

УДК 82-312.9:82.091

DOI 10.58423/2786-6726/2026-2-28-44

ISSN 2786-6726 (Online), ISSN 2786-6718 (Print)

Received: 10.02.2026

Accepted: 23.03.2026

Published: 30.05.2026

*Nataliia Deviatko*

## **Genre and stylistic features of fantasy works and the terminological history of the genre's formation**

### **1. Problem statement**

In contemporary literary discourse, fantasy remains a genre marked by persistent terminological debate. Despite its extensive presence within the global cultural space, the theoretical framework for identifying the genre-specific and stylistic boundaries of fantasy still requires further clarification. This difficulty stems from the absence of a unified approach to defining a *fantasy text* and from the need to differentiate fantasy from adjacent categories within the broader paradigm of speculative fiction.

The question of the genre's genesis and the evolution of its conceptual dominants – from mythopoetic origins to modern transformations shaped by postmodernist influences – demands separate and focused consideration. Moreover, discrepancies in the interpretation of key concepts established by genre theorists call for a systematic reassessment of the terminological apparatus employed in the analysis of fantasy works. Clarifying the correlation between heroic and comic components, as well as determining the function of the mythopoetic substrate within the textual structure, constitutes an essential step toward an objective evaluation of fantasy's place in the contemporary literary process.

### **2. Analysis of recent research and publications**

The scholarly understanding of the fantasy paradigm was initially shaped by the works of international theorists, many of whom combined academic research with creative writing practice. Studies by J. Clute and J. Grant (1999), R. Jackson (1981),

*Acta Academiae Beregsasiensis, Philologica 2026/2: 28–44.*

E. Swinfen (1984), T. Todorov (1975), B. Attebery (1992), and F. Mendlesohn (2008) are particularly significant for defining the genre, clarifying its boundaries, and situating it within the broader field of non-realist literature. Issues concerning the ontology of the *secondary world* and the specificity of the *literature of wonder* are conceptually articulated in the essays of J. R. R. Tolkien, R. Zelazny (2025), and A. Sapkowski (1993), while various aspects of the genesis, rhetoric, and poetics of speculative writing have also been examined by S. Lem (1984), D. Hahn (2017), K. Hume (1984), and D. Suvin (1979).

Among the indispensable works in international fantasy studies, Tz. Todorov's (1975) *The Fantastic* remains important for clarifying the distinction between the fantastic, the uncanny, and the marvelous; B. Attebery's (1992) *Strategies of Fantasy* approaches fantasy as a flexible field defined by recurring structural and thematic strategies; F. Mendlesohn's (2008) *Rhetorics of Fantasy* offers an influential typology based on the reader's mode of entry into the secondary world; and K. Hume's (1984) *Fantasy and Mimesis* is significant for understanding fantasy as a distinct imaginative mode that transforms and reinterprets reality. *The Cambridge Companion to Fantasy Literature*, edited by F. Mendlesohn and E. James (2012), serves as an important reference point for situating the present study within international fantasy scholarship, while D. Suvin's (1979) *Metamorphoses of Science Fiction* remains relevant for framing fantasy within the wider domain of speculative fiction. Within this broader critical tradition, one of the least clarified issues remains the internal worldview differentiation of fantasy itself.

In Ukrainian literary studies, interest in fantasy discourse has shown a steady and systematic increase. The theoretical foundations for the study of genre transformations and the meta-genre nature of speculative fiction are laid out in the works of O. Stuzhuk (2006), N. Kopystyanska (2005), O. Bondareva (2006), and O. Romanenko (2014). The archetypal dimension and mythological integrity of the genre are analyzed in the studies of N. Sytnyk (2009) and O. Tykhomyrova (2008), while the genesis of Ukrainian fantasy and its genre modifications have been examined by O. Leonenko (2010), S. Khorob (2017), O. Shaposhnyk (2014), O. Zhuravska (2018), and Yu. Zaichenko (2019).

The present article also draws on works important for the analysis of mythopoetic structure, character functions, and initiatory models in fantasy, including V. Propp's (1968, 1984) studies of folktale morphology and historical poetics, C. Vogler's (2007) interpretation of mythic structure in narrative, D. Hahn's (2017) observations on quest and multidimensional perspective, V. Dudurich's (2018) reflections on the reader's immersion into fantasy worlds, and I. Pomazan's (2013) discussion of Tolkien's reception in Ukrainian scholarship.

Despite the substantial body of existing scholarship, issues of terminological precision in the interpretation of fantasy's core functions, as well as the analysis

of worldview differentiation within the genre, remain insufficiently studied and require further investigation.

The aim of the article is to conduct a systematic analysis of the genre and stylistic features of fantasy and to clarify the terminological framework of the genre's development. To achieve this aim, the following objectives are set:

- 1) to trace the history of the genre's formation, from its earliest identifiable examples to the epic narrative forms of the mid-twentieth century;
- 2) to explicate the conceptual functions of fantasy (*enchantment*, *secondary belief*, and *recovery*) through the prism of J. R. R. Tolkien's theoretical legacy and to clarify their terminological interpretation within Ukrainian scholarly discourse;
- 3) to analyze the worldview differentiation between the *heroic* and *comic* modes of fantasy, particularly in the context of postmodernist influence;
- 4) to determine the role of the mythopoetic substrate and archetypal models in the construction of the artistic world and in the formation of the fantasy hero's identity.

