

Shevchenko M. Y. Parkhomenko K. O. Linguistic adaptation of terminology by the examples of Thomas Elyot's typical works

The article analyzes main methods of adaptation of English terminology. Specific concept "terminology" is studied in its nominative structure. Novelty of the article lies in scantiness of this field researches and deep interaction of this notion with philosophy, sociology and lexicology. Thomas Eliot's creative works served as the material due to their valuable ethical content. Introduction, interpretation and kind of assimilation were determined to be fulfilled by means of authors object settings. The necessity of language, science in general and philosophy in particular is rather noticeable. It could be satisfied either by internal resources or by external ones, i.e. by adoption of new words, first of all, from classical languages – Latin and Greek. Therefore, there are two methods: not owing to consideration in extensive context but by interpretation of the semantics of new lexical units during its nature explication or by means of logical allocation of lexical units; explaining the semantic of nominative units through two words, that are already all known and lexically constant. Adoption of foreign words as objective historical fact inherent to all languages in different degrees, it is a display of evolution, an important source of language development, because lexicology is the most «extensible» scientific field for all kinds of foreign mergers, the field which reflects any changes taking place in social life. It has been established that tendency of development, the process of terminology's structure enriching in the system of ethic vocabulary and specificity of Early Modern English lexicon can be identified by factors promoting their expansion.

Key words: linguistic adaptation, Early Modern English, terminology, semantics, T. Elyot.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 30.01.2014 р.

Прийнято до друку 28.03.2014 р.

Рецензент – д. філол. н., проф. Глущенко В. А.

УДК 811.111'276.1

P. Yu. Shopin

POSTMODERN PYGMALIONISM

The Pygmalion myth can be applied as a metaphor to explain the modern subject. The myth's ambivalence and transitory state between reality and illusion resonate with the symptoms of the subject of modernity. The modern subject is split between myth and enlightenment (The 'splitting of the modern subject' is discussed by Cascardi [1, p. 2], who argues that 'the modern subject is in fact positioned within a field of conflicting discourses'.), and the Pygmalion myth sheds light on the nature of this split. The myth itself

is fraught with ambiguity because it is entwined as a foreign element in the fabric of each text, and the dynamic of the relationship between Pygmalion and Galatea destabilizes the myth. On the one hand, artists use the Pygmalion story to inform their works and to present the mythical consciousness of the subject. On the other hand, the Pygmalion myth is demythologized by artists, and is changed according to their understanding or not-understanding of the miracle. Every new version of Pygmalion aims to explain the old myth as fiction but *nolens volens* reintroduces mythology.

As long as Pygmalion considers himself to be capable of rationally explaining the miracle and assuming the role of the dominant subject, he risks becoming a slave to mythology and instrumental reason. Here I follow Adorno and Horkheimer [2, p. 54] in arguing that the Pygmalion myth describes a subject-object relationship where '[m]an's domination over himself, which grounds his selfhood, is almost always the destruction of the subject in whose service it is undertaken'. Amalgamation of power and reason means that Pygmalion's attempts to produce a miracle are efforts to gain power over his creation. In order to reach this goal, Pygmalion is ready to resort to mythology.

For Adorno and Horkheimer, mythology is not historically superseded by rationality but constitutes human experience of reality and is common in everyday life. Hence it is reasonable to consider the modern versions of Pygmalion as variants of a myth, in spite of the fact that most comparative studies tend to view Pygmalion as a theme or a story [3; 4; 5]. By treating the Pygmalion myth as a myth, it is possible to do justice to the modern interpretation of the Pygmalion mythology and to contribute to its comparative study. All the versions of the Pygmalion myth are important in this context, since there is no priority of one work over any other, and each text contributes to the reactivation of mythical consciousness in the age of modernity.

