

## РОЗДІЛ 12 ПОРІВНЯЛЬНЕ ЛІТЕРАТУРОЗНАВСТВО

UDC 82-2.792+808.1:159.9

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/tps2663-4880/2023.30.55>

### PSYCHOLOGY OF LITERARY CREATIVITY AS A SUBJECT OF REPRESENTATION IN MODERN DRAMATURGY (BASED ON THE PLAYS OF KOKI MITANI (JAPAN) AND NIS-MOMME STOCKMANN (GERMANY))

### ПСИХОЛОГІЯ ЛІТЕРАТУРНОЇ ТВОРЧОСТІ ЯК ПРЕДМЕТ ЗОБРАЖЕННЯ У СУЧАСНІЙ ДРАМАТУРГІЇ (НА МАТЕРІАЛІ П'ЄС КОКІ МІТАНІ (ЯПОНІЯ) ТА НІС-МОММЕ ШТОКМАНН (НІМЕЧЧИНА))

Yuhan N.L.,

[orcid.org/0000-0001-6845-6731](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6845-6731)*Doctor of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor,  
Professor at the Department of Oriental Languages  
Luhansk Taras Shevchenko National University*

Borzova O.D.,

[orcid.org/0000-0003-2748-2647](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2748-2647)*Lecturer at the Department of Oriental Languages  
Luhansk Taras Shevchenko National University*

This article examines the psychological aspects of literary creativity portrayed in contemporary world drama, drawing from the Japanese comedy “University of Laughs” (1996) by Koki Mitani and the German play “The Ship Won’t Come” (2010) by Nis-Momme Stockmann. The authors explore various psychological facets of the creative process, including the generation of artistic texts, the reimagining of reality within an artistic context, the key stages of the creative process, the connection between the generated text and the author’s subconscious, as well as the author’s personal identity (along with the meta-writer and meta-character). Additionally, the authors delve into the impact of the playwright’s aesthetic energy on the emotional and intellectual responses of the audience, censors, critics, and actors. Furthermore, the unique and profound characters in these works, both protagonists and antagonists, along with their strategies of artistic creativity, lend themselves to the application of psychological theories such as Gestalt psychology’s theory of creativity, Carl Jung’s archetypes classification, and K. Pearson’s model of the “journey of the inner hero”. K. Mitani and N.-M. Stockmann’s characters are presented not just as individuals within specific socio-historical contexts but also as embodying typical roles, akin to Protagonists and Antagonists, and even assuming symbolic, archetypal significance (such as Father and Child). What both of these dramatic works share is their profound dialogical nature, blending intertextuality characteristic of postmodern texts with metadrama and duodrama genre features. The compositions primarily revolve around character dialogues, featuring polemics and interactions with each other. This multi-layered polyphonism at the heart of the dialogue-driven narratives contributes significantly to the resolution of stagnant or crisis-ridden psychological states, fostering the internal growth and transformation of each character during the creation of a new artistic text, and promoting harmonious relationships with partners, one’s inner self, and the surrounding reality.

**Key words:** psychology of literary creativity, contemporary Japanese and German dramaturgy, comparative studies, catharsis, archetype, “expensive to the hero”.

