the confessional membership, but also according to the ability to obtain the access to the knowledge, the ability to transmit and form the social memory.

According to S. Krymskyi, the existential national existence is revealed through the living filling of the concepts: the House – the Field – the Temple, where the breadth of the symbols is revealed in the ideological life of the particular nations through the diversity of their experience and archetypes.

The idea of the temple as the expression of the higher power blessing, the divine protection for the particular community, is related to the human's shrine and ethos, and means the connection between the heaven and the earth, the ideology of the sacred wise existence.

The important function of mentality as a historical movement factor is its protective role (Krymskyi, 2006: 279).

The symbols of the temple have not only the religious, but also the social and communicative context, which is emphasized by “the archetype of wisdom of the world that was considered as the Book, the God's Text” (Krymskyi, 2006: 291).

The temple in the social space of the Ukrainian nation can be considered as a part of the sign, symbol, communicative, and informational system that due to its sacred status plays a role in the peculiar archetypal formation which is the essential part of the national memory and regulates the common consciousness.

At the level of the written culture the Sacred Tradition changes the Sacred Writing, and the Christian religious ideology goes beyond the particular nation.

Christianity in its orthodox dimension in the domestic realities has not only become the system of the religious beliefs, but, above all, has defined the transition to the new level of the social and communicative development – from the oral pagan culture to the writing culture.

Strengthening the church impact to the social existence was a result of the active work of its social and communication institutions (first, of all libraries), and the formation of the orthodox content of the history was reflected in the writing heritage of the monasteries.

The next level is the printing which was the turning point of the missionary and propaganda activity of the Orthodox Church against the aggressive pressure of the Catholic ideology and culture and thereafter it served as the way of maintaining the Orthodox tradition for the Ukrainian nation (Lomachinska et al, 2019: 201).

The mentality basics of the national identity were inherited from the Byzantine model of Christianity (caesarepapism). M. Popovich notes the tendency to think outside the natural and legal categories, the absence of the critical attitude to the non-legal governmental actions, comp-

liance with the manipulative pressure of the dominant narratives, submission and obedience to the power of the autocratic rule, and so forth. The bearer of such a consciousness who lives within the bounds of the severe disciplinary measures is able to easily shift away from the silent obedience to the opposite state and turn into “the human of lawlessness” (Popovych, 2006: 202).

However, analyzing the state power mental archetypes it can be argued that the sacralization of the governance inherited from the Byzantium Empire has become more common in the Russian Orthodox Church. At the same time, for the Ukrainian national consciousness, it is typical to desire the personal freedom.

The general tone of the Old Russian social consciousness was led by the collective consciousness of the ordinary free people, the basic category of population, the full members of the community.

“The people, the democratic element of the society, was not detached from the governance and took part in by means of the *veche* gatherings. The main fighting strength remained the militia. This led to the formation of the developed political consciousness, with such characteristic features as patriotism, social activity, the proud of the full-fledged free man, the worker and the warrior that carries a weapon.” (Popovych, 2006: 213).

M. Kostomarov characterizes the sociocultural changes which the Ukrainian people experienced in the sixteenth century as the awakening after “the long lethargy.” (Kostomarov, 1994). The people's life and self-consciousness transformed rapidly, which primarily was linked to the Cossacks development after the decline of which the gradual transition to the calm, civilian life took place – the so-called “the rural man” type was formed – the type of person that had inside the Cossack spirit and was familiar with the civilian life realities. In the religious context, in Ukraine, as well as in the West, there was a common sacred beginning, which was reflected in the variety of the brotherhoods that existed at that time, for their part, was leading to the strengthening of “the metaphor of the unified mystical body that was supported by the oath to the holy relics, kissing the cross, the saint patron cult, the common possession of the relics, the Holy Communion” (Kalakura, 2015: 247).

In Ukraine, during the Cossack period, the “borderlands” phenomenon – the lands that are located at the border of the cultures, the civilizations, and the national states – appeared clearly.

In the modern scientific thought, the “borderland” phenomenon is considered in a broad, meaningful context – as the inter-ethnic borders and the being of small cultural groups, that are involved in the dialogue of the more powerful cultures, as the search of the religious symbiosis in the cross-confessional space and the linguistic diversity of the borderlands.

The “borderland” paradox lies in the fact that the modern boundaries on one hand separate people, and create the solidarity forms, therefore the new social communities on another; that is why its sense can reflect the colonial character – the lack of realization and the incompleteness of a particular territory which is surrounded by the dominant powers, and it can also uncover the potential of a cultural cooperation (Kolinko, 2017: 98).

