

УДК 821.161.2.02

ЧОБАНЮК Марія – кандидат філологічних наук, доцент кафедри романської філології та компаративістики, Дрогобицький державний педагогічний університет імені Івана Франка (Україна, Дрогобич) (mariya_chobanyuk@ukr.net)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4917-8008>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24919/2522-4557.2019.44.191900>

Бібліографічний опис статті: Chobanyuk, M. (2019). Interpretation of Ukrainian postmodernism at the turn of millennium. *Проблеми гуманітарних наук: збірник наукових праць Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка. Серія «Філологія»*, 44, 109–117. doi: 10.24919/2522-4557.2019.44.191900.

ІНТЕРПРЕТАЦІЯ УКРАЇНСЬКОГО ПОСТМОДЕРНІЗМУ НА МЕЖІ ТИСЯЧОЛІТЬ

Анотація. У статті проаналізовано сутність реценції українського постмодернізму на межі XX та XXI століть. Зазначено, що постмодернізм – надзвичайно складне та багатовимірне явище сучасної культури, яке провокує наукові дискусії серед літературознавців, філософів, соціологів, культурологів, мистецтвознавців, політологів та інших. Серед досліджень вітчизняних літературознавців, присвячених проблемам українського літературного постмодернізму, варто назвати насамперед праці Т. Гундорової, Н. Зборовської, Р. Харчук, І. Старовойт, В. Агеевої, Д. Затонського, С. Андрусів, І. Фізера та інших.

Дискусії про постмодернізм і його репрезентацію в українській культурі актуальні й сьогодні. Акцент зроблено на літературному осмисленні саме українського постмодернізму. Український постмодернізм суттєво відрізняється від західної моделі постмодернізму через низку факторів, з-посеред яких – історичні обставини та національні особливості. У сучасному українському літературознавстві, зокрема в критиці, усталилася тенденція вести мову про дискурс постмодернізму передусім у теоретичному плані, і найвагоміша частина цього дискурсу пов'язана з визначенням меж, обґрунтуванням якісних характеристик цього явища, введенням у науковий обіг парадигми постмодерністських дефініцій і т. ін. Зазначено, що український постмодернізм зародився в політично складних нестабільних умовах, а розвивався у час, коли культура й соціум приходили до нормального стану, тобто в період здобуття Україною незалежності. Автор наголошує, що сучасна українська культура може постати лише на межі розвитку традиційної та новаторської тенденцій, а справжній культурний смисл сьогодення слід убачати в діалозі культур.

Дослідивши специфіку реценції українського постмодернізму на межі тисячоліть, автор висновує, що в постмодернізмі є багато моментів та аспектів, зумовлених, зокрема, його належністю до певних національних культур, котрі

потребують окремого розгляду та аналізу. Тема постмодернізму залишається актуальною для досліджень і має перспективи для подальшої праці над нею.

Ключові слова: постмодернізм; суспільство; діалог культур; дискурс; реценція.

CHOBANYUK Mariya – Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor, Department of Romance Philology and Comparative Studies, Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University (Ukraine, Drohobych) (mariya_chobanyuk@ukr.net)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4917-8008>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24919/2522-4557.2019.44.191900>

To cite this article: Chobanyuk, M. (2019). Interpretation of Ukrainian postmodernism at the turn of millennium. *Problemy humanitarnykh nauk: zbirnyk naukovykh prats Drohobyskoho derzhavnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu imeni Ivana Franka. Seriiia «Filolohiia» – Problems of Humanities. «Philology» Series: a collection of scientific articles of the Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University*, 44, 109–117. doi: 10.24919/2522-4557.2019.44.191900.

INTERPRETATION OF UKRAINIAN POSTMODERNISM AT THE TURN OF MILLENNIUM

Summary. The article analyzes the essence of the reception of Ukrainian postmodernism at the turn of the 20th and 21st centuries. It states that postmodernism is an extremely complex and multidimensional phenomenon of modern culture, which to this day provokes scientific discussions among literary critics, philosophers, sociologists, cultural scientists, art critics, political scientists etc. Among the studies of domestic literary critics devoted to the problems of Ukrainian literary postmodernism are the works of T. Gundorova, N. Zborovskaya, R. Kharchuk, I. Starovojt, V. Ayevoy, D. Zatonsky, S. Andrusov, I. Fizer and others.

