

STEZHKO Yuri Grigorievich

Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor, Department of Foreign Languages
National Aviation University; 1, Cosmonaut Komarov Str., Kiev, Ukraine, 03058;
тел. +38 (044) 406 72 42; e-mail: istezhko@ukr.net; ORCID ID: 0000-0002-0226-8081

**LANGUOCULTURAL IDENTIFICATION OF UKRAINE
IN ARTISTIC TRANSLATIONS OF POSTMODERNISTS**

Abstract. The priority of the domestication strategy with the formation the national identity of a reader is defined. The *object* of the research is artistic translation in the language-cultural synchrony of postmodernism and as the *subject* of the translation the strategy is chosen. The *purpose* is covering of the strategy of artistic translation in the context juxtaposition of the cultural and historical traditions of modernism and postmodernism which is grounded on the translations of world classics by domestic writers. *Methods* of research: the comparativistics, analogies, a lifting from abstract to concrete, the analysis and synthesis. *Methodology* consists of: linguistic philosophy of V. von Humboldt and the sociolinguistics of E. Sapir; linguistic imperatives of postmodernism; a synergistic vision of linguistic and cultural development. The *finding* of the paper is substantiation of the domestication strategy in a situational combination with the foreignization as it is an appropriate postmodernist method of the national identification of the reader. The combination of controversial strategies that generates the phenomenon of synergy is justified. The field of *practical value* of the results is regarded for the teaching of individual topics for some courses of translation studies, the development an appropriate extra courses, etc. *Results.* It is proved: the illegality of denial of the pluralism of strategies an artistic translations; the conditionality of the domination of some strategy by the task and the purpose of the translation; a parity role of the translator and the author in creating the idea of the art work; the conditionality of the prospect of researching the problems of artistic translations by the transience of cultural transformations.

Key words: artistic translation, postmodernism, domestication, foreignization, creativity, national identity.

The problem statement. The problem of the translation which deals with the national interests begins with the period of the first translation of the Bible. The question has arisen since – what the translation is, which the role of the translator in relations with the author is, which the place of translation in the author's intentions is, which the role of translation in shaping the national consciousness of the reader is. A lot of answers were given in different national and cultural conditions. It was the reason for the endless and hot discussions and as a result of disputes there appeared a new idea of choosing the strategy of the translation, its conditionality by the national-cultural demands of society. By the way disputes were handled between the supporters of different strategies – on the one hand the foreignization which history started with the period of a tender attitude to the translation of some sacred texts of the Bible. On the other hand the domestication, Ukrainian roots go far in time of national self-expression by I. Kotlyarevskii, P. Kulish, S. Rudanskii and M. Rudnitskii. Different assessments of the translation creativity by the founders of the Ukrainian traditions of the translation were a ground for disputes about the acceptable limits and about the right of a translator for free interpretation of an author's intentions.

Connection with previous researches. The urgent need for the national identification of Ukrainians (due to modern socio-cultural orientation) made only a more acute problem of choosing a literary translation strategy and paid special attention to Ukrainian linguists and translators. Outstanding Ukrainian linguists, writers – T. Halushchynskyi, L. Grebinka, I. Degtyareva, V. Karaban, Y. Klene, L. Kolomiets, G. Kochur, P. Kulish,

Y. Levitsky, M. Lukash, P. Morachevskiy, M. Novykova, D. Pavlychko, M. Rylsky, M. Rudnitsky, M. Starytsky, V. Svidzinsky, M. Striha, M. Tereshchenko and others have made a significant contribution to the study of the problem of translation through the prism of national culture. Creative achievements of Ukrainian postmodernists and literary critics Y. Andrukhovych, E. Barana, T. Gundorova, N. Zborovskaya, Yu. Izdrik, A. Kamianets, S. Kvit, L. Kolomiets, T. Nekertchyan, M. Pavlishina, V. Pakhareno, D. Popil also greatly contributed to our study.

However, it seems that the theme of the connection of literary translation with the formation of national consciousness of the reader has not had adequate coverage and a clear assessment of the role the postmodern innovations on literary creativity yet. **Statement tasks of research.** Now we are going to join the forming ideas about the expediency and limits of the world classics domestication in the Ukrainian translation. Therefore, **the aim** of our short study is to highlight the strategy of literary translation in context of cultural and historical traditions of modernism and postmodernism on some samples of translations of world classics by domestic writers.

