

*Chobanyuk M. M.,**orcid.org/0000-0002-6047-4852**Candidate of Philological Sciences,**Associate Professor at Linguistic and Intercultural Communication Department**Drohobych State Pedagogical University named after Ivan Franko*

POSTMODERNISM: A VIEW OF MODERN UKRAINIAN LITERATURE

Summary. The perception of the culture of recent decades, including the culture of postmodernism, is not unambiguous in terms of saturation of the meanings that make it up. Deviation from the canons and the emergence and interpenetration of various trends that took place in the last century have formed a new approach to creativity and the essence of life in general. The aim of the study is to analyze the reception of Ukrainian postmodernism at the turn of the XX and XXI centuries. The emphasis is on the literary understanding of the reality of the situation of Ukrainian postmodernism.

The relevance of the proposed work is related to the substantiation of the thesis that postmodernism is an extremely complex and multidimensional phenomenon of modern culture, which to this day causes scientific discussions among literary critics, philosophers, sociologists, culturologists, art critics, political scientists. The scientific literary world of the XXI century still studies, analyzes, rethinks and reinterprets the aesthetics of postmodern art of the XX century. The article notes that postmodernism has formed its own ideology, the main theses of which were devastating criticism of traditional values, humanism, historicism and rationalism, rejection of the structure of modern society and a person capable of being responsible for their actions. Attention is drawn to the fact that Ukrainian literary postmodernism is analyzed ambiguously, seeing in it often an imposed, not self-sufficient, fast-moving, avant-garde-outrageous phenomenon, and therefore somewhere incomplete.

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

Key words: Ukrainian postmodernism, concept, postmodernism, culture, reception.

Statement 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, culturologists, art critics, political scientists, and others. The peculiarities of postmodernism are associated primarily with the intellectual tension of the end of the millennium – not so much a calendar result as a generalization of European culture, which «has reached its growth and strength, and has not got rid of its most drastic problems [1, p. 5].

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

Analysis of recent research. In modern Ukrainian literary studies, in particular in criticism, there has been a fairly stable tendency to talk about the discourse of postmodernism primarily in the theoretical sense, and the most important part of this discourse is connected with the definition of boundaries, the substantiation of the qualitative characteristics of this phenomenon, the introduction into scientific circulation of the paradigm of postmodern definitions, etc. Ukrainian postmodernism differs significantly from the Western model of postmodernism due to a number of factors, primarily such as historical circumstances and national characteristics. Among the studies of domestic literary experts devoted to the problems of Ukrainian literary postmodernism, the works of T. Gundorova, N. Zborovska, R. Kharchuk, and I. Starovoyt should be mentioned first of all. Another line of research is the reinterpretation of previous cultural eras and the work of their prominent representatives from postmodern worldview positions. These are primarily the works of T. Gundorova, V. Ageeva, D. Zatonsky, and others.

Considerable attention in modern Ukrainian literary studies is also paid to the study of theoretical issues of postmodern artistic practice. These are, in particular, the works of S. Andrusiv, I. Fizer, Yu. Ilchuk (Radionova), S. Russova, R. Semkiv, etc. The studies of Ukrainian and foreign literary experts devoted to the problems of foreign postmodernism appear to be thorough. Among them, it is worth noting, in particular, the works of B. Bigun, A. Merezhyńska, B. Bakula, M. Lypovetskyi, Z. Krasnodembskyi, V. Boletskyi, K. Unilovskyi, M. Epshtein, I. Skoropanova, and others. In our opinion, the study of literary (Ukrainian, Russian, Polish) postmodernism in a comparative aspect by L. Lavrynovych is interesting.

Presentation of the main material of the research. Finding out the essence of literary trends, methods, stylistic trends has always been an important problem of literary theory. The complex and long process of understanding a certain direction has different stages, of which the initial one is one of the most complicated, because it is parallel to the formation of the studied phenomenon.

Postmodernism owes its very existence to the past, which it seems to deny as a self-sufficient phenomenon and which can only be a source for the creation of postmodern works. Trying to trace the reasons for this «chronological expansion» of postmodernism, U. Eco emphasizes its most important feature, which can be considered a defining characteristic of postmodernism as a cultural phenomenon, and reveals the historical conditionality of this direction. The writer notes: «I myself am convinced that postmodernism is not a fixed chronological phenomenon, but a kind of spiritual state. In this sense, the phrase that any epoch has its own postmodernism is legitimate. Obviously, every epoch at some point comes to the brink of crisis» [2, p. 427].