### **3. Research methods and methodology**

The methodological framework of this study is based on a comprehensive approach that integrates general scientific methods with specialized methods of literary analysis. In particular, the following methods are employed:

- 1) the diachronic (historical-genetic) method, used to trace the evolution of the fantasy genre and the stages of its terminological formation;
- 2) hermeneutic analysis, applied to reinterpret and clarify the fundamental concepts within J. R. R. Tolkien's theoretical legacy;
- 3) the comparative method, used to contrast the worldview models of heroic and comic fantasy and to analyze the reception of the genre across different cultural paradigms (modernism and postmodernism);
- 4) mythocritical and archetypal analysis, employed to determine the role of the mythopoetic substrate in the construction of the artistic world and in the structuring of the hero's image.

The hermeneutic method is applied primarily to the reinterpretation of Tolkien's essay *On Fairy-Stories*, especially to the clarification of the concepts of enchantment, secondary belief, recovery, and escape in their original theoretical context. The comparative method is used to distinguish between heroic and comic fantasy as two worldview-oriented modes of the genre and to trace the influence of postmodernism on their divergence. Mythocritical and archetypal analysis informs the discussion of the mythopoetic substrate of fantasy, including the role

of quest structure, archetypal character functions, and initiatory models in shaping the artistic world and the fantasy hero's identity.

#### 4. Presentation of the main material

Among the existing definitions of the fantasy genre, the formulation proposed by J. Clute and J. Grant appears to be the most precise:

*“A fantasy text is a self-coherent narrative. When set in this world, it tells a story which is impossible (as we perceive it); when set in the otherworld, that otherworld will be impossible, though the story may be realistic. ... A fantasy text requires empathy from the reader; the reader must live the story alongside the author and the characters”* (Clute–Grant, 1999).

This definition is particularly significant because it encodes not only formal characteristics but, more importantly, reveals the worldview foundations of fantasy and the mechanism of its influence on the reader. The definition proposed by J. Clute and J. Grant may be more precisely understood within the broader field of contemporary fantasy theory. In particular, B. Attebery's concept of fantasy as a *fuzzy set* (Attebery, 1992), F. Mendlesohn's emphasis on rhetorical entry into the secondary world (Mendlesohn, 2008), and K. Hume's understanding of fantasy as an imaginative mode all confirm that the genre should be interpreted not only through fixed definitions, but also through its structural principles, narrative rhetoric, and worldview-related functions (Hume, 1984).

When situated within this broader theoretical field, fantasy appears not as a fixed and isolated form, but as a genre whose historical formation and internal differentiation require separate consideration.

Although literary scholars began using the term *fantasy* as early as the 1920s and 1930s, the genre acquired its definitive form as a coherent system embodied in a wide range of works only in the second half of the twentieth century. One of the earliest works identified by scholars as fantasy proper is R. E. Howard's *Conan* series – a cycle of nearly twenty stories published between 1932 and 1936. Although the Conan cycle is often treated as one of the earliest recognized examples of fantasy proper in twentieth-century scholarship, the prehistory of the genre also includes such important predecessors as G. MacDonald, W. Morris, and Lord Dunsany, whose works significantly shaped the development of modern secondary-world fantasy.

The next major landmark was J. R. R. Tolkien's *The Hobbit, or There and Back Again*, which was initially classified as an *authorial fairy tale* and did not attract sustained scholarly attention, despite its considerable popularity with a broad readership. Soon after the publication of *The Hobbit*, Tolkien began work on the epic narrative *The Lord of the Rings* (1954–1955), a work that opened a new chapter in both literature and literary studies. It is precisely this text that is widely regarded as

the foundation for the development of the fantasy genre as a whole and, in some scholarly interpretations, as the first fully realized exemplar of fantasy.

Upon completing his major work *The Lord of the Rings*, J. R. R. Tolkien offered a scholarly justification for the specific genre principles underlying his creative practice. This justification is articulated in the essay “*On Fairy-Stories*” (1947), which, despite its significant influence in international scholarship, remains insufficiently known within the domestic academic context. The essay is frequently encountered under the incorrect title “*On Fairy Tales*” (*Pro charivni kazky*), a mistranslation that substantially distorts the conceptual focus of the study.

In this work, J. R. R. Tolkien identifies three fundamental functions of a fantasy narrative:

- 1) *enchantment* – the reader’s imaginative involvement in the world depicted in the literary work;
- 2) *secondary belief* – a firm and sustained conviction in the internal truth of the fictional world and its coherence with reality, on the basis of which a new *secondary world* is constructed;
- 3) *recovery* – recovery, or the ability to see things as if for the first time (Tolkien, 1983).

When applying these criteria in textual analysis, it is essential to note that the category of the *secondary world* is not evaluative in nature; rather, it indicates the genetic connection of the fantasy space to objective reality.

The third criterion, *recovery*, requires particular attention, as it is frequently misinterpreted as *solace*. Tolkien does indeed address the importance of a happy ending to an adventure, emphasizing its significance for the reader no less than for the characters themselves. However, the issue lies in the organic affiliation of fantasy with the *literature of wonder* (*littérature du merveilleux*), as opposed to the *literature of the uncanny* (*littérature fantastique* in Todorov’s sense), in which a happy ending is typically rejected. Although Tolkien’s conceptual vocabulary differs from Todorov’s structural classification, Todorov’s model helps clarify why fantasy is most closely aligned with the mode of the marvelous (Todorov, 1975). From this perspective, fantasy belongs primarily to the mode of the marvelous, since it presupposes the acceptance of the impossible as internally coherent within the secondary world. However, the influence of postmodernism significantly transforms the fantasy genre. Consequently, a portion of fantasy texts aligns more closely with the mode of the uncanny than with the mode of the marvelous. This is most evident in the protagonists’ loss of agency and internal psychological complexity (with negative emotions being the only exception), as well as the characters’ dependence on external circumstances instead of achieving internal development.

