

OLENA YURCHUK¹

Lwowski Uniwersytet Narodowy im. Iwana Franki

SOME COMMENTS CONCERNING UKRAINIAN POSTCOLONIAL STUDIES

Repeated and diverse use of the notion of postcolonialism has not yet become the impetus for the development of postcolonial studies in the domain of Ukrainian literature. Sporadic attempts have been so far made to comprehend Ukraine's colonial legacy and postcolonial prospects. Most of these attempts do not exist as independent studies in the domain of postcolonial theory and are mainly related to consideration of some other issues. Nila Zborovska wrote on the prospects of "modern psychohistorical research in postcolonialism"². Hryhori Syvokin uses the term "colonial" in connection with the Soviet period.

Sometimes Ukrainian scholars coin their own terms, such as "post-totalitarian consciousness" suggested by Tamara Hundorova who claims that "post-totalitarian consciousness grows on the basis of official truth dethroning. The post-totalitarian heterogeneous speech itself undermines official consciousness and reveals the falsity of a totalitarian ideology, particularly of the one called the official truth"³. We can assume that the term "post-totalitarian consciousness" fits in the framework of postcolonial terminology and is synonymous to the phrase "postcolonial consciousness" when applied to the study of literature of the post-Soviet period.

The problem of using theories and terminology developed in the Western academy is emphasized by Volodymyr Morenets. Not rejecting the terms "postcolonialism", "post-totalitarianism" and "postimperialism" he discusses the need to take into account the specific character of the Ukrainian postcolonial condition. The scholar claims that putting Ukrainian problems related to the colonial period into the framework of foreign theories often leads to the "depreciation" of the tragic situations born by the colonial system. Thus,

¹ E-mail Address: ecenin@ukr.net

² N. Zborovska, *Kod ukrains'koï literatury: proekt psykhoistorii novitn'oi ukrains'koï literatury*, Kyiv 2006, p. 3.

³ T. Hundorova, *Pisliachornobyls'ka biblioteka. Ukrains'kyi literaturnyi postmodern*, Kyiv 2005, p. 177.

he offers his own set of terms: “We lead a serious conversation about literature, and my whole goal is *to insist on the determining character of such a factor of its self-development in the second half of the 20th century as ‘post-genocide condition*, which is a force at every level of artistic structure: starting with the level of language and style, and problem-and-theme level through the horizon of readers’ expectations to the critical reception of the artistic word and its semiotic nature”⁴. The concept of the “post-genocide condition” is legitimate for some contexts, but seems to be too narrow for the Ukrainian situation. It does not take into account the two factors which determined the existence of Ukraine as a colony: ethnocide (physical and spiritual destruction of a nation) and the role of the national intelligentsia in promoting the imperial discourse.

Other terms used in Ukrainian postcolonial studies include “postmodern postcolonialism” (Marko Pavlyshyn) and “nationally oriented postcolonialism” (Petro Ivanyshyn). Each of these terms reflects its author’s understanding of the processes taking place in Ukraine since gaining independence. According to Ivanyshyn, there exist two types of postcolonial approach in Ukrainian science – postmodern postcolonialism and nation-oriented postcolonialism. The scholar criticizes the proponents of the ‘postmodern postcolonialism’ for the ‘lack of patriotism’, and indirect commitment to imperialism. Ivanyshyn’s rejection of the postmodern version of postcolonialism and, hence, his denial of postmodernists’ creative activity seems to be superficial and ideologically-biased. Ivanyshyn’s vision of postmodern postcolonialism and national-oriented postcolonialism as two extremes a scholar has to choose between, is too dogmatic. He sees no alternative in this situation: “...the choice of a young postcolonial scholar at the repulsive face of colonialism is maximally specified. He can choose either literary studies as postmodern (neo-imperial) game indifferent or openly hostile to national culture or literary studies as an intellectual struggle for the revival and strengthening of national and cultural identity”⁵. In the context of Ukraine’s history, these two versions of postcolonialism can be rather considered as the separate stages of shaping Ukrainian consciousness in literature: postmodern postcolonialism (deconstruction of the imperial) and national-oriented postcolonialism (creating a culture designed to work for the Ukrainian national mythology for its own sake).

Scholarly works that combine the feminist approach with postcolonial discourse are a productive part of Ukrainian postcolonial studies. These include monographs by Solomiya Pavlychko, Oksana Zabuzhko, Nila Zborovs’ka and others.