Postmodernism has formed its own ideology, the main theses of which were the devastating critique of traditional values, humanism, historicism and rationalism, the rejection of the structure of modern society and man, able to be responsible for their actions. Postmodernism is a special spiritual state that characterizes the era. This state is characterized by feelings of confusion, despair, exhaustion. Postmodernism is not only a crisis worldview, but also an awareness of this crisis and self-awareness in this troubled world. And it is awareness and self-awareness that determines the relevance of the works of postmodernism.

In modern aesthetic theory, postmodernism is represented by a number of definitions that have ambiguous semantic characteristics. Among the most common, the dominant emphasis is on: – independent style and method of artistic development of reality; – intermediate style between modernism of the late XIX–XX centuries. and that which is just being formed; – way of thinking and modern knowledge of the world; – forms of modern human existence and existence.

Speaking of postmodernism, it is necessary to distinguish at least a few planes of understanding this concept. In our opinion, three significant meanings need to be distinguished, in which the term postmodernism was and still is most often used. This is 1) the name of the postmodern era (or its beginning) in the history of Western thought; 2) a word to denote a new postmodernization (post-industrial) phase of development of highly developed (only or in particular) Western societies; 3) as the very first formulation of the so-called – postmodernist – period of change in literature and art (together with their theory and accompanying criticism).

Postmodernism reflects the rupture of social and spiritual ties of life, the loss of moral landmarks in the world. We can note the main features of the postmodern art world – it's disharmony and destruction. This world is bizarre and horrible, there is nothing permanent here. It frightens with the depth of his crisis and hopelessness, uncertainty and confusion. The art world in postmodernism has no development, it is closed in on itself, like something split, has no integrity. It can be noted that chaotic, fragmentary and collage become a characteristic feature of postmodern works. And although the world has no continuation, it can be understood through the prism of past eras, the cultural experience of mankind. The only thing an artist can do is «try to comprehend the present being through the past» [3, c. 93]. Therefore, in the works of postmodernism we can observe a combination of stylistic elements, quotations from other periods of art. These combinations are aimed at understanding the present. Chaos in the works, on the one hand, reflects the chaos of the absurd world, and on the other – is a step towards its realization. The work of postmodernism is presented not as a ready-made thing, but as an interaction of the artist with the text, the text – with the space of culture, with art and so on. The text is depicted as the world, and the world as the text.

The work is a so-called conditional text and a conditional world. Everything in it corresponds to the rules of aesthetic play, inherent in most works of postmodernism. The artist does not seem to write, but plays in literature with the reader. Therefore, it seems that the heroes do not live, but play in life. The game allows you to move freely from one time to another, from reality – into the world of the subconscious. The question arises: do you need this game? The reason for the positive answer to this question is that it is the game that is able to overcome the tragedy of being at least on an aesthetic level. In addition, the aesthetic game allows the artist

together with the reader, the viewer to look not only into the secret corners of reality, but also into his inner world and, finally, to free a person from reality. In addition, the aesthetic game in the works of postmodernism is often combined with parody, irony, and this has always been a means of destroying any ideals, overcoming the drama of life. In the works of postmodernism behind the aesthetic game hides the dream of real life, the pursuit of truth and sincerity, the revival of universal norms and values.

The inconsistency of the universe as seen by the postmodernist's eye leads to the fact that no one has the right to the ultimate truth about the world. Therefore, postmodern works can be read in different ways. They leave a lot of space for the reader's imagination, make the mind work hard. This method of communication is used by the author so that people do not calm down in their existence, but learn to think and search.

The works of postmodernism are focused on creating an unusual impression, which becomes another manifestation of the game with the reader. The formation of readers' interest in the work forces postmodernists to look for new means for their artistic palette. Postmodern works are designed for the average reader who lives in the postmodern era.

In postmodern works, the creator is able to combine reality and fiction, conscious and subconscious, past and present. The artist has the opportunity to move from one space-time level to another. The horrible in life is frightening, and in art you can look closely at it, think about its causes and eventually develop your attitude to it.