Discussions about postmodernism and its representation in Ukrainian culture remain relevant today. The emphasis is on the literary understanding of the reality of the situation of Ukrainian postmodernism. Ukrainian postmodernism is significantly different from the Western model of postmodernism due to a number of factors such as historical circumstances and national characteristics. In modern Ukrainian literary studies, in particular in criticism, there is a fairly stable tendency to speak about the discourse of postmodernism primarily in theoretical terms, and the most important part of this discourse is related to defining the boundaries, substantiating the qualitative characteristics of this phenomenon, introducing pairs of scientific features into scientific phenomena, etc. It is noted that Ukrainian postmodernism was born in politically difficult unstable conditions, and developed at a time when culture and society came to a normal state, namely during the period of gaining independence of Ukraine. The author emphasizes that modern Ukrainian culture can only be on the verge of traditional and innovative development, trends and the true cultural meaning of the present should be seen in the dialogue of cultures.

Examining the specificity of the reception of Ukrainian postmodernism at the turn of the millennium, we conclude that in postmodernism, as well as in its affiliation with certain national cultures, there are still many points and aspects that need

separate consideration and analysis. The topic of postmodernism remains relevant to research and has prospects for further work on it.

Keywords: *postmodernism; society; dialogue of cultures; discourse; reception.*

Formulation of the problem. Postmodernism is an extremely complex and multidimensional phenomenon of modern culture, which to this day provokes scientific discussions among literary critics, philosophers, sociologists, cultural scientists, art critics, political scientists and others. The peculiarities of postmodernism are related first of all to the intellectual tension of the end of the millennium – not so much as a calendar result, but as a generalization of a European culture that «reached its growth and strength and did not get rid of its problems» (Starovoit, 2001, p. 3).

The purpose of the study is to analyze the reception of Ukrainian postmodernism at the turn of the XX and XXI centuries. The emphasis is on literary understanding of the reality of the situation of Ukrainian postmodernism.

Explaining the essence of literary trends, methods, style currents has always been an important problem in literary theory. A complex and long process of comprehending a particular direction has different stages, of which the priority is one of the most complicated, because it is parallel with the formation of the phenomenon under study.

Ukrainian postmodernism differs significantly from the Western model of postmodernism because of a number of factors, such as historical circumstances and national peculiarities.

Analysis of recent research. Among the researches of modern literary critics devoted to the problems of Ukrainian literary postmodernism, the works of T. Hundorova, N. Zborovskaya, R. Kharchuk, I. Starovoit should be mentioned. Another line of research is the reinterpretation of previous cultural epochs and the work of their prominent representatives from postmodern worldviews. This is primarily the works of T. Gundorova, V. Ageeva, D. Zatonsky and others.

Considerable attention in contemporary Ukrainian literary studies is given to the study of theoretical issues of postmodern artistic practice. These are, in particular, the works of S. Andrusov, I. Fizer, Y. Ilchuk (Radionova), S. Russova, R. Semkiv and others. The studies of Ukrainian and foreign literary critics devoted to the problems of foreign postmodernism are considered to be thorough. Among them are the works of B. Bigun, A. Merezhinsky, B. Bakula, M. Lipovetsky, Z. Krasnodembbsky, V. Boletsky, K. Unilovsky, M. Epstein, I. Skoropanova and others. Interesting, in our view, is the study of literary (Ukrainian, Russian, Polish) postmodern in the comparative aspect L. Lavrynovych.

Presenting main material. The perception of the culture of recent decades, including the culture of postmodernism, is not straightforward in terms of the saturation of the meanings that make up it. «The retreat from the canons and the emergence and interpenetration of the various trends that took place in the last century formed a new approach to the creativity and essence of life as a whole» (Chobaniuk, 2013, p. 119).

The question of the meaning and purpose of postmodernism in Ukraine has given rise to a lengthy debate, which was wittily summed up by one of its initiators, Yuri Andrukhovych: «The time has come when postmodernism in us is not criticized only by the lazy or dead» (Andrukhovych, 1998, p. 15). Indeed, postmodernism in Ukrainian practice is cursed, criticized, not perceived, or, conversely, praised and elevated to intellectual peaks, but no one can bypass it, no one will remain indifferent to its manifestations.