In the difficult historical circumstances of the religious and cultural contradiction, the Ukrainian people, saving their inner spiritual world and sheltering it from the historical disasters, have been able to go through the numbers of drastic dramatic challenges without losing their na-

tional identity. At the same time, as a result, "in such cultural traditions can be seen the tendency for the mythologizing of the ethnic history and the designing of the sacred world model reflection at the different stages that throughout the ages were represented in the art form." (Kalakura, 2015: 264).

The national worldview is reflected through the complexity of the folk and literary texts the most of which are defined by D. Chyzhevskiy as "the mixture of the particular national and historical elements." The national type of researching requires the consideration of the folk art, the historical periods experienced by the people, and the famous individuals related to the nation which is being researched. The folk wisdom of the Ukrainian people has its origins in the pre-Christian times and continues its development in the times of Christianity: Orthodoxy, Catholicism, Uniatism, Greek Catholicism. The Ukrainian folk culture has a variety of the common elements with other nations which grow wheat.

According to D. Chyzhevskiy, the main features of the Ukrainian national character are emotionality, sentimentalism, individualism, freedom-loving (Chyzhevsky, 2005: 54).

According to J.-L. Goff's ideas, the religious characteristics of the mentality formation have the common group and personal nature, each of which is closely related to another.

Therefore, the social reality defines the polyvariability of the behavior for self-expressing and the initiative of the particular individual, the same as the alternatives of the social movement in general.

In spreading of the religious values and beliefs the significant role was played the charismatic religious figures, preachers, ascetics (personality factor).

The medieval consciousness puts a stress on the group cooperation which later found its reflection in the activity of the collegiums and brotherhoods. Thus, it should be said about the special role of the religious leadership in the process of formation of the value foundations in the national identity context. Among the essential functions of the national religious leadership are missionary and propaganda (the social worldview formation by means of spreading the Christianity values), political (the impact on the political processes, the dynamic in the state to create the most suitable conditions for functioning the religious institutions), economical (the ideological justification of the economical basics as a social institute), cultural and educational (the formation of material and spiritual artifacts), moral and educational (the presentation of spiritual values through the education, literature, art) (Lomachinska, 2019).

The stated functions in the context of its historical development were in the close relationship which made it possible to spread the Christian religious and cultural tradition.

At the mental level, the religious leadership is taken not as the self-exaltation, but as the service to the community.

In the conditions of the modernity global challenges, the relation between religion and mentality finds its reflection in the strategies of the Christian missions: the Catholic Church emphasizes the importance of paying attention to the polyculture features within the missionary activities among the diverse ethnic and cultural communities with the inherent world perception and the awareness about their own identity, providing the equality and tolerance, whereas the Orthodox Church stands for the maintenance and spreading the values of the national cultures

that genetically are linked to the Orthodoxy (Lomachinska, Grebenyuk, 2020: 58).

Mentality is a dominant constant of the national existence and carries out its functions when acts as a creative force of the historical scenes which creates the national destiny. The mentality of every nation is unique, therefore the challenges of the modern world require the research of the social, psychological, ethnic, and cultural features of every nation to provide the effective cooperation with other communities and to avoid possible cross-cultural conflicts.

### Conclusions

Mentality is one of the forms of the social experience accumulation, the set of historically accepted ideas, viewpoints, stereotypes, forms and behavior which are laid down is the public consciousness by means of education, culture, religion, a language through the years.

The *mentality* is a genetic code of the nation, its historical memory. The *mentality* is a feature that is formed historically, but it can be changed constructively, according to the density of the social time.

The analysis of the community mentality in a particular epoch demands on regenerating the spiritual base, physical, intellectual, and moral image with the help of analyzing the language, the cultural artifacts, the religious symbols, and rituals. Every mental formation has its imaginary lines of a friend and foe which were formed by ideologies, beliefs, and religious values.

The religious factors of the mental formation in the Middle Ages were explained by the role of the Church as a social center with a variety of functions at that time. The church institutions formed the basis for the annalistic, the church culture, serving as a transmitter of the social consciousness. In the Ukrainian national consciousness, the idea of the temple is the expression of the higher power, blessing, the divine protection for the particular community. The temple in the social space of the Ukrainian nation can be considered as a part of the sign, symbol, communicative, and informational system that due to its sacred status plays a role in the peculiar archetypical formation which is the essential part of the national memory.

