УДК 821.161.2.0
DOI 10.58423/2786-6726/2025-1-203-215

Mariya Chobanyuk

Postcolonial criticism: literary aspect of Ukrainian literary studies

1. Statement of the problem

"Why do postcolonial communities still draw on imperial experiences? Why, after all postcolonial societies … have become independent, does the problem of colonial relations not lose its relevance? [Because] thanks to the [imperial] literary canon … which often remains the criterion of evaluation … [as] a universal norm, the burden of antiquity continues to dominate the cultural achievements of much of the postcolonial world."

Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin,
"The Empire Writes Back" (1989) (Ilnytskyi, 2000, p. 9).

Postcolonial criticism is a direction in modern literary studies that emerged in the English-speaking world in the late 1970s based on the integration of the greatest achievements of deconstructivism, psychoanalysis, Marxism, new historicism, feminism, taking into account the historical and cultural models of countries that have freed themselves from the colonial yoke. Postcolonial criticism raises issues of ethnicity, national identity, cultural universality, cultural hybridity and cultural difference, problems of language, history. The work of the American literary critic of Arab origin Edward Said (1935–2003) "Orientalism" (1978) played a decisive role in the creation of the theory of postcolonial criticism.

Orientalism as a field of study originated in the West and defined the framework of knowledge about the East from a Western perspective. Since Orientalism emerged under the conditions of Western dominance over the East, postcolonial criticism seeks to deconstruct texts produced by former colonial powers, highlighting their dependence on the interests of the ruling circles of world leaders. The Marxist wing of postcolonialism today considers postcoloniality in literature as an attempt to resist international capitalism (see Williams–Chrisman, 1994). "Like any other theory, postcolonialism has its limitations and key points. It is often characterized by a romantic idealization of the "other", the different… This distinct postmodern theme

of "otherness" or self-identity in current conditions is threatened to be embodied in banally similar works" (Halych, 2003, p. 6).

2. Analysis of recent research

In English-language literary studies, postcolonial criticism is represented by such names as, for example, Stephen Slemon, Helen Tiffin, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, Homi K. Bhabha, Arun Mukherjee, and others. In Ukrainian literary studies, postcolonial criticism has become the subject of research by M. Pavlyshyn, M. Shkandrij, O. Ilnytskyi, V. Shevchuk, M. Riabchuk, and I. Dziuba. The purpose of this article is to analyse the development of postcolonial criticism in contemporary Ukrainian literary studies.

3. Presentation of the main material of the research

Marko Pavlyshyn, studying the emergence and development of postcolonial criticism, notes: "From the end of World War II until approximately 1970, most of the overseas colonies of Western European countries became independent. In connection with this process, the adjective "postcolonial" spread in the English language in the meaning: "relating to the period after gaining independence" (Pavlyshyn, 2002, p. 703). The term "postcolonialism" is used to denote the theoretical and critical methodology used in the study (of literature, politics, history, etc.) of the former colonies of European empires. However, here it is important to distinguish between two types of opposition to colonialism in culture: anticolonial and postcolonial.

Anticolonialism should be considered the usual resistance to colonialism, attempts to overturn the hierarchies of colonial values in order to replace false imperial myths with authentic ideas of national liberation. Pavlyshyn, analysing the postcolonial features of modern Ukrainian culture, also draws attention to the fact that "anticolonial strategies are united by the structure of denial... of former colonial arguments and values. Anticolonialism is no less monological and ideologized than its opponent" (Pavlyshyn, 1994, p. 67).

The nature of postcolonialism is different. Postcolonialism understands that the anticolonial stance often reproduces, in reverse, elements of colonialism and thus paradoxically preserves them. The postcolonial approach can be considered a confrontation not at the level of a simple denial of colonialism and approval of its opposite, but also at a deeper level of awareness. Postcolonial thinking is characterized by the use of both colonial and anticolonial experience and an understanding of the relativity of these two historical structures. Postcolonialism is less reactionary, more original and creative. It does not simply fight against colonialism; instead, it seeks to transcend it. Postcolonialism uses the experience

of colonialism not for the sake of repelling it, but for the formation of its own consciousness. Although postcolonial consciousness is not free from political engagement, it tends to favour pluralism, tolerance, compromise, and irony.