Representing fundamental material. The literary translation is a cultural and historical phenomenon and its strategy is changing with every civilizational transformation. Cultural influences on the choice of translation strategy are especially visible in comparing translations of world classics into Ukrainian at different times. We are about the differences in the forms of reflection of reality, as to the author's integrity, and about the saving of the linguistic and cultural authenticity of the original through the imperatives of modernism and postmodernism.

The epoch of Modern, which is characterized by unlimited domination of rationalism, which is destructive for creativity of formal and logical accuracy of translation and became methodologically the basis of the position about the fundamental irreducibility of the original, the inability to give the author's individuality in the artistic translation. It was believed that «all without exception, works of art are unplayable with some forms of reproduction; the originality of any creative act is in the individuality of the author» [1, p. 165]. Therefore, the translator must constantly follow the logic of the author intentions, accurately reproduce the foreign-language cultural environment.

The strategy of literary translation as a form of literary creation was determined by the imperative of preserving foreign authenticity, artificiality of the normative language, the rationalism in the reflection of reality. Literary achievements of modernism are a set of ideologies of social-realistic «sacralization» public purposes, the statements of the hypertrophied social optimism, universal collectivism and social conditioning of the individuality. The translation as a form of literary work was involved with the indoctrination too: it manifested itself in the imperative preservation of the authenticity of foreign language, the artificiality of artistic media of the aesthetic expression, the sanctioning the Ukrainian language.

However, the social-realistic imperatives of rationality, the foreignization, the objectivity, and so on are losing their significance, with its social and cultural transformations. Comprehensive administrations of culture involved a crisis phenomenon in art and literature; eventually, modernism has run out its potential as the national leader. Therefore, it is natural that the literary community tried to search new esthetic kinds, artistic directions of the creative self-realization. The sprouts of the linguopragmatics were born in the depths of social realism, which ultimately fructified of postmodernism with its vision of a translation strategy what is far from ensuring the authentic of the original with minus to the national culture. «Postmodernism does not want to have anything to do with the search for authenticity..., F. Webster rightly notes. We cannot understand, for example, what Dickens really said, because we live in the XXI century...» [8, p. 231].

Philosophers, culturologists, and then the linguists started a talk about «a powerful intellectual renewal, which can be called as «a postmodern revolution» [6, p. 227]. The methodological principles of Modern era – literary classicism, fundamental intransigence, author's inviolability, uniqueness, objectivity, rational fundamentalism – went into oblivion along with the ideologems of the Modern era. The space was opened for «rethinking the role of texts and cultures of the original language and the translation and the relations of the author and translator in the new cultural and historical dimension» [6, p. 228]. A new paradigm of literary translation consistently gained ground with the twentieth century end.

In general, the «powerful intellectual renewal» manifested itself in the comprehensive liberalization of translation activity – appearance of «parody, ridicule old styles, an ironic reinterpretation of shapes, a comparison and mixing of everything and making of bright crafts» [8, p. 321]. The creative potential of outstanding Ukrainian writers of postmodernists Yu. Andrukhovych, O. Zabuzhko, A. Irvant, and others have opened the backdrop of cultural liberalization. Postmodernism has now become a powerful intellectual stream in accordance with some estimates. The new intellectualism is a relational, irrational, nihilistic attitude to the culture (V. Kremen) like modern social realities. Ukrainian translation became the features of irony, a play, a carnivality, metaphorization, free interpretation of the text on the ground that the creativity is non-administrated, it is always in conflict with rationality, logical thinking. «Creativity... is an entirely irrational mystical ability» [7, p. 264]. Only irrationalism can ensure the relative sovereignty of the subject, the ability to resist the administrating the literary creativity. The translator with its «flying» mind which is out of limits and established norms, reflecting all literary experience forms a number of possibilities for creating their own product of creativity. And as high level of freedom as high the level of heuristics – right up to «enlightenment». The highest level of creativity is achieved with leaving out the limits of logical way of thinking to the level of intuition, the unconscious. Now it is completely justified to speak about postmodernism as «one of the intellectual fiction of our time» (Yu. Andrukhovych).

