

Bilingualism and the Figures of Postcolonial Speech: Cultural Transfers of Modern Ukrainian Prose

Artur Malynovskyj

Department of World Literature, Odesa National University named after I. Mechnykov
French Boulevard 24/26; 65044, Odesa, Ukraine

Email: malinowski_artur@ukr.net

Abstract Bilingualism is described as a communicative space in which official and alternative speech, imperial discourse, and anti-colonial resistance coexist. The tension between them creates the ground for numerous figures of postcolonial speech. It is characterized by a subversive, self-revealing tone, a hidden pathos of debunking the respectful attitude to the language of the colonizer. It is also about the maturation of Ukrainian literature in the national language in terms of hybrid identity, the integration of the upper circle of society in the imperial circles. The asymmetrical relationships between identifying oneself with the empire, the plots of official careers, official biographies, independent language behavior, and mental space are traced. The divergence between following the distorted national and psychological Little Russian identity and the historical memory of ethnic roots, the place of origin of Ukrainian statehood, and the connection with ancient traditions are revealed. The phenomenon of marginality appeared in the crossing of these components, with an almost inseparable center and periphery. They constantly cross and create the phenomena of diglossia, multilingualism, speech interference. The interaction of the donor language and the recipient language is based on the principle of transfer, recognition, assimilation on the margins of the discourse of power and its transformation into speech with opposite meanings. The complex language map of Ukraine illustrates the permanence of imperial policy, which only changed the forms of its presence in the subordinate territories and according to the conjuncture moved the assimilation boundaries towards complete absorption, appropriation, or apparent demonstration of ethnic identity. The application of the transfer methodology allows us to understand the complexity of nowadays integrational processes in Ukraine in the context of the cultural and historical situation of the first half of the XIX century.

Keywords bilingualism; hybrid identity; imperial imagology; creolization; cultural transfer.

Author **Artur Malynovskij**, PhD of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor of Odesa National University named after I. Mechnykov. Author of more than 100 scientific articles in the field of Ukrainian and Russian philology. His PhD thesis is dedicated to the study of genre forms of the Russian classical novel. He is working on a doctoral thesis devoted to the anthropological aspects of Ukrainian prose of the first half of the XIX century. Research interests include literary anthropology, cultural transfer, frontier studies, literature and politics, rhetorical strategies of the literary text, geopoetics, postcolonial theory, Eastern European studies, Ukrainian and Polish comparative studies.

Introduction

Bilingualism becomes a political and ideological factor due to the relationship of domination and subordination, the polarization of cultural superiority and inferiority. The granting of various statuses of the official imperial language with a flexible and developed lexical and grammatical structure and seemingly limited and suitable only for every day using local dialect causes a dramatic conflict of culture. It becomes the key to understanding the Ukrainian colonial situation, a component of the thesaurus of an era. Bilingualism does not involve the parity of two languages, but oppression, enslavement, and a kind of truncation and reduction of the authentic language to the dialect. It is not only a matter of tsarist policy and a side view, and a superior attitude to ethnically assimilated territories, but also of the voluntary imposition of an imperial yoke and, as a consequence, the production of a half-hybrid identity.

Not only isolated declarations of non-literature features of the Ukrainian language, such as the well-known dispute between H. Kvitka and P. Hulak-Artemovskij or the lamentation of P. Kulish about the underdevelopment of vocabulary to denote abstract concepts (“how to express in Ukrainian about objects foreign to the people”), but also the recognition of the extraterritoriality of national culture and words, the attention to them of the higher circles of society equally invested in the colonial paradigm. E. Hrebinka describes some spaces of using Ukrainian language in St. Petersburg circles:

Petersburg is a colony of educated Little Russians. All the places present, all the academies, all the universities are flooded with compatriots, and when

determining a person for service, the Little Russian pays special attention to how un homme d'esprit... the Empress rides four horses, and our two Little Russian Cossack cameras on her heels. The Emperor often, they say, jokes with them in the Little Russian language. (Hrebinka 566)

Of course, this passage with the term “colony” clearly outlines the boundaries of Ukrainian as another one, distinguishing it as an ethnic touch on the general imperial map. The pathos of subordination and awareness of the place of *one-self* culture in the allotted circle of society is embodied as a typical colonial narrative. The assertion of the presence of Ukrainian, the need for its development and implementation in writing, the prose is nothing more than an inversion of the widespread use of the Russian language. Peter Barry indicates:

