

РОЗДІЛ 10 ФОЛЬКЛОРИСТИКА

UDC 398:008:316.77:81'42

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/tps2663-4880/2025.42.2.49>

THE IMAGE OF THE “ALIEN/OTHER” IN THE CONTEXT OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF IMAGOLGY AS AN INTERDISCIPLINARY SCIENCE

ОБРАЗ «ЧУЖОГО/ІНШОГО» В КОНТЕКСТІ СТАНОВЛЕННЯ ІМАГОЛОГІЇ ЯК МІЖДИСЦИПЛІНАРНОЇ НАУКИ

Slobodian N.V.,

orcid.org/0000-0001-6117-3958

PhD in Philology,

*Assistant Professor at the Department of German Philology and Methods of Teaching German
Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University*

Nesterchuk K.M.,

*orcid.org/0000-0001-6117-3958**Assistant at the Department of Romance and Germanic Philology
Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University*

The article examines the development of imagology as an interdisciplinary humanities discipline and analyzes its key concept – the image of the “alien/other”. It is emphasized that imagology emerged in the context of literary comparativism in the 1950s and later evolved into a field focused on the study of interethnic stereotypes, representations of national images, and the mechanisms of their formation in literature, folklore, and the arts in general. Particular attention is paid to the opposition “own/alien” as a universal binary structure of thought, which historically originates from primitive consciousness and remains relevant in contemporary social, political, and cultural discourses.

Based on the concepts of T. Todorov, D.-A. Pageaux, G. Dizerinka, J. Leerssen, and other scholars, the article highlights various approaches to analyzing national images and their representations. It is noted that relying on the methodology of such disciplines as comparative literature, historical hermeneutics, and discourse analysis, contemporary imagological research focuses on the reception of images that carry both aesthetic and political dimensions. It is demonstrated that the value characteristics of the “one’s own” and the “aliens” partially coincide with those inherent in worldview categories during the mythological era. The “own/alien” opposition, rooted in archaic worldviews, continues to be relevant in today’s globalized world, undergoing transformations but not losing its significance.

The article analyzes current scholarly works on the history of Ukrainian folkloristics that address the issue of interethnic communication. The focus is placed on the fact that intercultural interactions, which unfolded over a long historical period, served as the foundation for the formation of ethno-stereotypes and biased perceptions of representatives of other ethnic groups. Examples from Ukrainian folklore – in particular, the image of the German – confirm the persistence of ethno-stereotypes and their dependence on historical and social contexts. Based on research in Ukrainian folklore, the article reveals stereotypical perceptions of the “German” as a stable image of the “other” with a clear semantic charge.

The article concludes that imagology is a relevant discipline that contributes to a deeper understanding of the mechanisms of identity construction, intercultural interaction, and the formation of ethnocultural images in collective consciousness.

Key words: imagology, “own/alien”, “alien/other”, intercultural communication, interethnic stereotype, national image.

У статті розглянуто процес становлення імагології як міждисциплінарної гуманітарної науки та проаналізовано ключове для неї поняття – образ «чужого/іншого». Наголошено, що імагологія виникла у контексті літературної компаративістики 50-х рр. XX ст. та надалі трансформувалась у напрямок дослідження міжетнічних стереотипів, репрезентацій національних образів та механізмів їх формування в літературі, фольклорі та мистецтві загалом. Особливу увагу приділено опозиції «свій/чужий» як універсальній бінарній структурі мислення, що історично бере початок із первісної свідомості та зберігає релевантність у сучасних суспільних, політичних і культурних дискурсах. На основі концепцій Ц. Тодорова, Д.-А. Пажо, Г. Дізеринка, Дж. Лірсена та інших дослідників висвітлено різноманітні підходи до аналізу національних образів та їх репрезентацій.

Зазначено, що, спираючись на методологію таких наук, як компаративістики, історичної герменевтики та дискурс-аналізу, сучасні дослідження в сфері імагології зосереджуються на рецепції образів, які мають як естетичну, так і політичну складову. Доведено, що ціннісні характеристики «своїх» і «чужих» частково збігаються із тими, що були притаманні світоглядним категоріям у міфологічну епоху. Опозиція «свій/чужий», закладена ще в архаїчному світогляді, продовжує залишатися релевантною в сучасному глобалізованому світі, видозмінюючись, але не втрачаючи своєї актуальності.