Due to the extremely flexible artistic system of postmodernism, which denies any canons, postmodern phenomena can be traced in works of various genres – both poetic and dramatic. Postmodernism is not a crisis art, but it is an art that arose in times of crisis. It can be assumed that the crisis age that gives rise to art is not in itself hopeless. And so there is hope that art itself is able to overcome this crisis.

Myth plays an important role in the works of postmodernism. The mythical nature of postmodern consciousness is able to raise the phenomena of modernity to the philosophical level, relevant in any period of cultural history. Thanks to the myth, we can see the individual in the aspect of the universal. It encourages us to think, to evaluate our existence in the context of eternity. The nature of the myth best fits the essence of postmodernism.

Quite unusual in postmodern works are the author's connections with the text, the author with time, with space. Text, time, space depend on the author. However, the author also feels dependent on the work. Postmodernists are trying to create a modern chronicle of their time. And although the author's opinion is usually hidden, but the creative beginning testifies to the victory of the human over the chaos and chaos of life. I would like to draw attention to the fact that the plot in the works of postmodernism is mostly divided into micro-plots, works of the characters themselves, author's comments and so on. This fragmentation of the text indicates the disintegration of the integrity of reality itself, formed in the world and human consciousness. But all these micro-plots are united by the will and feelings of the narrator. Everything that has fallen apart in the world is united by a creative beginning.

In postmodern works, the individual looks to some extent like a marginal being. It seems to be at the crossroads of different eras. «It is the product of a crisis of existence, and this crisis affects its inner state» [3, p. 94]. Postmodern works are designed for the average reader who lives in the postmodern era.

Despite the mass, postmodernism is characterized by a certain focus on the cultural reader. By depicting a man who appeared on the ruins of different epochs, artists try to revive his past spiritual experience. Artists try to force the average person to look at themselves and the world differently from the standpoint of cultural experience. The concept of man is marked to some extent by irony and skepticism. An ironic look is inherent in a person inwardly free. Therefore, irony gives a special freedom to both the hero and the author in the works of postmodernism.

The peculiarity of the heroes of postmodern works of art is evident in comparison with the heroes of other literary epochs and trends. Yes, the romantic hero does not perceive the surrounding reality, he is looking for a world of dreams and ideals. The hero in realistic works is forced to live in the conditions in which he found himself and look for a rational way out of them. The hero of modernism builds a new world in his imagination. The hero of postmodernism also remains to live in the conditions in which he found himself, but, unlike the realist, he no longer believes in anything, so he has nowhere to move. The only thing that can help him overcome the isolation of time and space is irony and play. They provide an opportunity to gain the degree of freedom without which a person ceases to be a person.

The art of postmodernism tends to multilingual styles, techniques, cultures, which leads to a kind of universality that combines different aesthetic and ideological systems. At the same time, the artistic culture of postmodernism denies any stereotypes, causal relationships, linearity, plot, psychological determinism. This leads to a multidimensional and ambiguous interpretation of postmodernist artistic texts. On the example of samples of modern literature we can observe the phenomenon of loss of authority of the author, the desire of art to reflect, a critical reassessment of national traditions.

Ukrainian postmodernism differs significantly from the Western model of postmodernism due to a number of factors, primarily such as historical circumstances and national characteristics.

Among the researches of domestic literary critics devoted to the problems of Ukrainian literary postmodernism, it is worth mentioning first of all the works of T. Gundorova, N. Zborovska, R. Kharchuk, I. Starovoit. Another line of research is the reinterpretation of previous cultural epochs and the work of their leading representatives from postmodernist worldviews. This is primarily the work of T. Gundorova, V. Ageeva, D. Zatonsky and others.

The question of the meaning and purpose of postmodernism in Ukraine gave rise to a protracted discussion, which was wittily summed up by one of its initiators – Yuri Andrukhovych: «The time has come when postmodernism in our country is not criticized only by the lazy or the dead» [4, p. 15]. Indeed, postmodernism in Ukrainian practice is scolded, criticized, not accepted, or, conversely, praised and elevated to intellectual heights, but no one can avoid it, no one will remain indifferent to its manifestations.