Solomiya Pavlychko elaborated on the complex problems facing the researcher of this phenomenon in the Ukrainian case: «In literature, modernization has its aspects. It provides honest answers to numerous questions: In what language do we speak about literature, tradition, and generally about ourselves? Can even the concept of a forbidden or inconvenient topic exist? Who is the canon of our classics? What forces do you have on the literary margin?» (Pavlychko, 1999, p. 22).

In contemporary Ukrainian literary criticism, in particular in criticism, there has been a fairly stable tendency to speak about the discourse of postmodernism, primarily in theoretical terms. The most important part of this discourse is related to the definition of boundaries, the substantiation of qualitative characteristics of this phenomenon, the introduction into the scientific revolution of the paradigm of postmodern definitions, etc. On the one hand, this is natural because the theoretical and conceptual basis of postmodernism, as A. Merezhinsky rightly points out, «is in its infancy, contains a number of contradictions and substantially changes its strategies in the 60–70s and 80–90s» (Merezhynska, n.d.). On the other hand, researchers point to the partiality and secondaryness of Ukrainian literary postmodernism: «Postmodernism ... remains first of all a discussion and a discourse – a conversation and an essay; there is no intersection of them with the usual artistic text (postmodernism without Eco, without Zuckerkandl, without Cortázar, without Fowles) – so it remains, first of all, the realm of elegant intellectual fiction ...» (Yeshkilev, 1998, p. 50).

The concept of «discourse» (from Latin *discursus* – reasoning), which belongs to the important concepts of cultural studies of the second half of the twentieth century, inherited modern art from the works of poststructural philosophers – Michel Foucault and Jean-François Lyotard, where it became a key point signs, symbols, concepts, authorities of a particular culture and their hierarchy. The concept was modernized over the centuries that separated it from the work of Renaissance philosophers, including René Descartes. Discourse in the fullest sense of the term is the linguistic thinking of this era, it is related to the worldview priorities, history, current situation in society. The densified meaning of a discourse derives from its specialization (political, artistic, scientific discourse of a certain epoch, etc.), in this sense it can be open (avant-garde) or hermetic (Byzantine canon); translational and regressive. «The discourse reflects the consciousness of the enlightened people of their time, including the non-verbal moments it seeks to reproduce. The analysis of a certain discourse involves modeling the very nature of theorizing, its rhetorical techniques, fragile views and intellectual adaptation of opponents» (Man, 1999, p. 16).

Due to the complex ideological conditions in which Ukrainian society and the literary and artistic life were located, in particular during Soviet times, the modern discourse of Ukrainian literature was «not fully developed and complete» (Popil, 2011, p. 184). Because of this, he was unable to create a proper basis for the emergence of Ukrainian postmodernism. However, it is undisputed that Ukrainian modernism has evolved and, after being liberated from totalitarian control, postmodernism has created the necessary conditions for a critical interpretation of modernism. It was during the Ukrainian postmodern era that the most thorough studies of Ukrainian modernism appeared.

Ukrainian postmodernism began to develop in the conditions of social realism, it was started by the then representatives of the underground – in particular, the Kiev ironic literary school (V. Dibrova, B. Zoldak, L. Poderevyansky). The first Ukrainian postmodernists did not consider themselves to be such, until after postmodernism established itself in the West, they began to identify with it. Ukrainian authors have started discussions about the Ukrainian past (most often in the context of modernism), trying to find out how it influenced postmodernism and whether it influenced it at all. «Chimeric prose» of the 60's – 80's is a specific Ukrainian «unreflected version of postmodernism» (Lavrynovych, 2002, p. 5).

The emergence of postmodernity on the territory of Ukrainian culture is a consequence of the entry of the Ukrainian society into the context of global problems of today. According to L. Lavrynovych, «reflected» Ukrainian postmodern literature of the 80s – 90s differentiates in Ukrainian criticism both on the generational principle and on the writers' orientation to the Western or national tradition. In general, the most striking feature of the Ukrainian literature of different schools and generations is the emphasis on the marginal, which becomes a typical one. The creativity of most Ukrainian writers is difficult to correlate with the specific postmodern style of writing by Western authors: in each individual work different variants of it are combined. The most Europeanized variant of postmodernism is the Ukrainian carnival metaprose, which is characterized by «the lowest level of elitist tightness and appeals to the mass reader» (Lavrynovych, 2002, p. 18).