While using the postcolonial interpretation scheme, Ukrainian scholars point out some aspects that are of key importance for understanding the Ukrainian colonial and postcolonial experience. For example, in her analysis of Ukrainian literature since the independence, Tamara Hundorova emphasizes the necessity to take into account the way it was influenced by the post-Chornobyl experience. Hence, nuclear discourse becomes part of Ukrainian postcolonial practices which has influenced the formation of “literature after Chornobyl”⁶.

⁴ V. Morenets’, *Holos u pusteli*, “Slovo i chas” 2006, no 4, p. 83.

⁵ P. Ivanyshyn, *Natsional’no-ekzystentsial’na interpretatsiia (osnovni teoretychni ta prahmatychni aspekty)*, Drohobych 2005, p. 75.

⁶ T. Hundorova, *op. cit.*, p. 264.

Moreover, focusing on the issues of Ukrainian postcolonial cultural discourse, Tamara Hundorova introduces the notion of a 'transit culture' and suggests the relevance of the idea of ressentiment (Friedrich Nietzsche, Max Scheler) as well as Albert Camus' concept of rebellion to Ukrainian postcolonial practices⁷. One may, however, raise an objection that ressentiment provides for regarding the colonizer's world as a just and rightful one while the world of the colonized is perceived as marked by envy, vengeance and anger. Utilizing the concept of Camus' rebel seems to be of incontestable relevance here, as it puts much value on rebellion as such, understanding it not as an affective activity born of ressentiment (envy, vengefulness) but as the moment of slave's self-awareness and getting a grip of the situation through defining the limit of humiliation s/he can suffer.

Apart from the issues of Ukrainian colonial and postcolonial experience and national identity, Ukrainian intellectuals focus on the prospects for Ukrainian political nation-building. Mykola Riabchuk, for example, focuses in his book *Postcolonial Syndrome: Observations* (2011, in Ukrainian) on the "complex process of the modern Ukrainian nation's emancipation from the pre-modern 'imagined community' defined by some as 'the Russian world' "⁸.

Ukrainian literary studies in English are of key importance for Ukrainian postcolonial studies. Works by scholars from the Ukrainian diaspora prove the relevance of conceptualizing the history of Ukrainian literature in terms of postcolonial theory which result in creating new schemes of interpretation as regards a number of iconic writers. The most influential in this context are the works by George G. Grabowicz who has developed his own "historiographical formula" (as is stated by Tamara Hundorova) and deconstructed the stereotypical images of Taras Shevchenko, Ivan Franko and Lesya Ukrainka embedded in the Ukrainian popular consciousness (*The Poet as Mythmaker: A Study of Symbolic Meaning in Taras Ševčenko*, 1982; *Shevchenko yakoho ne znayemo* [The Shevchenko We Don't Know], 2000; "Vozhdivstvo i rozdvoyennia: 'valenrodyzm' Franka" [Chieftdom and dissociation: Franko's 'Wallenrodism'], 1997; "Kobzar. Kamenyar. Dochka Prometeya" [Kobza Player. Stone Cutter. Daughter of Prometheus], 1999).

The difficulty of naturalizing postcolonial approach in Ukrainian literary studies is also connected with the fact that significant postcolonial studies concerning Ukrainian issues have been published outside Ukraine. These large-scale and innovative interpretations are often perceived by the Ukrainian academy as a view "from outside", not inherently embedded in the Ukrainian reality. A special attention in this context should be paid to the works by Ola Hnatiuk and Myroslav Shkandrij.

The monograph by Hnatiuk, *A Farewell to the Empire: Ukrainian Debates on Identity* contains theoretical assumptions and analysis of the Ukrainian national identity formation on the basis of the late 20th century Ukrainian intellectual discourse. The author reveals the essence of such concepts as "nation", "national identity", "cultural identity", "tradition", and "modernity". Hnatiuk shows understanding of the national as imaginary, formed in the period of modernism and discursive. Her analysis is focused on the debates of Ukrainian intellectuals of the 1980s and 1990s fostering the development of nativism and westernization in Ukrainian culture. Favours westernization, Hnatiuk seems to underestimate the

⁷ T. Hundorova, *Tranzytna kultura. Symptomy postkolonial'noi travmy: staty ta eseï*, Kyiv 2013.

⁸ M. Riabchuk, *Postkolonial'nyi syndrom. Sposterezhennia*, Kyiv 2011, p. 3.

phenomenon of the Zhytomyr school of prose. At the same time, she tends to idealize representatives of the Bu-Ba-Bu literary group, especially Yuri Andrukhovych⁹.