У статті аналізуються психологічні аспекти літературної творчості, які зображені в сучасній світовій драматургії (на матеріалі японської комедії Кокі Мітані «Академія сміху» (1996) та німецької п'єси Ніс-Момме Штокманна «Корабель не прийде» (2010)). Автори розглядають основні питання психології літературної творчості, а саме: психологічні особливості процесу породження художнього тексту (як оригінального, так і вторинного); основні стадії творчого процесу, зв'язку породжуваного тексту як з авторської сублімацією, так із «Я» письменника (метаписателя і метаперсонажу), вплив естетичної енергії драматурга на емоційно-інтелектуальну сферу реципієнта, цензора, критика, акторів та ін. До того ж створені у даних творах оригінальні та глибокі образи протагоніста та антагоніста, а також їх стратегії художньої творчості дозволяють застосувати при аналізі драм психологічну теорію творчості гештальтпсихології, класифікацію архетипів К.Г. Юнга, модель етапів «подорожі внутрішнього героя» К. Пірсона і т. п. Персонажі К. Мітані та Н.-М. Штокмана постають перед читачем /глядачем не тільки як особистості, що діють у конкретному соціально-історичному середовищі, вони набувають типового (як Протагоніст і Антагоніст), символічного, архетипного значення (Батько, Дитина). Обидва драматургічні твори зближує те, що вони наскрізь діалогічні. Інтертекстуальність постмодерністських текстів поєднується тут із жанровими особливостями метадрами і дуодрами, в основу композиції покладено діалог персонажів, що полемізують один з одним. Цей принциповий багаторівневий поліфонізм сприяє виходу із застійного чи кризового психологічного стану, якісному внутрішньому зростанню

кожного героя творів у процесі породження нового художнього тексту, гармонізації відносин із партнером, зі своїм внутрішнім «я» і навколишньою дійсністю.

**Ключові слова:** психологія літературної творчості, сучасна японська та німецька драматургія, компаративістика, катарсис, архетип, «подорож героя».

**Problem Statement in a General Context and its Relevance to Significant Scientific and Practical Objectives.**

The fields of domestic and foreign psychology of creativity have yielded a multitude of both theoretical and practical approaches for enhancing human creative potential. These encompass psychological theories concerning the formation, development, and structure of creative abilities, in addition to various psychological strategies for generating new texts. These strategies include philosophical intuitionism, associationism, theories of creativity from Gestalt psychology, behaviorism, psychoanalysis as proposed by Z. Freud and K.G. Jung, and contributions from humanistic psychology, among others [1, p. 21–34; 2, p. 13–27; 3, p. 37–59]. Notably, not only professional psychologists but also wordsmiths and artists, through their works, endeavor to delineate and analyze the stages and intricacies inherent in the creative process of crafting or reimagining an artwork. Within the scope of this study, we aim to explore this theme, with specific reference to the contemporary Japanese play “University of Laughs” (“Warai no Daigaku,” 1996) by Koki Mitani (三谷幸喜 – みたにこうき, Mitani Kōki), and the German work “The Ship Will Not Come” (“Kein Schiff wird kommen” 2010) by Nis-Momme Stockmann.

**Review of Recent Studies and Publications Informing the Author’s Work.** The problem under consideration has garnered attention in recent studies and publications, forming the basis of the author’s investigation. Notably, the Japanese-language segment of the internet predominantly features critical reviews of K. Mitani’s “University of Laughter” and the 2004 film adaptation of the play, directed by Mamoru Hoshi [see, for example, 4 and 5]. Simultaneously, the poetic qualities of Japanese comedy have piqued the interest of Ukrainian researchers. E. Vasiliev, for instance, interprets “University of Laughter” as a form of “theatre within theatre,” delving into its genre-specific elements, notably its metatheatricity [6, p. 193–199]. I.A. Mozharevskaya, on the other hand, has conducted an investigation into the intertextuality and intermediality of “University of Laughter,” treating it as a modern drama-parabola [7]. Furthermore, N. Yuhan’s article draws a comparison between K. Mitani’s work and “Franziska”, a contemporary German drama by playwright Thea Dorn. The focus of this comparison lies in the genre specificity, examining it as both a metadrama and a simultaneous remake [8].