Postcolonialism was formed under the influence of poststructuralism and postmodernism, where the prefix *post-* does not exclude parallel existence in time and expresses not so much a negation as a dialectical removal of modernism and structuralism. Thus, according to Pavlyshyn, the postcolonial, while distancing itself from the colonial, simultaneously absorbs its historical experience, and the latter coexists with it in the same time, space, and even within a single cultural phenomenon.

This definition of the postcolonial in culture presupposes a preliminary definition of cultural colonialism. Political scientists consider colonialism primarily as a set of measures through which the colonizer seizes and exercises power over the colonized, forcing it to act in accordance with the decisions and interests of the colonizer. Economists, on the other hand, see its main feature in the subjugation of the economy of the colonized territory to the problems of the colonizer, particularly in terms of securing advantages in the global market. Cultural colonialism is a set of measures of cultural institutions and ideologies in any cases of popular or high culture, aimed at supporting political and economic power. M. Pavlyshyn, in his article "Cossacks in Jamaica: Postcolonial features in modern Ukrainian culture", noted: "The emergence of political and cultural postcolonialism is a gradual process consisting of multidimensional and non-simultaneous changes in the views and actions of individuals and groups..." (Pavlyshyn, 1994, p. 65). He continues: "For almost two centuries, as long as the idea of a modern Ukrainian nation has existed, anticolonial positions have been an element of colonialism, which were especially clearly expressed in Ukrainian romanticism and in certain types of Ukrainian modernism... If colonialism tabooed and eliminated the memory of persons and events in the history of culture that denied the provinciality and secondary nature of Ukrainianness, then anticolonialism emphasized and privileged them. It returned to the canon, for example, Panteleimon Kulish, "History of the Rus", "Books of the Genesis of the Ukrainian People", the executed revival with Mykola Khvylovy included, the corpus of dissident culture of the 60s and 70s together with the poetry of I. Kalynets and V. Stus, and the culture of the diaspora" (Pavlyshyn, 1994, p. 65).

Research under the auspices of postcolonial studies, according to Pavlyshyn, can be provisionally divided into three groups. The first is theoretical attempts to answer the question: "What is postcolonialism?" Metacriticism constitutes a particularly large part of postcolonial studies, perhaps because of the prestige of "theory" in the Western humanities since the 1980s (see, for instance, Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin (1989) and the collections edited by Gulm (1993), Williams and

Chrisman (1994)). The second group consists of deconstructive readings of colonial discourses by Said (1978), Barker, Hulme, Iversen and Loxley (1984), Spurr (1993). In such studies, special attention is often paid to the construction of the binary opposition "ours/other", where the "other" (most often racially different) is considered as a category of exclusion and, therefore, oppression. The opposite strategy has hardly been explored: the extension of the imperial "we" to the colonized subject and the deprivation of any consciousness, except the imperial one (see Lutsky (1971), H. Grabowicz (1992), Berehulyak (1995)). The third group consists of studies of formerly colonized cultures. It includes works that emphasize the colonial factor, as well as those that consciously do not classify themselves as part of the school of postcolonial criticism and find other keys to the phenomena of Indian, Senegalese, New Guinean, or other cultures (for example, JanMohamed (1983), Madubuike (1983), Lazarus (1990)).

The potential for geographical expansion of the object of postcolonial studies is considerable. Their conceptual apparatus can be used in deciphering the cultures of the Russian Empire, the Soviet Union, and the countries that emerged after it (see Grabowicz, 1994). The experience of postcolonial studies can be used to study the structures of imperial dominance in the manifestations of metropolitan Russian culture (including in its canonical texts, which are usually given a universally human, supra-national status) and non-Russian cultures (the phenomenon of "loyal" or "collaborative" culture), as well as the study of anticolonial and postcolonial principles within colonized cultures. Such research is key to the intellectual, scientific – in general, cultural – decolonization of both the former peripheries and the former centre.