It is now time for a short excursus into the postmodern condition of Pygmalionism. While the age of enlightenment – despite criticizing and undoing the myth – accepts Pygmalion as its paragon and disciple, postmodernity does not trust grand narratives [6, p. 37] and treats Pygmalion as a liminal case: one of many other metaphors for the postmodern subject. Because the only grand narrative 'likely to stand a chance of success is the acceptance of the heterogeneity of dissensions' [7, p. 251], Pygmalion recedes from the public eye, and Galatea becomes a changeling left to the postmodern critic, who – by undermining the powers of Pygmalion – endows Galatea with unprecedented subjectivity and freedom. Galatea is allowed to be different and independent, but her animation becomes a myth once again. The subject of modernity may now be symbolized not by Pygmalion, who can be seen no longer, but by the self-sufficient Galatea. In this frame of reference, the myth once again reasserts its controversial relation to oppression and domination, becoming the celebration of individuality and strangeness.

Let us not be deceived by the semblance of the emancipatory power of Galatea's claim towards her independence. Postmodernity does not resolve the problem of mythical consciousness and the domination of Pygmalion. Bauman

[7, p. 259] must be right when he states that '[t]he postmodern condition has split society into the happy seduced and unhappy oppressed halves'. The happy seduced half of the society is no less dominated by the existing order than the unhappy oppressed half. It is worth keeping in mind that instrumental reason conceals itself in the multivocality of postmodern myth. Pygmalion disappears as a hero, but he remains on the stage as a symptom. The true dialectic of the Pygmalion myth in postmodernity lies in that Pygmalion becomes the *rend* – if to use Didi-Huberman's terminology [8] – in the fabric of the text; he is obliterated by the seduced narrator, who conceives of Galatea as a nonconformist and an emancipated individual. By proceeding dialectically and focusing on the split in the 2011 novel by Lucinda Brant, one can unveil Pygmalionism in its alleged absence from the text and relate the postmodern Pygmalion to his modern origins.

Autumn Duchess is a marginal novel far away from the mainstream literature, and that is why it is a good example for the study of Pygmalionism as a liminal case in the postmodern condition. It is a historical romance, set in 1777, which tells the story of Antonia, the Duchess of Roxton, who mourns the loss of her husband and refuses to put away the black. Later, she falls in love, and the romance begins. The book is an eclectic novel, full of anachronisms, conflicting ideas, and incongruities, which makes it consonant with the poetics of postmodernism [9, p. 224]. The novel's fetishism, with its animation of the inanimate, Pygmalionesque motives, and the inclusion of cacophonous discourses make it a legitimate case for the analysis of the postmodern Pygmalion. Let us look at the first two chapters of the novel and pay particular attention to the minor character whose importance cannot be recognized by the reader without the knowledge of the author's allusions.

Autumn Duchess begins with mutual adoration between Antonia and Jonathan, her future lover. The reader witnesses adoration from the point of view of Jonathan, and Antonia is seen as an 'exquisite feminine beauty', the vision of whom 'stopped breath in his throat' [10, p. 1], which is reminiscent of the moment of adoration in other versions of Pygmalion. The gaze as the means of animating the object of adoration is contrasted with reification as 'it was only natural he should give himself the leisure to drink her in' [10, p. 1]. 'His admiring gaze' [10, p. 1] both animates Antonia and alienates her in the eyes of the reader, who succumbs to the ruthless logic of the romance. The reader can marvel at 'the porcelain skin of her décolletage glowing flawless against the bottomless black of her gown' [10, p. 1], not noticing how he alienates a human being to the point of perceiving her as an inanimate object, 'as if she was a statue carved of alabaster draped in black cloth; as much a fixture of the ballroom as a blazing chandelier or the enormous, richly woven tapestry hanging behind her' [10, p. 2]. When the dancers begin pairing up and walking past her, they do not notice Antonia, as if she were only a statue. Such reification is deemed unnerving and false; Jonathan wonders why she is 'being deliberately avoided' [10, p. 2], and finds no answer.