Shkandriy in most cases explains the emergence of imperial or anti-imperial discourse by half-conscious influence of the political situation: “The imposition of cultural hegemony is detected here not as a conscious idea but as a presence of which the writer may be imperfectly aware, one that broods darkly in the background, invisibly manipulating notions of power and authority and attitudes to nation, class and gender, and geography and history”¹⁰. In this regard, the author of the book *Russia and Ukraine: literature and the discourse of empire from Napoleonic to postcolonial times* uses the term *subliminal information*. The readers of the Ukrainian translation of Shkandriy’s book, though, are likely to be misled by the equivalent *sublimovana informaciya* [*sublimated information*] introduced by the translator, Petro Tarashchuk¹¹. The emphasis put on the notion of sublimation puts Shkandriy’s reading into the framework of the psychoanalytic approach. But it is hardly worth to perceive the imperial discourse present in Russian literature as the result of the sublimation process. Sublimation initially involves repressing a definite desire, its modification and replacement. Imperial texts were aimed not at the exclusion of their own imperial ambitions, but at their consolidation, legitimization in the consciousness of the empire representatives and colonized people. In the same way, the sublimation strategy does not work at the level of the texts that form the opposition to the colonizers. The works of Taras Shevchenko, Lesya Ukrainka and Mykola Khvylovy do not contain the repressed desire to resist the Russian Empire, but consciously aim at this resistance. The latter comprises a logical (“healthy”) desire of the national elites to get rid of the oppression that interferes with the adequate development of their own culture.

On the whole, the notions of postcolonial artistic practice (postcolonial literature), postcolonialism, postcolonial theory are yet to be comprehended by Ukrainian scholars.

Postcolonial artistic practice represents a “wide range of multi-stylistic phenomena that attracted the attention of the audience and critics with the new interpretation of philosophical, political, and ethical foundations of modern civilization through the prism of historical experience of those ethnic cultures which have so far been withdrawn to the periphery as subordinated, marginalized, discriminated”¹². It is characterized by politicization, decentralization, pluralism, specific psychology (the problem of overcoming the inferiority complex).

Postcolonialism is understood as the period chronologically coinciding with the collapse of colonies, as well as a generic term for all cultural phenomena which experienced colonial alteration. *Encyclopedia of Postmodernism* states that “postcolonial designates the state of peoples and regions formerly colonized principally by western imperial nations,

⁹ O. Hnatiuk, *Požegnanie z imperium. Ukraïnskie dyskusije o tożsamości*, 2003.

¹⁰ M. Shkandriy, *Russia and Ukraine: Literature and the Discourse of Empire from Napoleonic to Postcolonial Times*, p. 271.

¹¹ M. Shkandrii, *V obı̄makh imperii: rosijs'ka i ukraińs'ka literatura novitn'oï doby*, per. P. Tarashchuk, Kyiv 2004, p. 410.

¹² V. Budnyĭ, M. Il'nyts'kyĭ, *Porivnialne literaturoznavstvo*, Kyiv 2008, p. 322.

and the study of the material and cultural implications of that history and its aftermath”¹³. This interpretation expresses only one aspect of postcolonial studies – the analysis of the colonized people’s culture, but does not include another aspect of postcolonial studies, the interpretation of imperial discourse in the literature of the colonizer.

Ukrainian postcolonial literary studies have to more systematically take into account the developments of postcolonial theory as a set of ideas, beliefs, concepts focused on the study of the cultural legacy of the colonial past by reinterpreting imperial and colonial discourses, their interaction and mutual influence. The analysis of imperial and colonial discourses serves as a basis for identifying the author’s position, preserving the national essence, rethinking relations between the imperial center and periphery, overcoming infantile beliefs about the marginality of the colonized culture, and strengthening decentralization.

While applying postcolonial theory in the Ukrainian context it is necessary to be *clearly aware of the past colonial status of Ukraine as the “immoral otherness”*, without which it is impossible to get rid of ambivalent consciousness and develop the understanding of the colonial past as such that requires deconstruction and reinterpretation.