The characterization of the current state of Ukraine as postcolonial, according to Ivan Dziuba, requires development and clarification, especially when it comes to culture. The literary critic believes that "we are still far from finally overcoming the colonial state: if we consider not only the well-being of the subjects of cultural creativity, but also the reality of the relationship between cultural potentials and energy capacities of cultural carriers (books, press, mass media, linguistic and mental orientation of culture, etc.), and ultimately – the dangerously distorted configuration of the cultural space within the former USSR, the Russification lines of force of which are still far from being demagnetized. At best, overcoming this colonial state will take an entire historical era" (Dziuba, 1998, p. 24).

The obsession of Ukrainians with their identity, language, culture, and the very problem of their national existence is quite simply explained by historical circumstances, which, as is well known, were unfavourable for a stateless nation. Even more pressing is the fact that "the Ukrainian present does not contribute to the treatment of historical neuroses, since the formally independent Ukrainian state has preserved the colonial status quo rather than opening a consistent and

comprehensive program of decolonization" (Riabchuk, 2002, p. 2). If Russia was an empire, then Ukraine was its colony. Historians will undoubtedly continue to debate the political and economic nuances of these peculiar relations, but it is already obvious that many of the features of postcolonialism identified by its researchers also apply to cultural activity in the Russian Empire. Many scholars (Ashcroft, Griffiths, Tiffin, etc.) did not limit themselves to describing "national culture after imperial power", but used the term to describe "the entire culture affected by imperial processes from the beginning of colonization to the present day" (Ilnytskyi, 2000, p. 10). Such an interpretation, according to Oleh Ilnytskyi, emphasizes the existence of "a constant tension throughout the entire historical process initiated... by imperial aggression". The following conclusions are especially resonant with the Ukrainian experience: "Despite all the specific and characteristic regional differences, the common feature of these [postcolonial] literatures is that they all emerged in their modern form from the colonial experience and were shaped in active opposition to imperial power, emphasizing their distinctiveness in the face of the threat of absorption by the imperial centre. That is why they are distinctly postcolonial" (Ilnytskyi, 2000, p. 10).

In this context, it is worth mentioning the book by the Canadian professor from Winnipeg, Myroslav Shkandrij, entitled "Russia and Ukraine: Literature and the Discourse of Empire from Napoleonic to Postcolonial Times" (Shkandrij, 2001). It is not so much about Russia as about Ukraine, not so much about imperial discourse as about anti-imperial or, as some would say, Ukrainian-nationalist discourse ("nationalist", of course, in the Western sense of the word). At the same time, the book is in many ways pioneering: in essence, it is the first attempt to conceptually, based on broad literary material, consider Russian–Ukrainian relations as a struggle of two discourses, to apply the methodology of postcolonial studies popular in the West to the analysis of texts more or less familiar to us. From this perspective, the work deserves close attention, since its achievements and shortcomings can significantly influence the development of a promising direction in Ukrainian humanities.

In the preface to his book, Shkandrij outlines its main goal: to show how "the discourse of empire appears in Russian literature of the 19th century, giving impetus to the corresponding counter-discourse in Ukrainian literature" (Riabchuk, 2002, p. 2). In broad terms, the author is talking about expanding the framework of postcolonial studies, taking them beyond the traditional boundaries in which these studies were formed – the boundaries of the relations of future Western European metropolises (primarily England and France) with their colonies in Asia, France, and Latin America. From this perspective, Shkandrij's book is polemical about the idea spread by his colleagues that the concept of "imperialism" should be applied only to states with overseas possessions. The

object of imperial discourse, he argues, can include not only overseas colonies, but also imperial borderlands and adjacent territories. Despite the significant differences between these regions and their descriptions, the construction of "literary Ukraine" in Russian literature has much in common with the discursive mastery (domination) of other "newly acquired" lands by the empire – such as Siberia, the Caucasus, Central Asia, and Poland.