A considerable number of journal and newspaper reviews in Germany are dedicated to N.-M. Stockmann’s works. In an article by J. Raschke, the analysis centers on autobiographical motifs in the playwright’s work, “The Ship Will Not Come”. The theater critic reaches the conclusion that, despite the numerous coincidences in the details, the play, which portrays the antagonistic relationship between a father and son, cannot be regarded as autobiographical. The author possesses a unique dramatic talent: while the plays are firmly grounded in everyday life, they remain distinct from a journalistic or documentary perspective on the unfolding events [9]. In a critical article addressing the production of Stockmann’s play at the State Theatre in Rendsburg, the plot is interpreted as a dialogue between a father who wholeheartedly embraces his adult child’s inner world while simultaneously guiding and instructing, and a son who has relegated the family tragedy to his subconscious, causing it to “resurface” and confront his “inner child” [10].

**This article aims to shed light on the unresolved aspects of the general problem that it addresses.** Specifically, the issue of the spontaneous generation of an artistic text on stage through the interaction of two dramaturgical characters in metapieces-duodramas, as presented by Japanese and German authors, has yet to receive attention in both foreign and domestic literary studies. Furthermore, the comparative analysis of “University of Laughter” by K. Mitani and “The Ship Will Not Come” by N.-M. Stockmann is a novel perspective that has not been explored previously.

**Statement of the Article’s Objective.** The objective of our work is to analyze the psychological aspects of literary creation as portrayed in contemporary world dramaturgy, using the Japanese comedy by K. Mitani and the German play by N.-M. Stockmann as primary materials.

**Presentation of the Study’s Core Material with Comprehensive Scientific Justification.** Koki Mitani stands as a celebrated figure in Japanese theater, acknowledged for his diverse talents as a playwright, writer, screenwriter, film director, actor, and comedian. He has garnered acclaim for his comedic contributions, receiving the prestigious Kazuo Kikuta Theatre Award for his outstanding work in the realm of comedy.

The plot of his play is straightforward. “University of Laughter” revolves around two main characters –

Hajimi Tsubaki, the author of the comedy “Hamlet and Juliet,” who works within the theater company known as “Laughter University,” and Matsuo Sakisaki, a censorship officer with the Metropolitan Police Department, tasked with preventing the staging of new works during the year 1940. The entire narrative unfolds within the confines of the interrogation room at the Metropolitan Police Department, where a verbal duel between these two men takes center stage. The censor repeatedly denies permission for the comedy to be performed during the wartime period. He insists that the playwright modify the text to align with the prevailing sentiments of the era, emphasizing themes of patriotism and pathos, all while stripping away humor. In his relentless pursuit of obtaining the necessary approval for his troupe’s performance and his determination to tackle impossible creative challenges, Tsubaki tirelessly rewrites the comedy. Paradoxically, with each revision, “Hamlet and Juliet” becomes increasingly humorous.

What we encounter here is a metadrama, a “theater within a theater, “and a remake – among the most widely embraced strategies of postmodernism. K. Mitani, through recoding, dialogues, and intricate interplay with the reader and viewer, breathes new life into the renowned, already mythologized Shakespearean texts. He saturates the underlying context with allusions, reminiscences, and ironic contexts, as indicated in sources [11, p. 29; 12, p. 128].

The “duel” between the author and the censor revolves around socio-political motives. The censor, Matsuo Sakisaki, serves as a security officer in the censorship department of the Tokyo Police. In his prior role, he was involved with the “labor movement in Manchuria”. Sakisaki holds a deep-seated aversion to the world of theater, particularly to the genre of comedy, which he deems unserious and at odds with the contemporary societal requirements. He insists that the author’s remake should not be based on Shakespeare’s “Romeo and Juliet” but on “Hamlet.” According to him, the idea of avenging the king’s death aligns more closely with the spirit of the times, as it “will contribute to the education of our fellow citizens in courage and bravery” [13, p. 25].

