CHARLES UNIVERSITY IN PRAGUE

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

Department of Electronic Culture and Semiotics

Bc. Inese Pintāne

A Critical Semiotic Study of Finnish, Latvian and Czech Myths

Master's Thesis

Supervisor: **Mgr. Martin Švantner, Ph.D.**

Prague 2021

Statutory Declaration

I hereby declare that the following Master's thesis is my independent work and that all sources and literature that I have used have been duly cited. This Master's thesis was not used in order to obtain another or the same degree.

Prohlášení

Prohlašuji, že jsem práci vypracovala samostatně. Všechny použité prameny a literatura byly řádně citovány. Práce nebyla využita k získání jiného nebo stejného titulu.

Ve Vlašimi dne 14. května 2021   Bc. Inese Pintāne

                                                                 ……………………………

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my Master's thesis supervisor, Mgr. Martin Švantner, Ph.D., for his guidance and inputs throughout this process.

No words can express my gratitude to my family for their endless patience and faith in me.

ABSTRACT

This Master's thesis invites its readers into the realm of myths where various deities and mythical creatures dwell and spend their days creating the human world and different cultural artefacts. To find out more about this realm and its possible variations, the author of this Master's thesis has chosen to study myths of relatively distinct nations. Since the author is familiar with the local language and customs of Finns, Latvians and Czechs, the author's choice fell on the myths of the given nations. Since everything in the realm of myths is in constant flux, the only way to detect what was considered valuable in it by its inhabitants at some point in time was to pause this process. To do it, the author approached the myths through the method called *transvaluation* developed by James Jakób Liszka in his book "The Semiotic of Myth: A Critical Study of the Symbol" (1989). Although still not very familiar among folklore scholars, this method enabled the author to view myths as trilevel entities and detect in them various social constructs passed from generation to generation. As the readers will later see, the author was able, by approaching myths from the perspective of *transvaluation*, to reveal various norms encoded in them.

Keywords: Finns, Latvians, Czechs, myths, Liszka, transvaluation, semiotics, folklore

ABSTRAKT

Tato diplomová práce zve své čtenáře do říše mýtů, kde přebývají různá božstva a mýtické bytosti a tráví své dny vytvářením lidského světa a různých kulturních artefaktů. Aby se dozvěděla více o této říši a jejích možných variacích, rozhodla se autorka této diplomové práce studovat mýty relativně odlišných národů. Jelikož autorka zná místní jazyk a zvyky Finů, Lotyšů a Čechů, padla její volba na mýty daných národů. Protože se všechno v říši mýtů neustále mění, jediným způsobem, jak zjistit, co v ní v nějakém období považovali její obyvatelé za cenné, bylo pozastavení veškerých procesů probíhajících v této říši. To bylo umožněno pomocí metody zvané *transvaluace*, která byla představena Jamesem Jakóbem Liszkou v jeho knize „The Semiotic of Myth: A Critical Study of the Symbol" (1989). Ačkoli tato metoda mezi folkloristy stále není příliš známá, umožnila autorce této diplomové práce pohlížet na mýty jako na trojúrovňové entity a odkrýt v nich různé sociální konstrukty předávané z generace na generaci. Jak čtenáři později uvidí, autorčino studium mýtů pomocí metody *transvaluace* v nich pomohlo odhalit různé zakódované normy.

Klíčová slova: Finové, Lotyši, Češi, mýty, Liszka, transvaluace, sémiotika, folklór

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Once three people interested in folklore met and started to discuss the mythology of various nations. Their discussion led them to Latvian mythology, and they could not agree about the origin of *Dievs*[1]. One thought that *Dievs* had become an integral part of Latvian mythology because of the influence of Christianity. He explained that *Dievs* resembles the Latin word *Deus* and, in Latvian, is always used as a proper noun, never as a common name. The second one disagreed and expressed the idea that Latvian *Dievs*, the same as Lithuanian *Dievas* and Latgalian *Dīvs* must have their roots in Hinduism and comes from *Daevas*. The third one told others that *Dievs* could be a derivative either from *diena* (a day) or *devīgs* (giving) and is just another name for *Pērkons*. Although their discussion lasted for many hours, in the end, they went their separate ways without reaching an agreement.

When deciding to study folklore and aiming for reliable results, one should reckon with difficulties, such as: "How to determine if a given folk item is the creation of a community or belongs to an individual author? Where are set the borders between various folk genres? How to track down the shift in a community's traditions if the origin of folk items is unclear?" After he learns that even prominent folklore scholars[2] accuse each other of not knowing the borders between various folk genres and that many folk items are fictional and created under the influence of the romanticism movement[3], his confusion will only grow.

---

[1] *Dievs* (God in English) is the highest deity next to *Pērkons* (the god of thunder) in Latvian mythology. According to Šmits, ancient Latvians in later times used *Dievs* and *Pērkons* interchangeably to refer to the same deity. In his opinion, Latvian *Dievs* is relative to the Latin word *Deus* and the Sanskrit *Daevas*. He explains that *Dievs* is always used as a proper noun, and Latvians do not refer to other deities as gods. In his opinion, *Dievs* in Latvian mythology has a wide range of functions, such as a patron of men, a conflict solver, etc. Also, *Dievs* himself can get into a fight with other deities. (Šmits, 1918, pp. 11-16, 20)

One can find *Deews* (*Dievs* in modern Latvian) both in Stender's "Lettisches Lexicon, darin alles nach den lettischen Stammwörtern aufzuschlagen" (1758, pp. 67-68) and Lange's "Vollständiges deutschlettisches und lettischdeutsches Lexicon, nach den Hauptdialecten in Lief- und Curland" (1773, pp. 74-75) translated into German as *der Gott* (God in English). Stender refers to *Dievs* as deity (*deewiba*) and someone who is generous (*deevigs*).

As per Kursīte, before the Latvian pagans got baptized, the term *Dievs* was used to refer to shining heaven, heaven deity, or daylight. She explains that the basis of *Dievs* is the idea of something that is shiny and draws similarities between *Dievs* and the word *diena* (a day). (Kursīte, 2009, Dievs)

[2] For example, Dundes (1997) insisted that Lévi-Strauss had analysed fairy tales instead of myths. Also, Kerbelytė (2011, pp. 23-28) claimed that Propp had not had any understanding of fairy tale.

[3] For example, although admitting that in the Kalevala, one can find runes known to Finns, Ervast (2018, p. 38) thought that Lönnrot had dreamed the Kalevala out. Kursīte (1996, p. 215) and Šmits (1918, p. 4) refer to the possibility that some Latvian folk items are creations per order. Also, Czech scholars doubt the authenticity of "The Queen's Court and Green mountain Manuscripts".

Since this Master's thesis does not aim to study myths as compilations of functions leading from point A to point B but aims to learn something about people from their stories, it is necessary to find a method to reach this goal. The author of this Master's thesis thinks that James Jakób Liszka has developed such a method. This method is called *transvaluation*.

According to Liszka, transvaluation is an integral part of every myth. In his opinion, through this process of transvaluation, a community creates various social constructs to guide and limit the actions of its members. Liszka thinks that these constructs are prone to change and that this change takes place considering the needs and purpose of a community. To detect these constructs, he offers in his book "The Semiotic of Myth: A Critical Study of a Symbol Advances in Semiotics" (1989) to look at stories as static entities frozen in time and in their analysis to use Jakobson's theory of markedness.

Learning that Liszka's theory is not very well known among folklore scholars motivated the author of this Master's thesis to approach folk texts from the perspective of Liszka's transvaluation and consequently assess its applicability in the studies of folklore.

Since Liszka's method is supposed to enable one to detect the norms and the hierarchical structure of a community, the author assumed that this approach might uncover some similarities or differences between various nations. Since one can look at the Finns, Latvians and Czechs as relatively distinct nations, and there is almost no comparative research devoted to studying the myths of the given nations, the author decided to choose them and their folklore for the study purposes of this Master's thesis. As a result, the author formulated a hypothesis claiming that myths of Finns, Latvians and Czechs might reveal some differences in beliefs, values, norms and customs of the given nations.

The author has divided this Master's thesis into two parts. The first part (chapters 1-6) is devoted to introducing semiotics as a critical study of signs and Liszka's theory of transvaluation. The second part (chapters 7-9) deals with studying Finnish, Latvian and Czech myths from Liszka's perspective of transvaluation.

Since even scholars, such as Boas or Thompson[4], among themselves cannot define myth and set its borders, the texts for the purposes of the given study will be selected taking into consideration Liszka's criteria for a story to count as a myth which he introduces in his article "Myth and Vision" (1998). Consequently, this Master's thesis aims to study stories

---

[4] Boas has expressed the opinion that it is impossible to draw a sharp line between myths and folktales because the same tales which occur as myths also appear in the form of folktales (1938, p. 609). Also, Thompson has drawn attention to the fact that there is no consensus among researchers which traditional stories shall be called "myths", "legends", "folktales" and "animal tales" (1955, p. 482).

that fulfil the following criteria: 1) explain the emergence of something that is still a part of human culture and 2) reflect upon the change in a state of affairs.

The author of this Master's thesis aims to study each myth at three interrelated levels – the agential, actantial and narrative. Whereas the analysis of a myth at the agential level should reveal some norm encoded in it, the study of the myth at the actantial level should help the author detect the behavioural patterns that are being considered a threat to this norm. The examination of the last [the narrative] level should reveal symbols that embody either transgression or obedience to that norm.

If one discovers nothing new, then at least one will perceive what is already known.

PART ONE. SEMIOTICS AND THE THEORY OF TRANSVALUATION

1. A NARRATIVE

One late winter afternoon, when snow was falling and a slight wind blowing, a mother took her small daughter for a walk through a long avenue of snow-covered trees. Soon after they had started their walk, the mother gently looked at her daughter and asked if she wants to hear a story portraying gods and mythical creatures. With eyes sparkling and lips twisted in a big, friendly smile, the little girl turned her face to her mother. The mother responded to her daughter with a warm smile and began her story:

"Once there lived a beautiful virgin named Ilmatar whose father was almighty Ilma. Although she was beautiful and kind, Ilmatar was used to spend her days in loneliness and isolation.

One day, feeling unhappy and longing for a son, Ilmatar decided to come down to the sea, where the East Wind and the sea took pity on her and made love to her. As a result, Ilmatar conceived Väinämöinen.

For long seven hundred years, she had been patiently carrying Väinämöinen under her heart till once again, she started to experience feelings of loneliness and desperation. She prayed to almighty Ukko to end her suffers and make parturition finally begin.

Suddenly out of nowhere appeared a big duck. The duck was looking for a safe place to land and lay her eggs. Ilmatar decided to help the duck out and raised her shoulders and knees out of the sea. The duck chose to come down on one of her knees, where she laid six golden eggs and one iron egg. After she laid the eggs, the duck gathered them up, sat on them and fell asleep.

Ilmatar was trying her best to avoid any movement that the eggs would not fall into the sea, but then came the moment when she could not stand any longer the pain in her knee, and she decided to stretch her leg. As a result, the seven eggs rolled off her knee and fell into the sea, where they cracked into small pieces that later transformed into heaven, earth, sky, stars, sun, moon and clouds. Instantly the time started its flow.

Ilmatar felt delighted seeing this transformation and busied herself to shape the lands and add the finishing touches to the world. After that, Väinämöinen started to

move in Ilmatar's womb. Wanting to see the world, and after quite a struggle, Väinämöinen was born[5]."

The mother concluded her story. Without knowing that the mother's story is the myth passed from generation to generation, the little girl observed similarities between the mythical realm and her one. The discovery of these similarities led her to conclude that the story has something to do with the existing state of affairs. The little girl liked the story so much that she asked for more. The mother felt relieved knowing that she had managed to communicate the story to her small daughter.

According to Sebeok, there must always be a message producer or source and a message receiver or destination that whichever kind of communication could happen (Sebeok, 2001, pp. 28-29). He claims that it is still unknown how most producers generate or, in other words, formulate a message (ibid., p. 31). Sebeok sees human beings as something that is *"capable of launching an enormous number of novel messages appropriate to an indefinite variety of contexts"* (ibid., p. 31). According to him, *"message-as-formulated must undergo a transductive operation to be externalized into serial strings appropriate to the channel, or channels, selected to link up with the destination"* (ibid., p. 31). Such neurobiological transmutation leading from one form of energy to another he calls *encoding* (ibid., p. 31). *"When the destination detects and extracts the encoded messages from the channel, another transduction, followed by a series of still further transmutations must be effected before interpretation can occur"* (ibid., p. 31). This pivotal reconversion he defines as *decoding* (ibid., p. 31). Sebeok claims that *"encoding and decoding imply a code, a set of unambiguous rules whereby messages are convertible from one representation to another; the code is what the two parties in the message exchange are supposed to have, in fact, or by assumption, totally or in part, in common"* (ibid., p. 31). As stated by Sebeok, *"receivers interpret messages as an amalgam of two separate but inextricably blended inputs: the physical triggering sign, or signal, itself, but as unavoidably shaped by context"*, but how receivers take into consideration context is generally unknown (ibid., p. 32).

Peirce, similarly to Sebeok, thinks that a message, in other words, a sign contains something that enables one to interpret it. This "something" Peirce calls the interpretant and

---

[5] Lönnrot, E. Kalevala. 1849, pp. 3-7.

claims that *"it is all that is explicit in the sign itself apart from its context and circumstances of utterance"* (CP 5.473)[6].

As one will see later (in chapters 3 and 5), context is one of the constituents, besides neurobiological factors, enabling an interpreting agency to decide upon a sign's purpose and value. Due to such constituent as context, finitely determined and unequivocal signs are not possible.

When one, especially at a very young age, is told a story similar to the previously mentioned myth, he enjoys its otherworldly side. He does not speculate about the motives of the storyteller. The little listener realises that the same as he is dependent on his parents and needs to listen to them, the same are mythical heroes in the hierarchical relationships. Through inference, he learns that society is hierarchical. He realises that society decides about someone's place and role in the hierarchy based on his qualities. Without him knowing, the teleological system and identity of the little listener get shaped through various signs.

The doctrine studying how every living entity or the product of living entity communicate in signs is called semiotics. According to Eco, one can approach the culture from a semiotic perspective because semiotics can help explain communicational processes taking place in it (Eco, 1976, p. 28). In Liszka's opinion, contrary to other theories, semiotics does not aim to show that a text has a more fundamental meaning than its apparent one and neither view text as a compilation of predictable causal relations (Liszka, 1989, pp. 1-10). He thinks that semiotics aims to disclose the rules of the symbol processes and in no way is dogmatic. Liszka explains that *"critical semiotics substitutes understanding and explanation for dogma, and where interpretation is delimited or directed, it suggests possibility"* (ibid., p. 16).

This Master's thesis does not aim to study the communicational process itself and the form in which a message gets passed. On the contrary, it seeks to detect the values and the hierarchical structure of a narrator's community which he introduces to his audience.

The next chapter aims to give an overview of semiotics as the doctrine of signs and assess its applicability in the critical study of myths aiming to reveal norms and customs encoded in them.

---

[6] Peirce: CP 5.473 Cross-Ref:†† in The Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce. Ed. Hartshorne, C, Weiss, P, and Burks, A. W. Charlottesville, Va.: InteLex Corp., 1994. Electronical edition.

2. SEMIOTICS, OR THE DOCTRINE OF SIGNS

Semiotics is not a new discipline. It has a long and complex history whose roots can be traced back to Ancient Mesopotamia (Manetti, 1993). Many philosophers, such as Aristoteles, Augustine of Hippo, or Roger Bacon, long before John Locke came up in his "Essay Concerning Human Understanding" (1690) with a doctrine called *semeiotics*, had tried to understand what is a sign and how it functions (Deely, 2011).

The term "semiotics" comes from the Greek word *semeion*, usually translated as "sign". According to Deely, such a translation is inaccurate, and *semeion* should be translated as a "natural sign" because, in antiquity, this term was used only to refer to natural phenomena such as meteorological occurrences and symptoms of diseases (Deely, 2011, p. 698).

For society, back then, in the 17th century, when Locke came up with semiotics, the term itself was nothing new. It was commonly used in medicine (Waal, 2013, CHAPTER FIVE). Locke significantly extended its reference and introduced it into philosophy (ibid., CHAPTER FIVE). He proposed to apply the method developed for interpreting the symptoms of diseases to all knowledge (ibid., CHAPTER FIVE).