The one-sided treatment of Ukrainian history providing the vision of Ukraine as a permanent colony suppressed by successive imperial centers (the Mongol-Tatars, Poland, the Russian Empire) has resulted in a stereotype that Ukraine cannot be imagined outside the imperial context. This view is seen in textbooks on Ukrainian history which mythologize the framework “Ukraine as a colony vs. the imperial center” picturing it as a site of apocalyptic struggle between good and evil. The pro-Soviet nostalgia has also found its place in the Ukrainian consciousness, presenting the imperial Russia and colonial Ukraine as fraternal nations and the Soviet Union as a joint project of “peoples’ friendship”.

In the Ukrainian postcolonial reality, three types of consciousness can be distinguished: *pro-imperial* (flirting with the empire by substituting concepts like “colonized” with “fraternal”, promoting ideas that Ukraine cannot exist without Russia etc.), *nostalgic* (perception of the past époque as a particularly significant period manifested e.g. through preservation of the imperial symbols), and *pseudo-patriotic* (ambitious rejection of the possibility to recognize Ukraine as a colony, which masks a deeply rooted reluctance to perceive Russia as an empire and its policy as aggressive towards the Ukrainian nation). It is important to bring to notice that today’s Ukrainian authorities’ discourse is neo-colonial in itself and aimed at reintegration of the Ukrainian into the Russian at the level of politics, economics, and culture. Taking all this into account, it is easy to explain the widespread treatments of Ukraine’s colonial status either as something sacred (that is, especially valuable for understanding the process of shaping the Ukrainian national identity) or as something imaginary (invented to destroy the natural “friendship” of Ukrainian and Russian people).

The postcolonial perspective provides the possibility to interpret the previous colonial experience as the “immoral otherness” which requires analysis, but should not become a priority. This interpretation will change the axiological perspective, and actualize the search of a pre-colonial version of a nation’s history. The postcolonial practices aimed at

¹³ L. Phillips, *Postcolonial*, in: V. E. Taylor & Ch. E. Winqvist (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Postmodernism*, Routledge 2003, p. 314.

destroying the stereotypical way of understanding empire as a significant Other will contribute to the process of self-identification. In the Ukrainian postcolonial situation, the analysis of the colonial paradigm embodied in the empire/colony dichotomy should be based on taking into account the reversed situation: the impact of the colony on the imperial center.

The axiological vector of “recollecting” the past requires modification as well. The Ukrainian postcolonial consciousness should be based on the idea that the Russian imperial expansion was possible not due to the Ukrainian nation’s inability to be independent, but primarily because Russia needed the Ukrainian context as the way of joining the long-standing European tradition and culture. In this regard, Mykola Riabchuk claims that “Ukrainians’ inferiority complex with regard to the metropolitan Russian culture is by no means determined by ‘poverty’, ‘weakness’ or ‘the secondary character’ of their own culture (...) Actually, the Ukrainian inferiority complex is determined by the very fact of comparison, that is, by the situation Ukrainians were put into for many decades”¹⁴.

This provocative statement may be illustrated by the history of Russian imperial textuality as the process of appropriation of Ukrainian cultural and historical artefacts.

The Russian Empire began to burgeon as a text not earlier than in the 17th century. Such a delay may be explained by the fact that the cultural development of the empire did not go hand in hand with the expansion of its territory. The period since the 15th century (the Grand Duchy of Moscow and, since Ivan the Terrible, Tsardom of Russia) witnessed a rapid expansion of Russia’s borders at the expense of neighbouring nations. Culture remained a marginal issue; there was no intellectual elite that would articulate the historical/colonizing experience in the form of text. Russian literature, for example, knew no tradition of chronicles, which means that from its very beginning it was not focused on preserving the facts of Russian history. It may be explained in two different ways: either Russian culture – which took shape later than the Russian territory – “missed” to adopt the genre of chronicle that had already developed in the neighbouring literatures (Ukrainian and Polish ones), or there was no need of documenting the manifestations of Asianness which became part and parcel of Russia’s social order. The second explanation is grounded in the fact that later on, in the period when Russian imperial textuality was gaining a foothold, the national elite turned not to the domestic textual experience that had a marginal status and presented Russia as a relatively “young” historical entity (since the 15th c.) with underdeveloped culture, but to the foreign one, that of Ukraine.

In such a manner, in the 17th century, the Russian Empire launched the process of incorporating Ukrainian culture into the Russian context and whereby appropriating the cultural patterns based on the art of Kyivan Rus’.

Postcolonial theory emphasizes *establishing identity through stressing the importance of the nation’s pre-colonial past.* Postcolonial studies focus mainly on the interpretation of the colonial experience. In the Ukrainian context, such a focus generates a futile vicious circle “Empire – Colony – Empire” leaving no space for the national non-imperial discourse to come into being and fostering the idea that the Ukrainian nation has created its identity either within the colonial paradigm or in opposition to it.