Solomiya Pavlychko specified the complex of problems facing the researcher of this phenomenon in the Ukrainian case. In the work «Discourse of Modernism in Ukrainian Literature» the author emphasizes that in literature modernization has its aspects. It provides honest answers to numerous questions: «In what language do we speak about literature, tradition, and ourselves in general? Can there even be the very notion of a forbidden or inconvenient topic? Who makes up the canon of our classics? What forces are nurtured on the literary margin?» [5, p. 7]

In modern Ukrainian literary criticism, in particular in criticism, there is a fairly strong tendency to talk about the discourse of postmodernism primarily in theoretical terms, and the most important part of this discourse is related to defining boundaries, substantiating the qualitative characteristics of this phenomenon. «Postmodernism ... remains with us first and foremost a discussion and discourse – a conversation and an essay; there is no intersection of them with the usual artistic text (postmodernism without Eco, without Zuskind, without Cortasar, without Fowles) – so it remains, first of all, the realm of elegant intellectual fiction...» [6, p. 50].

Due to the difficult ideological conditions in which Ukrainian society and literary and artistic life found itself, in particular during the Soviet era, the modern discourse of Ukrainian literature was «not fully developed and full-fledged» [7, p. 183]. Because of this, it was unable to create a proper basis for the emergence of Ukrainian postmodernism. However, it is undeniable that Ukrainian modernism has nevertheless developed, and postmodernism, freed from totalitarian control, has created the right conditions for a critical understanding of modernism. It was in the era of Ukrainian postmodernism that the most thorough studies of Ukrainian modernism appeared.

Ukrainian postmodernism began to develop in the conditions of socialist realism, it was started by the then representatives of the underground – in particular, the Kyiv ironic literary school (V. Dibrova, B. Zholdak, L. Poderevyansky). The first Ukrainian postmodernists did not consider themselves as such, until when postmodernism was established in the West, they began to identify with it. As we can see, Ukrainian postmodernism originated in politically difficult and unstable conditions, and developed at a time when culture and society were returning to normal, namely at the time of Ukraine's independence. Domestic authors have started discussions about the Ukrainian past (most often in the context of modernism), trying to find out how it influenced the emergence of postmodernism and whether it influenced at all. The «whimsical prose» of the 1960s and 1980s is specifically a Ukrainian «unreflected version of postmodernism» [7, p. 185].

The emergence of postmodernism in Ukrainian culture is a consequence of the entry of Ukrainian society into the context of today's global problems. According to L. Lavrynovych, the «reflected» Ukrainian postmodern literature of the 80s and 90s is differentiated in Ukrainian criticism both by the generational principle and by the writers' orientation to the Western or national tradition. In general, the most striking feature of Ukrainian literature of different schools and generations is the emphasis on the marginal, which becomes a typical state. The work of most Ukrainian writers is difficult to correlate with the specific postmodernist style of writing of Western authors: each individual work combines different versions. The most Europeanized version of postmodernism is the Ukrainian carnival metaprose, which is characterized by «the lowest level of elitist tightness and appeals to the mass reader» [8, p. 4].

Essays are most involved in the force field of postmodernism. The essay is notable for the fact that it seems to be placed within reality in the formation, where it involves various forms of its awareness. Oksana Zabuzhko's synchronous reflections, collected under one cover of «Chronicles of Fortinbras» [9], is one of the interesting attempts to crystallize the meaning of current 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.

Ukrainian literary postmodernism is analyzed ambiguously, seeing in it an often imposed, not self-sufficient, fast-moving, avant-garde-outrageous phenomenon, and therefore somewhere incomplete (S. Kvit [10], O. Yarovy [11, 12], P. Ivanyshyn [13]). These authors are hostile to postmodernism in Ukrainian theory and practice, because they believe that postmodernism destroys the Ukrainian national identity, which has already suffered from the cataclysms of the past.

Conclusions. In our culture, there is now a completely justified choice of what should remain in the asset, and what will long become a liability of the artistic consciousness. Exactly, until a clear opposition to postmodernism is formulated, it will absorb the arguments of criticism, turning them to its advantage. Despite all the differences, it is obvious that the national specificity of Ukrainian postmodernism is mostly due to the Baroque style consciousness. The past and the future – like mirror walls around the present – with each significant event changes their integrity, which is permeated by a new semantic pattern, a different spirit of the time; but no matter what happens, the national culture is protected as a whole, its current state cannot but agree with the past.