In the 19th century, Charles Sanders Peirce, inspired by Locke and other philosophers, developed semiotics. He, similarly to Locke, saw semiotics as the doctrine of signs and identified it with logic.

> *"Logic, in its general sense, is, as I believe I have shown, only another name for semiotic ({sémeiötiké}), the quasi-necessary, or formal, doctrine of signs…"* (CP 2.227).

According to Peirce, semiotics deals with the essential nature of the different kinds of signs (speculative grammar), the general conditions of their relations to their objects (critics), and the general conditions of their fulfilling purposes (speculative rhetoric) (Waal, 2013, CHAPTER FIVE).

To find more about semiotics and assess its place among other disciplines, one can take a look at Peirce's system of sciences explained in the following section.

2.1 Peirce's System of Sciences

According to Liszka, Peirce, in his later years, was very interested in developing a systematic classification of the sciences (Liszka, 1996, p. 3). Peirce achieved his intention, but, as points out Liszka, Peirce's *"system reflects a very broad, classical sense of "science", not restricted to the modern empirical sciences alone but understood as an attempt to systematize knowledge"* (ibid., p. 3). As per Liszka, in Peirce's system of sciences, one finds *"not only laboratory sciences such as chemistry but also human sciences such as ethnology, as well as disciplines such as history and literary and art criticism"* (ibid., p. 3). Because Peirce's classification of sciences is more like the systematization of knowledge, there is also a place in it for semiotics.

Peirce recognized two branches of sciences: theoretical and practical.

"I recognize two branches of science. Theoretical, whose purpose is simply and solely knowledge of God's truth; and practical, for the uses of life..." (CP 1.239).

The theoretical sciences he divided into two subbranches – the sciences of discovery (CP 1.239) and the sciences of review (CP 1.243). His primary focus area was the sciences of discovery which he grouped into three classes (CP 1.239). The first class was mathematics (CP 1.240), the second class was philosophy (CP 1.241) and the third one – the special sciences (CP 1.242). This distinguishing was made based on the observational technic each science uses. Whereas mathematicians use the iconoscopic technique of observation, philosophers employ the coenoscopic one (Liszka, 1996 pp. 4-5). The practitioners of the special sciences take the idioscopic approach (ibid., p. 6).

Semiotics in Peirce's classification of sciences, one finds under philosophy. Peirce himself viewed semiotics as the most coenoscopic "science" of sciences and claimed that semiotics, similarly to mathematics, can be used in any science, especially in human sciences (ibid., p. 9). It is so because semiotics, as a coenoscopic doctrine, does not require any special equipment or background knowledge (Waal, 2013, CHAPTER ONE). In principle, anyone can do it. Semiotics studies what ought to be and investigates the universal and necessary laws crucial for the sign functioning (Liszka, 1996, pp. 2-5). It is both formal and normative doctrine. It can be characterized as normative because it is primarily concerned

with the questions of truth and establishing conditions for what can count as veracious (ibid., p. 5).

Since it attempts to discern the necessary circumstances for that norm to exist, it is also formal (ibid., p. 5). Semiotics, similarly to mathematics, uses abstraction and generalization. The difference between them is that whereas mathematics makes no positive or negative assertions about hypothetical and conditional propositions, semiotics does (Waal, 2013, CHAPTER ONE).

Based on everything previously written in this section, one can make the following assumptions:

1) Due to the compatibility of semiotics with any study field, one must be able to study myths semiotically.

2) The semiotic approach should enable one without any special equipment or background knowledge to decode myths.

3) By approaching myths from the semiotic perspective, some norms and values encoded in them might get revealed.

The following chapters are devoted to introducing the concept of myth and the theory of transvaluation. Subsequently, one should be able to evaluate the truthfulness of the above assumptions.

3. THE UMWELT OF MYTH

After the walk, the little girl and her mother returned home. The little girl went to her room to play with her toys. For many hours the little girl was cheerfully playing when suddenly her father entered the room. The father was radiating happiness and excitement. He told her that he had got something for her. The girl ran to him. When she reached him, the father spread his palm towards her. In his palm was lying a bubble blower. The little girl gratefully took it and ran to blow bubbles. At first, she did not succeed in it, and the failure made the little girl cry. Seeing his daughter crying, the father decided to teach her how to blow them. He took the bubble blower, and in a restricting voice, told her to watch what he is doing. The little girl was a good student and carefully followed each move and word of her father. When the little girl tried for the second time to blow bubbles, she succeeded. Soon her room was full of soap bubbles of different size, shape and weight. Some were delighting the little girl for several seconds, while others only for a few moments. Some of them were flying next to each other, while others were moving away from each other. If the girl was careful enough, she could catch a bubble with the blow stick and blow another bubble right next to it. Although two of them got intersected, they remained split by an indivisible wall. They never became one whole. Whenever the little girl looked into a bubble, she did not discover anything new. All she saw was just a deformed fragment of her room. Every time the little girl tried to touch a bubble, it got destroyed. Despite their variety, all bubbles shared some common characteristics. First of all, they all were closed environments. Secondly, in them, the little girl did not see anything new, unfamiliar to her. Thirdly, every time the little girl wanted to touch one of them, it changed its physical form.

Myths similarly to these soap bubbles are diverse. Some of them are long, while others are short. Whereas some myths may make their readers laugh, some, on the contrary, cry. Their readers, similarly to the little girl looking into the bubble, do not discover anything new. They perceive just things with which they are already familiar.

To gain a better understanding of myth, one should get familiar with Uexküll's concept of Umwelt explained in his works "A Foray into the Worlds of Animals and Humans" (2010) and "The Theory of Meaning" (1982)[7].

---

[7] In German "Umwelt und Innenwelt der Tiere" (1909) and "Bedeutungslehre" (1940)

In these works, Uexküll presents Umwelt as a closed world, among many other ones, which may overlap each other. The next section of this Master's thesis aims to give a general overview of this concept.

3.1 Uexküll's Theory of Umwelt

As per Uexküll, each living subject has its own unique Umwelt constructed according to its experience and needs. An Umwelt is the result of everything one perceives and everything it produces. According to Uexküll, in the Umwelts are present only objects which carry some biological significance for their subjects, or in other words, some meaning (Uexküll, 2010, p. 53).

Uexküll claims that when a subject gets confronted by such an object, a process called the "functional cycle" gets launched (ibid., pp. 42-52). In particular, a perception mark (form, movement, taste, colour or odour which the object possesses) triggers this process. After the receptors have detected this perception mark, they forward the signal to the organ of perception, the brain. One's brain is the place where it gets decided on how to treat the confronted object. The decision is being made based on the experience and needs of the subject. Also, the subject's mood plays a very crucial role in this decision making. The decision made by the perception organ, later on, is forwarded to the subject's effect organs, for example, to the right hand or left leg. After the effect organ has received the command coming from the brain, it acts. This act assigns to the object a particular effect mark. Each effect mark may become a perception mark, consequently triggering a new functional cycle. Theoretically, this process may continue ad infinitum. According to Uexküll, the functional cycles are goal-oriented and guided by nature, that is to say, by instinct (ibid., pp. 49-91). Their sequence is not random. If it were, then all we would have would be just chaos. Since the Umwelt is not rigid and develops together with its subject, the number of these cycles present in the Umwelt is not restricted. According to Kull, *"it is very improbable that a functional cycle once created by the subject will ever disappear, in the course of various contradictions met by the subject, these cycles are augmented by new elements, made more complex, but remain their old content"* (Kull, 1997, p. 307). In Uexküll's opinion, *"the functional cycle teaches us that perception marks, as well as effect marks, are expressions of the subject and the qualities of the object included in the functional cycle can only be referred to as their vehicles"* (Uexküll, 2010, p. 125).

The objects found in one's Umwelt have various functions. There are objects with whom the subject, throughout its life, undertakes all sorts of actions. Such objects can be different companions (lovers, friends, enemies, and others). There are also objects that the subject uses in creating familiar paths or in marking its territory. According to Uexküll, fewer objects are present in someone's Umwelt, less challenging it is for it to orient itself in its Umwelt (ibid., p. 96). The objects that the subject can find in its Umwelt, it associates with particular mental images. Uexküll claims that *"we notice in all objects that we have learned to use the act which we perform with them, with the same assurance with which we notice their shape or colour"* (ibid., p. 94). The act of learning is over when the perception image gets linked with the corresponding effect image. One can deduce that the subject recognizes objects in its Umwelt based on the mental perception and effect images once assigned to them.

With the perception image, one can understand the unity of perception marks (colours, odours, taste, shape, and others) the subject associates with the object. With the effect image, one can understand all the actions (effect marks) the subject remembers performing with the object. If one day the subject needs to find or recognize something, the search image, which is the subjective result of the subject's repeated experience, gets activated in its perception organ to help it to resolve this problem – either to find the object or the substitute for it. The search image contains everything (the perception and effect marks) the subject remembers about the given object. According to Uexküll, the search image, similarly to the territory or familiar path, is the subject's subjective production (ibid., p. 119).

In Uexküll's opinion, the same object can be present in different Umwelts (Uexküll, 2010, pp. 126-132; 1982, pp. 26-33). Subjects may share not only the same objects but become objects themselves in someone else's Umwelt. If the same object is present in several Umwelts, one can perceive these Umwelts as interconnected. Uexküll claims that each independent Umwelt cuts out of object being found in several Umwelts a particular piece, in other words, the characteristics that are suited to form the perception mark carriers as well as the effect mark carriers for their unique functional cycles. (Uexküll, 2010, pp. 130-131). As believed by Kull, Umwelts get interconnected in the semiosphere (Kull, 1997, p. 305). He claims that any two Umwelts, when communicating, are a part of the same semiosphere (ibid., p. 305). One can assume that with communication Kull means sharing the same objects.

According to Uexküll, all-encompassing world space is just a conventional fable (Uexküll, 2010, p. 70). He insists that there is no space independent of subjects and that in

each Umwelt space is perceived differently (ibid., pp. 53-70). As per Uexküll, in the Umwelt can be present three different spaces, which interpenetrate and complete but also partially contradict each other (ibid., p. 54). Uexküll distinguishes between effect space, tactile space, and visual space (ibid., pp. 53-70).

In effect space, important are directional signs which help the subject to orient itself. Uexküll claims that every living subject owning the semi-circular canal can distinguish between six directions, in pairs of opposites: to the left and the right, upward and downward, forward and backward, and that it feels these directions out differently in comparison with other subjects (ibid., pp. 54-59).

Whereas directions are building blocks in the effect space, the place serves as a building block in the tactile one. This block, according to Uexküll, is all the time fixed (ibid., p. 60). He claims that when a subject is feeling out an object, one can observe how a place connects itself with directional steps (ibid., p. 61). The result of this combination is a formed image. As per Uexküll, only subjects endowed with an ability to see can separate tactile and visual space (ibid., p. 61).

Thanks to visual space, the subject can experience changes in the size and qualities of objects found in its Umwelt. Unlike effect space and tactile space, visual one is fenced with an impenetrable wall that one shall call the horizon or farthest plane. As stated by Uexküll, this plane includes all visible objects (ibid., p. 61). He claims that the position of this plane in one's Umwelt is not fixed and rigid. (ibid., p. 63). On the contrary, according to Uexküll, every subject pushes this plane during its life only farther and farther (ibid., p. 63).

Time, similarly to space, is also perceived differently in each Umwelt. In Uexküll's opinion, *"space and time are of no immediate use to the subject. They only become meaningful when numerous perception marks (features) must be distinguished that would otherwise, without the spatiotemporal framework of the environment, coincide"* (ibid., p. 73).

According to Uexküll, every Umwelt is a mixture of two separate environments. One of them is the product of the perception signs that external stimuli have ever awakened in the subject. The second one is an environment that is not bound to experience, or, at most, to a singular experience. Uexküll sees such an environment as magical and thinks that, in this magical environment, nature, in other words, instinct guides the subject (ibid., 119-124). In this magical environment, the subject, rather than following a familiar path, follows the inborn path (ibid., pp. 119-124). If the subject listens to its instinct and follows the inborn path, it can do things it has never done before or appropriately treat previously unknown

objects. Uexküll claims that the inborn path, the same as the familiar path, leads the subject through visual and effect space (ibid., p. 122). These two paths are different only in one aspect. Whereas, in the familiar path, a series of perception and effect signs get established through experience, in the inborn one, the same appears as a magical phenomenon.

If one recalls the myth from the first chapter, one, hopefully, will be able now with the assurance to explain how the little girl managed to process something at first unfamiliar to her. Although the little girl heard the myth for the first time in her life and did not know that it is something passed from generation to generation and portrays the world of her ancestors, she still was able to conclude that it has something to do with her one. In the myth, the same as in the soap bubbles, she saw deformed fragments of her own Umwelt. The receptors of the little girl, following the inborn path, in the myth detected the familiar perception marks, which they afterwards sent to the girl's perception organ, where the appropriate perception and effect images got activated and consequently combined into the search image. Since the girl could find the objects corresponding to the search image in her environment (Umwelt), she realised that she and the myth through these objects are interconnected. In other words, her Umwelt and the narrator's Umwelt are of the same semiosphere.

Perhaps one might be wondering now about what Uexküll's theory of Umwelt has to do with Liszka's theory of transvaluation. Since the title of this Master's thesis says "A Critical Semiotic Study of Finnish, Latvian and Czech Myths", this chapter aimed to look at myths from another (independent) perspective than that of Liszka.

If one views myths as Umwelts interconnected in the semiosphere by the objects they share, one realises that these objects must have a fixed function and value. This assumption corresponds with Liszka's idea (introduced in chapter 4) that myths are tied with the teleological system of community and portrays its values and norms, which according to Liszka, change.

One can find confirmation to the assumption expressed in the above paragraph in Lotman's book "Universe of the Mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture" (1990), where he explains the semiosphere as following:

"As an example of a single world looked at synchronically, imagine a museum hall where exhibits from different periods are on display, along with inscriptions in known and unknown languages, and instructions for decoding them; besides there are the explanations composed by the museum staff, plans for tours and rules for the behaviour of the visitors. Imagine also in this hall tour-leaders and the visitors and

imagine all this as a single mechanism (which in a certain sense it is). This is an image of the semiosphere. Then we have to remember that all elements of the semiosphere are in dynamic, not static, correlations whose terms are constantly changing…" (Lotman, 1990, pp. 126-127).

Since myths, the same as Umwelts, change together with their authors, the only way to uncover what was considered by them valuable and purposeful at some point in time is to study their myths synchronically. The given approach takes Liszka and, through transvaluation (introduced in chapters 4 and 5), helps others reveal previously mentioned entities.

4. MYTH AS TRANSVALUATION OF THE WORLD

"Myth is a powerful kind of story which determines a culture's predominant moral understanding of the world" (Liszka, 1998, p. 95).

This chapter aims to give a general overview of a myth from the perspective of Liszka. One can find detailed information regarding the myth's structure in chapter 6.

According to Liszka, *"myths are not merely a passive representation of cultural life, rather they are reflexive, in the sense that the cultural participants view their own culture through the spectacle of myth"* (Liszka, 1989, p. 15). In Liszka's opinion, when one tells a story, he simultaneously transvaluates the world (Liszka, 1998, p. 96). Liszka thinks that *"myths, in particular, are a transvaluation of the rules and concepts which structurate the economic, social, political, and cosmic fabric of a culture"* (Liszka, 1989, p. 15). He claims that in a myth, when viewed *"as a transvaluation, one finds a condensed, sometimes displaced, sometimes distorted, version of cultural values"* (ibid., p. 14). Liszka explains that *"transvaluation is the idea that every representation of something also involves a valuative estimation of the referent"* (Liszka, 1998, p. 97). In his opinion, transvaluation leads to a change *"in condition or state of affairs that may affect only a single soul – or the entire cosmos"* (ibid., p. 96).

According to Liszka, *"every story has a prehistory, a background, which serves as the focus of the crisis"* (ibid., p. 96). He explains that usually, a story begins by showing the disruption of an order or its absence, and the main focus of the story is overcoming this crisis (ibid., p. 96). In the course of a story, re-evaluation of the values, norms or beliefs takes place, and as a result, at the end of a story, the old order is modified or a new one established (ibid., pp. 96-97, 105).