The theory of translation is free from the ideas about immunity of author's intentions, the potential of irrationalism was discovered in comprehension of reality, aesthetic pluralism, an eclectic combination of different genres, factuality and fictitiousness in the creation of realities and the various opportunities of creativity domestication, a broad interpretation of the original were spread out in general. The translator sees himself in dialogical relations with the author, he shares to readers a world outlook, the existential state of the writer through his own inner world from the position of own philosophical-ideological and valuable orientations.

Currently, postmodern transformations have substantially changed the notion of the functional significance of artistic translation and opened the mighty potential of the translation strategy of domestication as a factor of national identification. Literary postmodernism declares the freedom for the creation of meaning which makes a translator as important as the author of a work and a translation even could be better in artistic value than the original (Look at «Aeneida» by I. Kotlyarevskiy.)

But we would betray the objectivity in covering topic in case of hiding the criticism of the literary postmodernism. Yu. Andrukhovych in the article «The Apology of Postmodernism» does hyperbolization, saying that the «postmodernism is not criticized only by the lazy or dead». So, if for somebody postmodernism was a powerful intellectual renewal, then in eyes of others it is blasphemy, a fashionable imitation of Western culture, the destruction of national identity. We should noted the validity of the position of E. Baran, S. Grabovsky, O. Yarovy and other opponents of Ukrainian postmodernism, who see loss of Ukrainian identity in postmodernism. It's asserted that Ukrainian postmodernism due to its lost self-identity in the times of totalitarianism is inappropriate and premature comparing with the West with its rich democratic experience. Ukrainians

should initially go a long way of democratic development in order to adequately perceive national culture in the spirit of postmodernism.

But there is a question: is the Ukrainian postmodernism identical to some Western examples, is it true that Ukrainian translations reflect foreign values, cultural traditions, which at the same time destroy our values and whether it is premature. With regard to the devastating effect of postmodernism on national identity, the thesis is refuted by the «Ukrainianization» of a foreign language and a deep domestication, as seen in the translation of Ukrainian postmodernists.

It is also wrong to speak of prematurity in the event that a new cultural phenomenon objectively matures against the backdrop of civilizational transformations, the subculture of the youth environment. Nowadays it is necessary to agree with the ideas of literal innovations to Yu. Andrukhovych: «The devaluation of the high word: to write as poetically as possible. There is a shizz of the old generation. The young people are doing something another kind» [2, p. 143]. This is «something else» – «carnavalization of artistic language», filling foreign-language works with modern Ukrainian vocabulary, values that return the reader to national origins. Therefore it is quite justified that, under the conditions of wide liberalization of all spheres of social existence, Ukrainian postmodernism is firmly established in literary work and seems to acquire national-cultural features. The originality of Ukrainian postmodernism is the reaction to reevaluation of values, the adoption of a new content of intellectualism, and an answer to the linguistic and cultural demands of the average reader.

It seems reasonable to agree with the opinion of the leading representative of Ukrainian postmodernism Yu. Andrukhovych that postmodernism – is the only possible way for artistic expression for today [3, p. 66]. The conditionality of artistic translations by historical and cultural factors most clearly manifested itself when comparing translations of Shakespeare's «Hamlet» at different times by a plethora of prominent Ukrainian writers as Yu. Andrukhovych, L. Hrebinka, Yu. Klen, G. Kochur, P. Kulish, M. Rudnitsky, Yu. Fed'kovych.

Translations of «Hamlet» take a prominent place in Ukrainian cultural heritage and every translation is a reflection of cultural-historic traditions. First what is seen is differences in the language of heroes, in the linguistic expression of events and relations in translation of different times. The modern language of the characters of Shakespeare in the translation by Yu. Andrukhovych is full of reminiscences, which are far from Shakespeare's times. Ironies, aphorism, game, modernization of events and characters of Heroes, the esthetic vulgarization are the most typical characteristic of the translation. Yu. Andrukhovych (as oppose, to say, to L. Hrebinka's translation) is not too concerned with the authenticity of the transmission of the characters, allows interpretations that do not always correspond to the semantic correspondence of the word and its emotional color, the spirit of the Ukrainian language, the Ukrainian autochthonous language culture of the Cossack. And it is not a complete list of features that are able to characterize the translation of «Hamlet» by Y. Andrukhovych.