In the climactic scene, the playwright and the censor offer explanations for their actions. Sakisaki, from the very beginning, delayed granting permission for the play and presented the author with seemingly impossible creative challenges. His aim was to make the protagonist abandon his aspirations, to make him surrender, and to acknowledge his creative impotence. However, against all odds, the playwright displayed remarkable persistence, continuously revising the texts. Most remarkably, with each revision, the play

became increasingly humorous [13, p. 108]. The censor, in the course of the play, reveals not only his official and police persona but also his refined aesthetic sensibility. He justifies his actions by stating, “Since your theater is primarily involved in producing lowbrow comedies, I believed it was my duty to intervene in such a manner” [13, p. 109].

Hajimi Tsubaki directly communicates to the censor that his quest to make the comedy even funnier is, in essence, an act of rebellion against the system, a protest against the infringement upon civil rights and freedoms, and an encroachment on creative freedom [13, p. 110–111]. Consequently, the Japanese play brings to the forefront the enduring conflict between the artist and the authorities, the quandary of the freedom of self-expression, and the author’s responsibility for their work. However, the playwright’s method of challenging the authorities by disregarding the censor’s directives and pushing the situation to absurdity ultimately proves unsuccessful. During the wartime era in Japan, any form of comedy, no matter how brilliant, is deemed entirely inappropriate. As succinctly put, “You have crafted a brilliant comedy. Yet, comedy, even the most brilliant, finds no place in this juncture of our country’s history” [13, p. 116].

K. Mitani’s comedy ingeniously resolves this conflict. The concluding scenes are emotionally charged and psychologically nuanced: the playwright rewrites the text for the final time, making it very funny, despite the censor’s adamant prohibition against using comedic artistic devices. The censor attempts to shield the author from being called to the frontlines, but unsuccessfully. Eventually, he resorts to pleading, literally beseeching the author to return from the war unharmed. He promises to safeguard the manuscript of the play and even offers to take on one, or perhaps all, of the roles in a future production.

At the heart of this comedy lies the process of creating an artistic text. It unfolds through eight distinct stages, spanning eight days during which the censor presents the playwright with complex and occasionally impossible creative challenges. Undeterred, the playwright refines the text in his unique way. Consequently, an exceptionally artistic text emerges from an ordinary and hastily modified Shakespearean tragedy, “Romeo and Juliet”, which had failed to elicit even a smile from Sakisaki upon its initial reading. In the culminating scene, the censor not only commends the talent of comedy writer Hajimi Tsubaki but also acknowledges, despite identifying himself as a man “completely devoid of a sense of humor” [13, p. 49], that he ended up “laughing eighty-three times” when reading the final version [13, p. 123].

Before us unfolds a psychological duel between the protagonist and the antagonist. The censor characterizes himself as strict, uncompromising, inflexible, and direct; he cannot be swayed or pacified [13, p. 7]. Sakisaki holds certain stereotypical notions about playwrights: for instance, he believes creative individuals to be lacking punctuality [13, p. 1]. He also harbors a disdain for what he perceives as “theatrics” and dismisses them as “worthless comedians” [13, p. 24, 26]. Simultaneously, from the very first page, it becomes evident that the censor possesses a large and kind heart: Sakisaki rescues a crow from death, tending to it and caring for finches. The transformation of his inner world through exposure to the world of theater does not appear to be psychologically baseless.

The image of the playwright undergoes a significant transformation throughout the play. Initially, he presents to the censor a rather lackluster adaptation of Shakespeare’s “Romeo and Juliet”. At this stage, Tsubaki’s primary concerns revolve around the career advancement and well-being of his troupe, the University of Laughter. As numerous dialogues between Tsubaki and Sakisaki reveal, the text was deficient in logic, plausibility, clarity of character motivation, highly artistic comedic situations and techniques, precision in details, and more. The author even describes the creative process as “quickly slapped together from something already performed” [13, p. 23].

During the revision and finalization of the Shakespearean text, both the author and the censor undergo significant changes. Tsubaki ceases his attempts at ingratiating himself with Sakisaki, no longer offering gifts or forcibly inserting patriotic slogans into scenes that do not align with the comedy’s concept and pathos. Throughout their interactions, Sakisaki reveals himself as a creative individual with a keen sense and deep appreciation of art. His input on alterations to the text aids in making the play funnier and artistically superior. This dynamic transformation in their relationship enhances the comedic quality of the work.