To assess the rightness of Liszka's assumptions, one can recall the Finnish myth from the first chapter. At the beginning of this myth, the narrator gives his audience some background information and introduces the main characters. This information explains what led to the crisis later in the course of the myth. The narrator tells his audience that the main heroin Ilmatar was used to spend her days in isolation and longed for a son. When she could not anymore stand her condition, she decided to change the situation. She went down to the sea where she conceived Väinämöinen, who did not bear immediately. A lot of things needed to happen before the previous state of affairs could change. As one can see, Liszka is right

when saying that an integral part of a story is a crisis, which in the course of a story, gets overcome. Also, his claim that one at the end of a story can observe a change is veracious.

Liszka recognizes the power of a story to create a definite vision of the world and influence the human understanding of the way things are (ibid., p. 97). In his opinion, "*myths are among the most powerful kinds of stories in this respect and, consequently, they often create the grandest vision*" (ibid., p. 97).

According to Liszka, myths are unique among other types of stories because of two following reasons. Firstly, they explain the emergence of something like the cosmos, the first human being, or some cultural artefact (ibid., p. 98). Secondly, myths are held to be true by their audience and, because of this reason, function as a source of information, knowledge and wisdom (ibid., p. 98). Because of these characteristics, a myth can be powerful and can influence and conduct people.

As per Liszka, the difference between myths and their closest cousins, folktales and fairy tales, is that myths explain the emergence of something that is still an integral part of a given community (ibid., pp. 98-99).

According to Liszka, when the audience stops to consider a myth credible, it loses its power and becomes an ancient map that is no longer accurate about the terrain it maps (ibid., pp. 99, 102). For a myth to preserve its power, it needs to be either historiographically or figuratively true.

For a myth "*to be historiographically true, it must have come from the original witness of the event – the creator – whose words may have been directly given to the narrator, or who may have been inspired to tell the story as such*" (ibid., p. 100). It means, according to Liszka, that the current narrator is supposed to have a direct or proven lineage with the first narrator that a myth could be considered historiographically veracious (ibid., p. 100). As pointed out by Liszka, the acceptance of such a lineage is very often, naively, taken for granted (ibid., p. 100).

If a myth represents some human condition, which is still credible and the audience can identify with, it is figuratively true (ibid., pp. 100-101).

The previously mentioned Finnish myth meets both Liszka's criteria for a story to count as a myth. It tells about the creation of the world. Although the myth's historiographical truth can be by somebody questioned, it is at least figuratively true. It is figuratively true because it portrays the emergence of something that is still an integral part of the given nation – the world its members inhabit.

According to Liszka, for a story to be understandable, it must satisfy at least three conditions. These conditions are temporal contiguity, event concatenation and teleological coherence (ibid., p. 102). Whereas temporal contiguity provides sense to a story, event concatenation provides a possible meaning (ibid., p. 102). Teleological coherence generates a certain significance and is the ultimate organizing principle of the story (ibid., pp. 102, 104).

Once more, one finds in the Finnish myth the confirmation of the truthfulness of Liszka's assumptions. In it, one can observe the sequence of events. The narrator arranges them in the order in which they occurred in time. In other words, they are put in chronological order and are related to each other. Besides, the narrator in his story-telling reflects upon objects that are well-known to the given nation and tells the story following local conventions.

One can find similar ideas to those so far expressed in this chapter, also in Jakobson and Bogatyrev. They similarly tie an item of folklore with a community. In their opinion, for a folk story to exist, it must be adopted and sanctioned by the community (Jakobson and Bogatyrev, 1980, pp. 4-5). They claim that a community prunes a created work, the same as its language, to fit its taste and needs, and it retains only those items of folklore that have a functional value for it (ibid., pp. 5-6). Things that do not serve some purpose get rejected by the community and consequently die out (ibid., pp. 5-6). According to them, a folkloristic work is extrapersonal and is a compound of norms and impulses (ibid., p. 9). For them, oral works are the manifestations of communal creativity and, similarly to a language, follow some general structural rules.

Although Liszka's theory of myth is logical and easy to grasp, there is some indetermination. Instead of analysing oral stories, he studies written texts. Myth, in its most general sense, is an object of oral tradition. The view shared by folklorists is that, at the moment, when an item of folklore gets written down, it becomes a literary work (Lemeškin, 2016). Jakobson and Bogatyrev write that strict borders between folk work and literary texts are hard to establish because of the inability to carry out empirical research (Jakobson and Bogatyrev, 1980, p. 7). A similar idea one can find in Thompson, who also thinks that strict borders between various folk genres are almost impossible to set (Thompson, 1955, p. 486).

Since nowadays a myth may be perceived by one more like a literary work than a folk item, the following question bothers the mind: "Can one approach a myth with unclear origin as a communal creation reflecting the values of a given community?" According to Jakobson

and Bogatyrev, it can be. They assert that creators of both folk and literary works follow the rules of a given community. To show the rightness of their assumption, they look at the folklore from the perspective of Saussure's *langue* and at literary tradition from that of *parole* (ibid., p. 4). Whereas *langue* is a system that unities the community and allows the flow of communication among its members, *parole* is the actual manifestation of its norms and rules.

Even though one can look at myths as literary texts, one should keep in mind that myths are creations of an individual who is a member of a community and, as a such, is forced to obey its rules to be heard and understood. If another member of the same community can grasp the message encoded in a myth, it means that the myth's author followed the rules, and consequently, one can assume that it does not matter if the myth was heard or read, was folk or literary.

To develop his theory of transvaluation, Liszka draws inspiration from Peirce and refers to a myth as a symbol. The following section focuses on Peirce's understanding of the symbol in expectation to find out something about the possible kinship between the myth and the symbol.

4.1 A Symbol

For Peirce, a sign is a triadic relation between the representamen (sign), interpretant and object.

> *"A sign stands for something to the idea which it produces or modifies. Or, it is a vehicle conveying into the mind something from without. That for which it stands is called its object; that which it conveys its meaning; and the idea to which it gives rise, its interpretant…"* (CP 1.339).

Although Peirce has developed a very detailed classification of signs, given the study object of this Master's thesis, in more detail here will be discussed only his second trichotomy and, in particular, one of its constituents – the symbol.

Peirce's second trichotomy (which chronologically was the first one) foresees three ways in which a sign can refer to its dynamic object (CP 1.369, CP 8.335).

Peirce defines *"an icon as a sign which is determined by its dynamic object by virtue of its own internal nature"* (CP 8.335). According to him, an icon exhibits a similarity or analogy to an object it refers to (CP 1.369). In his opinion, an index is a sign *"that is determined by its dynamic object by virtue of being in a relation to it"* (CP 8.335). It means that an index like a demonstrative or relative pronoun forces one's attention *"to the particular object intended without describing it"* (CP 1.369). The third [symbol] Peirce defines *"as a sign which is determined by its dynamic object only in the sense that it will be so interpreted"* (CP 8.335). It *"signifies its object by means of an association of ideas or habitual connection between the name and the character signified"* (CP 1.369).

Peirce claims that a symbol has a triple reference to its object – denotation, connotation and information (CP 2.418, CP 1.559). According to him, whereas denotation is the symbol's direct reference to the object, its reference to its ground through its object is connotation. Finally, information is the reference to the symbol's interpretants through its object (CP 1.559). In other words, information is the result of the functional interrelation between denotation and connotation or, as claims Liszka, the quantity of the interpretant (Liszka, 1989, p. 27). Based on the functional interrelation among denotation (breadth) and connotation (depth), information can remain constant, increase or there can be no information.

> *"First, that, as long as the information remains constant, the greater the breadth, the less the depth; Second, that every increase of information is accompanied by an increase in depth or breadth, independent of the other quantity; Third, that when there is no information, there is either no depth or no breadth, and conversely"* (Peirce, in Liszka, 1989, p. 30).

According to Peirce, *"every symbol is necessary a legisign"* (CP 8.335). Peirce explains that *"a legisign is a law that is a sign"* (CP 2.246). It is a law established by men (CP 2.246). In Peirce's opinion, what makes a legisign different among other types of signs is that it *"has a definite identity, though usually admitting a great variety of appearances"* (CP 8.334). From this can be concluded that a legisign can never be perfectly determined.

Although every symbol is a legisign, it can simultaneously also be a rheme, a dicisign or an argument (Waal, 2013, CHAPTER FIVE). This division foresees how a sign determines its dynamic interpretant. According to Peirce, *"a rheme is a sign which is understood to represent its object in its character merely"* (CP 2.252). A dicisign he terms

as *"a sign which is understood to represent its object in respect to actual existence"* (CP 2.252). The last [an argument] Peirce explains is *"a sign which is understood to represent its object in its character as a sign"* (CP 2.252). A rheme can be a term, such as a common noun. An example of a dicisign is a proposition, and a syllogism is an exemplar of an argument.

Peirce claims that an argument can be of three kinds – deduction, induction and abduction (CP 2.96). For an argument to become a symbol, it must involve a discent symbol, i.e., proposition, which is its premiss (CP 2.253), composed of terms. Based on Liszka (Liszka, 1989, pp. 26-47), a myth seems to be an argument, respectively an obsistent one, i.e., deduction (CP 2.96).

Although a symbol is the result of a habit, Peirce claims that there always exists a living thing for it that is no mere figure of speech (CP 2.222). According to Peirce, a symbol changes, but this change happens slowly (CP 2.222). As it develops, its meaning grows (CP 2.222). It can incorporate new elements and throw off the old ones (CP 2.222). In Peirce's opinion, *"all words, sentences, books, and other conventional signs are symbols"* (CP 2.292). According to him, a symbol *"cannot indicate any particular thing, it denotes a kind of thing"* (CP 2.301). It is a general sign (CP 2.341). As per Peirce, *"the value of a symbol is that it serves to make thought and conduct rational and enables us to predict the future"* (CP 4.448).

From written above can be concluded that if one decides to view myth as a symbol, then in a myth, one may find representations of things found in one's environment and that these representations are established based on some rule and serve some purpose. As a community develops and changes, so do its myths together with it. Myth is powerful because it establishes some patterns and, as a result, may conduct one's actions.

It follows from the above that the kinship between the myth and the symbol lies in the following aspects: they both a) serve some purpose, b) develop together with the corresponding community and c) conduct and influence their target audience.

Although semiotics, according to Peirce, is not an empirical science and can only presuppose what ought to be, it is evident that previously mentioned semioticians: Uexküll, Liszka, and Peirce, although coming from different periods and parts of the world, share similar ideas, such as that Umwelt/myth/symbol grows and changes together with its owner. To put it another way, they use different names for the same entities.

Based on this, one can presuppose that there is some universal truth and that semiotics might help discover it.

Since one now has a general idea of a myth, the next chapter aims in detail to discuss the process of sign growing – transvaluation, i.e., rule-like semiosis.

5. TRANSVALUATION EQUALS RULE-LIKE SEMIOSIS

In the previous chapter, one found out that myths, also known as symbols, evolve through *transvaluation*. They reach a new developmental stage every time the community they belong to modifies its teleological system. In the book "The Semiotic of Myth: A Critical Study of the Symbol (Advances in Semiotics)" (1989), Liszka compares transvaluation with a rule-like semiosis and even claims that transvaluation is the most comprehensive species of the interpretant (ibid., p. 71). Since these two terms, semiosis and interpretant, have not been discussed yet in the previous chapters, this chapter aims to provide one with knowledge about them. As a result, one should gain a better understanding of transvaluation and myth's changing nature.

It was explained, in section 4.1, that from the perspective of Peirce, a sign is a triadic relation between the representamen, object and interpretant. According to Peirce, this relation gets constituted in semiosis. In this process, which can theoretically continue ad infinitum, a sign grows and becomes more definite (CP 5.594, CP 2.92). The following quote of Peirce gives a detailed elucidation of semiosis:

"A sign is anything which is related to a Second thing, its Object, in respect to a Quality, in such a way as to bring a Third thing, its Interpretant, into relation to the same Object, and that in such a way as to bring a Fourth into relation to that Object in the same form ad infinitum. If the series is broken off, the Sign, in so far, falls short of the perfect significant character. It is not necessary that the Interpretant should actually exist. A being in futuro will suffice…" (CP 2.92).

From the above, one can conclude that a sign gets constituted by means of the interpretant. An interpretant is a rule or habit that restricts the scope of a sign's usage and possible interpretations. Since a community changes, its rules change together with it. The old rules serve as a basis for the formation of new signs. As a result, new rules get established. One can say that every (new) sign is the compilation of elements found in its predecessors and every new interpretant is the derivation of former ones.

According to Danesi, semiosis is not just a process in which signs evolve, it is also the process of interlinking three dimensions of human existence – the body, the mind and culture (Danesi, in Sebeok, 2001, p. xii). Sebeok shares a similar opinion to Danesi and claims that

every living organism and its inanimate extensions undergo semiosis and that semiosis is a critical attribute of our lives (Sebeok, 2011, p. 28). In Sebeok's opinion, for semiosis to take place, at least two actants are needed: the observer and the observed (ibid., p. 33). This idea corresponds to Liszka's assumption expressed in chapter 4 that myths portray how a community evolves due to its dissatisfaction with the former condition. Whereas a community acts as the observer, the observed is a condition. Based on its observations, a community changes its artefacts.

According to Short, semiosis occurs in a context (Short, 2007, p. 158). Short describes context as being one of purposefulness (ibid., p. 158). From this can be concluded that semiosis is purpose-guided.

Since there is a direct linkage between myths and the community they portray, they are teleological. For that reason, that they are teleological, teleological semiosis takes place within them. Since teleological semiosis is an integral part of every myth, they are genuine signs.

"Teleological semeiosy is capable of generating genuine signs, i.e., conventional symbols" (Liskza, 1996, p. 33).

If this is true, then myths are genuine signs that are translatable only by the same rules which constitute them. In other words, an interpretant not only establishes the relation between the sign and its object but also guides and limits its interpretations.

"A Genuine Sign is Transuasional Sign, or Symbol, which is a sign which owes its significant virtue to a character which can only be realized by the aid of its Interpretant…" (CP 2.92).

From this, one can conclude that without knowing the local convention, one most likely will not be able to detect signs in myths and consequently translate them. If one follows, in sign translation, a conventional rule to connect the sign as the representative of its object, that rule must be of the same community as the sign is. If one does not, there is a high likelihood that it might get misinterpreted or even remain uninterpreted. To assess the rightness of this assumption, one may take a look at the word *mauka*. Theoretically, this word may appear in a myth. This word is present in Finnish and Latvian and, in each of these languages, it has a different meaning. Whereas, in Finnish, it means "tasty", in Latvian – "a

woman who engages in sexual activity for money". If, for instance, a Latvian, while interpreting a Finnish myth, encounters above mentioned word and processes it as a Latvian word, this might result in the myth's misinterpretation.

To perform sign translation correctly, one should be either a member of the given community as the sign is or have sufficient knowledge about it. Confirmation to this assumption one can find in Danesi's book "Understanding Media Semiotics" where he writes that *"a semiotician must have knowledge of the culture in which a representation is created in order to put forward an interpretation of it"* (Danesi, 2002, p. 26).

According to Condit, texts are polysemic, and she claims that people are able to construct a variety of responses to any text (Condit, 1989, pp. 106-108). It means that the very same text (sign) can be interpreted by different people differently. The words of Condit, even more, strengthen the credibility of the previously expressed assumption that without the knowledge of the teleological system to which the myth belongs, its interpreter most likely will not be able to carry out a trustful interpretation of it. If one aims to discover values and norms encoded in myths without having sufficient knowledge of a source community, he risks creating a false picture of this community.

As per Waal, *"when discussing the interpretant, Peirce draws two threefold divisions, one concerning the relation between the sign and the interpretant, and another concerning different types of interpretants that result"* (Waal, 2012, CHAPTER FIVE).

"In the first division – concerning the relation between the sign and the interpretant – Peirce distinguishes between immediate, dynamic, and final interpretant" (ibid., CHAPTER FIVE). The immediate interpretant can be understood either as a "total unanalysed effect" that a sign is intentionally designed to produce, as a process which allows the interpreting agency to interpret its sign as interpretable as such or as a product resulting from feelings, vague impressions and qualities (Liszka, 1996, p. 26). *"The dynamic interpretant, on the other hand, consists of the direct or actual effect produced by a sign upon some interpreting agency"* (ibid., p. 26). Its products are actions, events or singular ideas, and it has both an active and a passive modality (ibid., p. 26). Lastly, *"the final interpretant is any rule-like or law-like effect a sign has on any interpreting agency"* (ibid., p. 27). Its products are laws, habits and regularities (ibid., p. 27). *"The final interpretant can be understood as the means by which a sign becomes connected or interrelated into a system of signs, that is translated "into another system of signs"* (ibid., p. 27). The final interpretant is "the product" of sign translation (ibid., p. 27).