In the translation of «Hamlet» by L. Grebinka in the 30's of the last century one can see clearly the features of modernism with its classicism, rationalism and accuracy in the reproduction of Shakespeare's intentions and the veracity of the representation the origin's content with the literary vocabulary of the central-northern Ukrainian sub ethnos.

An expression of foreignization or lexical puritanism in the spirit of classicism is difficult to see in the translation by Yu. Andrukhovych. Rather, we have a manifestation of the common memory of the Ukrainians, the colorist language of the Cossacks. «Ukrainization» of the classical work by Yu. Andrukhovych at the depth of domestication corresponds to the translation of «Aeneida» by the founder of the writing of the «living» word, the spokesman of the original language of Ukrainians – I. Kotlyarevsky.

«Ukrainization» by Yu. Andrukhovych of the first creation is more expressive in the background of comparison of the above-mentioned passage of translation with translations of other Ukrainian representatives of past cultural and historical traditions. However, it is impossible to provide a wide range of translations in limited volumes of the article, therefore we note only the main difference between translations - the difference between strategies – dominance of foreignization during modern times and of domestication in post-modern time.

Significant differences, in our opinion, with the interpretations of the first creation of «Hamlet» by representatives of different times and cultures are natural phenomena and have an explanation. It is known that artistic translation as a cultural phenomenon is sensitive to any social and political transformations that the Ukrainian reality is so saturated – and this has been manifested in the new forms of its reflection.

Today one thing is obvious – development of culture, on the one hand, is an objective process and it is impossible to stop this process – it can only be artificially suppressed by ideological prohibitions, the administration of culture, the censorship of literature, as has already happened in our recent history; on the other hand, the development of culture is a subjective process, which includes the mentality, originality of the author and translator. In the understanding of U. Eko, the words are conventional signs, and the choice of the meaning of a word from the plurality of its interpretations is carried out by the interpreter (that is, the translator) on the basis of the code. «A code is a model that is the result of conditional simplifications made in order to ensure the possibility of transmitting this or that message» [4, p. 83].

The code itself is an expression of the subjective interpreter's perception of information on the basis of intercultural communicative experience. In general, multiplicity, polysemy in the translation of the author's idiolect with the focus on interests, the recipient's requests, is confirmed. Therefore, the discrepancies in the interpretations of the above fragment from Hamlet by different translators (each in their own way gave the composition meaning) are explained due to the differences of personal codes of interpreters and the coincidence of linguistic codes (the Ukrainian language). Following U. Eko, the conditionality of interpreting by the translator's personal code, giving the meaning of the work is a kind of reflection as a mental projection of all acquired worldview and cultural experience for the text as an entropy system.

During the period of postmodern culture, the basic principle of lingual pragmatics (C. Pearce) has been established in the translation theory, according to which the meaning of the word should be perceived in the light of possible consequences and practical results. That is why the word is interpreted by the translator as a matrix of possible states of reality, as a field for interpreting the author's intentions in accordance with the requests of the national reader or authentic culture. Thus, they were fully justified: «two principles of translation: one of them requires the resettlement of a foreign author to us, – so that we can see in him a compatriot, the other, on the contrary, makes us demand that we go to this foreigner and agree with conditions of his life, his language composition, his features» [5, p. 39]. What, in fact, we have on the example of the translations of Shakespeare's «Hamlet».