The question of the legitimacy of applying postcolonial methodology (and terminology) to the analysis of Russian–Ukrainian relations is resolved, in the author's opinion, automatically, if one only carefully examines the reality described by the terms "colonialism" and "imperialism". In particular, the term "colonialism," Shkandrij notes, is used mostly when it is necessary to designate the invasion and settlement of representatives of one country in another, with the introduction of its own government, legal system, and institutions. "Imperialism", on the other hand, refers to a wide range of unequal (exploitative) relations – political, economic, cultural – which, however, are not necessarily associated with the mass resettlement of the civilian population. Russia's domination over Ukraine, notes Shkandrij, was carried out both according to the imperial model (especially in the 12th–18th centuries, when local rights, institutions, and judicial proceedings were significantly limited, up to their complete liquidation), and according to the colonial model (distribution of land to Russian owners and mass resettlement of people).

The main argument in favour of postcolonial methodology in the book on imperial discourse remains the cultural argument, approximately in the sense in which Marko Pavlyshyn used it in the article on Andrukhovych's "Recreations": "Cultural phenomena (works of art, cultural institutions in the cultural life of society) can be considered colonial if they contribute to the establishment or development of imperial power: they deprive of prestige, narrow the field of activity, limit the visibility, or even destroy what is local, autochthonous – in a word, colonial; instead, they emphasize the dignity, global scale, modernity, necessity and naturalness of the capital, the central" (Pavlyshyn, 1993, p. 116). The use of the terms "colonial" and "postcolonial", as Shkandrij rightly notes, to designate the situation of cultural and political enslavement in which people have just emerged from, is entirely legitimate in relation to Ukrainian history and the present. Cultural subjugation is invariably accompanied and conditioned by political subjugation – that is, various forms of coercion, direct and indirect violence. In fact, it is precisely the situation when the usual and obvious difference between cultures begins to be perceived in evaluative categories, that is, when, to paraphrase Said, one culture perceives the difference of another as a weakness, and the latter, in turn, adopts and assimilates such a view of itself as "objective", that most clearly indicates the unequal relations between these cultures, the overt or covert mechanisms of political or politico-economic dominance of one cultural

group over another. Myroslav Shkandriy approaches the problem of "cultural subjugation" with a slightly different methodological perspective: for him, such subjugation is carried out through a passive (in this case, Russian-imperial) discourse. The main conclusion that follows from Shkandrij's book is that any public discourse not only reflects reality and does not simply influence our attitude towards it, but also changes it, thus "representing" and creating a kind of para-reality, one that becomes more real than the reality it supposedly describes. This understanding of discourse forms the basis of Edward Said's work "Orientalism", which, according to Shkandrij himself, was a kind of model and source of inspiration for him, despite the significant, and sometimes fundamental, differences in the objects of study.

Myroslav Shkandrij's reference to the national trauma inflicted upon the Russian mentality by a century of colonial oppression and, accordingly, the "internalization" of imperial violence against other peoples seems to be influential. He argues that its consequences, along with the corresponding Ukrainian traumatic legacy, can be addressed and perhaps overcome by both cultures through the adoption of postcolonial artistic practices. In this, he aligns with Marko Pavlyshyn, who describes the "postcolonial" as an approach to the colonial legacy that rises above the binary opposition of "colonial" and "anticolonial" discourses and creates its own discourse on the basis of a free play with them as parts of its historical heritage. Shkandrij, following Pavlyshyn, proves the productivity and prospects of this approach by analysing the works of Yuriy Andrukhovych, showing how the "postcolonial" prose writer deconstructs not only imperial myths, but also national ones, in particular the traditional depiction of Ukraine as an innocent victim of evil neighbours, primarily demonic Russia. From this perspective, Shkandrij rightly points to certain elements of postcolonial irony (and self-irony), hybridity, and proteanism in Khvylyovy's work. Even earlier, in his discussion of Ukrainian modernism, he speaks of the significant complication of Ukrainian anticolonial discourse, its enrichment with elements of self-reflection, internal polemics, in particular polemics with the dominant populist doctrine, and the emergence within its framework of alternative discourses – feminist, aesthetic, and avant-garde.