Lord Cavendish – a secondary character in the novel – explains to Jonathan that Antonia ‘is a divinely beautiful, sweet-natured creature who is to be pitied’, as there are rumours that ‘sorrow has unhinged her’, and her son had to invite Sir Titus Foley, ‘a dandified physician who’s made a name for himself in the study and treatment of female *melancholia*’. There are first symptoms of Galatea’s alienation: her strange behaviour is perceived as madness. However, Antonia is a postmodern heroine, a nonconformist who manages to stand out against the efforts to normalize her. The reader is given what he wants to perceive: the painted veil of heterogeneity. But before we proceed to the celebration of difference, it is worth noting Sir Titus Foley, a character who is mentioned at the beginning of the novel and then happily forgotten until chapter eleven.

Jonathan misunderstands the reason for Antonia’s alienation. He believes that ‘her son keeps her under lock and key’ [10, p. 10]. For him, it is no ‘wonder she’s suffering from *melancholia*’, as she ‘has no life at all; bullied and badgered and totally misunderstood’ [10, p. 10]. Jonathan’s misunderstanding of Antonia’s alienation places him in complicity with her son and Sir Titus Foley. Therefore, she will not ‘need the peculiar attentions of a supercilious quack’, and Jonathan will become ‘someone to talk to and a sympathetic shoulder to cry on’ [10, p. 10] for her, only to realize the normalizing scenario, designed by her son. Thus, Jonathan will involuntarily accomplish the job of Sir Titus Foley and ‘cure’ Antonia’s melancholia, because her alienation is caused by the fact that her son wants her to enjoy life and love again.

Antonia’s son does not know what to do to ‘drag her out of the vat of grief and self-pity’ [10, p. 12]. She was ‘once animated, happy creature’ [10, p. 13], but now her mourning is a cause of sorrow and distress to her son; she is seen as an inanimate object, lacking life. As a result, he decides ‘to try a different approach, one [...] the eminent physician Sir Titus Foley had assured him was the only way to shake his mother to her senses’ [10, p. 13]. Sir Titus Foley is mentioned for the second time in the novel. The Duke resorts to his services to make his mother happy again. The reader is led to believe that Antonia’s nonconformism does not wane, which happens for the reason that one does not know about Sir Foley’s ‘different approach’ and can only surmise what it involves. After a discussion with his mother about her mourning, the Duke informs Antonia that he has invited Sir Titus Foley [10, p. 14]. Yet again Sir Titus Foley emerges, and mere mentioning his name produces a shudder in Antonia: “*What?*” she responded, a quick agitated movement of a slender wrist flicking open her fan. She suppressed a shiver of loathing’ [10, p. 14]. Sir Titus Foley is ‘a disgusting, fat-fingered quack’ for her and his summoning is ‘incroyable’ [10, p. 14]. The novel postpones revealing to the reader the ominous nature of Foley’s treatment until much later in the novel, and one hardly understands why the Duke can blackmail Antonia by saying that he will ‘gladly dispense with the services of Sir Titus Foley, despite his assurances that he can cure [Antonia] of this excessive and

unreasonable melancholy' if she agrees to stop mourning [10, p. 15]. His words send 'a chill down Antonia's spine', and an unknowing reader may believe that she 'visibly stiffened' after these words because she could not stand the idea of conforming. 'Cure her?' mentally exclaims Antonia in disbelief [10, p. 15]. Why does she become cold and rigid like a statue when she hears the name of Titus Foley and his intention to 'cure her'? The text beguiles the reader and seemingly meets his expectations by highlighting Antonia's refusal to conform as the reason for her agitation: 'Conform? The word wasn't in her vocabulary. [...] She had always been just herself' [10, p. 16]. Although Antonia does not conform due to the treatment, she is animated by Jonathan when she sees him, and their relationship becomes the driving force of the romance. Despite the postmodern insistence on difference and nonconformism, the text deceives the reader by presenting conformism in the guise of independence and free will of Galatea.