This linguistic difference amounts to a sense that the linguistic furniture belongs to somebody else, and therefore shouldn't be moved around without permission. Some post-colonial writers have concluded that the colonizers' language is permanently tainted, and that to write in it involves a crucial acquiescence in colonial structures. (Barry 129)

The National Narrative: Speech Interference, National Identity, Imperial Discourse

This state of things was characterized by internal conflict and tension, so it was to “explode” one day in several opposing anti-colonial tendencies. Peripheral zones of culture must move to their nuclear depths, the imaginary dialect (“Little Russian dialect”) demonstrates a reception shift in the metropolitan consciousness and is nothing more than an inversion of deeply popular authentic living language. The canon of Ukrainian prose is created with this living language, embodied in a kind of ensemble of *The Little Russian Stories Told by Hrytsko Osnovyanenko* (Малороссийские повести, рассказываемые Грицьком Основьяненко). They have got special value. Because Kvitka found adequate correlations of the art object and theme with the way of expression, expressing its denotative properties in the language. The word becomes textured due to the saturation of folk rhythmic melodies and the sound of the emotional tuning fork of the Ukrainian soul. The author proved that “you can be touched by the Little Russian language.” And in a review of the book Hrebinka emphasized: “Having read now *The Stories* by Osnovyanenko, we feel sorry for those who do not know this language. They are deprived of true pleasure” (Hrebinka 473). The way to national literature through the development

of stylistic norms, harmonization of language grammar with the grammar of human behaviour, the use of language tools to study the differences of *the native* picture of the world reproduces the logic of postcolonial thinking. Language as a decoding state of dependence captures the transition *from adaptation to mastery*, when “the colonial writer is an independent ‘adept’ in the form, not a humble apprentice, as in the first phase, or a mere licensee, as in the second” (129).

Such liberation of the word from the burden of secondary nature, emancipation towards the individual, non-normative development of its aesthetic qualities makes intercultural dialogue the basis of postcolonialism. In other words, the colonial situation *is transferred* to the level of its interpretation with subsequent use in the anti-colonial position. The dialectics of this process was formulated by M. Pavlyshyn: “Anti-colonial strategies are united by the structure of negation—shifting upside down—the former colonial arguments and values” (Pavlyshyn 227). However, this “rearrangement” is not just an action of inertia, but an almost tectonic shift with several positive consequences. It is as if the capture of the colonial-imperial into the orbit of the national, the consistent debunking of the state of dependence through the language, and its deconstruction, reversal in ruthless and all-consuming speech discourse. According to the Polish researcher D. Kolodziejczyk, the transfer is

first of all, the gesture of freedom—emancipation from the need for an exact copy (colonial mimicry) to the comprehension of the ability to exist in language—to comprehend the difference through which language (imperial) remains independent.” The point is that the language of the metropolis, which “becomes a means of expression in the (post) colonial cultural space, ceases to be the property of the empire. (Kolodziejczyk 26)

Thus, even political and ideological conflicts are transferred into a space of creative rethinking, and their critical passion is softened by cultural intentions, play, multi-vector projections, and a multitude of interpretations.

There is the effect of transfer in this removal, within which the Ukrainian language detached from ideology and applied to the reproduction of Ukrainian realities, and therefore conventional and largely distorted Russian language coexist based on creative competition, controversy, in the field of the asymmetric relationship between language and reference space. This middle and marginal status of Russian speaking strategy among Ukrainian writers of a culturally peripheral phenomenon allows us to denote the same adaptation as a background for intercultural dialogue. Many works of literary critics (B. Bakula, Y. Barabash, P. Barry, Homi K. Bhabha,

O. Hlotov, T. Hundorova, M. Ilnytskyj, D. Kolodziejczyk, M. Shkandriy, O. Feduta) are devoted to the problem of interference and bilingualism in the thesaurus of this period. They investigate the mechanisms of decoding and unmasking the word of the empire in the territories of the suburbs. The writers resort to them inside the text in very colourful imagotypes, continuously mocking the Little Russian phenomenon as a distorted model of national behaviour and mocking Moscow influence as anti-behaviour, as a personification of strangers and enemies. These oppositions are widely embodied in Russian-language texts of Ukrainian prose, creating a zone of semantic turbulence, the division between the subject and the means of its reproduction. It turns out that the emblem of the imperial as negative is presented in its language, which is made possible by several parody techniques and a kind of surzhyk, an idiolect of this language. A gap in which postcolonial dissent, subversive tools of subtext are growing up is formed at the break of the literary norm and the purely mental deformation of language at the grammatical level. Such a duality of unattractive coverage of the imperial within its rhetoric was not only an Aesopian language, a hidden communication but also it strengthened and concentrated anti-colonial pathos.