However, on the background of the liberalization of all spheres of life in a linguistic discourse, a compromise position rises. It was suggested to put between two controversial strategies one more strategy – neutralization, that is, the unmarked translation style (G. Ts. Fong, R. Nir), according to which none of the two cultures will be dominated by translation. In today's theorists, the idea of neutralizing the translation (when «apart from the «polar» strategies of translation ... is considered as an independent strategy of so-called «golden mean» [9, p. 5] has found its warm support. Domestication or foreignization is seen as components of the neutral strategy of linguistic and cultural adaptation of the text, as it relates to it as a special and general. «At the same time, lin-

guocultural adaptation is seen as a bi-directional process» [ibid.], oriented to a neutral attitude towards cultures, but «in practice the translator tends to intuitively strive for the «golden mean», at different moments of translation preferring one or the other strategies» [9, p. 10]. This combination of controversial strategies generates a synergy phenomenon when the achieved artistic effect exceeds the overall effectiveness of each strategy. However, in practice, the choice of the strategy of artistic translation is given to the discretion of the translator, – as he considers appropriate to convey the author's intentions to the foreign reader, how the translator realizes his own national devotion. This right of the translator justifies the replacement of words, their own writing or, conversely, omission, rebuilding the design sentence, replacing some national-cultural markers with others, etc. Let's face it, the reader thinks of images, associations, so the translator should not blindly copy the manifestations of another culture, especially if they are contrary to cultural traditions, the interests of forming national identity. For the reader, the translator is the same artist for the significance in the creation of artistic value, as the author.

We do not take responsibility for evaluating both the translation strategies and the position of translators, but we ask the question which linguistic and cultural traditions today correspond more to the national identity – language what is devoid of national color, the emasculation of everything that returns the reader to the national roots, authentic, «foreign» to the Ukrainian reader the reproduction of another language, another culture – or the language of the national reader who has absorbed the centuries-old history and culture of Ukrainianness. The rhetorical question. As for us, the question what the strategy of translating – domestication or foreignization – should be chosen by a nationally conscious translator, has an unequivocal answer: «the resettlement of a foreign author to us - so that we could see a compatriot in it», add – and contemporary. So, is it worth for the tradition of classicism losing the opportunity to bring the national language culture to the level of world literary classics, awakening the reader's sense of exaltation, pride in his own language, culture? Again, the question is rhetorical. The translator must identify the author's cultural markers and find their Ukrainian equivalents in the modern language, acceptable to the national reader; they must reflect national cultural features, mentality, and the spirit of Ukrainian language. Currently, postmodernist transformations have substantially changed the notion of the functional significance of artistic translation, which, through the «Ukrainianization» of world classics, has acquired new forms of national identity.

Conclusions. On the basis of the analysis of the translations of the literary association Bu-Ba-Bu it can be argued that literary postmodernism does not destroy national consciousness, identity, but vice versa – makes a foreign work the achievement of a national culture, a means of spiritual enrichment of a nation – through orientation to meet the spiritual needs of Ukrainians. The Ukrainian literary treasury was enriched by the efforts of domestic postmodernist translators with the world classics with the Ukrainian national color, thus raising the national language and culture to the world level. We believe that the words of K. Popper are suitable for the assessment of Ukrainian postmodernists: «An insignificant minority of creative people – people who create works of art, ... is a genuine value. These few exceptional personalities enable us to realize the true greatness of man. Moreover, despite the fact that these leaders of humanity know how to use the mind, ...they are never people of mind. The roots of such personalities extend deeper: to the depths of their personal instincts and desires as well as to the instincts and the desires of society, of which they are part» [7, p. 264]. However, history will give a true assessment of literary work for today even an «insignificant minority» of postmodernists. It is clear that present-day linguistic and cultural disturbances are not the last, and the artistic intelligentsia must be ready to accept new fundamental changes in the theory of translation.

And finally. **Prospects for the next researches.** We admit the possibility of another evaluation to the role of postmodern artistic translations and the strategy of domes-

tion, and therefore position our intelligence as a subjective position. Within the framework of the article we could not disclose all the multifaceted nature of the translation in the formation of national consciousness, and therefore the subject needs to be further explored in the context of the long-term perspective of new national-cultural transformations.