The strategy advocated by Myroslav Shkandrij and Marko Pavlyshyn, as noted by Mykola Riabchuk, appears highly appealing; however, it is worth noting that neither Russian nor Ukrainian literature has yet gained sufficient internal freedom for a "postcolonial" liberation from their dominant discourses. In fact, in Ukraine, despite formal independence, a kind of cold civil war persists, including at the level of the notorious "struggle of two cultures", the outcome of which remains difficult to predict. This, of course, supports anti-imperial mobilization and the corresponding discourse in Ukrainian literature; on the other hand, it also reinforces the traditional imperial discourse, giving it certain hopes for further

dominance and opening a second (or, rather, twenty-second) breath for its supporters. Consequently, Shkandrij's words about Stus can be largely applied to the majority of today's Ukrainian writers: "postcolonial by desire, anticolonial by necessity" (Riabchuk, 2002, p. 6).

Postcolonial discourse in Ukrainian culture has emerged only relatively recently. There has been a noticeable postcolonial trend in Ukrainian literature for some time. Marko Pavlyshyn considers Valery Shevchuk, a writer whose style somewhat resembles Latin American "magic realists", as a pioneer of this trend since the 1970s. An admirer of Ukrainian medieval and Baroque heritage, he found opportunities to save the past by fitting it into new and modern cultural frameworks; as an implicit critic of Gogol, he managed to transform the provincializing structures of Gogolism into neutral material for new aesthetic ideas. He created an aesthetically productive means of denying the naturalness of the empire, which consists in depicting it as a pathological, grotesque, and terrifying institution.

Postcolonial cultural phenomena are those that do not reduce all issues to the binary opposition of "imperial centre / colonial periphery", but address other aspects of contemporary life. It is in this sense that film, popular music, and various manifestations of youth culture that focus on issues of the environment, lifestyle, mass culture, and feminism, can be considered postcolonial phenomena.

Postcolonial criticism in general, and Ukrainian criticism in particular, is characterized by an effort to overcome the inferiority complex. Vivid evidence of this is the topics of modern literary studies: national self-criticism, problems of cultivating national self-consciousness, features of the Ukrainian mentality, the concept of "great literature", and the world context of Ukrainian writing. Attention is increasingly being paid to the writers' focus on the self-affirmation of national consciousness.

Another notable feature of Ukrainian postcolonial literary studies is the appeal to the Christian worldview. Analytical studies are focused on the study of the syncretism of Christianity and paganism, the image of God in the writer's worldview, the reception of Holy Scripture, the biblical imagery of texts, the interpretation of biblical motifs, images of evil spirits and demonological creatures.

4. Conclusions

Postcolonial criticism is a literary methodology that involves various aspects of the study of writing in a postcolonial society. Although today's Ukrainian culture cannot be called postcolonial, M. Pavlyshyn claims that a considerable postcolonial space has already emerged within it, where free improvisations on experienced colonial and anticolonial themes are possible, and a departure from the dignified

but somewhat predictable culture and literature of obligation that existed between the official and oppositional spheres in colonial Ukraine.

The analysis of postcolonial criticism in Ukrainian literary studies makes it possible to identify a number of specific features that become political, in particular, when compared with colonial criticism, and offers insight into the current state of Ukrainian literary scholarship.

Література

1. Галич Олександр 2003. Літературознавство на рубежі тисячоліть: напрями, школи, течії. *Українська мова та література* 34: с. 3–8.
2. Дзюба Іван 1998. Марко Павлишин: крізь «постмодерністські окуляри» і без них... В: Дзюба Іван ред. *Павлишин М. Канон та іконостас*. Київ: Час, с. 5–26.
3. Ільницький Олег 2000. Гоголь і постколоніальний контекст. *Критика* 4/3(29): с. 9–13.
4. Павлишин Марко 1993. Що перетворюється в «Рекреаціях» Юрія Андруховича? *Сучасність* 12: с. 115–127.
5. Павлишин Марко 1994. Козаки в Ямайці: постколоніальні риси в сучасній українській культурі. *Слово і Час* 4–5: с. 65–71.
6. Павлишин Марко 2002. Постколоніальна критика і теорія. В: Зубрицька Марія ред. *Слово, знак, дискурс. Антологія світової літературно-критичної думки XX ст.* Львів: Літопис, с. 531–535.
7. Рябчук Микола 2002. Імперія як дискурс. *Критика* 4/9(59): с. 2–6.
8. Shkandrij, Myroslav 2001. *Russia and Ukraine: Literature and the Discourse of Empire from Napoleonic to Postcolonial Times*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