As in Shaw's play, *Pygmalion* is a collective image in *Autumn Duchess*, where the Duke, Sir Titus Foley, and Jonathan jointly fulfil the function of animating Antonia. While the roles of the Duke and Jonathan in the process of animation are well decipherable, Sir Titus Foley stands out as an opaque reference to the psychological ideas at the dawn of the Age of Reason. The reader is misled into believing that Antonia was able to resist the normalizing practices of 'a disgusting, fat-fingered quack'. One is set on the wrong track in interpreting her disgust towards Foley. Brant gives a clue to her readers later: in the author's note, she explains that Sir Titus Foley is based on the real-life model of Patrick Blair, a doctor who treated melancholia in women and used 'water treatment to sadistic effect' [10, p. 352]. But she reveals this fact only after the animation of Galatea, presumably so as not to offend her readers' sensibilities at the very beginning. The instrumental reason of *Pygmalion* appears as a surreptitious symptom in the novel. Antonia's terror is turned into seemingly steadfast resilience and alleged non-conformity which crumble at the moment when she first sees Jonathan. What the story could really tell would be a story of domination, *Pygmalionism* in its pure mythical nature.

Patrick Blair, a psychiatrist in the early eighteenth century, used a method of water treatment remarkable for its cruelty and violence. His 'Cataritick way of cold Bathing' [11, p. 325] was more than effective in treating patients who refused to be normalized, and Antonia would have hardly stood a chance, in spite of her postmodern love for difference and nonconformism. Patrick Blair treated his patients as malleable matter. He would pour water over their heads, and his method relied on 'surprise'; he would blindfold his patients before subjecting them to water torture [11, p. 325]. In one of his notes from 1725, Blair speaks about 'curing' a married woman who was considered to be mad, because she did not love her husband and 'neglected every thing' [12, p. 327]. This woman is similar to Brant's Antonia in her refusal to love. He treated her first with 'frequent bleedings, violent Emeticks, strong purgatives and potent Sudorificks and Narcoticks', but none of these conventional ways of treating melancholia

‘workt for a wish’d for advantage’ [12, p. 327 – 328]. After a month of conventional treatment, Blair noticed improvement in the condition of his patient who ‘became insensibly to have the use of her Reason’; but she still refused to love her husband, only rarely allowing ‘her self to be called by his name which she could not endure before’ [12, p. 328]. One night, he put ‘her in hopes of getting home from thence [...] but when she went into the Room in which she was to Lay’, he ordered that she be stripped and blindfolded; she was ‘lifted up by force, plac’d in and fixt to the Chair in the bathing Tub’ [12, p. 328]. Unsurprisingly, this produced a terrible shock in the woman, ‘especially when the water was let down’ [12, p. 328].

First, Blair kept her in the ‘bathing Tub’ for thirty minutes, ‘stopping the pipe now and then and enquiring whether she would take her husband’ [12, p. 328]. But she resisted the ‘treatment’ and refused to love her husband until ‘at last being much fatigu’d with the pressure of the water she promised she would do what I desired’ [12, p. 328]. Blair’s instrumental approach towards normalizing his patient produced a ‘salubrious’ effect, but later she again refused to conform. Blair repeated his ‘treatment’, increasing the time of the ‘Tryal’ from thirty to sixty minutes and adding one more pipe to pour water not only over her head, but also ‘in her face or any other part of her head neck or breast’; and the woman first ‘would not promise to take her husband’ until she was exhausted and ‘promised to Love him as before’ [12, p. 328]. Blair did not believe his patient and repeated the treatment in several days’ time. The ‘3rd Tryal of the fall’ was ninety minutes long, and the woman promised obedience and love once again. However, the next day ‘she was as sullen and obstinate as ever’, and Blair threatened her with a fourth ‘Tryal’; he ‘took her out of bed, had her stript, blindfolded and ready to be put in the Chair’, when suddenly she could not resist anymore and, being terrified of the imminent torture, ‘she kneeled submissively that I would spare her and she would become a Loving obedient and dutifull Wife for ever thereafter’ [12, p. 328]. At last he was persuaded that she had been normalized, and he let her return to her husband and sleep with him, ‘which she did with great chearfullness’ [12, p. 328].