Within the framework of philosophical terminology, the description of this function readily correlates with the concept of *rebirth* achieved through immersion

in a worldview myth that contains actualized archetypes. By engaging with the sacred energy of myth, the individual returns to their own nature and to a life-affirming worldview, restoring psychological equilibrium, inner integrity, and the meaningful fullness of existence. Consequently, upon returning from the artistic world, the recipient acquires the strength necessary to productively transform their own reality. In her research on J. R. R. Tolkien's work, O. Tykhomyrova identifies precisely such mythological integrity as embodied in *The Lord of the Rings* (Tykhomyrova, 2008, pp. 117–118).

Similarly, the term *escape* is frequently misinterpreted as *flight* or *escapism*. Tolkienian escape should not be equated with destructive escapism, since it implies not the rejection of reality, but the recovery of the individual's capacity to return to reality in a renewed and more integral state. Tolkien's essay indeed addresses the *escape* of the individual from the destructive technogenic reality of modernity, which has become a hostile environment for humanity. The scholar's identification of Evil with true ugliness is fundamentally mythological in nature:

*“Progress is diseased by modernism, and we feel acutely both the ugliness of our creations and the fact that they serve evil. This causes a desire to escape – not from life, but from modernity and from the ugliness created by our own hands. Because for us, evil and ugliness are inseparably linked”* (cited in Pomazan, 2013, p. 13).

It is therefore likely that Tolkien perceived the post-war world as a devastated space, responsibility for which lies with humanity's choice of a misguided path of development. However, this *escape* is not final; rather, it is oriented toward the recovery of the individual and, subsequently, of the real world as a whole. The depth of the worldview myth helps to explain why, in the context of the Russian–Ukrainian war of the twenty-first century, symbolic elements from Tolkien's works were widely appropriated and became immediately intelligible even to those unfamiliar with the original texts.

As the genre evolved, its juxtaposition with science fiction became increasingly pronounced. The conflict between these two directions was particularly acute in Soviet literary studies, a context that significantly shaped audience reception of both genres. This confrontation appears to have been artificially provoked in order to fragment the speculative paradigm, since fantasy and science fiction themselves lack any inherent internal potential for such antagonism.

At the same time, a process of worldview differentiation took place within fantasy, resulting in the emergence of two dominant orientations within the genre: *heroic fantasy* and *comic fantasy*. This distinction may also be correlated with existing genre classifications in fantasy studies. In particular, F. Mendlesohn's *Rhetorics of Fantasy* demonstrates that fantasy may be differentiated according to the rhetorical mode by which the reader and the protagonist enter into relation with the fantastic world, whether through portal-quest, immersive, intrusion, or

liminal structures. In this sense, the distinction between heroic and comic fantasy in the present article should be understood as a working analytical framework for describing two different worldview orientations within the genre, rather than as a universally accepted typology.

Most works belonging to the heroic fantasy “*are characterized by profound philosophical depth, drama, and even a tragic plot, as the resolution of moral and ethical problems by the heroes often occurs on the brink of life and death*” (Pomazan, 2013, p. 12). This, however, does not preclude the presence of humorous elements within such texts. Comic fantasy is structured differently and primarily fulfils an entertaining function, employing play as a plot-forming principle. It was this variant that first came under the influence of postmodernism and, in the second half of the twentieth century, temporarily pushed heroic fantasy to the periphery of the literary process.

Works by J. R. R. Tolkien, U. Le Guin, and R. Zelazny can be identified as world-class examples of classic heroic fantasy. Despite the substantial nature of their plot structures, all these works are united by a high level of reflection on values, the absence of play as the basis of being, and an ethical component at the structural level of the work. Among the most prominent representatives of comic fantasy, the work of T. Pratchett stands out today, as he created his own ludic (play-based) fantasy space. This differentiation becomes especially visible in those literary cultures where postmodernism altered the genre unevenly and under specific ideological conditions. The post-Soviet space provides one of the clearest examples of such an uneven transformation.

The situation began to change in the second decade of the twenty-first century, with the gradual weakening of postmodernist positions. In the post-Soviet space, similar processes have been unfolding, though in a more complex form. Here, postmodernism entered cultural discourse both in its classical manifestation and in the form of an ersatz. As a result, this space did not experience the full evolution – or, more precisely, the subsequent degradation – of this worldview paradigm in parallel with the rest of the world. This asymmetry has produced specific difficulties in the perception and evaluation of postmodern phenomena and ideology.

In the post-Soviet cultural space, postmodernism often entered literary production not as a fully developed philosophical paradigm but as a set of external stylistic markers: irony, intertextual play, genre parody, and relativization of ethical hierarchies. In fantasy, this often resulted in the weakening of mythopoetic integrity and the replacement of initiatory depth with playful fragmentation. Such tendencies may be observed in a number of late and post-Soviet Slavic fantasy texts, where the secondary world functions less as an ontological model and more as a field of textual play.

These worldview differences were not only embodied in literary practice but also, to some extent, conceptually articulated by the writers themselves. While J. R. R. Tolkien and R. Zelazny articulated key features of *heroic fantasy*, the ideology of postmodernism within the genre was systematically articulated by the Polish speculative fiction writer A. Sapkowski. He not only sought to narrow the boundaries of fantasy to Celtic legends (Pomazan, 2013, p. 13) but also sharply opposed the genre to the fairy tale, denying any connection between fantasy and the ancient worldview myth. These ideas, formulated in the essay *No Gold in the Grey Mountains (Nie ma złota w Szarych Górach)* (Sapkowski, 1993), shaped the development of fantasy in Slavic literary cultures for several decades.