"In the second threefold division – the one according to the different types of interpretants that result – Peirce distinguishes between emotional, energetic, and logical interpretant" (Waal, 2013, CHAPTER FIVE). The emotional interpretant can be understood in terms of the feeling produced by the sign (ibid., CHAPTER FIVE). The energetic interpretant is an action that can be either physical or psychical (ibid., CHAPTER FIVE). The last [the logical interpretant] *"is a thought or other general sign, or a habit formed or modified"* (ibid., CHAPTER FIVE).

According to Waal, *"the two threefold divisions of the interpretants neither compete nor they can be reduced to one another, but they can be combined"* (ibid., CHAPTER FIVE). For example, a dynamic interpretant can be emotional, energetic or logical (ibid., CHAPTER FIVE).

From this, one can conclude that a community's rules can be variable. They can differ in their complexity, position in the hierarchy and strictness.

According to Liszka, *"meaning, like intension, does not subsist somewhere in the fabric of the mind, but accrues within the framework of a certain kind of relation between things, more specifically, the relation between two things and the rule which designates the one as the sign of the other"* (Liszka, 1989, p. 25).

In his opinion, to perform the translation of a symbol appropriately, two things have to be considered (ibid., p. 25). *"Firstly, the language of symbols cannot be reduced to the language of indices, intensions cannot be reduced to extension"* (ibid., p. 25). He claims that *"if such a reduction were artificially imposed, it would arbitrarily exclude the legitimate domain of symbolic activity"* (ibid., pp. 25-26). Liszka thinks that *"the language of the symbol is the means by which we incorporate the language of indices into a framework understandable from the perspective of intension and purpose"* (ibid., p. 26). This fact, as stated by Liszka, suggests the second characteristic of sign translation understood triadically (ibid., p. 26). Liszka perceives it as an essentially purposeful and teleological process (ibid., p. 26). He explains that *"the sign cannot be adequately comprehended in a singular function or representing some object; rather, it is tied to purpose and value through evaluation"* (ibid., p. 27).

Liszka claims that *"the meaning of a sign is engendered in its ability to delimit an interpretation which, in its final form, describes a rule in which a sign will develop in the course of relating its object to its interpreting agency"* (ibid., p. 26).

One can assume that a sign develops through inference. The following section focuses on this process, enabling one to draw conclusions based on evidence and reasoning.

5.1 Sign Translation as Inference

According to Liszka, inference in Peirce's semiotics seems to be the primary mode of translation (Liszka, 1989, p. 26). Peirce distinguishes between three main kinds of reasoning [inferences] – deduction, induction and abduction [also called hypothesis or retroduction] (CP 1.65, CP 2.98). These three inferences are types of argument (CP 2.96).

As stated by Peirce, *"deduction is that mode of reasoning which examines the state of things asserted in the premisses, forms a diagram of that state of things, perceives in the parts of that diagram relations not explicitly mentioned in the premisses, satisfies itself by mental experiments upon the diagram that these relations would always subsist, or at least would do so in a certain proportion of cases, and concludes their necessary, or probable, truth"* (CP 1.66).

Induction, he explains as the *"mode of reasoning which adopts a conclusion as approximate, because it results from a method of inference which must generally lead to the truth in the long run… All that induction can do is to ascertain the value of a ration"* (CP 1.67).

Abduction Peirce termed as *"the provisional adoption of a hypothesis, because every possible consequence of it is capable of experimental verification, so that the persevering application of the same method may be expected to reveal its disagreement with facts, if it does so disagree"* (CP 1.68).

Liszka, following Peirce, claims that an inference can be either analytic or synthetic (Liszka, 1989, p. 29). In Liskza's opinion, in analytic reasoning, *"there is no change in information, but there is an increase of extension and comprehension"* (ibid., p. 29). In synthetic inference, there is always an increase of information (ibid., p. 29). Liszka claims that whereas deduction is analytic reasoning, induction and abduction are synthetic ones (ibid., p. 31). According to Peirce, whereas deduction does not add anything to the premisses (CP 2.643), induction and abduction lead to new information (CP 2.430).

One may find in Peirce's semiotics other forms of reasoning that are derivatives of deduction, induction and abduction. For example, the analogy is a combination of elements that may be found in induction and abduction (CP 1.65), reasoning from the definition, also called a formal hypothesis, is a type of abduction (Liszka, 1989, p. 30) and definitum to the definition is a form of deductive reasoning (ibid., p. 30).

Besides the principal forms of inference and their derivatives, one may come across what Peirce calls operations, such as generalization, abstraction, extension, ascent, discovery, determination, among others (ibid., p. 30). These operations are also combinations of elements found in deduction, induction and abduction.

Liszka claims that one kind of semiotic operation or mode of translation discussed by Peirce in detail is determination (Liszka, 1989, p. 31). The preceding subsection shall introduce one with this operation and explain its connectivity with symbols and myths.

5.1.1 Determination

One, interpreting Peirce, can say that a determination is a continuous process, i.e., every determination enhances further determination, and is an example of semiosis where an interpretant helps an interpreting agency connect a sign with the most appropriate object (CP 1.447, CP 7.349, CP 4.536). As per Peirce, *"all determination is by negation; we can first recognize any character by putting an object which possesses it into comparison with an object which possesses it not"* (CP 5.294). In other words, the difference from other objects is what makes an object determined (CP 6.623).

Liszka sees determination as a subordinate to purpose and binds it to the discourse universe of a speech community (Liszka, 1989, p. 36). Also, Liszka claims that purpose is related to value (ibid., p. 46). He explains that "*purpose entails a goal or an end, and the end of an action is that which engenders purpose in an agent; the end of that action is valuable for that agent and, generally, provides the reason and motivation for that action. The value of an end, state, or element, in turn, is dependent on its relation among other ends, states, or elements within a system of such units*" (ibid., p. 46).

In Liszka's opinion, determination not only leads to an increase of depth of terms as claims Peirce (CP 2.364, CP 2.422, CP 2.428), but also restricts the breadth of certain vague subjects and is a kind of analytic inference (Liszka, 1989, p. 32). Moreover, Liszka explains that *"determination is established within the framework of a speech community"* (ibid., p. 32) and *"is correlative with consensus"* (ibid., p. 32).

Liszka claims that *"determination, as interpretation, is the process of making subject and predicate, reference and sense more definite"* (ibid., p. 37). *"As the sign becomes more determined its possible interpretations becomes less varied and the existing ones more rigid and habitual"* (ibid., p. 38).

Peirce claims that *"every subject is existentially determined with respect to each predicate"* (CP 1.485). Liszka writes that for Peirce, *"the object of every sign is an individual, and the signs that may serve as subjects of propositions are of two sorts: selectives and cyrioids"* (Liszka, 1989, p. 33).

Selectives, e.g., quantifiers, are either universal (any, every, all, no, none, whatever, whoever, everybody, anybody, nobody) or particular (some, something, somebody, a, a certain, some or other, as suitable one) (CP 2.289). Whereas universal qualities [quantifiers] are general, particular ones are vague (Liszka, 1989, p. 33). Selectives can be viewed as "directions" helping one to find an object (CP 8.181).

Cyrioids, i.e., signs of single objects, are all abstract nouns, which are names of a single character, such as personal pronouns, demonstratives and relative pronouns, among others (CP 8.181). The same as a determination of selectives depends on the context of their utterance, the same happens also in terms of cyrioids (Liszka, 1989, p. 35). Even in the case of cyrioids, a relation between a sign and its object cannot be finitely determined (ibid., p. 35).

Waal expresses a similar view to Liszka and claims that though any object can give rise to a great variety of signs, and though any sign can give rise to a variety of interpretations, each object limits or determines, what may be a sign of it, and each sign similarly limits what may be an interpretant of it (Waal, 2013, CHAPTER FIVE). He claims that Peirce's account further suggests that what is picked out as a sign and how it is interpreted depends on the purpose of its interpreter (ibid., CHAPTER FIVE). Also, he points out that, according to Peirce, signs cannot be perfectly determinate (ibid., CHAPTER FIVE).

From the above, one can see that although an interpreter is limited in his translations, his translations can never be perfectly determined and valid for all possible occasions.

One can say that through determination, one forms system(s) that help him to orient himself in his environment and limit his interpretations of things found in it. For example, one, interpreting Peirce, may found that through determination, one constitutes his attitude towards time by distinguishing between the past, present and future (CP 5.458) or that one creates codes of conduct that guide and restrict his actions (CP 5.517).

According to Liszka, *"Peirce suggests at least two kinds of teleology operative in semiosis, an objective one, in which, in and through process of determination, signs form a system which establishes a set of constraints represented by its interpretant, for any possible*

interpretation of those signs within the framework of a second, subjective teleology of the sign user" (Liszka, 1989, p. 45).

Liszka explains translation as the rule which reorganizes one level of organization through another, i.e., translation, in his opinion, involves the process of selection of elements of features that exist on the first level with their combination within the organization of the second (ibid., p. 42). This idea describes the very core of transvaluation (ibid., p 42).

According to Liszka, *"thus, although Peirce makes the relation between semiosis and purpose relatively clear, the relation between sign and value is left undeveloped in his system"* (ibid., p. 46). To explain the evaluative side of sign translation, Liszka draws inspiration from Saussure's notion of value. He thinks that both theories are compatible and that one might observe a resemblance between Saussure's theory of value and Peirce's theory of the interpretant, i.e., translation understood valuatively (ibid., p. 57). The following section is devoted to finding the ground for this Liszka's assumption.

5.2 Saussure's Notion of Value

In Liszka's opinion, when one carries interpretation of Saussure's notion of value out correctly, one gets a better understanding of the relationship between purpose and sign and, consequently, between the teleologies of sign systems and their use (Liszka, 1989, p. 57).

According to Saussure, when one thinks about the value of a sign, one considers first of all its properties of standing for an idea (CLG,1959, p. 114). This Saussure admits being just one side of linguistic value (ibid., p. 114). In his opinion, values are always composed: *"1) of a dissimilar thing that can be exchanged for the thing of which the value is to be determined; and 2) of similar thing that can be compared with the thing of which the value is to be determined"* (ibid., p. 115).

For gaining a better understanding of the combined value of a sign, Saussure introduces two relations existing in a language which, according to him, *"corresponds to two forms of human mental activity, both indispensable to the life of language"* (ibid., p. 123). These relations are syntagmatic and associative (paradigmatic in Jakobson). Saussure claims that syntagmatic relations are linear and are *"always composed of two or more consecutive units"* (ibid., p. 123). According to him, in the syntagmatic relation, *"a term acquires its value because it stands in opposition to everything that precedes or follows it, or both"* (ibid., p. 123). He claims that words *"that have something in common are*

associated in the memory, resulting in groups marked by diverse relations" (ibid., p. 123), thereby forming associative relations. One can say that these two relations form the basis of Jakobson's theory of markedness described later in section 5.3.

Whichever functioning linguistic item, according to Saussure, is *"a combination of two interdependent elements that acquire value only through their reciprocal action in a higher unit"* (ibid., p. 123). In other words, the whole is assigned its value through its parts that have their own value by virtue of their place in the whole. Saussure claims that the value of the whole term is never equal to the sum of the value of the parts (ibid., p. 132). For example, *"teacher + er" does not equal "teach x er"* (ibid., p. 132).

For Saussure, *"value is not fixed until it gets fixed by the concurrence of everything that exists outside it"* (ibid., p. 115). According to him, a single sign may stand for several values, for example, *"t can stand for t or s, g for g or ž"* (ibid., p. 29). In Saussure's opinion, the value of whichever sign is conditioned by its environment (ibid., p. 116). Furthermore, Saussure thinks that it is possible to replace signs with other signs without causing a change in value (ibid., p. 111). Also, *"the value of a term may be modified without its meaning or its sound being affected, solely because a neighbouring term has been modified"* (ibid., p. 120).

That the value is something relative is possible to prove with the example of chess. Chess as a system contains various figures. Also, it contains some rules presupposing the value and ability of each figure. But these rules do not foresee when and which figure to use. A player is the one who decides based on circumstances, his goal and moves of his opponent, which figure and when to use. A figure in various situations might have a different value. For example, since a bishop can move only diagonally, its movement is limited. At first, it makes him less valuable than a rook. Its value is three points. However, sometimes the usefulness of a bishop changes as the game progresses. Later, when the board is more open, a bishop may become more valuable because its mobility is greater after many pieces have been captured. However, imagine a situation, in which a bishop is blocked by a chain of pawns that occupy the same colour of squares as the bishop. If the bishop isn't mobile, it is not very valuable, regardless of how many points it is normally worth.

According to Liszka, *"the ability of the word to be exchanged for something dissimilar to itself, an idea or object, is comparable to the general notion of breadth; while the comparison of a sign within a system of signs is comparable to the general notion of depth"* (Liszka, 1989, p. 54). His assumption Liszka grounds in the following presumption: if *"value of the sign involves both its referential and connotational aspect"* (ibid., p. 55), then

"a signifier refers to a signified only through the mediation of the system of signifiers, while the system of signifiers coalesces into meaningful differences by means of anchorage in a referential system" (ibid., p. 55). According to Liszka, *"if this assessment is correct, then to the extent that value is the organization of relations between signatum and signantia and among signantia in Saussure, and the interpretant is the organization of the breadth and depth of a sign, the value and the interpretant are family-related notions"* (ibid., p. 55). Furthermore, to strengthen his assumption, Liszka points at Saussure's idea that the selection of signs is with regards to the purpose of the speaker but constrained by the system of signs elected by the user to fulfil his purpose (ibid., p. 56). As believed by Liszka, one may find in Saussure *"the same sorts of teleologies established by Peirce in his analysis of determination"* (ibid., p. 56).

Although Saussure approaches signs from the synchronic perspective, he the same as Peirce recognises that signs evolve.[8] They both acknowledge that every society has at its disposal some rules forming a system that guide the actions of its members. Nevertheless, a sign develops and acquires its meaning and value differently in Peirce and Saussure, and this is what makes one doubt the credibility of Liszka's latter assumptions.

In Peirce's understanding, signs, more specifically symbols, are tied to their community and its teleological system and evolve from previous signs taking into consideration a current state of affairs. Peirce's symbol is motivated and contains a rule which limits its referential scope and possible interpretations. In Saussure, everything is fundamentally different. Although Saussure perceives a language as a system composed of different rules and pre-established signs, it is and remains for him a system of pure values. It does not foresee some predetermined meaning and value for each sign. The sign user is the one in whose hands a sign becomes motivated. Otherwise, it is just an empty construct waiting for someone to give it a soul.

Also, Saussure's claim that a language[9] does not reveal anything about the peculiarities of a community to which it belongs makes one doubt the compatibility of both theories.

---

[8] *"Time changes all things, there is no reason why language should escape this universal law"* (CLG, 1959, p. 77).
[9] *"A popular notion is that a language reflects the psychology of a nation. But one serious objection opposes this viewpoint: psychological causes do not necessarily underlie linguistic procedures"* (CLG, 1959, p. 227).

"In short, does language provide some answers to questions that arise in the study of anthropology, ethnography, and prehistory? Many people think so, but I believe this is largely an illusion…" (CLG, 1959, p. 222).

The following section of this Master's thesis is devoted to Jakobson's linguistic concept of markedness, which according to Liszka, may enable one to detect various values and norms that are encoded in myths.

5.3 Jakobson's Linguistic Concept of Markedness

Since myths change together with their corresponding communities and Liszka aims to reveal what was considered by them purposeful and valuable at some point in time, he takes Jakobson's synchronic approach in his studies of myth.

Liszka thinks that Jakobson's approach is compatible with Peirce's views and can be used by one to gain a better understanding of a myth/symbol. Liszka makes such an assumption because of the similarities which he has detected between Peirce's objective idealism and Jakobson's isomorphism (Liszka, 1989, pp. 48-52). Also, he claims that Jakobson considered Peirce to be the forerunner of structural linguistics (ibid., p. 48).