References

1. Halych, Oleksandr 2003. Literaturoznavstvo na rubezhi tysiacholit: napriamy, shkoly, techii [Literary studies at the turn of the millennium: directions, schools, trends]. *Ukrainska mova ta literatura* 34: s. 3–8. (In Ukrainian)
2. Dziuba, Ivan 1998. Marko Pavlyshyn: kriz «postmodernistski okuliary» i bez nykh... [Marko Pavlyshyn: through "postmodernist glasses" and without them...] In: Dziuba, Ivan ed. *Pavlyshyn M. Kanon ta ikonostas*. Kyiv: Chas, s. 5–26. (In Ukrainian)
3. Ilnytskyi, Oleh 2000. Hohol i postkolonialnyi kontekst [Gogol and the postcolonial context]. *Krytyka* 4/3(29): s. 9–13. (In Ukrainian)
4. Pavlyshyn, Marko 1993. Shcho peretvoriuietsia v «Rekreatsiiakh» Yuriia Andrukhovycha? [What is being transformed in Yuriy Andrukhovych's "Recreations"?] *Suchasnist* 12: s. 115–127. (In Ukrainian)
5. Pavlyshyn, Marko 1994. Kozaky v Yamaitsi: postkolonialni rysy v suchasnii ukrainskii kulturi [Cossacks in Jamaica: Postcolonial features in contemporary Ukrainian culture]. *Slovo i Chas* 4–5: s. 65–71. (In Ukrainian)

6. Pavlyshyn, Marko 2002. Postkolonialna krytyka i teoriia [Postcolonial criticism and theory]. In: Zubrytska, Mariia ed. *Slovo, znak, dyskurs. Antolohiia svitovoi literaturno-krytychnoi dumky KhKh st*. Lviv: Litopys, s. 531–535. (In Ukrainian)
7. Riabchuk, Mykola 2002. Imperiia yak dyskurs [Empire as a discourse]. *Krytyka* 4/9(59): s. 2–6. (In Ukrainian)
8. Shkandrij, Myroslav 2001. *Russia and Ukraine: Literature and the Discourse of Empire from Napoleonic to Postcolonial Times*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Postcolonial criticism: literary aspect of Ukrainian literary studies

Mariya Chobanyuk, candidate of philological sciences. Drohobych State Pedagogical University of Ivan Franko, Department of English Language Practice and Methods of Its Teaching, associate professor. mariya_chobanyuk@ukr.net, ORCID: 0000-0002-6047-4852.

This article examines certain phenomena in modern Ukrainian literature and culture that can be described as postcolonial. Special attention is given to the transformations that distinguish these phenomena from the previous cultural system, as well as to the features and particularities of postcolonial criticism as a literary methodology.

It is noted that postcolonial criticism is a branch of contemporary literary studies that emerged in the English-speaking world in the late 1970s. It arose from the integration of the most influential approaches of deconstruction, psychoanalysis, Marxism, new historicism, and feminism, while also taking into account the historical and cultural models of countries that had liberated themselves from colonial rule. Postcolonial criticism addresses issues such as ethnicity, national identity, cultural universality, cultural hybridity and difference, as well as the problems of language and historical interpretation. A decisive role in the development of postcolonial theory was played by the work of Edward Said, an American scholar of Arab origin, particularly his book *Orientalism*.

The article emphasizes the importance of distinguishing between two types of cultural opposition to colonialism: anticolonial and postcolonial. The anticolonial stance involves direct resistance to colonialism, centred around genuine ideals of national liberation. The postcolonial perspective, however, goes beyond a simple rejection of colonialism and affirmation of its opposite. It involves a deeper awareness and critical engagement, characterized by the use of both colonial and anticolonial experiences and a recognition of the relativity of these two historical frameworks.

Political scientists primarily regard colonialism as a system through which the colonizer gains and maintains power over the colonized, compelling the latter to act in the interests of the former. Economists, in contrast, highlight the subordination of the colonized territory's economy to that of the colonizer, particularly in terms of benefiting the colonizer in the global market. Cultural colonialism refers to the deployment of cultural institutions and ideologies – whether in popular or elite culture – that support political and economic domination.