There is no mercy or doubt in Blair’s approach. His method is as immutable as madness itself. Galatea is animated, and her love for Pygmalion returns. It was naive of Shaw to say that Galatea could never love Pygmalion: about a month after the treatment, Patrick Blair paid a visit to the family and ‘saw every thing in good order’ [12, p. 328]. Fifteen tons of water in ninety minutes performs the metamorphosis; the myth is reintroduced as instrumental reason. Pygmalion becomes the epitome of domination, who shapes Galatea according to his enlightenment ideals. There is no place for not-knowing; everything is illuminated with the triumph of reason over madness. Alienation is thwarted through appropriation and suppression. Instrumental reason restores the absolute mythology where the subject is both enslaved and empowered.

Brant’s novel misplaces the accent and shifts the focus onto Antonia’s independence and nonconformism. When she is asked by Jonathan whether her

son threatened to summon Sir Titus Foley, Antonia is unsettled by the word 'threatened' and looks away, 'feeling heavy of heart' [10, p. 69]. The unwitting reader may assume that Antonia is disconcerted because she is independent and thinks it absurd that Jonathan may believe her son could threaten her. However, Sir Titus Foley, who is nothing but a name at this point in the text, could be the true source of heavy feelings on the side of Antonia. Her refusal to discuss this topic with Jonathan gives food for thought. Antonia's humiliation does not transpire, and her secret will stay with her for a long time, until the reader learns about Sir Titus Foley much later in the text. Yet he remains a minor character, and Antonia manages to resist his Pygmalionism.

Postmodern interpretation of Patrick Blair as Sir Titus Foley in the novel obfuscates Pygmalion's role in 'curing' Antonia. Having explored the symptom of Pygmalionism in *Autumn Duchess*, I would like to state that the Pygmalion myth is both refuted and reincarnated in the novel. Antonia refuses to be normalized by Sir Titus Foley, and no treatment can make her conform. The myth of instrumental reason is unveiled as self-deception on the side of Pygmalion, who believes in the omnipotence of his domination over Galatea. On the other hand, Pygmalionism remains a gap in the understanding of the text, as the Duke's assimilatory offer is unconsciously accepted by Antonia when she falls in love with Jonathan. Accepting the offer, Antonia succumbs to the powers of Pygmalionism without realizing it. The reader is deceived and is submerged into the myth of Pygmalion when Antonia comes to life thanks to her love for Jonathan. Sir Titus Foley's story appears as an innocuous pastiche. Postmodernism's 'protective wall of playful unconcern' [7, p. 260] splits the novel and hides almost all the traces of the subjugation of Galatea.

Pygmalion deceives himself when he thinks that Galatea is animated owing to his mastery, and Galatea escapes into an illusion of her independence from the normalizing force of Pygmalionism. The Pygmalion myth is dialectically experienced as both self-deception and authentic reality of the modern subject. Even the author of the myth is deceived in trying to demythologize it. There is no possibility of writing against the myth without evoking it in the mythical consciousness of the reader; but silencing the myth and distorting it is hardly a solution, since it leads to even stronger support for Pygmalionism as a rend in the fabric of the text. It is important to come to terms with the myth and achieve the balance between mythical and critical thinking, both of which may be relinquished in postmodernity, with its validation of difference and absolute not-knowing. Obliterating Pygmalionism misleads the reader and mythologizes the text from the perspective of Galatea, who – being unconsciously dominated and oppressed by the same forces of instrumental reason – is bequeathed with Pygmalion's supernatural powers.

In the postmodern condition, the Pygmalion myth may become the myth of Galatea, with the statue's assertion of independence from Pygmalion. Galatea becomes a voice of a new difference and selfhood. The postmodern tradition problematizes the Pygmalion myth only to install the myth of the all-potent subject in the guise of Galatea, or to obliterate the subject altogether.