In particular, to reveal various social constructs and changes in them, Liszka uses Jakobson's theory of markedness. This theory Jakobson employs in his analysis of the structure of the Russian verb system.

In his essay "Structure of the Russian Verb", Jakobson writes that *"one of the essential properties of phonological correlations is the fact that the two members of a correlation pair are not equivalent: one member possesses the mark in question, the other does not; the first is designed as marked, the other as unmarked"* (Jakobson, 1984, p.1). According to him, the marked constituent of this pair points at the absence of the unmarked one (ibid., p. 1).

Whereas markedness, according to Liszka, is the evaluative aspect of paradigmatic relations, ranking is that of the syntagmatic one (Liszka, 1989, p. 68).

In order to present how Jakobson's theory of markedness can be used by one in the study of a myth, Liszka refers to the correlation "God – man" (ibid., p. 67). Since the total value of God's characteristics outweighs that of man, God, according to Liszka, in classical Christian theology, is the unmarked constituent of the given correlation and man the marked one (ibid., p. 67). Liszka admits that such hierarchical correlation does not need to be valid

in all contexts. Based on this, one may assume that it can happen that, for instance, God does not have any value for an atheist because he may consider God to be a fictional character. Thus, he will consider a man to be superior to God. In other words, whichever correlation is a subjective phenomenon that varies not only from culture to culture but even from person to person.

Jakobson's example of such an asymmetrically hierarchical correlation is "donkey (осёл) – jenny (ослица)" (Jakobson, 1989, p. 2). In his opinion, the term "donkey" (осёл) is superior to "jenny" (ослица) because it can be used to refer to all individuals of that species without taking into consideration their gender. Since "jenny" (ослица) is used only to refer to a female donkey (ослица), its value, according to Jakobson, in the Russian language is lower, and thus "jenny" (ослица) is subordinate in the correlation "donkey (осёл) – jenny (ослица)" (ibid., p. 2).

That the correlation "donkey (осёл) – jenny (ослица)" is something relative and context-based, proves the fact that the term "donkey" (осёл) can become in another correlation, such as "fox (лиса) – donkey (осёл)", the marked constituent. Whereas the term "donkey" (осёл) in the Russian language is also used to refer to a not very intelligent person and "fox" (лиса) describes a person endowed with the bright mind, one presupposes that the members of Russian society prefer to identify with the latter one.

That not always a grammatical gender can play a supportive role, like in Jakobson's example, in the determination of the marked and unmarked constituent, one can observe in grammatically genderless languages such as Estonian. When an Estonian person is asked, if *eesel* (a donkey in Estonian) is male or female, such a question might confuse him. The person most likely will reply that *eesel* is *eesel*. Since the system of his mother tongue does not foresee some pre-established grammatical gender for the given term, he will assign a gender to this term by thinking about some particular *eesel*. When he wants explicitly to refer to a male or female donkey, he uses following constructions: *emane eesel* (a female donkey) and *isane eesel* (a male donkey). Even, then he will not consider one of them to be superior to the another. The same goes for *kass* (a cat), *koer* (a dog), *papagoi* (a parrot), and others. Although in the Estonian language exist correlations giving indications about an animal's gender, for example, "*lehm* (a cow) – *pull* (a bull)" or "*lammas* (an ewe) – *oinas* (a ram)" it seems impossible objectively to say which constituents of these correlations for Estonians are the unmarked ones and which the marked ones. The first reason is that any of these constituents is the derivative of another. The second reason is that when a person is

learning Estonian language, he is being taught both constituents of these correlations at once without further indications about which one is the unmarked one and which the marked one.

From everything so far written in this Master's thesis, one can assume that a community creates such hierarchical correlations as "God – man" to set a standard and show what is acceptable for it in some particular situation. Whereas the unmarked constituent embodies the norm, the marked one is its violation. The unmarked constituent is more simple and more general in comparison to the marked one. The latter one derives from the former one. Whereas the unmarked constituent can substitute the marked one, the opposite is not possible. When deciding which constituent will be the unmarked one and which one marked, a community considers two things: 1) the current needs of the community, 2) the value of each constituent.

The following chapter focuses on the general structure of narration in a myth. It is the last chapter devoted to discussing the theoretical side of studying myths.

6. THE GENERAL STRUCTURE OF NARRATION IN MYTH

According to Liszka, a myth is a human action encoded as narration that is a specific function of language (Liszka, 1989, p. 117). In his opinion, narration retains some general features of language structure of which it is a part (ibid., p. 117). Based on Jakobson's isomorphism, Liszka explains narration as *"a set of differences translated into another set of differences, creating a hierarchical integration which generates meaning"* (ibid., p. 117). In other words, when a narrator tells a story, he reflects upon some set of culturally meaningful differences, which he re-evaluates, i.e., transvaluates through a sequence of action.

6.1 The Mythemic Sequence

In Liszka's opinion, *"in its most general form, a myth may be viewed as a representation of an action that one can analyse into a series of consequently related sequences"* (ibid., p. 120). These sequences, more specifically the mythemic sequences, are the basic units of action in a myth (ibid., pp. 117, 120). He objects to Lévi-Strauss's formulation of the mythemic sequence as simply a subject linked with a function (ibid., p. 117). In Liszka's opinion, it is more complex. It is a linguistic representation of action, and it mirrors the syntactical-grammatical structure of the action sentences (ibid., pp. 117-118, 120). Liszka insists that when one utters something, he arranges words in a particular order which is almost always appropriate to the non-linguistic relation it suggests (ibid., p. 118). Undoubtedly the utterance is also produced following the grammatical order found in the cultural language. Consequently, one can assume that if a narrator's language, for instance, is SVO language, then he, in his story-telling, will place a verb after a subject and an object after a verb.

According to Liszka, the mythemic sequence consists of the following categories: agent, action, patient and consequence (ibid., p. 120). Here should be added that action leads both to result and consequence (ibid., p. 119). The thing done is a result, whereas the thing brought about is the consequence of an action and can be compounded into immediate and remote (ibid., p. 119).

As believed by Liszka, the mythemic sequence serves as a schema that sets a specific framework for dividing and organising events in a story (ibid., p. 120). The various aspects found within the mythemic sequence are, according to Liszka, hierarchically superimposed one upon another (Liszka, 1989, p. 120). As per Liszka, if one wants to gain a better understanding of the mythemic sequence, he should perform the analysis of a myth at three interrelated levels (ibid., p. 120).

6.1.1. The Three Levels of Myth

First is the agential level of narration. One at this level finds general features of dramatis personae (the agent-patient categories) *"in terms of the biophysical characteristics of (a) the agents (e.g., male, animal, human, etc.), b) social characteristics (e.g., kinship and affinal relations), (c) political characteristics (class, rank, etc.), and (d) economic characteristics (hunter, fisher, etc.)"* (ibid., p. 120). It is necessary to add that the way how these features are defined vary from culture to culture (ibid., p. 121). The agential level uncovers relative asymmetries between the various agents in a story and reveals what a given culture considers valuable.

Second is the actantial level of narration. One finds at this level information about things that agents do and conditions which patients suffer., i.e., the roles they play in the narrative (ibid., p. 120). Due to the mutual interaction between agents, one at this level can observe changes in markedness and rank. At this level are compared properties of the agents. If one of the agents exceeds the unmarked norm in one direction or another or does not possess or share that norm, he becomes marked. The increase of rank of the marked agent in relation to the unmarked one is what initiates the narrative activity of the story. The intrusion of marked agent motivates a crisis that seeks the restoration of the norm, whether the restoration occurs or not. Liszka claims that the interrelation of these two levels accounts partially for the transvaluative character of the narration (ibid., p. 121).

According to Liszka, *"these two levels point to a third level which connects the characteristics of the agents and their narrative roles within the general framework of what might be called the narrative type or plot"* (ibid., p. 128). He claims that based on *"who causes the disruption, and what sort of order is disrupted, what sort of crisis is created and who resolves the crisis, certain narrative genres can be generated"* (Liszka, 1998, p. 105).

Based on the moral vision each type engenders, Liszka distinguishes between four main narrative types:

1) *"Romance: the disruption of an existing order is caused by an opponent, and the resultant crisis is resolved by the hero by means of the defeat of the villain, and as a result leads to the restoration and enhancement of the original order"* (ibid., p. 105).

2) *"Tragedy: the disruption of an existing order is caused by a high-status hero and the resultant crisis resolved by the defeat of that hero through the guardians or forces of that disrupted order, the result being that the disrupted order is righted or restored"* (ibid., p. 105).

3) *"Comedy: the disruption of an implicit order is caused by a high-status opponent, leading to a crisis; the hero – who is usually of lower status, facilitates the transformation of the opponent, who is now incorporated into this more original, implicit order"* (ibid., p. 105).

4) *"Irony: the disruption is caused by a weal or ineffectual hero, whose efforts to change or violate the order prove fruitless; the order reimposes itself"* (ibid., p. 106).

The analysis of this [third] level enables one to find information about things that the given community considers either to be elements of order or transgression. Also, the study of this level can reveal the behavioural patterns the given community finds acceptable.

By now, it must be even more clear why Liszka points out the similarities between a myth and Peirce's symbol. They both are trilevel. When a narrator introduces agents, he refers to some real-life objects similar to them. One can say that by doing it, a narrator establishes icons. When a narrator assigns roles to agents, he creates causal connections between agents and the functions they perform. In Peirce, these would be indices. During the course of a myth, agents acquire more roles and characteristics. It leads to the increment of their depth. By negation with other agents, their breadth gets restricted. Consequently, symbols get created. These symbols help the members of a given community to detect both welcomed and unwelcomed behavioural patterns.

The second part of this Master's thesis is devoted to studying Finnish, Latvian and Czech myths by means of the theory of transvaluation. In the end, one shall be able to assess the applicability of Liszka's method in folklore, more specifically in myth studies.

PART TWO. A CRITICAL STUDY OF MYTHS

7. FINNISH MYTHS

Although stories portraying events from the lives of various deities and mythical creatures are not the rarity in Finnish folklore, one faced a lot of challenges to find some that could be from Liszka's perspective considered as myths.

In the introduction of this Master's thesis, one explained that a story, in Liszka's opinion, is a myth if it 1) explains the emergence of something that is still a part of human culture and 2) reflects upon the change in a state of affairs.

The majority of stories either explained the emergence of something or portrayed a change in a state of affairs.

Even if the author of this Master's thesis wanted to select stories that only partly fulfil Liszka's criteria, she faced new challenges. For example, most of the stories explaining some origin contained only one agent. Therefore, it was not possible to detect some correlations and afterwards tell which from two constituents is supposed to be the unmarked one and which marked.

The author of this Master's thesis familiarised herself with the following texts: "Satujen maailma: Suomen kansan sadut. I kokoelma" (Finne 1909), "Suomen kansan eläinsatuja" (Härkönen 1912), "Suomen kansan peikkosatuja ynnä legendoja ja kertomussatuja" (Härkönen 1913), "Suomen kansan seikkailusatuja" (Härkönen 1920), "Ilvolan juttuja: Kansansatusovitelmia" (Lehtonen 1932), "Kansansatusovitelmia Suomen lapsille" (Lehtonen 1932), "Tarulinna: Kansansatusovitelmia Suomen lapsille" (Lehtonen 1932), "Kanteletar: taikka, Suomen kansan wanhoja lauluja ja wirsiä" (Lönnrot), "Suomen kansan muinaisia loitsurunoja" (Lönnrot 1880), "Suomen kansan satuja ja tarinoita" (Salmelainen 1852, 1854, 1856, 1866), "Kanssantaruja Laatokan luotei-rannikolta: kesällä" (Schwindt 1883)[10].

The above-listed texts were all that the author of this Master's thesis knew and could find containing Finnish folk tales.

Although it was not easy to find stories that are myths from Liszka's perspective, one does not want to think that there are few of them in Finnish folklore and that Liszka's theory of transvaluation is incompatible with Finnish folklore.

---

[10] All of the previously mentioned works are available (in Finnish) from: http://www.lonnrot.net/etext.html [24 April 2021].

The discovery that Liszka's theory of transvaluation is used in the studies of musical narrative[11] encouraged the author of this Master's thesis to be creative, modify it and try to use it in studying other types of stories, not just myths.

The author has chosen and arranged the following myths in a way that they explain and complement each other.

7.1 How Stones and Rocks Were Created in the North

Before God created the world, the water was empty. Spending his days on the top of the golden statue in the middle of the sea, God one day began the world creation. And he saw his image in the water and said to it: "Get up from there, whatever you are!" Well, it got up, and it was a ghost. God said to him: "Dive underwater and gather clay from there and bring me that I can create a world out of it!"

The ghost dived underwater three times and gathered clay from there, and brought it to God, who was sitting on the top of the golden statue. God blew a living spirit into the clay and started rubbing the clay between his palms. He shaped the clay into birds and animals, trees and lands, flowers and plants. As a result, a good world got created.

But then the idea crossed the mind of the ghost that he, also, should make something. He dived under the water. From the depths of the water, he brought clay and from it, he baked snakes and thistles. But his evil clay toys did not come to life. They did not breathe or grow.

But then he noticed that from the clay into which God blew the life spirit appeared living things. And the ghost asked God to blow the life spirit into the remains of soil, that he could make from it his evil clay toys, birds of prey, and others. God refused to do it.

The ghost started to think that he shall try to steal a little of that living clay of God. On the seventh day, God was resting and sleeping on the top of the golden statue when the ghost arose out of the water, stole a little piece of that living clay, and hid it behind his cheek.

The ghost unsuccessfully tried to make from it his evil plants and animals.

---

[11] For example, Almén, B. A Theory of Musical Narrative. Indiana University Press, 2008.

Then God continued creation, resting every seventh day because of the Sabbath. And when God had created all the good things, he finally blessed all his work saying: "Let all the clay, wherein I blew the spirit of life, multiplies and grows up!"

At that moment, the animals and trees and grains started to multiply and grow at a miraculous pace. But there was also a tiny ball of living clay hidden in the ghost's mouth. At the moment, when God commanded his clay to multiply, that ball also began to multiply and swell.

God noticed that the ghost's cheek got bigger and asked: "What do you have placed between your cheek and gums?" "Snuff," the ghost answered. The clay in the ghost's mouth started growing so fast that he barely could hold his mouth closed.

"Why are you making such a grimace," God asked. The devil fearing the punishment, lied to God: "My teeth hurt!" But the clay continued swelling.

The devil was dying from a headache and could not breathe. He could not anymore hold the growing clay in his mouth, and it started to spurt out of his mouth. Because the devil stood to the North, the clay flew far to the North.

"What did you do?" God asked. "You stole my clay because it was about to grow and multiply? And when I blessed the clay, it also began to grow - and got hard in your mouth like rocks and stones. And as rocks and stones, the claw flew to that northern end of the world. Because of you, there is now an eternal curse put on the ploughmen of the North," God said.

And so it is; since then, the Nordic land has been rocky and cowered with stones. But this did not stop the devil from stealing the remnants of that creation clay of God and making other evil animals and plants, such as snakes, insects, flies, thistle and burdock.[12]

At the agential level of this myth, one finds two agents – God and the devil[13]. One can assume that the norm encoded at the agential level is that it is wrong to not obey orders. Since God gives orders to the devil, one assumes that at the agential level God is the unmarked constituent of the correlation "God – the devil". At the actantial level, one can observe changes in markedness and rank. If God at the beginning of the myth was unmarked

---

[12] In Finnish "Miten kivet ja kalliot pohjolaan luotiin". In Lehtonen's "Ilvolan juttuja. Kansansatusovitelmia Suomen lapsille". Otava, Helsinki, 1932. Available from: http://www.lonnrot.net/etext.html [23 April 2021].
[13] "D" is not capitalised, because the first letter of *piru* (the devil) in the Finnish version of this myth is neither capitalised.

and his value higher, then at the actantial level the rank of the devil increased. This, consequently, initiated the narrative activity of this myth. At the narrative level, the previous order with some modifications got restored. One assumes that whereas God is the symbol of obedience, the devil is the transgressor. The moral of the whole story is that if one decides to violate the norm, he or she shares the same qualities as the devil and sooner or later will get caught. One can assume that the given nation expects its members to identify with God and not with the devil.