Essayism is most involved in the force field of postmodernism. Against the background of previous canonical genre formations, the essay looks like some kind of «negative form».

The defining paradox of essayistic thinking is that «the individuality that needs to be substantiated finds an explanation for what needs to be substantiated – in itself (as with every postmodern phenomenon it is embodied in the course of self-determination)». «Autotematism is one of the defining features of a postmodern novel, where the dynamics of the essay often override the dynamics of the characters. Heroes are more static in postmodern prose than certain “trifling” themes that actually form a heuristic vision?» (Starovoit, 2001, p. 15).

This is mostly true of Andrukhovich's essay, in particular his book «Disorientation in the Territory». Exploring the connecting knots of current Ukrainian culture (both the state after the ball, and the loneliness, and the effect of the garb), he assumes

that postmodernism is «a circumstance of time and place from which we have nowhere to go, territory “between” and “inside”, to anyone, not a proper inter-civilizational, but also an extra-civilizational space, a central hole in Europe, a tectonic shift, a lost, lost commentary on Galicia, after all, this is Galicia itself» (Andrukhovych, 1999, p. 22).

The essay is marked by the fact that it seems to be placed within reality in becoming, where it draws various forms of its awareness. The synchronous reflections of Oksana Zabuzhko, collected under one cover of «The Chronicle of Fortinbras» (Zabuzhko, 1990), is one of the interesting attempts to crystallize the meaning of traveling cultural relations, mainly on literary material. As an intellectual portrait of the day, Zabuzhko's book came true in the critical discourse of Ukrainian postmodernism.

According to I. Starovojt, contemporary art is concerned solely with the postmodern idea of record, which is more about persistence and effort than talent. As the highest figure it could be a record of circulation: bestseller; content: ironic study of taboo topics, alternative story telling; dedication: letters of the Ukrainian alphabet. A new meta-genre in Ukrainian literature of the 1990s – anthologies – is also read as a choice of record texts and authors where each record can be overcome, otherwise it would be a repressive rule. «So now we have not one, but several literatures: official, ex-repressed, so-called, a professional one that still clarifies its popularity, and a marginal letter “for literary gourmets”. The movement of literature is not centripetal, as before (to the essence of the genre, to a masterpiece), but scattered, centrifugal (to the border of the arts and genre simulacra)» (Starovojt, 2001, p. 10). Contemporary art texts in Ukraine are generated by metatext, and most of the books that dominate the litprocess are cultural concepts. Postmodernism accepts all this and encourages the growth of the critical mass of writing where books are made from books.

D. Popil conditionally divides the Ukrainian reception of postmodernism into «pro-modern» and «anti-post-modern». To the postmodern reception of postmodernism, the scientist includes such writers of essayists and publicists as Yu. Andrukhovych, V. Eshkilev, T. Voznyak. These authors «may berate, criticize, even humiliate it, and subsequently balance the situation with positive judgments on the subject. Specific researchers themselves are always in the context of postmodernism, as they are usually the creators of its literary practice, which, as we have established, does not add to them consistency and objectivity in judgment» (Popil, 2011, p. 184). In T. Gundorova's work «Post-Chernobyl Library: Ukrainian Literary Postmodern» rethinks the specifics of the Ukrainian past and its influence on the formation of cultural «postmodern» modernity in Ukraine.

Ukrainian literary postmodernism is ambiguously analyzed, seeing in it often the phenomenon of imposed, unsatisfactory, fast-paced, avant-garde, and therefore inferior (S. Kvit, O. Yarovy, S. Grabovsky, P. Ivanyshyn). These authors are hostile to postmodernism in Ukrainian theory and practice because they believe that postmodernism is destroying Ukrainian national identity, which has so far been affected by the cataclysms of the past. For S. Kvit, for example, «“these -ism and post-” are signs of the present “time of confusion” and the art of “unclean conscience”, which carries

“superfluous conjecture” that clogs up language and, with it, national thinking. All this destroys Ukrainian culture» (Kvit, 1998, p. 65). O. Yarovy compares postmodernism with Stalinism and fascism. For him it is «“double lie”, “logic of a full stomach”, anti-word and anti-literature» (Yarovy, 2001a, p. 3). «Crossing the crosses in the seventeenth, de-legitimizing Shevchenko and imposing postmodernism are, to me, phenomena of the same order», the critic writes, and sees the future of new art in «to restore the sacred ...» (Yarovy, 2001b, p. 5).