Бібліографічні посилання

1. Алексеева М. Осмысление феномена непереводаемости философами XX столетия. *Вопросы философии*. 2014. № 2. С. 164–171.
2. Андрухович Ю. Перверзія: Роман. ВНТЛ-Класика. Львів. 2002. 288 с.
3. Андрухович Ю. Постмодернізм – не напрям, не течія, не мода. *Слово і Час*. 1999. № 3. С. 56–66.
4. Эко У. Отсутствующая структура. Введение в семиологию. ТОО ТК «Петрополис». СПб. 1998. 432 с.
5. Федоров А. Основы общей теории перевода (лингвистические проблемы): Для институтов и факультетов иностр. языков. 5-е изд. Санкт-Петербург: Филологический факультет СПбГУ; М.: ООО «Издательский Дом ФИЛОЛОГИЯ ТРИ». 2002. 348 с.
6. Корнаухова Н. Теория перевода после «постмодернистского переворота» *Фаховий та художній переклад: теорія, методологія, практика*: зб. наук. праць. (Київ, НАУ, 5–7 квітня 2013 р.). Аграр Медіа Груп. Київ. 2013. С. 227–231
7. Поппер К. Открытое общество и его враги. Москва: Феникс, Международный фонд «Культурная инициатива». 1992. Т. 2. 528 с.
8. Уэбстер Ф. Теории информационного общества. Москва: Аспект Пресс, 2004. 400 с.
9. Войнич И. В. Стратегии лингвокультурной адаптации художественного текста в переводе: автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук: 10.02.12. Перм. гос. ун-т. Пермь, 2010. 20 с.

Reference

1. Alekseeva, M. (2014), “Comprehension of the phenomenon of untranslatability by the philosophers of the twentieth century” [“Osmyslenie fenomeny neperevodimosti filosofami XX stoletiya”], *Questions of philosophy*, No. 2, pp. 164–171.
2. Andrukhoivich, Yu. (2002), *Perverzia: Roman [Perverziia: Roman]*, VNTL-Klasyka, Lviv, 288 p.
3. Andrukhoivich, Yu. (1999), “Postmodernism is not a direction, is not a trend, is not a fashion” [“Postmodernizm – ne napriam, ne techiia, ne moda”], *Word and Time*, No. 3, pp. 56–66.
4. Eko, U. (1998), *Missing structure. Introduction to semiology [Otsutstvuyushchaya struktura. Vvedenie v semiologiyu]*, TOO TK «Petropolis», Moscow, 432 p.
5. Fedorov, A. (2002), *Fundamentals of the general theory of translation (linguistic problems): For institutes and faculties of foreign languages. 5rd ed. [Osnovy obshchei teorii perevoda (lingvisticheskie problemy): Dlia institutov i fakul'tetov inostr. iazykov. 5-e izd.]*, «Izdatelskii Dom FILOLOGIIa TRI», SPb., Moscow, 348 p.
6. Kornaukhova, N. (2013), “The theory of translation after the «postmodern revolution»”, *Professional and artistic translation: theory, methodology, practice: digest of scientific works [“Teoriya perevoda posle «postmodernistskogo perevorota»”]*, *Fakhovi ta khudozhnii pereklad: teoriia, metodolohiia, praktyka: zbirnyk naukovykh prats*, Ahrar Media Hrup, Kyiv, pp. 227–231.
7. Popper, K. (1992), *Open society and its enemies [Otkrytoe obshchestvo i ego vrugi]*, vol. 2, Feniks, Moscow, 528 p.
8. Uebster, F. (2004), *Theories of the Information Society [Teorii informatsionnogo obshchestva]*, Aspekt Press, Moscow, 400 p.
9. Voynich, I. (2012), *Strategies of linguocultural adaptation of artistic text in translation: Author's thesis [Strategii lingvokulturnoy adaptatsii khudozhestvennogo teksta v perevode: avtoref. dis. ... kand. filol. nauk]*. Perm. gos. un-t Perm, 20 p.

Стежко Юрій Григорович

кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент кафедри іноземних мов, Національного авіаційного університету;
просп. Космонавта Комарова, 1, м. Київ, Україна, 03058; тел. +38 (044) 406 72 42;
e-mail: istezhko@ukr.net; ORCID 0000-0002-0226-8081