Remarkably, both Sakisaki and Tsubaki are acutely aware of the positive transformations that their interaction has introduced into their lives, and they express genuine gratitude. Tsubaki acknowledges this when he says, “AUTHOR: You know, I feel like I owe you a debt of gratitude. You really do have a talent for writing” [13, p. 95]. Similarly, Sakisaki conveys his gratitude, stating, “CENSOR: I am very grateful to you; you have opened my eyes to a world I had not even suspected existed before meeting you” [13, p. 130].

As the comedic characters engage in their constructive interaction, profoundly altering each other’s inner worlds, their images gradually take on a symbolic and generalized nature. They emerge as literary archetypal heroes who, over the course of the play, traverse the essential phases of the “hero’s journey.” This journey signifies not only the stages of human growth but also embodies the typical phases of a mythical narrative.

Let’s recall that Carol Pearson, drawing from the works of C.G. Jung, O. Rank, J. Campbell, E. Neumann, and others, devised a model outlining the stages of the inner hero’s journey. It’s worth noting that a person doesn’t necessarily experience these archetypes in a strictly sequential manner. The stages are as follows: 1. *Innocent*: Developing faith, confidence, and optimism. 2. *Orphan*: Realizing that adversity exists and nurturing realism. 3. *Warrior*: Learning to compete, achieve goals, and, if necessary, defend oneself. 4. *Caregiver*: Demonstrating care, empathy for others, and providing assistance. 5. *Seeker*: Possessing a desire for change and a willingness to explore new experiences. 6. *Lover*: Engaging in loving relationships, expressing romanticism, and making commitments. 7. *Destroyer*: Letting go of the old and embarking on a fresh start; taking action during desperate times. 8. *Creator*: Demonstrating creativity, innovation, and giftedness. 9. *Ruler*: Assuming responsibility and living in alignment with personal values. 10. *Magician*: Facilitating change by altering one’s thought patterns and behaviors. 11. *Sage*: Engaging in clear and critical thinking, and formulating one’s own opinions. 12. *Jester*: Finding enjoyment in life and work, savoring the present moment [14, p. 34–37].

In K. Mitani’s comedy, while the Playwright evolves from the archetypal images of “Innocent” and “Orphan” to “Magician” and “Sage,” the Censor progresses to the next stage – “Jester.” Tsubaki starts to transform his creative outlook, thinking with greater precision and critical acumen, and articulating his own opinions. Meanwhile, Sakisaki experiences an awakening, discovering latent intentions within him – the desire to relish life and work, to savor every moment of existence, including moments of enjoyment and laughter. He unearths a new world of creativity and theater, actively participating in theater performances and engaging in theatrical sketches as an actor.

In this context, it’s essential to note that Sakisaki not only surveys the local “theatregoers” about the “University of Laughter” troupe and the reputation of Tsubaki, the playwright, and director of the theater but also provides constructive advice on avoiding cheap

theatrical effects. The reader/viewer learns that the playwright dreamt of becoming a theater artist, he was creating decorations, and became deeply passionate about the world of theater [13, p. 48]. There's a close-knit relationship between the playwright and the troupe: when analyzing the play, one should not just read it but mentally envision the scenes and imagine specific actors in each role. Furthermore, individual roles and character lines are tailored for the theater's leading actors [13, p. 5, 21, 39, 95–99, 101–107]. Tsubaki is compelled to include gimmicks like sword swallowing and losing dentures in his text to appease the seasoned yet untalented actor Kinkan, as he believes that maintaining a positive psychological climate within the troupe takes precedence over theater aesthetics and the author's ego [13, p. 101–102]. The troupe accuses its playwright of cooperating with the police and of failing to resist the coercive pressures of censorship [13, p. 107]. Tsubaki experiences both psychological and physical violence from his troupe, with the actors resorting to physically assaulting their chief playwright and director.