To Ukrainian postmodernism, the demoralizing role and untimely nature of P. Ivanyshyn's article «Postmodernism and National Identification» is thrown. The scientist notes that «it implements anti-national and anti-human ideals under the slogans of humanism, globalization, cosmopolitanism, pseudodemocracy» (Ivanyshyn, 1999, p. 123). The author notes that postmodernism removes from the national consciousness and unconscious the inherent archetypes of God, Ukraine, Liberty. Because of this, national identity is destroyed, which leads to the deepening of «the denationalization and dehumanization of the modern generation» (Ivanyshyn, 1999, p. 129).

Conclusions and prospects for further research. Examining the specificity of the reception of Ukrainian postmodernism at the turn of the millennium, we conclude that, in postmodernism, as well as in its affiliation with certain national cultures, there are still many points and aspects that need separate consideration and analysis. The topic of postmodernism remains relevant to research and has prospects for further work on it.

Література

- Андрухович, Ю. (1999). *Дезорієнтація на місцевості* (с. 122). Івано-Франківськ: Лілея-НВ.
- Андрухович, Ю. (1998). Повернення літератури? *Повернення деміургів / Плерома 3'98: Мала українська енциклопедія актуальної літератури* (с. 15). Івано-Франківськ: Лілея-НВ.
- Єшкілєв, В. (1998). Дискурси в сучасній українській літературі. *Повернення деміургів / Плерома 3'98: Мала українська енциклопедія актуальної літератури* (с. 50). Івано-Франківськ: Лілея-НВ.
- Забужко, О. (1999). *Хроніки від Фортінбраса: вибрана есеїстика 90-х*. Київ: Факт.
- Іванишин, П. (1999). Постмодернізм і національно-духовна ідентифікація. *Українські проблеми*, 1–2, 123–130.
- Квіт, С. (1998). *Основи герменевтики* (с. 65–66). Київ: Вид. дім «Києво-Могилянська академія».
- Лавринович, Л. (2002). *Постмодернізм в українській, польській та російській прозі: типологія образу-персонажа*. (Дис. канд. філол. наук). Тернопіль.
- Ман, Поль де. (1999). *Аллегорії чтєня: фігуральний язык Руссо, Ницше, Рильке и Пруста* (с. 16). Екатеринбург: Изд-во Урал. ун-та.
- Мережинська, А. (б.р.). *Російська постмодерна література*. Взято з <http://studentus.com.ua/.../merejinskaya-anna-yurevna--russkaya-...>
- Павличко, С. (1999). *Дискурс модернізму в українській літературі*. Київ: Либідь.

- Попіль, Д.** (2011). Український постмодернізм у дзеркалі медіа. *Вісник Львівського університету*, 34, 183–187.
- Старовойт, І.** (2001). *Український постмодернізм у критичному та художньому дискурсах кінця ХХ століття*. (Дис. канд. філол. наук). Львів.
- Чобанюк, М.М.** (2013). Феномен постмодернізму як явище слов'янської культури. *Науковий вісник Східноєвропейського національного університету імені Лесі Українки. Серія: Філологічні науки. Літературознавство*, 13 (262), 119–123.
- Яровий, О.** (2001a, 19 квітня). Лист самому собі. *Літературна Україна*, 15 (4912), 2–5.
- Яровий, О.** (2001b, 1 березня). Скажу як є. *Літературна Україна*, 8 (4905), 4–7.