According to Castrén, God is the highest deity in Finnish mythology (Castrén, 2016, p. 16). He lives in heaven, from where he supervises all other deities. (ibid., p. 16). Sometimes people refer to him as *Ukko* (the old man in English) (ibid., p. 16). In Castrén's opinion, the evil or the devil is the concept that became part of Finnish mythology due to the influence of Christianity. He thinks that the devil (*piru* or *perkele* in Finnish) Finns have borrowed from the mythology of Indo-Germanic peoples, such as Slavs (*Perun*), Lithuanians (*Perkunas*) and Latvians (*Pērkons*) (ibid., p. 155).

7.2 The Origin of the Raven

> *Yes, I know how the raven was born. I am familiar with the origin of the eater. I know from what the black bird was created and how it was bred. The scoundrel raven, Lempo's bird, the most disgusting bird flying in the air, was born on a charcoal hill, where it was reared on a coaly heath, gathered from burning brands, and bred from charcoal sticks. Its head was made of potsherds, its breastbone from Lempo's spinning wheel and its tail from Lempo's sail, its shanks from crooked sticks, its belly from a wretch's sack, its guts from Lempo's needle-case, its rump from an air-ring, its crop from a worn-out kettle, its neck from Hiisi's loom, its beak from a sorcerer's arrow-tip, its tongue from Kirki's axe, and its eyes from a mussel pearl.*[14]

Since in this myth one cannot observe a change in a state of affairs, one can only presuppose that the narrator of this myth presents to his audience the symbol of something

---

[14] In Finnish "Korpin synty". In Lönnrot's "Suomen kansan muinaisia loitsurunoja". Helsinki, Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran kirjapainossa, 1880. Available from: http://www.lonnrot.net/etext.html [23 April 2021].

what is not good. The narrator in this myth assigns the following characteristics and roles to the raven:

the raven

the eater

the black bird

the scoundrel

the most disgusting bird flying in the air

Lempo's bird

is connected with Hiisi and Kirki

Lempo originally was the god of love and fertility in Finnish mythology, but due to the influence of Christianity, his reputation worsened (Castrén, M. A., 2016, pp. 155-161).

Hiisi, similarly to Lempo, was also considered to be something good. Hiisi was used to be a spirit in Finnish mythology. As times passed, its meaning changed. Under the influence of Christianity, Hiisi became an evil creature. (ibid., p. 53). Information about Kirki's place in Finnish mythology one was not able to find. One assumes that Kirki is borrowed from Greek mythology and is Circe[15].

From the information above, one can conclude that the narrator creates the symbol of the transgressor. This symbol is supposed to help people detect the evil forces present in their environment.

7.3 The Origin of the Cat

Of course, I know how the cat was born. I know about the incubation of the "greybeard". It was obtained on a stone. Whereas its nose is a girl's nose, its head is a hare's head. From Hiisi's plait of hair was made its tail. Its claws are of a viper. As feet, it has cloudberries, and the rest of its body comes from a wolf.[16]

The narrator in this myth assigns the following characteristics and roles to the cat:

---

[15] The goddess of sorcery.

[16] In Finnish "Kissan synty". In Lönnrot's "Suomen kansan muinaisia loitsurunoja". Helsinki, Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran kirjapainossa, 1880. Available from: http://www.lonnrot.net/etext.html [23 April 2021].

the cat

greybeard

was obtained on a stone

has a girl's nose

has a hare's head

has tail made from Hiisi's plait of hair

has viper's claws

has cloudberries as feet

the rest of its body comes from a wolf

Based on the cat's characteristics mentioned above, one can assume that the cat symbolises something not very good. For example, its tail was made from Hiisi's plait of hair, and the rest of its body comes from a wolf. The wolf in Finnish mythology is not considered as a valuable animal. People feared and hated it. The Finnish word for wolf is *susi*. *Susi* can be translated into English also as "a useless thing".

But since this myth, similarly to the previous one, portrays just a single agent, it is hard to guarantee that the given assumption about the cat being the embodiment of something negative is veracious.

Since people are used to perceiving cats and dogs as rivals having different qualities, perhaps the myth in the next section will bring some clarity into this situation. One thinks that the agents found in these two myths can be comparable because both myths come from the same book, "Suomen kansan muinaisia loitsurunoja" (Lönnrot 1880).

7.4 The Origin of the Dog

Of course, I know the dog's genesis. I am familiar with the puppy's origin. It was born in a field. Nine fathers produced it, and one mother brought it to birth. The Earth's mistress, Manuhutar, knocked its head out from a grassy knoll. Its legs she procured from stakes. Its ears she made from warm water-lily leaves. Its gums she struck out from life spirit, and his nose she formed from wind.[17]

---

[17] In Finnish "Koiran synty". In Lönnrot's "Suomen kansan muinaisia loitsurunoja". Helsinki, Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran kirjapainossa, 1880. Available from: http://www.lonnrot.net/etext.html [23 April 2021].

The narrator in this myth assigns the following characteristics and roles to the dog:

the dog

equals puppy

was born on a field

has nine fathers and one mother

has Manuhutar as its mother

has head from a grassy knoll

has legs from stakes

has ears made from warm-lily leaves

has its gums struck out from life spirit

has nose formed from wind

Based on the characteristics mentioned above, one can consider the dog as the symbol of something good.

If one compares both myths ("The Origin of the Cat" (from section 7.3) and "The Origin of the Dog") with each other and the qualities assigned to the agents present in them, one can establish a correlation "*dog – cat*" and consequently conclude which constituent from both is the marked and which one unmarked.

If one considers all characteristics assigned to both the cat (p. 46) and the dog (p. 47), one can conclude that the cat is the marked constituent and the dog is unmarked. Already the first fact that the cat is born on a stone and dog on a field indicates that the cat could be the valuation of some norm. As one already knows from the myth "How Stones and Rocks Were Created in the North" (section 7.1) stones are not being considered in Finnish society as something good and valuable.

7.5 Mielikki and Kuurikki

O forest-mistress, Mielikki,
the beautiful forest mother,
clothe yourself in the robe of luck,
attire yourself in the robe of generosity,
put the golden rings on your fingers,

wrap up your hands in the gold,

place the golden ribbon on your head,

put the golden earrings in your ears,

envelop your neck with the best pearls!

Often the noble mistress Mielikki,

after she has put the golden rings on,

wrapped up her hands in the gold,

placed the golden ribbon on her head,

put the golden earrings in her ears,

and enveloped her neck with best pearls,

come to help those in need.

Come, Mielikki, before comes

the cruel mistress Kuurikki

who has withy rings on her fingers,

the bracelets of witches on her arms,

the withy ribbon as her head bound,

in withy ringlets her locks,

withy pendants in her ears,

and the evil pearls around the neck!

Come, Mielikki, before comes

Kuurikki, the cruel mistress

not willing to help those in need![18]

In this myth are present two agents – Mielikki and Kuurikki. The narrator assigns to them the following characteristics and roles:

Mielikki	**Kuurikki**
beautiful	ugly
helps	does not help

Since the qualities assigned to Mielikki outweigh those of Kuurikki, one assumes that Mielikki is the unmarked constituent of the correlation "Mielikki – Kuurikki". One

---

[18] The folk song number 334 "Miellikki ja Kuurikki" in Lönnrot's "Kanteletar".

presupposes that the given society prefers beauty over ugliness and postulates that beautiful creatures tend to help, whereas the ugly ones not.

According to Castrén, Mielikki in Finnish mythology is the wife of Tapio (Castrén, M. A., 2016, pp. 114-145, 149). She is the forest mother and forest haltia. Other names for Mielikki are Mimerkki, Miiritär, Simanter, and Hiilitär. In Finnish folklore, she is portrayed as a beautiful woman with golden hair willing to help hunters.

Although not all stories analysed in the previous sections are myths from Liszka's perspective, one thinks that the simplified version of Liszka's theory or transvaluation helped one reveal something about Finns. Also, one thinks that Liszka's approach can be taken not only in the study of myths but also in other types of texts.

The next chapter is devoted to the Latvian myths.

8. LATVIAN MYTHS

When one starts looking for myths in Latvian folklore, one can find lots of various tales fulfilling Liszka's criteria for a story to count as a myth. There are stories portraying the absence of an order or dissatisfaction with the current one and, also, stories explaining, for example, the appearance of different languages or cultural artefact. One can say that in Latvian folklore are present all sorts of myths – aetiological, historical and psychological. Often in Latvian myths are portrayed at least two agents enabling one to detect what the given nation considered to be a norm and correspondingly its violation. All sorts of agents – deities, mythical creatures, national heroes and humans – are present in Latvian myths.

The above stated conclusions the author of this Master's thesis has drawn after getting familiar with the Latvian myths found at LU LFMI Latviešu folkloras krātuve, LU MII Mākslīgā intelekta laboratorija[19] and in digital archives of Latvian folklore[20].

Since one can find in Latvian folklore all sorts of myths, the author has decided for further study to select various myths to create a detailed picture of Latvians.

8.1 Creation of the World

When the world still did not exist, God with the Devil spent their days flying around in an infinite void. But then one day, God decided to create the world, and he said: "Listen, the Devil, you can run fast. Fly down and find the place where strange debris and dust are turning in a whirlwind. Gather some and afterwards bring the gathered to me." The Devil obeyed and hastily flew down.

Although he had run like a bullet, it took a good while to reach the described place. The Devil was trying his best to gather some particles of the mass. After quite a struggle, he succeeded to grab some of it.

But then, the Devil started to think about God and his intentions. He wondered if God wants them to use for his own good. After giving serious thought to it, the Devil decided to keep some part of the gathered debris and dust only for himself. Since the Devil had no garment to hide it, he put it into his mouth.

---

[19] Available from: http://pasakas.lfk.lv/ [24 April 2021].
[20] Available from: http://www.garamantas.lv/?lang=en [24 April 2021].

Holding the rest, the Devil started his way back to God. When he returned to God, he poured the dust and debris into his hand. Afterwards, God sowed them in the expanse of heaven and said: "Let it grow and be green." And behold, immediately upon the bottom appeared good, green, and flat land with the growing trees and blossoming flowers.

But then, the Devil noticed something also growing in his mouth. His cheeks protruded like mountains, and the Devil turned away from God so that God could not see his face. He managed to keep his mouth closed for some time, but then came the moment when he could not anymore. As a result, large earth clods started falling out from the Devil's mouth on the newly created world.

Nowadays, these clods are still visible all over the earth, and they are known as mountains.[21]

At the agential level of this myth, one finds two agents – God and the Devil. It can be assumed that the norm encoded in this myth is that one must obey orders. At the actantial level, one can observe changes in markedness and rank between God and the Devil. If God at the beginning of the myth was unmarked and his value higher, then later (at the actantial level) Devil's rank increased. At the narrative level, the previous order got restored and God became superior to the Devil. One assumes that whereas God is the symbol of obedience, the Devil is the transgressor. The moral of the whole story is that if one decides to violate the norm, he or she shares the same qualities as the Devil and sooner or later will get caught. One can assume that the given nation expects its members to identify with God and not with the Devil.

8.2 Why Does the Moon Change Shape

In ancient times, the dear Sun tied the knot with the shining Moon. For a long time, they lived happily and inseparably. They used to go to sleep and wake up together and had lots of children – the stars in the sky.

But one fine morning, the Sun woke up and noticed her[22] husband was gone. To look for him, the Sun started to rise earlier in the mornings. By doing so, she found out

---

[21] Available (in Latvian and German) from: LU LFMI Latviešu folkloras krātuve, LU MII Mākslīgā intelekta laboratorija, http://pasakas.lfk.lv/wiki/130201008 [16 April 2021].
[22] Contrary to the English, the Latvians refer to the Sun as a female and the Moon as a male.

that the Moon had become faithless. The Moon had fallen in love with the Sun's daughter – the fiancée of Auseklis[23].

With the burning heart, the Sun took a sharp sword and cut the unfaithful husband to pieces.

Therefore, the Moon often does not appear intact even today but as cut in two.

However, since that time, nothing has changed. The Moon is and remains the naughty boy. Every evening, when his wife lies down, he stands surreptitiously up and goes to visit his mistress. The Sun, on the other hand, tries to stay close to her daughter out of jealously.[24]

At the agential level of this myth, one finds two agents – the Sun and the Moon. One can assume that the norm encoded at the agential level is that if you decide to be with someone in the relationship, you are supposed to be faithful. Both the Sun and the Moon at the agential level are equals. Only later, at the actantial level, the value of the Moon increases. This initiates the narrative activity of this myth. At the narrative level, one can observe the creation of a new order – the Sun becomes the unmarked constituent of correlation "the Sun – the Moon". Whereas the Sun becomes the symbol of obedience, the Moon becomes the transgressor. The moral of the whole story is that if one decides to violate the norm, one embodies the qualities of the Moon and sooner or later, one will get caught and consequently punished. It is expected that the members of the given community choose to identify with the Sun and not with the Moon.

8.3 God Determines the Length of Life

God was in the process of determining the lifespan of animals and humans.

A horse was the first to come before God, and God said to it: "You shall live thirty years!" "That is too much," the horse objected. "I have to work so hard. In my last years, I will no longer be able to drag my bones". And the horse haggled until they agreed on eighteen years.

The second who came before God was a dog, and God told it: "You shall live thirty years!" "This is too much," the dog complained. "I have to freeze outside at

---

[23] The deity of the daybreak.
[24] Available (in Latvian and German) from: LU LFMI Latviešu folkloras krātuve, LU MII Mākslīgā intelekta laboratorija, http://pasakas.lfk.lv/wiki/130301002 [16 April .2021].

night, and during the day, I have a lot to do. In the end, I will no longer be able to earn my daily bread." And the dog moaned until God gave it a lifespan of twelve years.

A monkey appeared third, and God said again: "You shall live thirty years!" "This is too much," the monkey replied. "I have to play the fool all my life," he explained. And the monkey haggled until God gave it a lifespan of ten years.

The fourth came a man, and God also to him said: "You shall live thirty years!" "This is too little," the man complained. "At that age, I will just come to my senses. You should add more years to me," the man insisted. God added the eighteen years of the horse. But the man continued to haggle and said, "That is not enough because my children will not be grown up yet." The God added the twelve years of the dog, but the man was still unsatisfied with God's decision and told him that it is too few. In the end, God also gave the man the years of the monkey. The man was finally pleased with God's decision.

Since that time, nothing has changed. During the first thirty years, the man is fine. Then during his horse years, the man has to work hard. In the dog years, he no longer has good teeth and has to gnaw like the dog. In his monkey years, he only has the foolishness left over.[25]

At the agential level of this myth, one finds five agents – God, the horse, the dog, the monkey and the man. At the actantial level, one can observe how the animals and the man were unrespectful towards God. At the narrative level, one can detect a certain social hierarchy. One can see that God is superior, and all animals and humans are under his authority. The man is in a higher position than the animals. One can conclude that the horse's value is higher than the value of the dog or the value of the monkey. The monkey has the lowest rank in the given hierarchy:

<div align="center">

God

the man

the horse

the dog

the monkey

</div>

---

[25]Available (in Latvian and German) from: LU LFMI Latviešu folkloras krātuve, LU MII Mākslīgā intelekta laboratorija, http://pasakas.lfk.lv/wiki/130105001 [16 April 2021].

8.4 Why a Woman Never Has Time

In ancient times, God walked upon the earth looking like an old man. Walking like that, he once got lost and did not know where to go.

He stopped at a farm and asked a woman to show him the way. The woman replied: "I have no time to show every tramp the way. Go to the field where the ploughman will show you the way."

"Okay," said the old man, "if you have so little time, you will not have time for anything in your life." After saying this, the aged man went to the field to the ploughman.

The ploughman stopped the work, asked him to sit down next to him and offered to smoke a pipe. When the aged man had rested, he asked the ploughman to show him where to go. The ploughman showed him the way, and he walked away.

Since that time, the ploughman has always had time to talk and smoke a pipe, but the woman has to run from one job to another and never has time.[26]

At the agential level, one finds three agents – God, the woman and the man. God, in terms of this story, acts as a voice of the given society and has the highest position in the society. He decides based on the qualities (assigned at the actantial level) of the man and woman who to favour. One can assume that the norm encoded at the agential level is that people get what they deserve. Since the value of the man's qualities outweighs the value of the woman's, the man at the narrative level becomes the unmarked constituent of the correlation "woman – man". Whereas the man becomes the symbol of obedience, the woman becomes the transgressor. The moral of the whole story is that if one decides to violate the norm, all that he or she will have at the end will be suffers. One can assume that the given society places men on a higher rank than women.