The psychological influence of the theater environment on the playwright is also a topic explored by the renowned German playwright and theater director N.-M. Stockmann in his play "The Ship Will Not Come".

The unnamed protagonist of the play, a young but already well-known playwright in Berlin theater circles, shares his observations of the bohemian theater environment. He describes it as corrupt and soulless, and, much like the hero in K. Mitani's play, he is compelled to adapt to it and cater to prevailing trends. Theater producers and directors insist on finding a truly significant theme, yet, paradoxically, they still anticipate a standardized approach. Consequently, he feels compelled to create a monotonous and uninteresting body of work that aligns with popular tastes [15, p. 19].

The protagonist is in an alarming psychological and even physical condition. He struggles to maintain regular sleep patterns and proper eating habits, with his immune system compromised by alcohol, smoking, continuous stress, and overeating. Suffering from procrastination, he frequently descends into bouts of depression. The playwright grapples with a profound inability to find a meaningful theme for his new play, to the extent that he has almost lost his capacity to write, leaving his work's themes diluted and fragmented [15, p. 22–25].

At the outset of the play, the young playwright embarks on a rather uncomfortable and exceedingly dull journey from Berlin to his hometown on the island of Föhr, situated along the North Sea. His motivation

for this journey is not driven by a deep affection for his father but rather by ambitious aspirations. The author's intent is to craft a play about the fall of the Berlin Wall, motivated more by career considerations than genuine interest. Given that he himself was only eight years old at the time of the event, he plans to inquire of his father about how he experienced the fall of the Berlin Wall in this remote island, which the teenager had left hastily many years ago.

The protagonist remains entirely apathetic toward his island. On his journey back home, his imagination constructs vivid depictions of his elevated social standing in contrast to the islanders: "I am so exalted that any form of greatness pales in comparison to me. I have left these less fortunate individuals far behind. I am not an ordinary person; I am an aristocrat. I embody the purest knowledge, elevated by poetry" [15, p. 19–20].

The "important" play envisioned by the playwright transforms into a space for a heartfelt reunion between father and son. While the father finds joy and contentment in being with his son, the son is irked by the sense of *déjà vu* associated with old family customs. For example, their joint pizza-baking endeavors conclude much like they used to, with the son's persistent grievances and impatience. It can be surmised that they both deeply care for each other, as is often the case, but they also tend to get on each other's nerves. Nevertheless, both make sincere efforts to communicate in a reserved or affectionate manner.

The son is reluctant to acknowledge that he cannot confront his inner issues without his father's assistance. The father openly expresses that once he is no longer required and significant to his son, his life would lose its purpose. The stark antagonism between the Father and Son is poignantly illustrated in a brief passage: "I look at my father and think, 'How incredibly, extraordinarily, unbelievably aggravating it is that you are the key to my personal growth. 'My father looks at me and smiles'" [15, p. 9].

The playwright holds no recollection of how the Berlin Wall fell, and this event doesn't trouble him in the least. In fact, he believes this historical occurrence is insignificant, often exaggerated, and overly steeped in ideology. His father, on the other hand, feels disheartened. He perceives his son as self-centered, timid, and superficial. The son appears to "casually and entirely apathetically" dissect the lives of others, with no concern for their well-being. He is characterized as someone who fails to take life seriously, harbors a fear of daily existence, and exploits people and their destinies. The father concludes with a damning assessment, declaring, "You are mediocre – in the worst sense of the word",

and implores his son to finally “write about something that genuinely interests you!” [15, p. 44–45].