We must note that in the Ukrainian media we find more publications that assess Ukrainian postmodernism as a negative phenomenon rather than a positive one. This is probably due to a certain unpreparedness of Ukrainian society for many features and characteristics of postmodernism. Examining the specifics of the reception of Ukrainian postmodernism at the turn of the millennium, we conclude that in postmodernism, as well as in its belonging to certain national cultures, there are still many moments and aspects that require separate consideration and analysis. The topic of postmodernism remains relevant for research and has prospects for further work on it.

Література:

1. Старовойт І. Український постмодернізм у критичному та художньому дискурсах кінця ХХ століття. Львів. 2001. С. 3–20.
2. Эко У. Заметки на полях „Имени розы”. Москва. 1989. С. 425–467.
3. Боднарчук Т. До питання про модель людини і світу у культурі постмодернізму. *Культура і сучасність*. № 1. 2011. С. 93–97.
4. Андрухович Ю. Повернення деміургов. Івано-Франківськ. 1998. С. 15.
5. Павличко С. Дискурс модернізму в українській літературі. Київ, 1999. С. 7.
6. Єшкілев В. Дискурси в сучасній українській літературі [в] *Повернення деміургов*. Івано-Франківськ. 1998. С. 50.
7. Попіль Д. Український постмодернізм у дзеркалі медіа. *Вісник Львівського ун-ту*. Львів. 2011. Вип. 34. С.183–187.
8. Лавринович Л. Постмодернізм в українській, польській та російській прозі: типологія образу-персонажа. Тернопіль. 2002. С. 3–21.
9. Забужко О. Хроніки від Фортінбраса. Вибрана есеїстика. Київ. 1999. С. 340.
10. Квіт С. Основи герменевтики. Київ. 1998. С. 65–66.
11. Яровий О. Скажу як є. *Літературна Україна*. № 8. 2001. С. 4–7.
12. Яровий О. Лист самому собі. *Літературна Україна*. № 15. 2001. С. 2–5.
13. Іванишин П. Постмодернізм і національно-духовна ідентифікація. *Українські проблеми*. № 1–2. 1999. С. 123–130.

Чобанюк М. Постмодернізм: погляд сучасного українського літературознавства

Анотація. Сприйняття культури постмодернізму в сучасному літературному процесі за останні десятиліття не є однозначним з точки зору насичення смислів. Взаємопроникнення різних тенденцій та відступ від канонів, що мали місце у другій половині ХХ століття, сформували новий підхід до творчого процесу та й змісту життя в цілому. Метою даного дослідження є аналіз інтерпретації українського постмодернізму на межі третього тисячоліття. Звернено увагу на саме літературному осмисленні українського постмодернізму.

Науковий світ літератури ХХІ століття надалі аналізує, переосмислює, вивчає та по-новому інтерпретує естетику постмодерної творчості ХХ століття. Актуальність пропонованої роботи пов'язана з обґрунтуванням тези про те, що постмодернізм – багатовимірне явище сучасної культури, яке викликає наукові дискусії у середовищі політологів, мистецтвознавців, культурологів, філософів, соціологів, а особливо літературознавців.

У статті звернено увагу на те, що постмодернізм сформував власну ідеологію. Критика традиційних цінностей, історизму та раціоналізму, несприйняття устрою сучасного суспільства та людини, здатної бути відповідальною за свої вчинки, гуманізму – основні його тези. Зазначено, що український постмодернізм аналізують неоднозначно: явище несамодостатнє, швидкоплинне, неповноцінне, нав'язне.

Дослідивши специфіку рецепції українського постмодернізму кінця ХХ початку ХХІ століть, можемо стверджувати, що у постмодернізмі, як і в його приналежності до певних національних культур, надалі існує багато моментів та аспектів, котрі потребують окремого розгляду та аналізу. Тема українського постмодернізму залишається актуальною для досліджень і має перспективи для подальшої праці над нею.

Ключові слова: український постмодернізм, рецепція, постмодернізм, культура, концепція.