¹⁴ M. Riabchuk, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

In this situation, the Ukrainian postcolonial reflection has to focus not only on the colonial past, but on the pre-colonial stage of Ukraine's development as well. Awareness of the importance of the Ukrainian nation's pre-colonial development and assertion of the value of its own historical past help in overcoming the complex of double identity, the feeling of being split between what is one's own (maternal) perceived as native, but most often inferior, on one hand, and what is alien and interpreted as elite and superior, on the other.

Postcolonial theory provides *overcoming the changes-without-changes attitude, carried out through the substitution of concepts*. Being aware that the national culture is a system of signs which contain the information helping to understand the nation's cultural singularity, the empire tries to weaken the significance of the cultural symbols which contain encrypted social information and thus ensure formation of the national identity. At least two models of influence, namely the prohibition model and the substitution of concept model, work for the empire's interests. Both of them were used in the Ukrainian cultural while promoting the Russian imperial discourse. In the Tsarist Russia, the prohibition model dominated. The Ukrainian culture existed in the space of various taboos concerning the use of language, book and newspaper printing etc. The model of concepts substitution developed in the Soviet period. The Soviet ideology, not expressing overtly the ambition of destroying Ukrainian culture, replaced the Ukrainian national symbols with the imperial ones: at first on the level of renaming, then impregnating them with imperial fundamentals or markers. Due to the process of renaming, cultural phenomena were inscribed into the imperial nationless paradigm (within this framework, Taras Shevchenko called to rebel not against the Russian as the imperial, but against the Russian as the autocratic).

As far as the consequences are concerned, the early imperial prohibition model was not as dangerous as the Soviet model of concept substitution: while the oppression of Ukrainian culture aroused the opposition and fostered the development of anti-colonial movement, the system of "renaming" caused no objections. The signs of national culture did not disappear; they were still visible and seemingly endorsed by the imperial ideology, and, as a result, they did not need protection. The long-term situation of "renaming" has finally led to the substitution of concepts, displacing the national internal content of the cultural signs by imperial meanings.

Once the independence was gained, the need to integrate momentous events, figures, and texts back into Ukrainian culture was realized. For this purpose, the way was chosen which had been tested earlier by the imperial ideology – the one of renaming and concept substitution, of replacing imperial markers by national without deconstruction of the imperial cultural signs' semantic content. The Ukrainian culture, restoring its national identity, resorted to the imperial discourse. The process of "change without change" was announced in the 1990's of the 20th century. In August 1990, the first Congress of the International Association of Ukrainian Studies, witnessed the clash of the two attitudes: the one of Oles Honchar, who expressed the desire for change without destroying the system, and George Yurii Shevelov's who warned that new distorted interpretations could happen under the mask of changes.

Substitution of concepts in the postcolonial condition leads to devaluation of national cultural symbols. When unconsciously renamed, these symbols lose their relevance and acquire the features of restored artifacts irrelevant for the new national consciousness. The rejection of the renamed sign does not provoke the emergence of a new one, but causes the

vacuum effect. The vacuum has to be filled in and is being filled with a neo-imperialistic meaning. The national cultural sign becomes the object of manipulation and is transferred from the sphere of high culture into the domain of mass culture (Oles Buzyna's texts). The manipulation of the national culture is a pro-imperial one, so far as the national sign returned into the sphere of common interest loses its value as the element of Ukrainian national identity formation.

Postcolonial theory *analyzes the colonization processes as a consequence of not only aggressive imperial politics, but of the collaborative activity as well*. It would be altogether naïve to explain the colonization processes in Ukraine only by the Russian imperial policy. The present-day interrelation of Ukrainian and Russian cultures is the result of the imperial pressure just as much as it is the derivative of the submissive position of the Ukrainian native elites which contributed to the endorsement of imperial discourse.