8.5 Why Small Children Do Not Walk

In ancient times, a woman gave birth to her child. At the same time, a cow calved. God commanded a woman to throw her child over the chimney and, similarly, he

---

[26] Available (in Latvian and German) from: LU LFMI Latviešu folkloras krātuve, LU MII Mākslīgā intelekta laboratorija, http://pasakas.lfk.lv/wiki/130110001 [23 April 2021].

commanded a cow to throw her calf over her horns. He wanted them to do it that their children would be strong and could immediately walk right away they had born.

Whereas the cow obeyed God's order and threw her calf over her horns, the woman did not. The woman did not believe that her child could survive the throw.

After that, the calf immediately began to walk on its own legs, but the woman's child did not.

Therefore, human children, since that time, cannot walk right after they are born.[27]

At the agential level of this myth, one finds three agents – God, the woman and the cow. God, in terms of this story, acts as a voice of the given society and has the highest position in the society's hierarchy. Based on the characteristics that get assigned, at the actantial level, to the woman and the cow, one concludes that the cow ranks higher than the woman.

When one compares the given tale and the tales "God Determines the Length of Life" (section 8.3) and "Why a Woman Never Has Time" (section 8.4), one can presuppose that at some point in Latvian history, the hierarchical structure of the society was the following[28]:

God

men

animals

women

8.6 Laima

It has been a long, long time since Laima walked the earth, and everyone could see her. She had a child, but the child got lost in the world. Laima mourned her child incredibly and did not show herself to the people for a very long time.

---

[27] Available (in Latvian and German) from: LU LFMI Latviešu folkloras krātuve, LU MII Mākslīgā intelekta laboratorija, http://pasakas.lfk.lv/wiki/130103008 [26 April 2021].

[28] Here one guesses what ought to be because it is almost impossible to find out the exact date and place when the given myth was told for the first time. It is a possible model of the Latvian society around the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century. The date, the place of their recording and the information about the collector (not all data is known) were the entities that guided one in creating this model.

Eventually, she decided to look all over the world for her child. Laima only had one eye, and the same one was above her head.

Laima roamed the world, and as soon as she met someone, she lifted him over her head to see if it was not her child. As soon as she saw that it was not her child, she quickly put the person back on the ground. Instead of putting the person gently and slowly back to his place from where she had taken him, she threw him.

If Laima lifts a person to take a look at him, then the person is fine; if she puts him back on the ground, the person does not do well in his life.

Even these days, Laima still wanders around the world looking for her child, only today she is invisible to the human eye.[29]

At the agential level of this myth, can be found only one agent – Laima. At the actantial level, the narrator assigns to her the following characteristics and roles:

Laima[30]

can be good

can be bad

is superior to people

experiences the same emotions as people do

One can assume that Laima, the same as people, can be sometimes good and sometimes bad. Also, one can deduce that the Latvian pagans believed that deities experience the same emotions as people do. Perhaps the message of the whole myth is that in the life are forces that affect the human life without asking for his or her permission and that everyone experience both good days and bad days.

8.7 Basic Views and Cosmogony of the ancient Latvians

When one gets familiar with Latvian folklore, one will discover that, like in most cultures of the world, there is also an eternal struggle between good and evil, light and

---

[29] Available (in Latvian and German) from: LU LFMI Latviešu folkloras krātuve, LU MII Mākslīgā intelekta laboratorija, http://pasakas.lfk.lv/wiki/131501003 [26 April 2021].
[30] The goddess of faith.

darkness, life and death in the ancient Latvian mythological scene. Although this eternal struggle in Latvian mythology is not as polar as, say, in Christianity.

In Latvian mythology, deities are neither good nor bad. They are ambivalent. For example, *Laima* can be sometimes kind and sometimes evil to people (Kursīte, 2009, Laima; Šmits, 1918, pp. 2-5). Despite being associated with chaos, the Devil participates in world creation and may punish bad people (Šmits, 1918, pp. 62-63; Kursīte, 1996, pp. 8-9, 12534-0[31]). Even God may cheat other deities (Kursīte, 1996, p. 19; Šmits, 1918, p. 63). A deity's behaviour, in Latvian mythology, varies from situation to situation and depends on his or her relationship with other gods and people.

The world for the ancient Latvian is full of various spirits and deities who either try to disturb him or help in the struggle for survival. The Latvian pagan turns to gods at all times, whether he plans to start a job or goes about his day. The realm of magic is right next door, forcing him to acquire lots of knowledge to deal with sometimes quite capricious deities or not ruin the natural balance of things.

The pagan Latvian has a weak sense of individuality. He is one of his community, and everything outside it is strange. Nor he separates himself from nature. In his opinion, animals, plants and other "inanimate things" are endowed with feelings, mind and soul. Werewolves in Latvian mythology are direct evidence of the close link between man and nature (Kursīte, 2009, Vilkatis; Šmits, 1918, p. 126). Sons of bears and mares and other zoological wonders are considered natural phenomena in the Latvian pagan world (Šmits, 1918, p. 127; Kursīte, 1996, p. 32). One can assume that despite feeling connected to nature and animals, the Latvian pagan ranked himself higher than animals. The rightness of this assumption can be grounded in the fact that when Latvians were making sacrifices of living beings, they chose to sacrifice animals for gods instead of somebody of their own kind (Šmits, 1918, pp. 100-127; Kursīte, 1996, pp. 32-334). According to Kursīte, animals in Latvian mythology are not equal (Kursīte, 1996, pp. 32-334). For example, a cow in Latvian mythology has a higher value than a chicken.

The claim that the world for the ancient Latvian was hierarchical and that he had a fixed place in it is veracious. According to Kursīte, the world for the ancient Latvians is threefold (Kursīte, 1996, pp. 15, 102). Above is heaven's court, where his days spends God with his family. Also, there live the Sun and the Moon with their companions. In the middle

---

[31] The Latvian folk song number #12534. Available (in Latvian) from: http://dainuskapis.lv/daina/12534-0-Jauneklu-puisu-un-meitu-savstarpeja-satiksme [15 April 2021].

is the human realm. One can find in it not only mortal men and women but various lower deities and mythical creatures. At the bottom lives the mother of wraiths and the Devil. The ancient Latvian spends his days believing that after he dies, he continuous his life in this underground world (Šmits, 1918, p. 5). Also, there is a belief that all these realms are connected, i.e., what is happening in one actively influences the others.

Kursīte claims that one often may find in Latvian myths that God in the creation of the world cooperates with the Devil (Kursīte, 1996, pp. 8-9). According to her, whereas God in the Latvian folklore is associated with harmony, the Devil with disharmony (Kursīte, 1996, pp. 9). In Šmits's opinion, although sometimes it is hard to tell if God, i.e., the heavenly father, is the same God as *Pērkons* (the god of thunder) or not (Šmits, 1918, pp. 20-22), he is one of the two highest deities in Latvian mythology.

About the Moon being unfaithful to his wife – the Sun, one can find lots of folk songs and tales in Latvian folklore. (Šmits, 1918, pp. 16-19). According to Kursīte, in Latvian mythology, the Sun is the queen of heaven and is connected with day and light (Kursīte, 2006, Saule). The Moon, on the contrary to the Sun, is associated with night and darkness (ibid., Mēness). Auseklis, also called the morning star, in the Latvian mythological thinking, is the son of God (ibid., Auseklis) and the fiancée of one of the Sun's daughters.

Here should be added that one in the Latvian folk material can find different variations of the relationships among these agents. Similarly, to the Sun, who is sometimes romantically drawn to Auseklis, the Moon can be the fiancée of the Sun's daughter.

From everything written in this section one can assume that the results obtained through tri-levelled analysis of the Latvian myths in sections 8.1-8.6 are veracious. Consequently, one concludes that Liszka's method of transvaluation is functional and can be used in the study of Latvian folklore material.

If myths were something which origin is possible to date precisely, it would be possible through Liszka's method of transvaluation to create a very detailed picture of a community at a certain point in time. This could be done by putting together and comparing correlations from many myths. Like it was done by the author in section 8.5.

The next chapter is devoted to studying Czech myths.

9. CZECH MYTHS

When looking for the Czech myths, one got familiar with the following works: "Kosmůw letopis český" (Kosmas 2011), "Staré pověsti české" (Jirásek 2011), "Staropražské pověsti a legendy" (Kosnář 1947), "Šestero pověstí šumavských" (Peška 2017), "Daliminova kronika" (2011), fairytales of Božena Němcová (1979) and Karel Jaromír Erben (1983). These texts were all that the author could find containing some Czech folklore texts.

After the author familiarised herself with the given texts, she was able to make the following conclusions: 1) Deities and mythical creatures are not often found in Czech myths. 2) The most common agents in Czech myths are those of the human realm. 3) The majority of Czech myths explain the emergence of some social phenomenon. 4) One can find lots of myths in Czech folklore that meet Liszka's criteria for a story to count as a myth. 5) Some of Czech myths are not their own creation but are derived from somebody else[32].

The author has decided to analyse the following myths by means of Liszka's transvaluation because they are some of the most well-known myths among Czechs.

9.1 About the Tower of Babel

Once all people except eight perished in the water because of their sins. Those who survived rose in the East and headed in the direction of the South. The survivors were afraid of new floods.

When they reached one field called Shinar, they sat down and announced: "Let's build a tower which reaches to the heavens."

They started building the tower from hard bricks and used size instead of lime. At that time, they all spoke one language. Their deed displeased God, and he decided to confuse their languages so that brothers could not anymore understand each other. As a result, each of them started speaking their own unique language.

Then they stopped building the tower and went their separate ways. Everyone appropriated certain lands, and thus a variety of moral rules arose.

---

[32] The myth "About the Tower of Babel" is obviously taken from Old Testament.

Where the Greeks lived along the sea, also Slavs settled down and reproduced till Rome.[33]

At the agential level of this myth, one finds two agents – God and eight brothers. It seems that the norm encoded in it is that people should be respectful towards God and should know their place in the social hierarchy. One concludes that men are subordinated to God. At the actantial level, eight brothers become transgressors of this norm. The increase of their rank in relation to God initiates the narrative activity of this myth. One can observe at the end of this myth the restoration of the norm.

9.2 About the Forefather Čech

Once upon a time, two brothers with their families lived by the Vistula River. The name of one brother was Čech, and the name of the second one was Lech.

Unfortunately, their life by the Vistula River was not calm and safe. After some time to the area, they inhabited came other tribes. Instead of being friendly, the newcomers were very combative. As soon as the foreign men set out, they started killing the former people and rubbing their houses. Whereas men needed to fight against intruders to defend their homes, women with their children needed to hide in the woods.

"We cannot continue to live like this," the brothers said one day to their families. "It seems that here we will never again have peace. We should leave this land and look for a new place to live," they agreed and left the old settlement.

Their journey was long and not easy. No matter where they went, the lands were already inhabited by someone. Their children cried, the women lamented. Also, they were running out of food. The men, even though they were clenching their teeth, had pain in their legs. They were wandering around till they reached a mountain.

"We will rest here," the brothers decided, "it is getting dark anyway." They all went to sleep, and their night here was calm.

In the morning, Čech was the first to wake up. He told others that they need to continue to look for a place where to live. Čech did not know which direction to go.

---

[33] "Od babylonské věže a o sedmi dcát jazyciech" in Dalimilova kronika. MKP 1. vyd. Praha: Městská knihovna v Praze, 2011. Available from: http://web2.mlp.cz/koweb/00/03/36/98/64/dalimilova_kronika.pdf [19 April 2021].

He decided to climb to the top of the mountain to look around and later decide where to go.

It was not very high, and Čech very soon reached its top. He started looking around the region. "It is so beautiful here. Meadows are fertile and green. Also, I see deep forests and lots of rivers and streams," he said. Seeing the sun shining, everything around blooming, bees buzzing in the air, and birds flying under the blue sky, Čech spot a deer and a hare in the forest. And, most importantly, he saw nowhere a single trace of some human dwelling.

Čech ran down the mountain as fast as he could and immediately woke up his family. "We are here. We are going to live here," he announced, "this land is full of animals and birds, and I did not see any human dwelling in this area."

His people were happy to hear it. They immediately threw themselves into work. They cut down some trees, built houses for themselves, started cultivating fields. This wonderful land they started calling Bohemia.

Only Lech was not satisfied with the given state of affairs. Lech regretted that that morning when Čech found the place for them to settle down, he did not stand up before his brother. Lech did not like that all fame went to his brother Čech. He was feeling so devastated that he even could not sleep at night.

One day, Lech said to himself: "I cannot continue this way." He went to his family. He persuaded his family to leave together with him, and they set out to look for another place to live far away from the lands surrounding the mountain Říp.[34]

In this myth can be observed a crisis and consequently a change in the state of affairs. At the agential level, one finds two agents – Čech and Lech, who lost their home and thus need to be looking for a new place to live. One assumes that the norm encoded at the agential level is that the ruler can be just one. Since the qualities assigned to Čech outweigh those of Lech, Čech at the narrative level becomes the unmarked constituent of the correlation "Čech – Lech". Whereas Čech becomes the symbol of obedience, Lech becomes the transgressor. At the narrative level, a new order gets established. Whereas the family of Čech, at the narrative level, finds new land to inhabit, Lech's family needs to continue their search.

---

[34] A simplified version of the tale "O Čechovi" available in Czech in "Staré pověsti České" (2011), pp. 10-17.

9.3 About Libuše and Přemysl

Libuše ruled wisely at Vyšehrad. She always judged fairly the arguments and conflicts of people who came to her and asked for help. People liked and were satisfied with her. They respected her decisions.

But then, one day, to her came two quarrelsome neighbours. They argued over the field, one accusing the other of pushing its borders.

Libuše convened an assembly, which heard both neighbours out. Libuše was deciding about the best solution to the quarrel between both men. She decided to ask the members of the assembly for a piece of advice. After some thinking, she decided. "The younger man is right, and the land over which both of you quarrel is going to become his," Libuše announced.

The man who lost the dispute became furious and said to her: "Women have long hair but are half-witted. Woe to the men whom the woman rules." His words saddened Libuše. But she realised that a man could be a better ruler, and if only she had some man next to her, she would not need to be all the time alone and do everything on her own.

And she said: "Yes, I am a woman and rule like a woman. I do not judge you as strictly as a man would do. If you want a man to rule you, I wish that your wish becomes true. Let my horse run. Then follow it, and where it will stop, you will find your future ruler.

The next morning men started preparing for the journey. They did not know where they will go or how long their journey will take. Then they let her white horse out of the stable. They put the cloak on its saddle and let it ride out through the gate.

The men followed the horse. They all wandered in direction to the west for three days and three nights. The horse seemed to know the way.

On the third day, they arrived at the river Bílina. On its bank stood a settlement called Stadice. A man was ploughing a field behind it. He had two oxen and a hazel rod.

The white horse stopped at the man, and the men looking for a ruler knew that they have finally found the one. The eldest of men asked ploughman, "What is your name." "My name is Přemysl," the ploughman replied. „Přemysl, our current ruler

Libuse and all the nation wants you to become our new ruler and rule our country fairly.“[35]

Přemysl rammed the hazel rod into the ground and said, "Unfortunately, I have not finished ploughing this field. If you came later, our country would never know hunger."

Suddenly, three twigs grew out of the hazel rod, and green leaves started to grow on one of them. The men were astonished. Suddenly two twigs dried up, leaving only one.

"This means," explained Přemysl, "that this country will have several rulers, but only one of them will actually rule."

The men helped Přemysl to change into the prince's cloak and they were surprised when Přemysl decided to take his old shoes with him. "Why do you not leave them here," they asked him. "I want my descendants to know where they come from and never to rise above anyone," he answered.

When Přemysl arrived at Vyšehrad, he married Libuše. Přemysl, called the ploughman, started to rule the country together with Libuše after their wedding, and he ruled wisely and fairly.

At the agential level of this myth, one finds two agents – Libuše and Přemysl. It seems that the norm encoded at the agential level is that the ruler can be just one. Also, one presupposes based on this myth that Czechs before Libuše were used to have a male ruler. Since the qualities assigned to Přemysl outweigh those of Libuše, Přemysl at the narrative level becomes the unmarked constituent of the correlation "Libuše – Přemysl". Whereas Přemysl becomes the symbol of obedience, Libuše becomes the transgressor. When Přemysl, at the narrative level, becomes the ruler, the previous order gets restored.