References

- Andruxhovich, Yu.** (1999). *Dezoriantatsiia na mistsevisi [Disorientation on the ground]*. (p. 122). Ivano-Frankivsk: Lileia-NV [in Ukrainian].
- Andruxhovich, Yu.** (1998). Povernennia literatury? [Return of literature?]. *Povernennia demiurhiv / Pleroma 3'98: Mala ukrainska entsyklopediia aktualnoi literatury – The Return of the Demiurge / Pleroma 3'98: A Small Ukrainian Encyclopedia of Topical Literature* (p. 15). Ivano-Frankivsk: Lileia-NV [in Ukrainian].
- Yeshkiliev, V.** (1998). Dyskursy v suchasni ukrainskii literaturi [Discourses in Contemporary Ukrainian Literature]. *Povernennia demiurhiv / Pleroma 3'98: Mala ukrainska entsyklopediia aktualnoi literatury – The Return of the Demiurge / Pleroma 3'98: A Small Ukrainian Encyclopedia of Topical Literature* (p. 50). Ivano-Frankivsk: Lileia-NV [in Ukrainian].
- Zabuzhko, O.** (1990). *Khroniky vid Fortinbrasa: vybrana eseistyka 90-kh [The Chronicles of Fortinbras: Selected essay 90s]*. Kyiv: Fakt [in Ukrainian].
- Ivanyshyn, P.** (1999). Postmodernizm i natsionalno-dukhovna identyfikatsiia [Postmodernism and national-spiritual identification]. *Ukrainski problemy – Ukrainian problems*, 1–2, 123–130 [in Ukrainian].
- Kvit, S.** (1998). *Osnovy hermenevtyky [Fundamentals of Hermeneutics]*. (pp. 65–66). Kyiv: Vyd. dim «Kyievo-Mohylianska akademiia» [in Ukrainian].
- Lavrynovych, L.** (2002). *Postmodernizm v ukrainskii, polskii ta rosiiskii prozi: typolohiia obrazu-personazha [Postmodernism in Ukrainian, Polish and Russian Prose: A Typology of a Character Image]*. (Candidate's thesis). Ternopil [in Ukrainian].
- Man, Pol de.** (1999). *Allegorii chteniia: figuralnyi yazyk Russo, Nitsche, Rilke i Prusta [Allegories of reading: Figurative language of Rousseau, Nietzsche, Rilke and Proust]*. (p. 16). Ekaterinburg: Izd-vo Ural. un-ta [in Russian].
- Merezhynska, A.** (n.d.). *Rosiiska postmoderna literatura [Postmodern literature]*. Retrieved from <http://studentus.com.ua/.../merejinskaya-anna-yurevna--russkaya-...> [in Ukrainian].
- Pavlychko, S.** (1999). *Dyskurs modernizmu v ukrainskii literaturi [Discourse of Modernism in Ukrainian Literature]*. Kyiv: Lybid [in Ukrainian].
- Popil, D.** (2011). *Ukrainskyi postmodernizm u dzerkali media [Ukrainian Postmodernism in the Media Mirror]*. *Visnyk Lvivskoho universytetu – Bulletin of the University of Lviv*, 34, 183–187 [in Ukrainian].
- Starovoi, I.** (2001). *Ukrainskyi postmodernizm u krytychnomu ta khudozhnomu dyskursakh kintsia stolittia [Ukrainian postmodernism in the critical and artistic discourses of the late twentieth century]*. (Doctor's thesis). Lviv [in Ukrainian].
- Chobaniuk, M.M.** (2013). *Fenomen postmodernizmu yak yavyshe slovianskoi kultury [The phenomenon of postmodernism as a phenomenon of Slavic culture]*. *Naukovyi*

visnyk Skhidnoievropeiskoho natsionalnoho universytetu imeni Lesi Ukrainky. Serii: Filologichni nauky. Literaturoznavstvo – Scientific Bulletin of Lesya Ukrainka Eastern European National University. Series: Philological Sciences. Literary Studies, 13 (262), 119–123 [in Ukrainian].

Yarovi, O. (2001a, April 19). Lyst samomu sobi [A letter to himself]. *Literaturna Ukraina – Literary Ukraine, 15 (4912), 2–5 [in Ukrainian].*

Yarovi, O. (2001b, March 1). Skazhu yak ye [I will say as is]. *Literaturna Ukraina – Literary Ukraine, 8 (4905), 4–7 [in Ukrainian].*

Стаття надійшла до редакції 04.10.2019 р.