Empathizing with the object and realizing its animation, postmodernity is critical of the totalitarian and unreflective instrumental reason which underlies the modern Pygmalion mythology; but it fails to refute the myth and hence reveals its complicity with and affinity to modernity.

References

- 1. Cascardi A.** The Subject of Modernity / Anthony Cascardi. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- 2. Horkheimer M.** Dialectic of Enlightenment : Philosophical Fragments / M. Horkheimer, T. W. Adorno; trans. John Cumming. – NY. : Herder & Herder, 1972.
- 3. Dörrie H.** Pygmalion. Ein Impuls Ovids und seine Wirkungen bis in die Gegenwart / Heinrich Dörrie. – Opladen : Westdeutscher Verlag, 1974.
- 4. Joshua E.** Pygmalion and Galatea : The History of a Narrative in English Literature / Essaka Joshua. – Aldershot : Ashgate, 2001.
- 5. Weiser C.** Pygmalion: vom Künstler und Erzieher zum pathologischen Fall; eine stoffgeschichtliche Untersuchung / Claudia Weiser. – Frankfurt a.M. : Peter Lang, 1998.
- 6. Lyotard J.-F.** The Postmodern Condition : A Report on Knowledge / Jean-François Lyotard; [trans. by Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi.] – Manchester : Manchester University Press, 1984.
- 7. Bauman Z.** Modernity and Ambivalence / Zygmunt Bauman. – Cambridge : Polity Press, 1991.
- 8. Didi-Huberman G.** Confronting Images: Questioning the Ends of a Certain History of Art / Georges Didi-Huberman; [trans. John Goodman]. – University Park : The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2005.
- 9. Hutcheon L. A.** Poetics of Postmodernism : History, Theory, Fiction / Linda Hutcheon. – London : Routledge, 2005.
- 10. Brant L.** Autumn Duchess: A Georgian Historical Romance / Lucinda Brant. – Springleaf, 2012.
- 11. Hunter R.** Three Hundred Years of Psychiatry 1535-1860 : A History Presented in Selected English Texts / Hunter R., Macalpine I. – Hartsdale : Carlisle Publishing, 1982.
- 12. Blair P.** 'Cataritick Treatment' / Patrick Blair / Three Hundred Years of Psychiatry 1535-1860 : A History Presented in Selected English Texts / Hunter R., Macalpine I. – Hartsdale : Carlisle Publishing, 1982. – P. 326 – 329.

Шопін П. Ю. Пігмаліонізм в епоху постмодерну

Міф про Пігмаліона діалектично відтворюється як самообман і реальність сучасного суб'єкта. Навіть автор вводить себе в оману при спробі деміфологізувати міф. Неможливо спростувати міф через текст без його відтворення в міфологічній свідомості читача, проте замовчування міфу і його спотворення не є підходящим рішенням, оскільки це веде до ще більшої підтримки пігмаліонізму як розриву художнього полотна тексту. Читачеві слід зрозуміти природу міфу і досягти балансу між міфологічним і критичним мисленням, обидва варіанти якого відкидаються в епоху постмодерну з його твердженням відмінностей і абсолютного незнання. Замовчування пігмаліонізму як практики насильства суб'єкта над об'єктом вводить в оману читача і

міфологізує текст з точки зору Галатеї, яка, не усвідомлюючи, що знаходиться під гнітом все того ж насильства інструментального розуму, отримує надприродні творчі сили Пігмаліона і займає його місце. У стані постмодерну міф про Пігмаліона може стати міфом про Галатею. Статуя стверджує свою незалежність від Пігмаліона. Галатея стає представником нової відмінності і самостійності. Традиція постмодерну критично осмислює міф про Пігмаліона, аби як результат створити міф про всемогутнього суб'єкта в особі Галатеї або щоб повністю зняти питання про суб'єкта. Емпатія з об'єктом і його оживання характерні постмодерну, який критично ставиться до тоталітарного розуму, що криється за сучасною міфологією Пігмаліона. Однак емпатія заперечує міф і тому розкриває його спільність з сучасністю. Пігмаліон помиляється, коли думає, що Галатея оживає завдяки його майстерності. А Галатея рятується в ілюзії своєї незалежності від нормалізуючої сили пігмаліонізма.