**МОВНОКУЛЬТУРНА ІДЕНТИФІКАЦІЯ УКРАЇНСТВА
У ХУДОЖНІХ ПЕРЕКЛАДАХ ПОСТМОДЕРНІСТІВ**

Анотація. У статті висвітлюється національно-історична обумовленість стратегії художнього перекладу. Проводиться думка про літературний постмодернізм як закономірну реакцію на культурну лібералізацію, інтелектуальне оновлення нації. Постмодернізм розкриває творчий та інтелектуальний потенціал перекладача, визначає його паритетність із автором у творенні смислу. Відзначається пріоритетність стратегії доместикації у формуванні національної ідентичності читача. За *об'єкт* дослідження маємо художній переклад у мовнокультурній синхронії постмодернізму, за *предмет* - стратегію перекладу. *Мета:* висвітлення стратегії художнього перекладу в контексті культурно-історичних традицій модернізму та постмодернізму на зразках перекладів світової класики вітчизняними літераторами. *Методи* дослідження: компаративістики, аналогії, сходження від абстрактного до конкретного, аналізу та синтезу. *Методологію* становлять: лінгвофілософія В. фон Гумбольдта та соціолінгвістика Е. Сепіра; лінгвістичні імперативи постмодернізму; синергетичне бачення мовнокультурного розвитку. *Результат* роботи: обґрунтування стратегії доместикації у ситуативному сполученні із форенізацією як культуровідповідного постмодернізму засобу національної ідентифікації читача. Виправдовується комбінація контрверсійних стратегій, яка породжує феномен синергії. Сферою *практичного застосування* отриманих результатів бачиться викладання окремих тем курсу перекладознавства, розробка відповідних спецкурсів тощо. *Висновки.* Доведена: неправомірність заперечення плюралізму стратегій художнього перекладу; обумовленість домінування тієї чи іншої стратегії завданням та метою перекладу; паритетність перекладача та автора у творенні смислу; обумовленість перспективності дослідження проблем художнього перекладу швидкоплинністю культурних перетворень.

Ключові слова: художній переклад, постмодернізм, доместикація, форенізація, творчість, національна ідентичність.

Стежко Юрій Григорьевич

Кандидат педагогических наук, доцент кафедры иностранных языков Национального авиационного университета; просп. Космонавта Комарова, 1, г. Киев, Украина, 03058; тел. +38 (044) 406 72 42;
e-mail: istezhko@ukr.net; ORCID 0000-0002-0226-8081

**ЯЗЫКОВОКУЛЬТУРНАЯ ИДЕНТИФИКАЦИЯ УКРАИНСТВА
В ХУДОЖЕСТВЕННЫХ ПЕРЕВОДАХ ПОСТМОДЕРНИСТОВ**

Аннотация. В статье освещается национально-историческая обусловленность стратегии художественного перевода. Проводится мысль о литературном постмодернизме как закономерную реакцию на культурную либерализацию, интеллектуальное обновление нации. Постмодернизм раскрывает творческий и интеллектуальный потенциал переводчика, определяет его паритетность с автором в создании смысла. Отмечается приоритетность стратегии доместикации в формировании национальной идентичности читателя. *Объект* исследования – художественный перевод в языковокультурной синхронии постмодернизма, *предмет* – стратегия перевода. *Цель* – освещение стратегии художественного перевода в контексте культурно-исторических традиций модернизма и постмодернизма на образцах переводов мировой классики отечественными литераторами. *Методы* исследования: компаративистики, аналогии, восхождения от абстрактного к конкретному, анализа и синтеза. *Методологию* составляют: лингвофилософия В. фон Гумбольдта и социолингвистика Э. Сепира; лингвистические императивы постмодернизма; синергетическое видение языковокультурного развития. *Результат работы:* обоснование стратегии доместикации в ситуативном сочетании с форенизацией сообразно культуре постмодернизма как средства национальной идентификации читателя. Оправдывается комбинация противоречивых стратегий, которая порождает феномен синергии. *Сферой практического применения* полученных результатов видится преподавание отдельных тем курса переводоведения, разработка соответствующих спецкурсов и т. п. *Выводы.* Доказана: неправомерность отрицания плюрализма стратегий художественного перевода; обусловленность доминирования той или иной стратегии задачей и целью перевода; паритетность переводчика и автора в создании смысла; обусловленность перспективности исследования проблем художественного перевода быстротечностью культурных преобразований.

Ключевые слова: художественный перевод, постмодернизм, доместикация, форенізація, творчество, национальная идентичность.

Надійшла до редколегії 09.11.18