This broader Slavic context also helps clarify the internal differentiation of contemporary Ukrainian fantasy. Both of these worldview orientations are clearly discernible within it. A significant influence of postmodern aesthetics may be traced in the works of V. Arienev, O. Hovda, T. Zavitalo, D. Korniy, K. Matviienko, and H. Pahutiak, where playful strategies, intensified intertextuality, and semantic relativization often become structurally important. By contrast, heroic fantasy with a pronounced ethical foundation is represented in the works of D. Bilyi, A. Hulkevych, Ya. Katorozh, M. Marchenko, N. Matolinets, T. Mykitchak, M. Muliar, O. Tkach, and M. Chumarna, whose texts preserve the value-centered and initiatory potential of the genre. Beyond terminological disputes and ideological shifts, however, fantasy preserves a stable connection with mythological and archetypal structures.

In general, the number of definitions of the fantasy genre is no smaller than that of speculative fiction as a whole. Most frequently, fantasy is defined as the result of a synthesis of a reinterpreted worldview or cosmogonic myth, the fairy tale, and the chivalric romance.

The action in such works often unfolds within a conventional Middle Ages – a setting inherited from the chivalric romance along with the categories of heroic nobility. Yu. Zaichenko observes: “*Since the foundation of fantasy is built upon a social protest against rapid industrialization and, as its result, the soullessness of modern society, the fictional worlds of fantasy are mostly endowed with the features of the real or legendary past of Europe, typically the Middle Ages*” (Zaichenko, p. 103). The epic scale, tragic dimension, and a certain eschatological quality of fantasy texts constitute a reinterpretation of myth within the genre’s own coordinates, enabling the creation of a coherent and internally consistent world.

Fairy tales primarily persist within fantasy at the level of worldview influence and within the work’s moral and ethical framework. From the wonder tale, fantasy also inherits a system of characters described by V. Propp in “*Historical Roots of the Wonder Tale*” (Propp, 1984) and “*Morphology of the Folktale*” (Propp, 1968). It is from this mythological space that the protagonist and antagonist emerge, along with mediating figures such as the hero, the false hero, the rival, the magical helper, the

donor, and others. Unlike their folktale counterparts, fantasy characters possess a significantly greater degree of conscious agency and psychological complexity, reflecting an evolution of traditional character archetypes.

An essential feature of fantasy is its engagement with folklore and the creation of an original mythology correlated with archetypal representations of humanity. Some scholars include the presence of folklore or national mythology among the mandatory attributes of fantasy; however, under certain conditions, this criterion may prove misleading or lead to an inaccurate interpretation of a fantasy text. The national component is no less significant for fantasy than for any other genre, as it diversifies thematic concerns and enriches ideas in their life-affirming dimension. The world depicted by a fantasy author acquires a sense of realism through systematic detailing, and when such a world possesses a national horizon, its impact becomes even more pronounced. O. Shaposhnyk interprets the process of constructing a distinct reality as the creation of an entire complex of cultural heritage for such a world: *“language, literary heritage, traditions, clothing, rituals, and ceremonies”* (Shaposhnyk, 2014, p. 7).

Among the structure-forming features of fantasy, O. Stuzhuk identifies two primary ones:

- 1) *“a detailed fictional world, deepened in space and time”*;
- 2) *“the primacy of the human over the entourage, where the writer’s attention is focused on the formation of the hero, his spiritual growth,”* achieved through *“the application of a series of techniques, particularly the chronotope of the road”* (Stuzhuk, 2006).

Thus, the path of individual formation proves more decisive than even the degree of realism of the fantasy world itself. This principle is archetypal in nature and was formulated by C. Vogler in relation to mythologized texts: *“Such stories are accurate models of the functioning of the human mind, true psychological maps. They are psychologically effective and emotionally realistic, even when they depict fantastic, impossible, or unreal events”* (Vogler, 2007, p. 4). D. Hahn likewise addresses the initiatory function of the quest in his analysis of the multidimensionality of perspective in artistic works. He notes that through the journey along the path – understood as a quest – and, most importantly, within one’s own inner world, the hero discovers personal identity and harmony (Hahn, 2017, p. 529).

The potential for immersion in the fantasy world is so profound that works of this genre possess a *“specific property of withdrawing the individual from reality”* (Dudurich, 2018, p. 23), as the reader is able to *“enter the image with the integrity of their entire being”* (V. Limonchenko) (cited in Dudurich, 2018, p. 23). This phenomenon may facilitate either personal development or, conversely, absorption, occurring when – under certain circumstances and even for extended periods – the world of the book comes to dominate the reader’s perception of

reality. Although concerns regarding the potentially negative effects of such immersion do exist, they are often overstated.

## 5. Conclusions

The present study establishes that fantasy constitutes a self-coherent system in which the unreality of the depicted world is compensated for by logical consistency and worldview depth. A re-examination of J. R. R. Tolkien's theoretical legacy makes it possible to argue that the key functions of the genre – *enchantment*, *secondary belief*, and *recovery* – are ontological in nature and are directed toward the restoration of the integrity of the human personality rather than toward a purely entertaining effect. It is further demonstrated that the worldview differentiation between heroic and comic fantasy is determined by differing attitudes toward the mythological substrate: whereas the heroic mode actualizes archetypal models and the initiatory path of the hero, the comic mode, under the influence of postmodernism, tends toward deconstruction and play. Consequently, fantasy should be understood not as a form of destructive escapism, but as a means of mythopoetic comprehension of reality that, through immersion in the *secondary world*, enables the recovery of an individual's spiritual resources.