Проаналізовано актуальні наукові праці з історії української фольклористики, присвячені проблематиці між-етнічної комунікації. Увага зосереджена на тому, що саме міжкультурні взаємодії, які розгорталися протягом тривалого історичного періоду, слугували основою для формування етностереотипів та упереджених уявлень про представників інших етносів. Приклади з українського фольклору, зокрема образ німця, підтверджують стійкість етностереотипів та їхню залежність від історичного й соціального контекстів. На основі досліджень з українського фольклору розкрито стереотипні уявлення про «німця» як зразок усталеного образу «іншого» з чітким семантичним навантаженням.

Зроблено висновки про актуальність імагології як науки, що сприяє глибшому розумінню механізмів конструювання ідентичності, міжкультурної взаємодії та формування етнокультурних образів у колективній свідомості.

Ключові слова: імагологія, «свій/чужий», «чужий/інший», міжкультурна комунікація, міжетнічний стереотип, національний образ.

Problem statement. Imagology, a science whose origins trace back to French comparative-historical literary studies of the 1950s, has formed relatively recently. As stated in the literary encyclopedia, the term “imagology” derives from the Latin *imago*, meaning “image” or “representation”, and denotes the distinction between the objective environment and its subjective perception. When C. G. Jung introduced this term into analytical psychology, he proceeded from the idea that an image is never identical to the object; it can only resemble it [1, p. 412].

Volodymyr Morenets rightly notes that in cultural studies, the “other/alien” is viewed as something irrational, unknown, unacceptable, or inadequate in relation to the dominant worldview and that, in the process of rationalization, it often (though not always) acquires negative characteristics [2, p. 10].

Imagology studies the images of “others” or “aliens” – nations, countries, cultures – which are transformed into stereotypes within national consciousness; that is, into stable, emotionally charged, generalized representations of the “alien”, formed within a specific socio-historical context. From this follows that imagology not only uncovers the image of the “alien”, but also, through the processes of reception and evaluation, characterizes the subject itself, reflecting its national self-awareness and internal system of values.

Nowadays, thanks to its interdisciplinary nature, imagology has expanded its scope across various humanities disciplines and draws upon a wide range of sources – literature, folklore, art, history, ethnography, ethnology, and more. It is regarded as a branch and method of cultural studies that examines how nations perceive each other in the context of cultural dialogue – specifically, the image of the “other” or “alien” (in relation to the receiving side) ethnos, culture, or country. Imagological research thus aims to develop a general model for the perception of foreign-language cultures or the cultures of representatives of other nations or states.

The aim of this article is to explore the development of imagology as an interdisciplinary field within the humanities and to analyze the concept of the “Other” as central to its theoretical framework.

Presentation of the main material. To trace the early attempts at understanding the origins of “national images”, it is worth mentioning the metaphorical classification of images of the “other” proposed by French theorist Tzvetan Todorov. He identified two types: the first he called “Herodotus’s principle” (where “better” nations live closer, “worse” – farther away), and the second – “Homer’s law” (where the most distant peoples are endowed with the most appealing traits) [3, p. 26]. Such examples of “othering” continue to be used in contemporary social thought.

According to the research of Claude Levi-Strauss, at the archaic stages of human consciousness development, people tended to depict the world using oppositions and binary contrasts. Notably, such binary oppositions are often endowed with a universal character. One of these oppositions is “one’s own/aliens”, where “one’s own” are associated with fellow villagers, one’s own people or community, while “aliens” refer to another tribe, nation, or any category of people perceived as different from the majority. The “aliens” were approached with caution and fear, but at the same time, in the imagination of primitive humans, the world of the “aliens” possessed special, secret knowledge of reality – it was they who had access to magical practices and could foresee the future [4].