The mental archetypes of the authority in the national self-consciousness characterize the desire for personal freedom, patriotism, social activity. In the Ukrainian mentality, the "borderland" phenomenon has formed the desire for the inner spiritual world to be protected, the mythologizing of the ethnic history and the designing of the sacred world model, the preservation of the national identity.

At the heart of the Ukrainian model of the national spirituality there is sacrifice, mercy, non-violence, the recognition of the other peoples' freedom, the understanding of the historical destiny commonality which were mainly formed by the spiritual and educational activities of the national religious leadership members.

### REFERENCES

- Baltadzy, P., Matvieieva, L. (2019). The Category of "Mentality" in Contemporary Scientific Discourse. *Fundamental and applied researches in practice of leading scientific schools*, 34(4), 75-78 <https://farplss.org/index.php/journal/article/view/654>.
- Dubov, I. G. (1995). The Phenomenon of Mentality. *Journal of Russian & East European Psychology*, 33 (2), 39-54.
- Kuznetsova, E. (2017). The Mentality of the People: Theoretical and Methodological Aspect, *London Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Sciences*, 17, 2, 6 – 11. [https://journalspress.com/LJRHSS\\_Volume17/147\\_The-](https://journalspress.com/LJRHSS_Volume17/147_The-)

- [Mentality-of-the-People-Theoretical-and-Methodological-Aspect.pdf](#).
- Lomachinska, I. Grebenyuk, P. (2020). The phenomenon of missionary activity of Christian churches in the virtual space, *Skhid*, 5 (169), 54 – 59. [https://doi.org/10.21847/1728-9343.202.5\(169\)215022](https://doi.org/10.21847/1728-9343.202.5(169)215022).
- Lomachinska, I., Khrypko, S., Iatsenko, G. (2019). The ideological sources of religious leadership in Ukrainian cultural space, *Skhid*, 3 (161), 84 – 88 [https://doi.org/10.21847/1728-9343.2019.3\(161\).171725](https://doi.org/10.21847/1728-9343.2019.3(161).171725).
- Tulenkov, M., Gugnin, E., Shtepa, S., Patynok, O., Lipin, M. (2021). Mentality as Category of Social Philosophy in the Post-Pandemic Society. *Postmodern Openings*, 12, 393 – 403 <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/12.1Sup1/292>.
- Vasilyeva, K., Ochirov, O. (2017). The Mentality as the Image of the Cognitive Properties of the Other, *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 124, 39 – 42 [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329105375\\_The\\_Mentality\\_as\\_the\\_Image\\_of\\_the\\_Cognitive\\_Properties\\_of\\_the\\_Another](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329105375_The_Mentality_as_the_Image_of_the_Cognitive_Properties_of_the_Another).
- Antropolohichniy kod ukrainskoi kultury i tsyvilizatsii (2020). Kyiv: IPIEND im. I. F. Kurasa NAN Ukrainy, Knyha. 1. 432 p. (In Ukrainian).
- Blok M. (1973). Apologiya istorii ili remeslo istorika. Moscow: Nauka, 234 p. (In Russian).
- Vundt V.(2002). Psikhologiya narodov. Moscow: Izd-vo Eksmo; Sankt- Peterburg: Terra Fantastica. 864 p. (In Russian).
- Gurevich A. Ya. (1993). Ot istorii mentalnostey k istoricheskomu sintezu. In: *Spory o glavnom. Diskussii o nastoyashchem i budushchem istoricheskoy nauki vokrug frantsuzskoy shkoly «Annalov»*. Moscow: Nauka. 328 p. (In Russian).
- Dodonov, R. (1999). Teoriya mentalnosti: uchenie o determinantakh myslitelnykh avtomatizmov. Zaporozhe: r/a "Tandem-U". 264 p. (In Russian).
- Kalakura, Ya. S. (2015). Ukrainska kultura: tsyvilizatsiyni vymir. Kyiv: IPIEND im. I. F. Kurasa NAN Ukrainy, 2015. 496 p. (In Ukrainian).
- Kolinko, M. V. (2017). Rozvidky kulturnoho porubizhzhia: border, boundary, frontier studies. *Skhid*. 2 (148), 91-95. [https://doi.org/10.21847/1728-9343.2017.2\(148\).102808](https://doi.org/10.21847/1728-9343.2017.2(148).102808).
- Kostomarov, M. I. (1994). Slovianska mifolohiia. Kyiv: Lybid. 384 p. (In Ukrainian).
- Krymskyi, S. B. (2006). Arkhetypy ukrainskoi mentalnosti. In: *Problemy teorii mentalnosti*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 2006. 408 c. (In Ukrainian).
- Le Goff, Zh. (1992). Tsyvilizatsiya srednevekovogo Zapada. Moskva: Progress-akademiya, 376 p. (In Russian).
- Lebon, G. (1998). Psikhologiya mass. In: *Psikhologiya mass. Khrestomatiya*. Samara: Izdatelskiy Dom "BAKhrAKh". 592 p. (In Russian).
- Lomachinska, I. M. (2019). Vplyv relihiinoho liderstva na formuvannya tsinnisnykh zasad natsionalnoi pamiaty. In: *Trudne pytania pam'eci historycznej w paradygmacie dialogu kulturowego*. Bialystok: Bialoruskie Towarzystwo Historyczne, p.188 – 203 (In Ukrainian).
- Popovych, M. (2006). Ukrainska natsionalna mentalnist. In: *Problemy teorii mentalnosti*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka. pp.232 – 270 (In Ukrainian).
- Fevr, L. (1991). Boi za istoriyu. Moscow: Nauka, 635 p. (In Russian).
- Fromm, E. (2019). Vtecha vid svobody. Kyiv: «Klub Simeinoho Dozwillia». 288 c. (In Ukrainian).
- Chyzhevskiy, D. (2005). Filosofski tvory: u 4 t. Kyiv: Smoloskyp. T. 1: Narysy z istorii filosofii na Ukraini. Filosofiia Hryhoriia Skovorody.400 p. (In Ukrainian).
- Yung, K.-G.(2020). Arkhetipy i kollektivnoe bessoznatelnoe. Moscow: «Izdatelstvo AST», 496 p. (In Russian).