## Література

1. Бондарева Олена 2006. *Міф і драма у новітньому літературному контексті: поновлення структурного зв'язку через жанрове моделювання: монографія*. Київ: Четверта хвиля.
2. Дудурич Віталій 2018. Місце феномену «фентезі» у процесі формування особистості. *Філософська антропологія і філософія культури* 384/11: с. 23–27.
3. Журавська Оксана 2018. *Дихотомія «реального» й «ірреального» хронотопу як категоріальна жанрова ознака українського химерного роману 2-ї половини ХХ ст. Дисертація на здобуття наукового ступеня кандидата філологічних наук*. Київ: Київський університет імені Бориса Грінченка.
4. Зайченко Юлія 2019. Функціонування архаїзмів в англійських текстах фентезі. *Актуальні питання іноземної філології: науковий журнал* 10: с. 102–107.
5. Копистянська Нонна 2005. *Жанр, жанрова система у просторі літературознавства: монографія*. Львів: Паіс.
6. Леоненко Олександра 2010. *Жанр фентезі в українській прозі кінця ХХ – початку ХХІ століття. Автореферат дисертації на здобуття наукового ступеня кандидата філологічних наук*. Черкаси: Черкаський національний університет імені Богдана Хмельницького.
7. Помазан Ігор 2013. *Провідні напрямки масової літератури: навчально-методичний посібник для студентів 3 курсу, які навчаються за напрямом*

- підготовки 6.020303 – Філологія (кредитно-модульна система). Харків: Видавництво НУА.
8. Романенко Олена 2014. Жанрові моделі масової літератури: походження, напрями еволюції та типологія. *Вісник Львівського університету. Серія філологічна* 60/1: с. 315–322.
  9. Ситник Наталія 2009. *Фентезі Дж. Р. Р. Толкіна: архетиповий вимір художньої структури. Автореферат дисертації на здобуття наукового ступеня кандидата філологічних наук*. Сімферополь.
  10. Стужук Олеся 2006. *Художня фантастика як метажанр (на матеріалі української літератури XIX–XX ст.)*. Дисертація на здобуття наукового ступеня кандидата філологічних наук. Київ: Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка.
  11. Тихомирова Олена 2008. Дж. Р. Р. Толкін і література XX століття. In: *Світова література на перехресті культур і цивілізацій*. Сімферополь: Кримський архів, с. 115–126.
  12. Хороб Соломія 2017. *Жанрові особливості української фантастики кінця XX – початку XXI століття*. Дисертація на здобуття наукового ступеня кандидата філологічних наук. Тернопіль: Тернопільський національний педагогічний університет імені Володимира Гнатюка.
  13. Шапошник Оксана 2014. *Жанрово-стилістична та ідіостилістична специфіка перекладу фентезі (на матеріалі англомовних текстів сучасної дитячої літератури та їх українських перекладів)*. Автореферат дисертації на здобуття наукового ступеня кандидата філологічних наук. Херсон: Херсонський державний університет.
  14. Attebery, Brian 1992. *Strategies of Fantasy*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2979/4780.0>
  15. Clute, John – Grant, John eds. 1999. *The Encyclopedia of Fantasy*. London: Orbit.
  16. Hahn, Daniel 2017. *The Oxford Companion to Children's Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
  17. Hume, Kathryn 1984. *Fantasy and Mimesis: Responses to Reality in Western Literature*. New York–London: Methuen. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1771923>
  18. Jackson, Rosemary 1981. *Fantasy: The Literature of Subversion*. New York–London: Methuen.
  19. James, Edward – Mendlesohn, Farah eds. 2012. *The Cambridge Companion to Fantasy Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CCOL9780521429597>
  20. Lem, Stanisław 1984. *Microworlds: Writings on Science Fiction and Fantasy*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
  21. Mendlesohn, Farah 2008. *Rhetorics of Fantasy*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press.
  22. Propp, Vladimir 1968. *Morphology of the Folktale*. Translated by Laurence Scott. 2nd ed. Austin: University of Texas Press.
  23. Propp, Vladimir 1984. *Theory and History of Folklore*. Translated by Ariadna Y. Martin and Richard P. Martin. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

24. Sapkowski, Andrzej 1993. Pirog albo Nie ma złota w Szarych Gorach. *Nowa Fantastyka* 128/5. <https://letscoretro.pl/websites/kultura-asapkowski/publicys/pirog.html.po.htm> (Accessed: 10.02.2026).
25. Suvin, Darko 1979. *Metamorphoses of Science Fiction: On the Poetics and History of a Literary Genre*. New Haven–London: Yale University Press.
26. Swinfen, Ann 1984. *In Defence of Fantasy: A Study of the Genre in English and American Literature since 1945*. London–Boston: Routledge – Kegan Paul.
27. Todorov, Tsvetan 1975. *The Fantastic: A Structural Approach to a Literary Genre*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
28. Tolkien, Christopher ed. 1983. Tolkien J. R. R. On Fairy-Stories. In: *The Monsters and the Critics, and Other Essays*. London: George Allen – Unwin, pp. 109–161.
29. Vogler, Christopher 2007. *The Writers Journey: Mythic Structure for Writers*. Studio City: Michael Wiese Productions.
30. Zelazny, Roger 2025. *On Writing Science Fiction and Fantasy*. Positronic Publishing.