Early humans drew a clear line between the “own” world, to which they belonged, and the “alien” world, which they perceived as dangerous – whether it was a distant land inhabited by foreign tribes or an otherworldly realm populated by potentially hostile forces. Although the mythological era has passed and modern humans tend to rely on different frameworks to ascribe semiotic meaning to the objects around them, this division between “own/alien” continues to manifest in the contemporary world. However, some scholars argue that the line between “own/alien” is not fixed but rather fluid – it shifts both within each historical epoch and even more so over the course of historical development. As noted, “by the end of the Middle Ages, the fundamental opposition between “own” and “alien” had acquired a stable form – particularly in terms of social, cultural, and most significantly, religious distinction” [5, p. 44]. This continued for quite a long time, and only with the advent of the

Modern Era did the dichotomy of “own/alien” acquire new connotations and interpretations. “The perception of the “other” began to change primarily on the basis of real interaction with this “other”. However, the expansion of the worldview did not eliminate the problem of “own/alien”, but rather reactivated it in a new form. (...) The problem of “own/alien” has become not only a philosophical, social, or historical issue, but also a political one” [5, p. 45].

In recent decades, following powerful globalization and social changes, the opposition of “own/alien” has manifested itself vividly, particularly due to its political context. This dichotomy is especially evident among our contemporaries, and particularly among young people. “A young person, entering this world and striving to find their place in it, initially perceives it, quite naturally, as unfamiliar, and therefore alien and hostile. Hence arises the desire to find one’s place in the world, to find “one’s own” subculture, “one’s own” people, and to construct a world of “one’s own” in opposition to a world of “aliens” [6, p. 55]. It is worth noting that the value characteristics of “one’s own” and “aliens” partially coincide with those attributed to these worldview categories in the mythological era: “own” is associated with closeness, positive orientation, and identification with a helper or friend; while “alien” is typically characterized by complete antonymy – hostility, distrust, and the potential to cause harm to “own”. This can be explained by the fact that “in everyday life, the foundation of a modern person’s attitude towards people of other nationalities lies in stereotypes linked to behavioral and cultural features. In traditional societies, the perception of the “alien” was primarily mystical. From ancient times, the “alien” was always potentially an enemy, an enemy of the gods (“our gods”), a bearer of harmful magic” [5, p. 45].

Speaking about imagology as a science, which has undergone a rather complex development and faced considerable criticism throughout the 1950s–1980s, it should be noted that “it is still striving for recognition and is currently on the rise. Its methodology brings comparative research into the realm of intercultural relations. The scientific interest is focused on problems relevant to modern society, such as national and cultural identity, “decolonization”, and so on. This specialization is developing especially intensively in France and Germany” [7, p. 53]. As V. Budnyi notes in his research on national images and stereotypes, one of the first to thoroughly study mutual cultural perceptions of peoples, particularly the image of a certain ethnicity in the consciousness and literature of another nation, was the French comparatist Daniel-Henri Pageaux. He developed his compara-

tive research in the direction of a renewed *psychologie du peuple* (“national psychology”) [7, p. 53]. It was Daniel-Henri Pageaux who introduced the concept of the image of the “other/alien”, interpreting it – explicitly or implicitly – within parameters defined by predetermined factors. The French scholar explains it as follows: “I “see” the Other, but the image of the Other is, to a certain extent, an image of myself. It is impossible to avoid the fact that the image of the Other – on an individual level (the writer), a collective level (society, country, nation), or a semi-collective level (a group of like-minded people, widespread “opinion”) – turns out to be, at least to some degree, an extension of myself and my space” [8, p. 92]. Such approaches can be applied not only to the analysis of literary texts but also to folklore. The French literary scholar identifies four levels on which the process of studying a national image is based:

- a) the typical features of the image and their functioning within the analyzed text;
- b) sociocultural norms (the power lines of culture);
- c) cultural models that served as the foundation for constructing the image;
- d) the code that enables readers to recognize the image [9, p. 80-81].

Taking into account the peculiarities of cultural connections, Pageaux also offers a typology of the reception of national culture. He believes that another culture may be viewed as “superior” to one’s native national culture. For example, the Anglomania of 18th-century French philosophers, according to Pageaux, was a reaction to flaws in their own culture (lack of freedom, tolerance). The positive image of England served as a critique of French culture. Such “manias” for a foreign culture contribute to the creation of illusions – false, idealized images. Conversely, a foreign culture may be viewed as “inferior” to one’s own, which helps enhance the value of one’s native culture. As an example, Pageaux cites the Germanophobia of late 19th-century French writers, for whom the model was the “Roman mirage”. These writers contrasted German “barbarism” with the “moral superiority” of the Roman people.