Kvitka-Osnovyanenko's prose is a very characteristic phenomenon from this point of view. It contains parodies and stylizations that determine the "politics" of the text, the type of intertextual interaction with images and works of Russian literature. The first Ukrainian prose writer used the method of secondary modelling of plots and stereotypes known in literature and fixed in the public consciousness, thus creating superstructures of meaning, controversial artistic decisions. Therefore, this is not fiction or minor texts in terms of art. It is a programmed text strategy, which would allow extracting a deep national content from several skillfully glued literary masks and game intentions. *Letters to Publishers* (Письма к издателям), *Letters to the Luzhnytsk's Elder* (Письма к Лужницкому Старцу), *Invited Guests* (Званые гости), *Evstratij Myakushkin's memoirs* (Мемуары Евстратия Мякушкина) were built on the unmasking method. Their inherent feuilleton principle only emphasizes the controversy and difference from the texts of a similar direction in Russian literature. No wonder the problem of the author's attribution, especially about *Luzhnytsk's Elder* (Письма к Лужницкому Старцу), is too relevant and weighty precisely concerning the distinction between text and denotation, text and intertext, the original and ironically written copy. Kvitka parodies not only the innocence, helplessness and incompetence of Falalej Povinukhin (Фалалей Повитухин) but also the proto text of M. Novikov's *Letters of the Falalej* (Письма Фалалея) as a codification of the nobility ignorance.

Double controversy becomes a favourite technique of play at the reference and communicative levels of the work, acquiring the features of metatextuality as a very flexible strategy of comparisons, statements and objections, the search for differences and similarities. Evstratiy Myakushkin (Евстратий Менушкин) composes the instruction for a “fashionable” novel, which should be a parody of the trivial rhetoric of the literature written at that time, in particular, the Gothic novel and examples of its imitation in Russian literature. However, the author of the memoirs also becomes the object of parody. Playing on the border of denotation and signification at different levels of reception shows excessive attention to the sphere of textuality. The visible and the invisible, the declarative and the hidden, art object and context, and its peripheral zone coexist there. A separate group consists of works focused on the direct depiction of colonization. They are *Holovatyj* (Головатый), *The Foundation of Kharkiv* (Основание Харькова), *Tatar Raids* (Татарские набеги), *1812 in the Country* (1812 год в провинции). The postcolonial state of these works is derived with the dual identity, belonging to the world of the colonizer and the colonized, which causes “the fluid and unstable nature of personal and gender identity, the shifting, ‘polyvalent’, contradictory currents of signification within texts” (Barry 129). The narratives with a propaganda component, without ambiguities but with a monologue on behalf of the authorities shown in *The Letters to Kind Compatriots* (Листи до любезних земляків), *The Indefinite* (Бессрочный) are naturally excluded from this circle.

E. Hrebinka is a very interesting example of a controversial vision of history so far within the imperial horizons. He artistically elaborates and obscures an episode *Colonel Zolotarenko from Nezhin* (Нежинский полковник Золотаренко) from *The History of the Rus’* (Історія Русів) with romantic colours and frequently uses the folk epic in the description of Cossack heroics in *Tchaikovsky* (Чайковський). Critical intentions break through idealizing Potemkin as a historical figure. He was shown not only in the palace and ceremonial life but also in the private chamber. Against the background of the inconsistency of the mercantile St. Petersburg reality with the patriarchal ideology of the period of the empire’s formation, the strategy of its debunking in *The Seeker of the Place* (Искатель места) is revealed. Shevchenko’s novels appear as a powerful array of not so much anti-colonial orientation but *deconstructions of the colonial*. The development can be traced from self-interpretations of his works *The Mercenary* (Наймичка), *Varnak* (Варнак), *The Princess* (Княгиня) to polemics at the genre level with sentimentalist forms of imperial graphomania in *The Walking with Pleasure and Morality* (Прогулка с удовольствием и не без морали), hidden behind the academic presentability and grandeur of his-

torical lamentations and reflections in *The Artist* (Художник), significantly different from Russian literature interpretation of the phenomenon of unhappy consciousness on the background of the tragedy of the serfs in *The Musician* (Музыкант) and demoralizing soldiers in *The Unfortunate* (Музыкант).