In the following chapter, one can find conclusions that the author of this Master's thesis drawn during the writing process of this work.

---

[35] A simplified version of the tales „O Libuši" and „O Přemyslovi" available in Czech in "Staré pověsti České" (2011), pp. 27-34.

CONCLUSIONS

This Master's thesis aimed to study Finnish, Latvian and Czech myths from the perspective of transvaluation and consequently reveal some norms encoded in them.

In the first part of this Master's thesis, the author introduced Liszka's theory of transvaluation. This theory supposes that myths the same as Peirce's symbols during the time change and conduct the actions of people. According to Liszka, a community changes its symbols considering two things: 1) the current needs of the community and 2) their value. As stated by Liszka, it is possible to detect what a community at some point in time considered to be a norm and its violation only by approaching its myths synchronically. Liszka does it through Jakobson's theory of markedness. As believed by him, through this theory, one can detect various social constructs encoded in them. Often, in such a construct, one can find two constituents. One of the constituents is always superior to the other. According to Jakobson's theory, one of them is unmarked and the other – marked. One can assume that a community creates such constructs to set a standard and show what is acceptable for it. Over time, these asymmetrical social constructs change. Their constituents can exchange their places, or one or even both can get removed, thus giving place to new ones. As stated by Liszka, these asymmetrical constructs, in no case, are protected from repeated re-evaluation. To detect these constructs and changes in them, Liszka analyses myths at three interrelated levels – agential, actantial and narrative. Whereas the analysis of a myth at the agential level is supposed to uncover some norm encoded in it, the study of the myth at the actantial level should help one detect the behavioural patterns considered a threat to this norm. The examination of the last [the narrative] level, according to Liszka, should reveal symbols that embody either transgression or obedience to that norm.

In the second part of this Master's thesis, the author studied Finnish, Latvian and Czech myths by means of transvaluation. The stories for the purposes of the given study were selected considering Liszka's criteria for a story to count as a myth. These were the following: 1) it needs to explain the emergence of something that is still an integral part of a community's culture, 2) it portrays a change in a state of affairs. After the author selected the myths, she, similarly to Liszka, analysed them at three interrelated levels. As it turned out, not always the author was able to find stories fulfilling both Liszka's criteria. Also, the author not in all cases was able to detect some correlations.

In her studies of Finnish myths, the author discovered that it is a very challenging task in Finnish folklore to find stories that at the same time explain the emergence of something and also portrays a change in a state of affairs. Also, it was found out that a lot of Finnish myths that explain the origin of a natural phenomenon or cultural artefact contain only one agent. Consequently, it was not always possible to detect what Finns consider a norm and its violation. The author learnt that deities and mythical creators are not a rarity in Finnish myths. Also, the author found out that gods in Finnish myths rarely interact with humans.

One observed in Latvian folklore lots of various stories that one could consider from Liszka's perspective to be myths. There exist different myths explaining the emergence of natural phenomenon or the changes in the social hierarchy. One can detect in them all sorts of agents – gods, spirits, deities, humans, etc. The author observed that the most common agent that one can find in Latvian stories is God. Also, it was found out that there are not only myths where are present only gods but also myths where deities interact with people. The author learnt that the value and role of agents in Latvian myths are context-based. It means that their characteristics vary from story to story.

When the author familiarised herself with Czech folklore, she discovered that Czech myths are easily analysable by means of Liszka's method. The author found out that gods, goddesses or mythical creatures are not common agents in Czech stories. As it turned out, the most common agents in Czech myths are those of the human realm. Also, the author observed that Czech narrators, in their story-telling, focus on explaining the emergence of various social phenomenon and the model of the social hierarchy.

Although there were detected various norms in Finnish, Latvian and Czech myths and differences in the myth's structure and choice of agents among Finns, Latvians and Czechs, the author does not dare to say that these norms somehow portray unique perceptions of the world. Besides, it was discovered that some myths the given nations share. For instance, both in Finnish and Latvian folklore are present myths explaining the emergence of mountains, stones and rocks. Also, the agents acting in these myths are very similar in their characteristics. Additionally, the author discovered that both Czechs and Latvians have myths explaining the emergence of different languages. The discovery of these facts made the author think that the norms being passed among these nations from generation to generation are similar. For that reason, also, the world perception of these nations could be alike. Consequently, the hypothesis of this Master's thesis got rejected.

Since Liszka's method enabled the author to detect various social constructs, the author would like to assume that his method proved to be functional and can help one obtain

trustful results. Besides, the author thinks that Liszka's method can be applied not only in the studies of myths but also in the studies of legends and fairy tales. Also, in the author's opinion, Peirce's assumption of semiotics being compatible with other study fields is veracious.

In no way the conclusions expressed above shall indicate that the author got tired of thinking. On the contrary, things that got discovered will serve as a basis for the author's further studies both in folkloristics and semiotics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary

1.   Jakobson, R. and Bogatyrev, P. Folklore as a Special Form of Creation. Folklore Forum 13(1), 1980, pp. 1-21.

2.   Jakobson, R. Russian and Slavic Grammar Studies 1931-1981. Mouton Publishers, 1984, pp. 1-14. ISBN 90-279-3029-5.

3.   Liszka, J. J. A General Introduction to the Semeiotic of Charles Sanders Peirce. Indiana University Press, 1996. ISBN 0-253-33047-5.

4.   Liszka, J. J. Myth and Vision. Opción, Año 14, No. 25, Abril 1998, pp. 95-107. ISSN 1012-1587.

5.   Liszka, J. J. The Semiotic of Myth: A Critical Study of the Symbol (Advances in Semiotics). Indiana University Press, 1989. ISBN 0-253-33513-2.

6.   Saussure, F. de. Course in General Linguistics. New York, Philosophical Library, 1959.

7.   Sebeok, Th. A. Signs: An Introduction to Semiotics. Second edition. University of Toronto Press, 2001. ISBN 0-8020-8472-9.

8.   The Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce. Ed. Hartshorne, C, Weiss, P, and Burks, A. W. Charlottesville, Va.: InteLex Corp., 1994. Electronical edition.

9.   Uexküll, J. von. A Foray into the Worlds of Animals and Humans with A Theory of Meaning. University of Minnesota Press, 2010.

10.   Uexküll, J. von. The Theory of Meaning. 1982. Available from: https://monoskop.org/File:Uexkull_Jakob_von_1982_The_Theory_of_Meaning.pdf [10 April 2021].

11.   Wall, C. de. Peirce: A Guide for the Perplexed. Bloomsbury Academic, 2013. ISBN 978-1-4411-4327-3.

Secondary

1.   Almén, B. A Theory of Musical Narrative. Indiana University Press, 2008.

2.   Boas, F. General Anthropology. D. C. Heath and Company, 1983, pp. 609-626.

3.   Castrén, M. A. Luentoja suomalaisesta mytologiasta. Helsinki, Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, 2016.

4.   Condit, C. M. The Rhetorical Limits of Polysemy. Critical Studies in Mass Communication, Volume 6, Number 2, June 1989, pp. 103-122.

5.   Dalimilova kronika. MKP 1. vyd. Praha: Městská knihovna v Praze, 2011. Available from: http://web2.mlp.cz/koweb/00/03/36/98/64/dalimilova_kronika.pdf [19 April 2021].

6.   Danesi, M. Understanding Media Semiotics. Arnold, London, 2002.

7.   Deely, J. Four Ages of Understanding. University of Toronto Press, 2001.

8.   Digital   Archives   of   Latvian   Folklore.   Available   from: http://www.garamantas.lv/?lang=en [16 April 2021].

9.   Dundes, A. Binary Opposition in Myth: The Propp/Lévi-Strauss Debate in Retrospect, Western Folklore, Vol. 56, No. 1 (Winter, 1997), Western States Folklore Society,   pp. 39-50.   Available   from: https://www.jstor.org/stable/1500385 [19 April 2021].

10.   Eco, U. A Theory of Semiotics. Indiana University Press, 1976.

11.   Erben, K. J. Pohádky. Československý spisovatel, Praha, 1983.

12.   Ervast, P. The Key to the Kalevala. Literary Society of the Finnish Rosy Cross, 2018. ISBN 978-952-9603-53-4.

13.   Finne, J. Satujen maailma: Suomen kansan sadut. I kokoelma. Porvo, Werner Söderström Osakeyhtiö, 1909. Available from: http://www.lonnrot.net/etext.html [18 April 2021].

14.   Finne, J. Satujen maailma: Suomen kansan sadut. II kokoelma. Porvo, Werner Söderström Osakeyhtiö, 1910. Available from: http://www.lonnrot.net/etext.html [18 April 2021].

15.   Härkönen, I. Suomen kansan eläinsatuja. Helsinki, Kansanopettajain Osakeyhtiö Valistus, 1912. Available from: http://www.lonnrot.net/etext.html [18 April 2021].

16.   Härkönen, I. Suomen kansan peikkosatuja ynnä legendoja ja kertomussatuja. Helsinki, Kansanopettajain Osakeyhtiö Valistus, 1913. Available from: http://www.lonnrot.net/etext.html [18 April 2021].

17.   Härkönen, I. Suomen kansan seikkailusatuja. Helsinki, Kansanopettajain Osakeyhtiö Valistus, 1920. Available from: http://www.lonnrot.net/etext.html [18 April 2021].

18. Jirásek, A. Staré pověsti české. MKP 1. vyd. Praha: Městská knihovna v Praze, 2011. Available from: http://web2.mlp.cz/koweb/00/03/37/06/50/stare_povesti_ceske.pdf [18 April 2021].

19. Kerbelytė, B. Lietuvių tautosakos kūrinių prasmės. Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas, Kaunas, 2011, pp. 23-28. ISBN 978-9955-12-689-8.

20. Kosmas. Kosmův letopis český. MKP 1. vyd. praha: Městská knihovna v Praze, 2011. Available from: http://web2.mlp.cz/koweb/00/03/37/00/16/kosmuw_letopis_cesky.pdf [19 April 2021].

21. Kosnář, J. Staropražské pověsti a legendy. Druhé vydání. Vincentinum, Praha, 1947.

22. Krišjāņa Barona Dainu skapis. Available from: http://www.dainuskapis.lv/ [16 April 2021].

23. Kull, K. On Semiosis, Umwelt, and Semiosphere. Semiotica, 1998. Available from: https://www.academia.edu/38612077/On_semiosis_umwelt_and_semiosphere [10 April 2021].

24. Kursīte, J. Latviešu folklora mītu spogulī. Zinātne, Rīga, 1996. ISBN 5-7966-1126-7.

25. Kursīte, J. Tautlietu vārdene. SIA Dardedze Hologrāfija, Rīga, 2009.

26. Lange, J. Vollständiges deutschlettisches und lettischdeutsches Lexicon, nach den Hauptdialecten in Lief- und Curland. 1773, pp. 74-75. Available from: https://dspace.lu.lv/dspace/handle/7/4427 [19 April 2021].

27. Lehtonen, J. Ilvolan juttuja: kansansatusovitelmia Suomen lapsille. Otava, Helsinki, 1932. Available from: http://www.lonnrot.net/etext.html [23 April 2021].

28. Lehtonen, J. Kansansatusovitelmia Suomen lapsille. Helsinki, Otava, 1932. Available from: http://www.lonnrot.net/etext.html [18 April 2021].

29. Lehtonen, J. Tarulinna: Kansansatusovitelmia Suomen lapsille. Helsinki, Otava, 1932. Available from: http://www.lonnrot.net/etext.html [18 April 2021].

30. Lemeškin, I. Strukturální folkloristika. Minulost a budoucnost strukturalismu, Praha, 2016.

31. Lönnrot, E. Kalevala. Toinen painos. Helsinki. Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura, 1849.

32. Lönnrot, E. Kanteletar: taikka Suomen kansan wanhoja lauluja ja wirsiä. Available from: http://www.lonnrot.net/etext.html [17 April 2021].

33.   Lönnrot, E. Suomen kansan muinaisia loitsurunoja. Helsinki, Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, 1880. Available from: http://www.lonnrot.net/etext.html [18 April 2021].

34.   Lönnrot, E. Suomen kansan muinaisia loitsurunoja. Helsinki, Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran kirjapainos, 1880. Available from http://www.lonnrot.net/etext.html [18 April 2021].

35.   Lotman, Y. M. Universe of the Mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture. Indiana Univeristy Press, 1990. ISBN 0-253-33608-2.

36.   LU LFMI Latviešu folkloras krātuve, LU MII Mākslīgā intelekta laboratorija. Available from: http://pasakas.lfk.lv/ [12 May 2021].

37.   Manetti, G. Theories of the Sign in Classical Antiquity. Indiana University Press, 1993.

38.   Peška, B. Šestero pověstí šumavských. MKP 1. vyd. Praha: Městská knihovna v Praze, 2017. ISBN 9788075325839. Available from: http://web2.mlp.cz/koweb/00/04/31/55/13/sestero_povesti_sumavskych.pdf. [25 April 2021].

39.   Pohádky Boženy Němcové. Albatros, Praha, 1979.

40.   Salmelainen, E. Suomen kansan satuja ja tarinoita. Helsinki, Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, 1852 (ensimmäinen osa), 1854 (toinen osa); 1856 (kolmas osa); 1866 (neljäs osa). Available from: http://www.lonnrot.net/etext.html [18 April 2021].

41.   Schwindt, T. Kanssantaruja Laatokan luotei-rannikolta: kesällä 1879. Helsinki, Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, 1883 Available from: http://www.lonnrot.net/etext.html [18 April 2021].

42.   Short, T. L. Peirce's Theory of Signs. Cambridge University Press, 2007. ISBN 978-0-521-84320-1.

43.   Šmits, P. Latviešu mitoloģija. Latviešu rakstnieku un mākslinieku biedrība, Maskava, 1918.

44.   Stender, G. F. Lettisches Lexicon, darin alles nach den lettischen Stammwörtern aufzuschlagen. 1758, pp. 67-68. Available from: https://dom.lndb.lv/data/obj/58389.html [19 April 2021].

45.   Thompson, T. Myths and Folktales. The Journal of American Folklore, Oct. - Dec., 1955, Vol. 68, No. 270, Myth: A Symposium (Oct. – Dec., 1955), pp. 482-488. Published by American Folklore Society. Available from: https://www.jstor.org/stable/536773 [19 April 2021].

APPENDIX

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Abduction	A Synthetic type of inference.
Actantial level	The level at which one can detect various roles and qualities assigned to the heroes in the course of a myth.
Agential level	The level in a myth at which one can find various heroes.
Auseklis	Daybreak deity in Latvian mythology.
Deduction	An analytical type of inference.
Determination	A mode of inference that leads to an increase of a term's depth and restriction of its breadth.
Dievs	The highest deity in Latvian mythology.
Functional cycle	A process that enables one to connect a perception mark with an appropriate effect mark.
Ilmatar	A virgin spirit of the air in Finnish mythology
Induction	A synthetic type of inference.
Inference	The process during which one makes guesses and forms believes from things that are already known to him.

Interpretant	A habit, conventional rule, or association enabling one to connect a sign to its object.
Jumala	The highest deity in Finnish mythology.
Laima	The goddess of faith in Latvian mythology.
Marked	A violation of a norm.
Mielikki	The forest mistress and wife of Tapio in Finnish mythology.
Myth	A story which determines a culture's predominant moral understanding of the world.
Mythemic sequence	The basic unit of action in a myth.
Narrative level	The level in a myth at which one finds encoded the values and norms of a given community.
Perkele	The Devil in Finnish mythology.
Pērkons	The god of thunder, and one of the highest deities, in Latvian mythology
Semeion	A natural sign in the Greek language.
Saule	The queen of heaven in Latvian mythology.

Semiosis	A process in which signs get constituted, grow, and become more definite.
Semiosphere	An abstract sphere where several Umwelts get connected by sharing the same objects.
Semiotics	A formal and normative doctrine of signs studying communication processes taking place in society.
Sign	In terms of this Master's thesis, is a triadic relation between the representamen, interpretant and object.
Symbol	A sign representing a conventional relation between a sign and it object.
Transvaluation	A process during which get re-evaluated already known values.
Umwelt	The result of everything one perceives and everything it produces.
Unmarked	A norm.
Väinämöinen	A demigod, the first shaman in Finnish mythology.
Velns	The Devil in Latvian mythology.