The scholar identifies hispanophobia among the French during the Enlightenment, when Spanish “coarseness” and “cruelty” were contrasted with French “good taste” and “gentle character”. Sometimes, a foreign culture is perceived as “positive” and characterized by a two-way relationship. For instance, according to Pageaux, the gallophilia of some Spanish critics is based not only on a positive perception of France, but also on the recognition of the beneficial influence of French poets on Spanish literature. Foreign cultures are also often accepted

by the native culture without any evaluative process (this refers to the merging of cultures in which multilateral connections transform into unilateral ones, as in the cases of Pan-Latinism, Pan-Germanism, or Pan-Slavism) [9, p. 75–77].

This line of inquiry was continued by Belgian comparatist Hugo Dyserinck, who, based on the study of collective ideas about other ethnicities and cultures, sought to define the main tasks of imagology as a comparative discipline [10].

A perspective on the national stereotype is also offered by Joep Leerssen in his article “National Identity and National Stereotype” [11]. The scholar argues that the study of national images should be considered a “comparatist matter”, because “it addresses international relations more than it does different national identities” [11]. Leerssen states that “national characteristics are often specific cases and combinations of general moral polarities, and our thinking in terms of national characters boils down to the ethno-political projection of role models onto an imagined anthropological landscape” [11]. According to Leerssen, this very aspect forms the foundation for future research in imagology.

Joep Leerssen outlines eleven methodological principles for imagological research:

1. The goal of studying images is a theory of cultural or national stereotypes, not a theory of cultural or national identities. Imagology is concerned with representation, understood as textual strategies and discourse.

2. Imagology is not a form of sociology; its goal is to understand the discourse of representation, not society itself. While current attributes associated with a given nation are textual tropes rather than sociological or anthropological data, it is still somewhat valid to acknowledge the cultural context in which these images accumulate and from which they emerge into discursive practice. This practice is not the basis of collective – let alone national or public – opinion. The text is a more prevalent model, that is, an intertextual rather than a sociological problem. Literary tradition (which is never monolithic in any case) should not be seen as a simple reflection of national mentality or essentialism.

3. Our sources are subjective in nature; their subjectivity should not be ignored or filtered out, and must be taken into account during analysis. Certain nationalities are depicted within a perspective that is shaped by the text or discourse. Therefore, imagologists have a particular interest in the dynamic between hetero-images (representations of others) and auto-images (representations of one's own identity). Both are generally framed in national terms, but scholars

should be wary of interpreting them as straightforward reflections of empirical collective realities.

4. Imagology involves a specific set of characteristics and attributes that go beyond testable hypotheses or factual claims.

5. The first task of imagology is to establish the intertext of the national representation in question as an image.

6. The trope must also be contextualized and arise within the text. A balanced evaluation of how the image unfolds in the text requires awareness of poetic and variable conventions, as well as narrative techniques – not just bibliometric perception.

7. Historical contextualization is essential. Literary texts cannot be interpreted from the perspective of aesthetic timelessness. A variety of historical factors and class politics are relevant to achieving this.

8. A pragmatic-functional perspective should play an important role in the research conducted.

9. Based on all these methodological considerations, additional perspectives also emerge. In the long-term history of domestic clichés, certain variable constants may occur, and at times even oscillations between extreme evaluations.

10. The field of images presents a particularly relevant model that points not only toward the “other”, but also toward the content of selfhood through historical and cultural memory, which should be incorporated into the analysis.

11. The study of national images is inherently comparative: it addresses international relations rather than national identity. Moreover, patterns of national characterization become most distinct when examined as a multinational phenomenon [11, p. 370–374].

The author emphasizes the relevance of conducting research in the field of imagology, stating that “these methods and perspectives continue to define the specificity of imagology and will help it enrich the broad field of the humanities with its discoveries, as well as their interest in constructs of identity” [11, p. 374].

When considering folklore imagology, we see that, despite its conventionality, it vividly and clearly reflects people's character traits, their value orientations, speech manners, interpersonal relationships, and behavioral stereotypes shaped by specific socio-cultural environments. At the same time, research within imagology requires borrowing and integrating relevant knowledge and methodological frameworks from various disciplines: history, ethnopsychology, cultural studies, and others.

The Ukrainian comparatist scholar Dmytro Nalyvaiko argues that modern methodology for studying interethnic images is based on the philosophy of the relationship between the “I” and the

“other”, which imagology projects into the domain of intercultural processes [8, p. 93].