Postcolonial discourse in Ukrainian culture has emerged relatively recently. A noticeable postcolonial trend has been present in Ukrainian literature for some time, as evidenced by the works of Ivan Dziuba, Marko Pavlyshyn, Oleh Ilnytskyi, Myroslav Shkandrij, Mykola

Riabchuk, among others. Postcolonial criticism in general – and Ukrainian postcolonial criticism in particular – is marked by the overcoming of the inferiority complex. This is vividly reflected in the themes of contemporary literary studies: national self-criticism, the development of national self-awareness, the peculiarities of the Ukrainian mentality, the concept of "great literature", and the global context of Ukrainian writing. Special attention is given to the writers' focus on the affirmation of national consciousness.

Keywords: *postcolonial criticism, culture, system, methodology, world context, literary studies.*

Постколоніальна критика: літературознавчий аспект українського літературознавства

Чобанюк Марія, кандидат філологічних наук. Дрогобицький державний педагогічний університет імені Івана Франка, кафедра практики англійської мови і методики її навчання, доцент. mariya_chobanyuk@ukr.net, ORCID: 0000-0002-6047-4852.

У цій статті розглядаються певні явища в сучасній українській літературі та культурі, які можна було б назвати постколоніальними. Звертається особлива увага на трансформації, що відрізняють їх від культурної системи, що панувала раніше, а також на особливості та специфіку постколоніальної критики як літературознавчої методології. Зазначено, що постколоніальна критика – це напрям сучасного літературознавства, який виник в англомовному світі наприкінці 70-х років на базі інтеграції кращих досягнень деконструктивізму, психоаналізу, марксизму, нового історизму, фемінізму з урахуванням історичних і культурологічних моделей країн, що звільнилися від колоніального ярма. Постколоніальна критика порушує проблеми етнічності, національної ідентичності, культурної універсальності, культурної гібридності та культурної відмінності, проблеми мови, історії. Вирішальну роль у створенні теорії постколоніальної критики відіграла праця американця арабського походження Едварда Саїда «Орієнталізм».

У статті звернено увагу на те, що доцільно розрізняти два види протистояння колоніалізму в культурі – антиколоніальний та постколоніальний. Антиколоніальним варто вважати звичайний опір колоніалізму, де центральне місце займають справжні ідеї національного визволення. Постколоніальним можна вважати протистояння не на рівні простого заперечення колоніалізму й схвалення протилежного, а й на рівні усвідомлення. Постколоніальному ставленню притаманне використання досвіду як колоніального, так і антиколоніального, й розуміння відносності цих двох історичних структур.

Політологи розглядають колоніалізм насамперед як сукупність заходів, завдяки яким колонізатор перебирає і реалізовує владу над колонізованим, примушуючи його діяти згідно з рішеннями і в інтересах колонізатора; економісти натомість убачають його основну рису в підкоренні економіки колонізованої території проблемам колонізатора, зокрема в його вигоді на світовому ринку. Культурний колоніалізм – це комплекс заходів культурних установ та ідеологій у будь-яких випадках популярної чи високої культури, спрямований на підтримку політичної та економічної влади.

Наголошено на тому, що постколоніальний дискурс в українській культурі виник порівняно недавно. Існує вже деякий час і помітна постколоніальна течія в українській літературі. Про це свідчать праці Івана Дзюби, Марка Павлишина, Олега Ільницького, Мирослава Шкандрія, Миколи Рябчука та інших. Постколоніальну критику взагалі, а українську зокрема, характеризує подолання комплексу меншовартості. Яскраве свідчення цього – теми сучасних літературознавчих досліджень: національна самокритика, проблеми виховання національної самосвідомості, риси української ментальності, концепція «великої літератури», світовий контекст українського письменства. Увагу привертає спрямованість письменників на самоствердження національної свідомості.