The son rebuts this assessment by his father, but deep down, he concedes that his father is absolutely correct: “I am too afraid to immerse myself in the theater, which truly fascinated me” [15, p. 20]. He asserts, “I am like an eel, sliding through my world, sick everywhere. I am the voice of my generation. Yet, I can’t shed my own skin; it clings to me. I am repulsed by myself. I am constantly compelled to say something. And I do. Even when I don’t want to. But I have nothing new to convey. All I desire is to express one thing: I have nothing left to say to the world. I keep inventing variations on themes that are universally known and immutable” [15, p. 26].

The meeting with his father grows increasingly emotional, culminating in the revelation of a closely guarded family secret (Alzheimer’s disease and the death of his mother). Subsequently, the son departs from the island, possibly for the last time. The period of the Berlin Wall’s fall is interpreted by the conflicted pair as a time of upheaval within the family. In a manner common to real life, the family employed silence and concealment as survival strategies, preserving their internal comfort. Nevertheless, these repressed psychological traumas prevent the characters from opening up, establishing emotional and mental connections, and for the son, personal growth and improvement. Until the son confronts and processes this situation, he remains in the role of a vulnerable child who has nothing to communicate to the world. It is also significant for the father to, alongside his child, once again feel the pain of psychological trauma and the loss of a loved one and to reveal his true self to his son rather than wearing a comfortable and socially sanctioned mask.

To reexperience, both for himself and his father, the psychotraumatic situation long suppressed deep within the subconscious, the young playwright, before our eyes, creates a new text. From a genreological perspective, we witness a “theater within a theater,” a metadrama, and from a psychotherapeutic viewpoint, a psychodrama. Father and son appear to observe themselves from the vantage point of 1989, reflecting on their actions and emotions during the family crisis, and offering commentary and clarification [15, p. 31–42]. The process of returning home is primarily internal, and it can be painful and intense, yet also remarkably cathartic. Having undergone catharsis, the son abandons his plan to write a play about the Berlin Wall, recognizing the symbolic essence of this mental construct: “The wall represents the division of one thing from another. And nothing more. That’s it” [15, p. 44].

Similar to K. Mitani’s play, the interaction between the protagonist and antagonist in the creative process of crafting a highly artistic text suggests an architectural blueprint. Here, we witness the archetypes of the Father, embodying strategies of survival and success for the family, and the Child, yearning for parental love and care. In this particular family, the Father archetype assumes, to some extent, the roles of the Mother archetype. As the single parent, the father must impart Yin strategies to his son – teaching, nurturing, kindling hope, appealing to higher values, and securing people’s support. Naturally, any disruption in the equilibrium of these parental roles can lead to the vulnerability or downfall of the Son. The young playwright emerges from this intense inner struggle, filled with exhaustion but renewed. He begins to “see himself” at last, avoiding falseness in the depiction of his emotions and seeking what is genuinely authentic within him [15, p. 47].

**Conclusions from this study and prospects for further developments in this direction.** The comedy by Japanese playwright K. Mitani, “University of Laughter,” and the drama by German author N.-M. Stockmann, “The Ship Will Not Come”, explore and address fundamental questions within the psychology of literary creativity. These include: psychological aspects of the process of generating an artistic text, both in its original and secondary forms; the re-creation of factual reality by the creator within the context of their artistic concept; examination of the key stages involved in the creative process; exploration of the connections between the generated text, the author’s sublimation, and the author’s self (“I”), as well as the meta-writer and meta-character; influence of the aesthetic energy of the playwright on the emotional-intellectual sphere of the writer’s repertoire. Moreover, the unique and profound character portrayals of the protagonist and antagonist in these works, along with their strategies of artistic creation, offer a valuable platform for applying various psychological theories. These include the theory of creativity from Gestalt psychology, the archetypal classification by C.G. Jung, the model of the stages of the “journey of the inner hero” by K. Pearson, and more. The characters created by K. Mitani and N.-M. Stockmann transcend their roles as individuals within a specific socio-historical context. They take on typical roles as the Protagonist and Antagonist but also assume symbolic and archetypal significance as embodiments of the Father and Child archetypes.