The history of Ukrainian folkloristics also offers examples of studies relating to interethnic communication. It is precisely intercultural relations over the centuries that have laid the foundation for the formation of stereotypes and prejudices about other peoples. Heorhii Bulashev draws attention to this, noting that “Ukrainian legends and “pobrekhenky” (tall tales) did not, by the way, overlook the ethnicities with whom Ukrainians had and continue to have contact throughout their historical journey. The depictions of various nationalities reflect deep popular observation and, despite their brevity, sparkle with vivid color and lively humor. These legends and tales most often mention “Khokhols” and “Katsaps” or “Moskali”, followed by Poles (“Lyakhs”), Tatars, Jews (“Zhyds”), Germans, and Roma. The characteristics of different nationalities are free from any bias” [12, p. 146].

Intercultural and sociopolitical processes provided the basis for the formation of ethnostereotypes in oral folk creativity, among which the image of the “German” stands out distinctly. This stratum of folklore became especially active during times of political and social upheaval – such as World War I and World War II, and during waves of emigration and labor migration. Consequently, today there exists a wide variety of opinions, stereotypes, and biases about Germany and the German people, which, due to their social context and widespread dissemination, have become elements of folklore.

When analyzing the image of the German, it is essential to turn to the etymology of this ethnonym, as historically it has developed under the influence of a specific semantic load. The well-known lexicographer and folklorist of the first half of the 19th century, Pavlo Biletsky-Nosenko, in his renowned dictionary, provides the following explanation of the word “German”: “Any foreigner from Western Europe who does not know the Slavic languages”; and for the word “muteness”: “Germans. Foreigners. Mute people. A rabble of contemptible foreigners” [13 p. 245].

However, Metropolitan Ilarion offers a somewhat different interpretation regarding the origin of this ethnonym: “The traditionally popular belief that the Slavs formed this appellation from the Old Slavic adjective *нѣмъ* (“nemy” – “mute”) because they did not understand the language of the Germanic tribes and thus thought they were literally mute – is called into question by the fact that the Slavs also didn’t understand the languages of other neighboring peoples (Greeks, Romans, Asian nomads), yet did not consider them “mute”. This has led some researchers to ask whether the Slavic word *нѣмѣць* might

originate from another word altogether, and not from the adjective *нѣмъ* (“mute”)” [14, p. 284–285].

As M. Krasikov notes, many facts indicate that “folk etymology” does not always align with the actual etymology; however, folklore sources are a crucial factor in explaining this issue because they appeal to the undeniable relevance of the semantic meaning of the word “German” as a “person without language”. The author writes: “German” is an ironic and metaphorical designation; it refers to a person who does not understand the language of the people among whom they find themselves, and this, as they say, is their problem. This defining trait, as well as certain similarities in clothing, appearance, and manners among Germans, English, French, Italians, and other Western European peoples, led to a leveling of distinctions between them in the eyes of the local population, who gave foreigners a somewhat scornful nickname – Germans” [15, p. 126]. The scholar also cites paremias (folk sayings and proverbs) about Germans, which were commented on by Ivan Franko: “A mute German. Not mute, just doesn’t understand what the Ruthenian is saying to him”; “Talk to him, he’s a German! He doesn’t understand”; “Oh, Germans, where did your wits go? We used to mock the Germans when they first appeared here, but soon it turned out that their intellect far surpassed ours”; “He disappeared worse than the German. Why and how the German got lost – no one knows” [15, p. 450–451].

Conclusions. The image of the “alien/other” is a fundamental concept in studies dedicated to imagology – a discipline that emerged at the intersection of literary studies, cultural studies, sociology, and history. Imagology analyzes how cultural images of other nations, ethnic groups, or societies are formed, transmitted, and entrenched in collective consciousness through literary texts, folklore, art, and other forms of cultural representation. Research shows that perceptions of the “other” are inextricably linked to the subject’s self-identification, and the image of the “alien” is often a projection of one’s own values, fears, and ideals.

Contemporary imagology draws on the methodologies of comparative literature, historical hermeneutics, and discourse analysis, focusing on the reception of images that possess both aesthetic and political dimensions. The opposition of “own/alien”, rooted in archaic worldviews, continues to remain relevant in today’s globalized world, transforming in form but not losing its significance. Examples from Ukrainian folklore, in particular the image of the German, confirm the persistence of ethno-stereotypes and their dependence on historical and social contexts.