## References

1. Bondareva, Olena 2006. *Mifi drama u novitnomu literaturnomu konteksti: ponovlennia strukturnoho zviazku cherez zhanrove modeliuвання: monohrafiia* [Myth and Drama in the Contemporary Literary Context: Renewing the Structural Connection through Genre Modelling: A Monograph]. Kyiv: Chetverta khvyliia. (In Ukrainian)
2. Dudurych, Vitalii 2018. Mistse fenomenu «fentezi» u protsesi formuvannia osobystosti [The place of the phenomenon of “fantasy” in the process of personality formation]. *Filosofska antropohiia i filosofiia kultury* 384/11: s. 23–27. (In Ukrainian)
3. Zhuravska, Oksana 2018. *Dykhotomiia «realnoho» y «irrealnoho» khronotopu yak katehorialna zhanrova oznaka ukrainskoho khymernoho romanu 2-yi polovyny XX st. Dysertatsiia na zdobuttia naukovooho stupenia kandydata filolohichnykh nauk* [The Dichotomy of the “Real” and “Unreal” Chronotope as a Categorical Genre Feature of the Ukrainian Chimeric Novel of the Second Half of the Twentieth Century. Dissertation for the degree of Candidate of Philological Sciences]. Kyiv: Kyivskiy universytet imeni Borysa Hrinchenka. (In Ukrainian)
4. Zaichenko, Yuliia 2019. Funktsionuvannia arkhazmiv v anhlo movnykh tekstakh fentezi [The functioning of archaisms in English-language fantasy texts]. *Aktualni pytannia inozemnoi filolohii: naukovyi zhurnal* 10: s. 102–107. (In Ukrainian)
5. Kopystianska, Nonna 2005. *Zhanr, zhanrova systema u prostori literaturoznavstva: monohrafiia* [The Genre System in the Space of Literary Studies: A Monograph]. Lviv: Pais. (In Ukrainian)
6. Leonenko, Oleksandra 2010. *Zhanr fentezi v ukrainskii prozi kintsia XX – pochatku XXI stolittia. Avtoreferat dysertatsii na zdobuttia naukovooho stupenia kandydata filolohichnykh nauk* [The Fantasy Genre in Ukrainian Prose of the Late Twentieth and Early Twenty-First Centuries. Abstract of the dissertation for the degree of Candidate of Philological Sciences]. Cherkasy: Cherkaskiy natsionalnyi universytet imeni Bohdana Khmelnytskoho. (In Ukrainian)

7. Pomazan, Ihor 2013. *Providni napriamky masovoi literatury: navchalno-metodychnyi posibnyk dlia studentiv 3 kursu, yaki navchaiutsia za napriamom pidhotovky 6.020303 – Filolohiia (kredytno-modulna systema)* [Leading Trends in Popular Literature: A Teaching and Methodological Manual for Third-Year Students Studying in the Field of Training 6.020303 – Philology (Credit-Module System)]. Kharkiv: Vydavnytstvo NUA. (In Ukrainian)
8. Romanenko, Olena 2014. Zhanrovi modeli masovoi literatury: pokhodzhennia, napriamy evoliutsii ta typolohiia [Genre models of popular literature: origins, directions of evolution, and typology]. *Visnyk Lvivskoho universytetu. Seriiia filolohichna* 60/1: s. 315–322. (In Ukrainian)
9. Sytnyk, Nataliia 2009. *Fentezi J. R. R. Tolkina: arkhetyповyi vymir khudozhnoi struktury. Avtoreferat dysertatsii na zdobuttia naukovooho stupenia kandydata filolohichnykh nauk* [The Fantasy of J. R. R. Tolkien: The Archetypal Dimension of Artistic Structure. Abstract of the dissertation for the degree of Candidate of Philological Sciences]. Simferopol. (In Ukrainian)
10. Stuzhuk, Olesia 2006. *Khudozhnia fantastyka yak metazhanr (na materialy ukrainskoi literatury XIX–XX st.). Dysertatsiia na zdobuttia naukovooho stupenia kandydata filolohichnykh nauk* [Speculative Fiction as a Meta-genre: Based on Ukrainian Literature of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries. Dissertation for the degree of Candidate of Philological Sciences]. Kyiv: Kyivskiy natsionalnyi universytet imeni Tarasa Shevchenka. (In Ukrainian)
11. Tykhomyrova, Olena 2008. J. R. R. Tolkien i literatura XX stolittia [J. R. R. Tolkien and twentieth-century literature]. In: *Svitova literatura na perekhresti kultur i tsyvilizatsii*. Simferopol: Krymskyi arkhiv, s. 115–126. (In Ukrainian)
12. Khorob, Solomiia 2017. *Zhanrovi osoblyvosti ukrainskoi fantastyky kintsia XX – pochatku XXI stolittia. Dysertatsiia na zdobuttia naukovooho stupenia kandydata filolohichnykh nauk* [Genre Features of Ukrainian Speculative Fiction of the Late Twentieth and Early Twenty-First Centuries. Dissertation for the degree of Candidate of Philological Sciences]. Ternopil: Ternopilskiy natsionalnyi pedahohichnyi universytet imeni Volodymyra Hnatiuka. (In Ukrainian)
13. Shaposhnyk, Oksana 2014. *Zhanrovo-stylistychna ta idiosylistychna spetsyfika perekladu fentezi (na materialy anhlomovnykh tekstiv suchasnoi dytiachoi literatury ta yikh ukrainskykh perekladiv). Avtoreferat dysertatsii na zdobuttia naukovooho stupenia kandydata filolohichnykh nauk* [Genre-Stylistic and Idiostylistic Specificity of Fantasy Translation: Based on English-Language Texts of Contemporary Children's Literature and Their Ukrainian Translations. Abstract of the dissertation for the degree of Candidate of Philological Sciences]. Kherson: Khersonskiy derzhavnyi universytet. (In Ukrainian)
14. Attebery, Brian 1992. *Strategies of Fantasy*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2979/4780.0>
15. Clute, John – Grant, John eds. 1999. *The Encyclopedia of Fantasy*. London: Orbit.
16. Hahn, Daniel 2017. *The Oxford Companion to Children's Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