The adaptation of the Russian-language style to reproduce the Ukrainian realities generated by the empire was for the writer not only a “zigzag in his personal and creative destiny, an island in the Ukrainian-speaking sea” (Barabash 240), but also a real transfer with complex *diglossia* as dynamic unbalanced bilingualism. The experience of colonial practices and emigration confirms numerous examples of the coexistence of languages on the principle of functionality, depending on the scope. According to the unwritten rules of language were divided into poetic and prose, male and female, dead (“sleeping”) and living, conversational, with new literary norms. The most productive transients are singled out in this whole spectrum of interactions and oppositions. According to N. Azarova’s observations, transitions to a foreign language occur much more often in prose than in poetry, perhaps because it is more suitable for speech mimicry, creating the unity of the expression and the image. Besides, all realistic literature is based on this similarity, the inertia of which can be overcome only in the experiments of the new prose of the twentieth century. Apparently, for mimicry, writers resort to shifter words, or “transfer words,” “ambiguous” words, that allows writers to “overcome language boundaries and to be in different languages and between them simultaneously (Azarova 261).

Cultural Transfers, National Concepts, Imagological Projections

These words become concepts and definitions of national and cultural complexes in the literature, recognizable territorial markers. The toponym “Little Russia” (Малоросія) used by Ukrainian and Russian writers does not have a clear terminological definition but arises due to the historical association with the tradition of naming small primary, autochthonous, and large peripheral territories, neighbourhoods (oppositions “Little Hellas”—“Great Hellas,” metropolis—colonies). Through Byzantine mediation, this tradition migrated to the toponym of the Kyiv state as “Little Russia” as the centre, and “Great Russia” as the northeastern periphery. Over time, historical semantics have been overshadowed by a pejorative connotation. As Y. Barabash notes, “the phrase ‘Little Russia’ (Малая Россия) retained a specific secondary nature and subordination in the imperial consciousness, which could not fail to provoke and still provokes a counter-reaction” (Barabash 577). However, the ideologically deformed toponym is firmly and permanently entrenched in the public consciousness as a frontier feature of remote subterritories of “imaginary commu-

nities,”constructed on the imagological principle. The derived ethnonym “Little Russian” becomes synonymous with secondary and inferiority, as M. Hrushevskyj said “the spiritual slavery,”the syndrome of adaptation and integration into imperial structures. E. Malanyuk in his essay *Little Russian identity* (Малоросійство) proposed an exceptionally successful formulation in terms of the mechanisms of colonization and enslavement, deformation of national consciousness from within:

This type is nationally defective, mentally and spiritually crippled, and—in consequence, sometimes,—racially. In our Motherland (the main historical deposit of this human type) it has acquired a particularly pathological and not so simple character as, at first glance, it would seem. Due to that course of historical time on our land, the type of Little Russian became (at least in towns and cities) mass, and worst of all, traditional. And we must assume that the methods of so to speak *Little Russian production have been developed in Moscow for more than a century, and the system of those products has a solid, so to speak, scientific base.* (Malanyuk 30)

Of course, a consistent tradition of understanding Little Russian identity as an amorphous national hybrid, an ugly twist (by Y. Barabash, D. Dontsov, V. Lypynskyj, M. Khvylovyj, E. Malanyuk, I. Dzyuba, E. Sverstyuk, M. Ryabchuk, and others) provoked precisely by its imperial representation, the negative meanings embedded in this glued concept. Language takes a decisive part in the “production” of the imagological projection of the national image, inherited for enchantment and enslavement, sanctioned by the empire. Language is a metaphor for political actions and ideological influence, an agent of transfer and the imposition of a completely legitimate status of an ethnic branch. The pejorative meaning becomes possible in the conditions of diglossia as a linguistic asymmetry as bilingualism. “Bilingualism allows us to re-conceptualize a category that is absent in the native language. Bilingualism allows us to tear off the category itself and turn it into some speculation and abstraction” (Azarova 267). The amplitude of the term “Little Russia” as a political metaphor extracted from the historical semantics of the empire is quite wide: from neutral word usage and admiration for marginal exotics to ironical and indulgent tonality and even caustic ridicule of national weaknesses. We can find these shades of meaning in the prose of the first half of the XIX century.