Thus, imagology not only uncovers the mechanisms behind the formation of images of the “other”, but also contributes to a deeper understanding of national identity, cultural dialogue, and mutual per-

ception among peoples. This defines its significance as a discipline that helps to comprehend contemporary cultural and interethnic processes in a constantly changing world.

REFERENCES:

1. Літературознавча енциклопедія у 2 т. Авт.-уклад. Ю. І. Ковалів. Київ : ВЦ «Академія», 2007. Т. 1. 624 с.
2. Моренець В. Образ «іншого» – від первинного нарцисизму до аргументу ідеологічної риторики. *Наукові записки НаУКМА*. Т. 20-21: Теорія та історія культури, 2020. С. 10-16.
3. Образ Іншого в сусідніх історіях: міфи, стереотипи, наукові інтерпретації. Матеріали міжнародної наукової конференції, Київ, 15-16 грудня 2005 року / упорядник і наук. ред. Г. В. Касьянов. НАН України. Інститут історії України. Київ : Інститут історії України, 2008. 264 с.
4. Стоколос-Ворончук О. Етнотипи та їх художні стереотипи в українському анекдоті (на матеріалі видань XIX ст.) : автореф. дис. к. філол. н. : 10.01.07 «Фольклористика» / О. Стоколос-Ворончук. Львів, 2005. 22 с.
5. Чотири монологи про книжку Тамари Гундорової «Кітч і література». О. Пронкевич, Р. Харчук, А. Матусяк, В. Неборак / Альманах «ЛітАкцент». Випуск 2 / За ред. В. Панченка. Київ : Темпора, 2009. С. 44-57.
6. Крушельницька О. Опозиція «свій/чужий» в сучасній масовій літературі України та США (на матеріалі романів І. Карпі та Л. Вайсбергер) : автореф. дис. ... канд. філол. наук : 10.01.05 / О. І. Крушельницька; Бердян. держ. пед. ун-т. Бердянськ, 2016. 18 с.
7. Будний В. Розгадка чарів Цірцеї: національні образи та стереотипи в оновлені літературної етноімагології. *Слово і час*. 2007. № 3. С. 52–63.
8. Наливайко Д. Теорія літератури й компаративістики. Київ : Вид. дім «Києво-Могилянська академія», 2006. 348 с.
9. Pageaux D.-H. L'imagerie culturelle: de la littérature comparée à l'anthropologie culturelle. Synthesis. Bucarest, 1983. P. 79–88.
10. Dyerinck H. Imagology and the Problem of Ethnic Identity. *Intercultural Studies: Scholarly Review of the IAIS*, 2003. №1 (Spring). P. 285-294.
11. Лірсен Дж. Імагологія: історія і метод. *Літературна компаративістика*. Вип. IV: Імагологічний аспект сучасної компаративістики: стратегії та парадигми. Ч. II. Київ : ВД «Стилос», 2011. С. 362-376.
12. Булашев Г. *Український народ у своїх легендах, релігійних поглядах та віруваннях. Космогонічні українські народні погляди та вірування*. Київ : Довіра, 1992. 414 с.
13. Білецький-Носенко П. *Словник української мови* / П. П. Білецький-Носенко ; підгот. до вид. В. В. Німчук; АН УРСР, Ін-т мовознавства ім. О. О. Потебні. Київ : Наук. думка, 1966. 421 с.
14. Митрополит Іларіон. Етимологічно-семантичний словник української мови. Редакція й доповнення Ю.Мулика-Луцика. Вінніпег, 1988. С. 284–285.
15. Красиков М. «Я не чоловік, а Німець». Фольклорні матеріали / Михайло Красиков. Етнічна історія народів Європи: Зб. наук. пр. Вип. 17. Київ, 2004. С. 126–132.
16. Галицькоруські народні приповідки. Т. 2. Вип. 2 / зібрав, упорядкував і пояснив др. Іван Франко : у 3 т., 6 вип. Етнографічний збірник. Львів, 1908 Т. XXIV. 486 с.

Дата першого надходження рукопису до видання: 28.09.2025

Дата прийнятого до друку рукопису після рецензування: 30.10.2025

Дата публікації: 28.11.2025