### Ірина Ломачинська,

Київський університет імені Бориса Грінченка (м. Київ, Україна)  
e-mail: [i.lomachynska@kubg.edu.ua](mailto:i.lomachynska@kubg.edu.ua), ORCID 0000-0003-2537-6322

### Євген Дейнега,

Київський університет імені Бориса Грінченка (м. Київ, Україна)  
e-mail: [i.lomachynska@kubg.edu.ua](mailto:i.lomachynska@kubg.edu.ua), ORCID 0000-0003-2537-6322

### Олександр Донець,

Київський університет імені Бориса Грінченка (м. Київ, Україна)  
e-mail: [i.lomachynska@kubg.edu.ua](mailto:i.lomachynska@kubg.edu.ua), ORCID 0000-0003-2537-6322

## РЕЛІГІЙНІ ЧИННИКИ ФОРМУВАННЯ УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ МЕНТАЛЬНОСТІ

У сучасному глобалізованому світі дослідження ментальності як провідної характеристики нації, що визначає єдність релігійно-культурної традиції соціуму, зумовлено необхідністю налагодження ефективної міжнаціональної релігійно-культурної взаємодії. Метою аналізу є визначення релігійних чинників формування української ментальності з урахуванням історичного контексту та глобалізаційних викликів сучасності. Методологія дослідження ґрунтується на принципах позаконфесійності і світоглядного плюралізму, із залученням системи методів – історичного, діалектичного, порівняльного, аналізу, синтезу та узагальнення. У висновках підкреслюється, що ментальність – одна з форм акумуляції соціального досвіду, сукупність історично прийнятих ідей, поглядів, стереотипів, форм та поведінки, закладених у суспільній свідомості вихованням, культурою, релігією, мовою протягом хронологічно великих відрізків часу. Кожне ментальне утворення має свої умовні кордони «свого» й «іншого», сформовані ідеологіями, віруваннями, релігійними цінностями. Релігійні чинники формування ментальності зумовлюють роллю Церкви як основного регулятора суспільного життя. Храм у соціальному просторі української нації може розглядатись як своєрідне архетипічне утворення, частина знаково-символьної та комунікаційно-інформаційної релігійної системи, що регулює суспільну свідомість та є невід'ємною частиною національної пам'яті. Ментальні архетипи національної самосвідомості зумовлені феноменом «порубіжжя», визначили у соціальному плані прагнення до особистісної свободи, патріотизм, соціальну активність; у духовному вимірі – це прагнення до захищеності внутрішнього світу, жертвність, милосердя, ненасилля.

**Ключові слова:** ментальність, менталітет, українська ментальність, національна самосвідомість, релігійні архетипи, релігійні символи, релігійно-культурна традиція, сакралізована модель світу.