Both dramaturgical works share a common trait in their thoroughly dialogical nature. They blend intertextuality typical of postmodernist texts with the genre features of metadrama and duodrama. Their

composition is rooted in the characters engaging in dialogues, engaging in polemical exchanges with each other. This fundamental multilayered polyphony contributes to breaking free from stagnant or crisis-ridden psychological states, fostering the qualitative internal growth of each character within the works as

they generate new artistic texts. It also facilitates the harmonization of their relationships with their partners, their inner selves, and the surrounding reality.

The prospective avenue for further research is the analysis of the nuances of artistic psychologism within modern world dramaturgy.

#### REFERENCES:

1. Карпенко Н.А. Психологія творчості : навч. посіб. Львів : ЛьвДУВС, 2016. 156 с.
2. Руда Н.Л. Психологія творчості. Миколаїв : Іліон, 2021. Част. 1. 96 с.
3. The Cambridge Handbook of Creativity / edited by James C. Kaufman & Robert J. Sternberg. Cambridge University Press, 2010. 512 p. (Series: Cambridge Handbooks in Psychology).
4. PARCO 劇場開場50周年記念シリーズ『笑の大学』2023年2月PARCO劇場にて上演決定. URL: <https://engekisengen.com/genre/play/46421/> (date of access: 10.15.2023).
5. 笑の大学. 劇場公開日:2004年10月30日. URL: <https://eiga.com/movie/41170/> (date of access: 10.15.2023).
6. Васильєв Є.М. Сучасна драматургія : жанрові трансформації, модифікації, новації : монографія. Луцьк : ПВД "Твердиня", 2017. 532 с.
7. Можарівська І.О. Інтертекстуальність та інтермедіальність сучасної драми-параболи (на матеріалі п'єси Кокі Мітани "Академія сміху"). *Вісник Харківського національного університету імені В.Н. Каразіна. Серія «Філологія»*. 2020. Вип. 86. С. 60–66.
8. Yuhan N. At the Intersection of the Genres of Metadrama and Remake: Transformation of Classic Stories in Plays by Thea Dorn (Germany) and Koki Mitani (Japan). The 8th International Scientific and Practical Conference *Global and Regional Aspects of Sustainable Development* (March 26–28, 2023; Copenhagen, Denmark). Berlitz Forlag, 2023. P. 274–282.
9. Raschke J. Niss-Momme Stockmann. *Literaturland SH*. URL: <https://www.literaturland-sh.de/autorinnen/stockmann-nis-momme> (date of access: 09.23.2023).
10. "Kein Schiff wird kommen" in Rendsburg: Schweigen und Zudecken. *NDRkultur*. URL: <https://www.ndr.de/kultur/buehne/Kein-Schiff-wird-kommen-in-Rendsburg-Schweigen-und-Zudecken-keinschiffwirdkommen100.html> (date of access: 10.15.2023).
11. Jameson F. *Postmodernism or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. London & New York, Duke University Press, 1991. 438 p.
12. Шостак О.Г. Пошук власної ідентичності як постмодерна гра у творчості Шермана Алексі. *Вісник університету імені Альфреда Нобеля. Серія «Філологічні науки»*. 2022. № 2(24). С. 121–130.
13. Warai no Daigaku University of Laughs by Koki Mitani. URL: <https://warai.no.daigaku.-2004.-hdtv.-720p.-aac.x-264.tt-0436886-ry-n> (date of access: 10.15.2023).
14. Pearson C. *Awakening the heroes within: Twelve archetypes to help us find ourselves and transform our world*. 1st ed. N.Y. : HarperOne, 1991. 352 p.
15. Stockmann N.-M. *Das Schiff kommt nicht*. 2010: schaeferphillippen. TM. Theater und Medien GbR. URL: [www.schaeferphillippen.de](http://www.schaeferphillippen.de) (date of access: 10.15.2023).