17. Hume, Kathryn 1984. *Fantasy and Mimesis: Responses to Reality in Western Literature*. New York-London: Methuen. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1771923>
18. Jackson, Rosemary 1981. *Fantasy: The Literature of Subversion*. New York-London: Methuen.
19. James, Edward – Mendlesohn, Farah eds. 2012. *The Cambridge Companion to Fantasy Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CCOL9780521429597>
20. Lem, Stanisław 1984. *Microworlds: Writings on Science Fiction and Fantasy*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
21. Mendlesohn, Farah 2008. *Rhetorics of Fantasy*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press.
22. Propp, Vladimir 1968. *Morphology of the Folktale*. Translated by Laurence Scott. 2nd ed. Austin: University of Texas Press.
23. Propp, Vladimir 1984. *Theory and History of Folklore*. Translated by Ariadna Y. Martin and Richard P. Martin. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
24. Sapkowski, Andrzej 1993. Pirog albo Nie ma złota w Szarych Gorach [Pirog, or No Gold in the Grey Mountains]. *Nowa Fantastyka* 128/5. <https://letsforetro.pl/websites/kultura-asapkowski/publicys/pirog.html.po.htm> (Accessed: 10.02.2026). (In Polish)
25. Suvin, Darko 1979. *Metamorphoses of Science Fiction: On the Poetics and History of a Literary Genre*. New Haven-London: Yale University Press.
26. Swinfen, Ann 1984. *In Defence of Fantasy: A Study of the Genre in English and American Literature since 1945*. London-Boston: Routledge – Kegan Paul.
27. Todorov, Tsvetan 1975. *The Fantastic: A Structural Approach to a Literary Genre*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
28. Tolkien, Christopher ed. 1983. Tolkien J. R. R. On Fairy-Stories. In: *The Monsters and the Critics, and Other Essays*. London: George Allen – Unwin, pp. 109–161.
29. Vogler, Christopher 2007. *The Writers Journey: Mythic Structure for Writers*. Studio City: Michael Wiese Productions.
30. Zelazny, Roger 2025. *On Writing Science Fiction and Fantasy*. Positronic Publishing.

### **Genre and stylistic features of fantasy works and the terminological history of the genre's formation**

**Nataliia Deviatko**, candidate of philosophical sciences, associate professor. Dnipro Academy of Continuing Education, Department of Philosophy, associate professor. [natalia\\_ptah@ukr.net](mailto:natalia_ptah@ukr.net), ORCID: 0000-0003-0162-1194.

The article provides a comprehensive philological analysis of the genre and stylistic features of fantasy and traces the terminological history of its formation as an independent genre within literary discourse. The relevance of the study is determined by the need to overcome terminological ambiguity and the simplified reception of the fantasy paradigm, which has long been perceived primarily through the lens of entertainment literature. The study examines the genesis of the genre, from R. E. Howard's *Conan* cycle to

J. R. R. Tolkien's epic narrative *The Lord of the Rings*, which laid the foundation for the modern *literature of wonder*.

Particular attention is devoted to the hermeneutic reinterpretation of J. R. R. Tolkien's theoretical legacy. The author argues that the fundamental functions of fantasy – *enchantment*, *secondary belief*, and *recovery* – possess not only aesthetic but also profound ontological significance. The concept of *recovery* is clarified as a mechanism for restoring the integrity of the human personality and overcoming the destructive influence of technogenic civilization. Within the context of the genre's evolution, the study explores the worldview differentiation between *heroic* and *comic* fantasy, demonstrating that the heroic mode tends toward philosophical tragedy and ethical choice at the brink of existence, whereas comic fantasy, shaped by postmodern play, gravitates toward the deconstruction of the mythological substrate.

The article substantiates the role of the mythological substrate and archetypal models (following V. Propp and C. Vogler) in the construction of the artistic world. It demonstrates that the *chronotope of the road* and the quest function as an initiatory principle enabling both the hero and the recipient to attain personal identity. The study concludes that fantasy should be understood not as a form of negative escapism, but as a productive mode of mythopoetic comprehension of reality, which facilitates a return to a life-affirming worldview through immersion in the *secondary world*. The scientific novelty of the research lies in the clarification of the terminological apparatus and in the analysis of the transformation of fantasy's genre features within the Slavic literary space under the influence of postmodernism.

**Keywords:** *fantasy literature, mythopoetics, genre paradigm, secondary world, secondary belief, heroic fantasy, escapism, postmodernism.*

### **Жанрово-стильові особливості творів фентезі і термінологічна історія становлення жанру**

**Дев'ятко Наталія**, кандидат філософських наук, доцент. Дніпровська академія неперервної освіти, кафедра філософії, доцент. natalia\_ptah@ukr.net, ORCID: 0000-0003-0162-1194.