Ключові слова: *постколоніальна критика, культура, система, методологія, світовий контекст, літературознавство.*

Posztkoloniális kritika: az ukrán irodalomtudomány irodalmi aspektusa

Chobanyuk Mária, filológiai tudományok kandidátusa. Drohobicsi Ivan Franko Állami Pedagógiai Egyetem, Angol Nyelvgyakorlati és Módszertani Tanszék, docens. mariya_chobanyuk@ukr.net, ORCID: 0000-0002-6047-4852.

A tanulmány a kortárs ukrán irodalom és kultúra bizonyos jelenségeit vizsgálja, amelyek posztkoloniálisnak nevezhetők. Az elemzés külön figyelmet fordít azokra az átalakulásokra, amelyek megkülönböztetik ezeket a jelenségeket az előző kulturális rendszertől, valamint a posztkoloniális kritika irodalmi módszertanának jellemzőire és sajátosságaira.

Megállapítást nyert, hogy a posztkoloniális kritika a kortárs irodalomtudomány egyik irányzata, amely angol nyelvterületen alakult ki az 1970-es évek végén. A dekonstrukció, a pszichoanalízis, a marxizmus, az új historicizmus és a feminizmus legmeghatározóbb megközelítéseinek integrációjából jött létre, figyelembe véve azoknak az országoknak a történelmi és kulturális modelljeit, amelyek megszabadultak a gyarmati uralomtól. A posztkoloniális kritika olyan kérdésekkel foglalkozik, mint az etnicitás, a nemzeti identitás, a kulturális egyetemesség, a kulturális hibriditás és különbözőség, valamint a nyelv és a történelem értelmezésének problémái. A posztkoloniális elmélet kialakulásában döntő szerepet játszott Edward Said, arab származású amerikai tudós munkássága, különösen az *Orientalizmus* című könyve.

Az elemzés hangsúlyozza, hogy meg kell különböztetnünk a gyarmatosítás elleni kulturális ellenállás két típusát: az antikolonializmust és a posztkolonializmust. Az antikolonialista álláspont a gyarmatosítással szembeni közvetlen ellenállást jelenti, amelynek középpontjában a nemzeti felszabadulás valódi eszméi állnak. A posztkoloniális szemlélet viszont túlmutat a gyarmatosítás egyszerű elutasításán: mélyebb tudatosságot és kritikai viszonyulást foglal magában. Jellemzője, hogy egyaránt felhasználja a gyarmati és az antikolonialista tapasztalatokat, és felismeri e két történelmi struktúra relativitását.

A politológusok elsősorban olyan rendszerként tekintenek a gyarmatosításra, amelyben a gyarmatosító megszerzi és fenntartja a hatalmat a gyarmatosított felett, és arra kényszeríti, hogy a saját érdekei szerint cselekedjen. A közgazdászok ezzel szemben a gyarmatosított terület gazdaságának a gyarmatosító gazdasági érdekeinek való alárendeltségét

hangsúlyozzák, különösen a haszonszerzés tekintetében. A kulturális gyarmatosítás a kulturális intézmények és ideológiák olyan működését jelenti – akár a populáris, akár a magas kultúrában –, amely a politikai és gazdasági uralom fenntartását szolgálja.

A posztkoloniális diskurzus az ukrán kultúrában viszonylag nemrégiben jelent meg. Az ukrán irodalomban már egy ideje megfigyelhető egy posztkoloniális irányzat, amit olyan szerzők munkái is bizonyítanak, mint Ivan Dziuba, Marko Pavlyshyn, Oleh Ilnytskyi, Myroslav Shkandrij, Mykola Riabchuk és mások. A posztkoloniális kritika általában – és különösen az ukrán posztkoloniális kritika – az alsóbbrendűségi komplexus leküzdésével jellemezhető. Ez élénken tükröződik a kortárs irodalomtudomány témáiban: a nemzeti önkritika, a nemzeti öntudat kialakításának problémái, az ukrán mentalitás sajátosságai, a „nagy irodalom" koncepciója, valamint az ukrán irodalom világkontextusa. Külön figyelmet érdemel az írók nemzeti tudat megerősítésére irányuló törekvése.

Kulcsszavak: *posztkoloniális kritika, kultúra, rendszer, módszertan, világkontextus, irodalomtudomány.*