The Ukrainian elites' collaboration has a long history starting with the events accompanying the battle of Poltava, when the majority of Cossacks did not support Hetman Mazepa's attempt to get rid of the imperial pressure. Later on, the Ukrainian intelligentsia went over to Peter I's side, sticking the imperial label of a traitor on Hetman Mazepa and supporting his excommunication. The term *kochubeystvo* (*kochubeyhood*) derived from the name of Mazepa's denunciator Vasyl Kochubey has been used since then to denote the Ukrainian national variant of collaboration. The reasons for choosing collaboration with the empire by the Ukrainian intelligentsia may have included a range of different attitudes, such as: "it is only temporary" (cooperation with the aggressor is recognized as a temporary condition), "I do not care" (compromise with the empire is caused by national indifference), "I need it" (collaborators implement their own will to power). These attitudes correspondingly form the models of behavior: *marginality* (based on the first two attitudes of the long-lasting collaboration and the "homestead mentality" indifference which fix the understanding of one's own nation as inconceivable outside the imperial context) and *favoritism* (integration into the imperial system to indulge one's personal desire for power). Despite differences in attitudes, both models provoke the same result – the identification with the imperial, updating the 'us' and 'them' dichotomy with the third option: 'us like them' (nation – collaborator – Empire).

It is important to *identify the author's position in the text* in postcolonial studies. The text analysis aimed at exploring the presence of the author's consciousness in it, takes into account the fact that any narration is ambivalent, "Janus-faced" (Homi K. Bhabha), so the author cannot get a decisive label of either "national hero" or "enemy". The author in the text always wears a mask defined by the ideological strategy he has chosen (colonial, anti-colonial or postcolonial). The "masked" author is not identical to the author as a biographical person. His mask is a transformation of his biography that releases the complexes generated by the colonial situation.

The author's consciousness varies in different epochs. The analysis of the author's position in the context of the 'Empire vs. colony' discourse reveals the origins of the fixed models of response to the colonial condition. Rather than evidencing the complete change of the author's consciousness in different periods, it demonstrates the modification of roles being reactions to the imperial experience. The author's consciousness within postcolonial theory is not an exclusive and unique phenomenon; it can experience modifications in narrations belonging to different periods.

The situation of the author's meeting with the 'Other' is of great importance in the postcolonial criticism as well. Within the dichotomy of Empire and colony, the imperial 'Other' speaks the language of the master, prompting his own senses. In most cases, the colonized author uses this prompt and chooses the position of articulation the 'alien' imperial text. This process is conditioned by the self-defense mechanism and is carried out through the double marginalization of the national colonial speech, when not only is the empire suppressing the unfavourable discourse, but the colonized subject is plays into the hands of the empire, adjusting his narration to its needs.

Reading the history of Ukrainian literature in the light of postcolonial theory is the way of dismantling stereotypes which attributed to the imperial element the significant role in the process of the national culture development. Understanding the importance of the pre-colonial historical experience creates the opportunities for establishing new axiological attitudes which would provide the understanding of Ukraine's colonial status as the "immoral otherness" requiring reinterpretation. In literature, this situation would at last provoke the emergence of national-oriented texts set beyond the framework of the empire-related conflicts and complexes.

OLENA YURCHUK

Some comments concerning Ukrainian Postcolonial Studies

Summary

The paper focuses on the prospects offered by the postcolonial approach in the domain of Ukrainian literary studies. The study of the cultural legacy of the colonial past aimed at reinterpreting imperial and colonial discourses as well as their interaction and mutual influence responds to the crucial challenges facing the today's Ukrainian society. The analysis of imperial and colonial discourses serves as a basis for identifying the author's position, preserving the national essence, rethinking relations between the imperial center and periphery, overcoming infantile beliefs about the marginality of the colonized culture, and strengthening decentralization.

Keywords: postcolonial condition, postcolonial literature, postcolonial studies, imperial discourse

Niektóre uwagi dotyczące Ukraińskich studiów Postkolonialnych

Streszczenie

Artykuł skupia się na perspektywach, oferowanych przez podejście postkolonialne w zakresie ukraińskich badań literackich. Zbadanie spuścizny kulturowej przeszłości kolonialnej skierowane na reinterpretację dyskursu imperialnego i kolonialnego, ich wzajemnych relacji i oddziaływań, odpowiada na kluczowe wyzwania, które stoją przed dzisiejszym społeczeństwem ukraińskim. Analiza dyskursu imperialnego i kolonialnego służy podstawą do identyfikacji postawy autora, pozwala na zachowanie pierwiastka narodowego, ponowne przemyślenie relacji pomiędzy imperialnym centrum a peryferią, przewyciężenie infantylnych przekonań o marginalności skolonizowanej kultury, jak również wzmocnienie decentralizacji.

Słowa kluczowe: stan postkolonialny, literatura postkolonialna, studia postkolonialne, dyskurs imperialny