Ключові слова: великий нарратив, ілюзія, міф, пігмаліонізм, постмодерн.

Шопин П. Ю. Пигмалионизм в епоху постмодерна

Миф о Пигмалионе диалектически воспроизводится как самообман и реальность современного субъекта. Даже автор вводит себя в заблуждение при попытке демифологизировать миф. Невозможно опровергнуть миф на письме без его воспроизведения в мифологическом сознании читателя, но замалчивание мифа и его искажение не являются подходящим решением, поскольку это ведет к еще большей поддержке Пигмалионизма как разрыва художественного полотна текста. Читателю следует понять природу мифа и достичь баланса между мифологическим и критическим мышлением, оба варианта которого отвергаются в эпоху постмодерна с его утверждением различий и абсолютного незнания. Замалчивание пигмалионизма как практики насилия субъекта над объектом вводит в заблуждение читателя и мифологизирует текст с точки зрения Галатеи, которая, не осознавая, что находится под гнетом все того же насилия инструментального разума, получает сверхъестественные творческие силы Пигмалиона и занимает его место. В состоянии постмодерна миф о Пигмалионе может стать мифом о Галатее. Статуя утверждает свою независимость от Пигмалиона. Галатея становится представителем нового различия и самости. Традиция постмодерна критически осмысливает миф о Пигмалионе, чтобы в результате создать миф о всемогущем субъекте в лице Галатеи или чтобы полностью снять вопрос о субъекте. Эмпатия с объектом и его оживление характерны постмодерну, который критически относится к тоталитарному разуму, лежащему за современной мифологией Пигмалиона. Однако эмпатия не отрицает миф и поэтому раскрывает его общность с современностью. Пигмалион заблуждается, когда думает, что

Галатея оживає завдяки його майстерству, а Галатея рятується в ілюзії своєї незалежності від нормалізуючої сили пігмаліонізму.

Ключевые слова: большой навратив, ілюзія, міф, пігмаліонізм, постмодерн.

Shopin P. Yu. Postmodern pygmalionism

In the postmodern condition, the Pygmalion myth may become the myth of Galatea, with the statue's assertion of independence from Pygmalion. Galatea becomes a voice of a new difference and selfhood. The postmodern tradition problematizes the Pygmalion myth only to install the myth of the all-potent subject in the guise of Galatea, or to obliterate the subject altogether. Empathizing with the object and realizing its animation, postmodernity is critical of the totalitarian and unreflective instrumental reason which underlies the modern Pygmalion mythology; but it fails to refute the myth and hence reveals its complicity with and affinity to modernity. Pygmalion deceives himself when he thinks that Galatea is animated owing to his mastery, and Galatea escapes into an illusion of her independence from the normalizing force of Pygmalionism. The Pygmalion myth is dialectically experienced as both self-deception and authentic reality of the modern subject. Even the author of the myth is deceived in trying to demythologize it. There is no possibility of writing against the myth without evoking it in the mythical consciousness of the reader; but silencing the myth and distorting it is hardly a solution, since it leads to even stronger support for Pygmalionism as a rend in the fabric of the text. It is important to come to terms with the myth and achieve the balance between mythical and critical thinking, both of which may be relinquished in postmodernity, with its validation of difference and absolute not-knowing. Obliterating Pygmalionism misleads the reader and mythologizes the text from the perspective of Galatea, who – being unconsciously dominated and oppressed by the same forces of instrumental reason – is bequeathed with Pygmalion's supernatural powers.

Key words: grand narrative, illusion, myth, postmodern, pygmalionism.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 27.01.2014 р.

Прийнято до друку 28.03.2014 р.

Рецензент – к. філол. н., доц. Савельєва Н. О.