У статті здійснено комплексний філологічний аналіз жанрово-стильових особливостей фентезі та простежено термінологічну історію його становлення як самостійної жанрової одиниці в літературознавчому дискурсі. Актуальність дослідження зумовлена необхідністю подолання термінологічної неоднозначності та спрощеної рецепції фентезійної парадигми, що тривалий час розглядалася крізь призму розважальної літератури. У роботі проаналізовано генезис жанру, починаючи від циклу Р. Е. Говарда про Конана та епічних полотен Дж. Р. Р. Толкіна, що заклали фундамент сучасної «літератури див».

Окрему увагу приділено герменевтичному переосмисленню теоретичної спадщини Дж. Р. Р. Толкіна. Автор доводить, що засадничі функції фентезі, такі як «зачарування» (*enchantment*), «вторинна віра» (*secondary belief*) та «відновлення»

(*recovery*), мають не лише естетичне, а й глибоке онтологічне навантаження. Зокрема, уточнено зміст терміна «*recovery*» як інструмента реконструкції цілісності людської особистості та подолання деструктивного впливу техногенної цивілізації. У контексті еволюції жанру досліджено світоглядне розмежування між «героїчним» та «комічним» напрямками фентезі. Виявлено, що героїчна парадигма тяжіє до філософської трагедійності та етичного вибору на межі буття, тоді як комічне фентезі, сформоване під потужним впливом постмодерністської гри, орієнтоване на деконструкцію міфологічного субстрату.

У межах дослідження обґрунтовано роль міфологічного субстрату та архетипних моделей (за В. Проппом та К. Воглером) у побудові художнього світу. Доведено, що «хронотоп дороги» та квесту є ініціальним принципом, який дозволяє герою та реципієнту віднайти власну ідентичність. Автор резюмує, що фентезі постає не як форма негативного ескапізму, а як продуктивний спосіб міфопоетичного осмислення реальності, що забезпечує людині повернення до життєствердного світогляду через досвід перебування у «вторинному світі». Наукова новизна роботи полягає в уточненні термінологічного апарату та висвітленні специфіки трансформації жанрових ознак фентезі у слов'янському літературному просторі під впливом постмодерну.

**Ключові слова:** *фентезійна література, міфопоетика, жанрова парадигма, вторинний світ, вторинна віра, героїчне фентезі, ескапізм, постмодернізм.*

### **A fantasy-művek műfaji és stílári sajátosságai, valamint a műfaj kialakulásának terminológiai története**

**Deviatko Natália**, a filozófiai tudományok kandidátusa, docens. Dnyiprói Továbbképzési Akadémia, Filozófiai Tanszék, docens. natalia\_ptah@ukr.net, ORCID: 0000-0003-0162-1194.

A tanulmány átfogó filológiai elemzést nyújt a fantasy műfaji és stílári sajátosságairól, valamint nyomon követi a műfaj önálló irodalmi diskurzuson belüli kialakulásának terminológiai történetét. A kutatás aktualitását az indokolja, hogy szükség van a terminológiai bizonytalanság és a fantasztikus irodalom leegyszerűsítő értelmezésének meghaladására, mivel a műfajt hosszú ideig elsősorban a szórakoztató irodalom felől közelítették meg. A tanulmány a műfaj eredetét vizsgálja R. E. Howard *Conan*-ciklusától J. R. R. Tolkien epikus elbeszéléséig, *A Gyűrűk Uráig*, amely megalapozta a modern fantasy-irodalmat.

Különös figyelmet kap J. R. R. Tolkien elméleti örökségének hermeneutikai újraértelmezése. A szerző amellet érvel, hogy a fantasy alapvető funkciói – az *elvárázsolás*, a *másodlagos hit* és a *helyreállítás* – nemcsak esztétikai, hanem mély ontológiai jelentőséggel is bírnak. A helyreállítás fogalmát a tanulmány az emberi személyiség integritásának visszaállítását és a technogén civilizáció romboló hatásának meghaladását szolgáló mechanizmusként értelmezi. A műfaj fejlődésének kontextusában a kutatás feltárja a heroikus és a komikus fantasy közötti világnézeti differenciálódást, rámutatva arra, hogy a heroikus módusz a filozófiai tragikum és az egzisztenciális határhelyzetben meghozott etikai választás felé tendál, míg a posztmodern játék által alakított komikus fantasy a mitológiai szubsztrátum dekonstrukciója felé mozdul el.

A tanulmány alátámasztja a mitológiai szubsztrátum és az archetipikus modellek – V. Propp és C. Vogler nyomán értelmezett – szerepét a művészi világ megalkotásában. Bemutatja, hogy az út kronotoposza és a küldetés az iniciáció elveként működik, lehetővé téve mind a hős, mind a befogadó számára a személyes identitás megtalálását. A kutatás arra a következtetésre jut, hogy a fantasyt nem a negatív eszképzizmus egyik formájaként, hanem a valóság mitopoétikus megértésének produktív módusaként kell értelmezni, amely a másodlagos világba való belemerülés révén elősegíti az életigenlő világnézethez való visszatérést. A kutatás tudományos újdonsága a terminológiai apparátus pontosításában, valamint a fantasy műfaji sajátosságai átalakulásának elemzésében rejlik a szláv irodalmi térben, a posztmodernizmus hatása alatt.

**Kulcsszavak:** *fantasztikus irodalom, mitopoétika, műfaji paradigma, másodlagos világ, másodlagos hit, heroikus fantasy, eszképzizmus, posztmodernizmus.*