Imperial imagology designed and transplanted the image that fully corresponded to its horizon of expectation to Ukrainian consciousness. Such a cultural transfer was fully in line with the “geographical” guidelines for territorial and intellectual

occupation by demonstrating a pretended cultural exchange. The voluntary acceptance of Little Russian identity, and, as a consequence, seduction by imperial privileges reflects the dialectic of labile expansion, carried out in the stream of “overlapping territories, intertwined histories” as E. Said would say. The effect of weaving, imposed on domination, subjugation, relentless control determines the essence of imperial policy.

Just as none of us is outside or beyond geography, none of us is completely free from the struggle over geography. That struggle is complex and interesting because it is not only about soldiers and cannons but also about ideas, about forms, about images and imaginings. (Said 42)

Of course, behind this imaginary concept, a balanced, well-thought-out and structured on the political, ethnic, religious and cultural levels, the integration of Ukrainian elites was in the highest aristocratic circles.

The duration of the creation of signs of the secondary stage by convincing imperial rhetoric, accentuated by E. Malanyuk, is also confirmed in the substantiation of the complex multilevel transformation of “Mazepas” into “Little Russians” by the Viennese historian A. Kappeler. Consistent co-optation of the Cossack elite into state institutions and convergence with the dynasty led to acculturation and erasure of ethnic differences. Integrated on the principle of political loyalty, the newly formed Little Russians approached the highest pyramid of power, ceased to be the opposition, and, conversely, were the first to maintain an imperial image in a system of concentric circles. Such migrations within the empire confirmed the “attractiveness of ascending the line of assimilation” (Kappeler 15). Let us recall the artistic texture of Gogol’ recreating this “movement” to the fair of imperial vacancies, contrasting “old national, simple-hearted and at the same time rich surnames” “to those low Little Russians who tear themselves out of tar, traders, fill the chambers and public offices like locusts, tear the last penny from their fellow countrymen, fill St.Petersburg with snitches, finally make capital and solemnly add to their surname ending the syllable -ov instead of -o” [Ukrainian surnames often end in -o, e.g. Shevchenko, and Russian surnames frequently end in -ov, e.g. Krylov] (Gogol 15).

Therefore, according to A. Kappeler, the concept of colonialism does not exhaust the essence of Ukrainian-Russian relations and characterizes rather the permanent state of co-dependence of the metropolis and the periphery. “An important difference from the colonial countries of the West is that there was no division into the imperial Russian ruling class and non-Russian lower classes in the class-based

Russian Empire... Ukraine was also not a classic colony of the Russian Empire. There was no spatial, cultural or racial distance, nor was there any legal discrimination against Ukrainians compared to Russians” (Kappeler 16). Despite the polemical conclusion of the scientist, it should be remembered that the empire is a rather complex formation, which does not always coincide with the concepts of the dominant nation and colonization. It not only appropriates others but also provides places for the “location of culture” of other peoples in its territory. Although, as it turns out, this is also a form of influence and appropriation. The semiotics of empire as a deliberate arrangement of signs, cultural significance and mapping has a special effect on the literary process. According to O. Ilnytskyj,

imperial culture does not involve a zero-sum cultural game, which is constantly played by Ukrainian and Russian critics and through which cultural values and writers (Somov, Hrebinka, Kvitka, Gogol and others) should be included in either one or the other “nation,” and the “nationality” itself is interpreted only in contradictory binary schemes. This approach, of course, leaves no room for the national fluidity, ambiguity or uncertainty that was the hallmarks of the empire. (Ilnytskyj 22)

Mapping the Empire as the Way of Attribution to Others

Thus, it is precisely those gaps and boundaries that create enclaves of cultural interactions and map the empire as a mosaic text. It becomes an analogue of transnational geopolitical formation with alternate changes of rigid subordination by fragile and labile redefinition, and weakening of hierarchy. In this sense, the empire was a *melting pot*, or a *salad bowl*, in which despite all the mixing and integration there are still infusions of the *different and non-national*, not assimilated by the hegemonic discourse. It follows that “imperial culture testifies to the existence of an early form of Ukrainian consciousness in it” (Ilnytskyj 23). It was embodied in various forms of being interested in national culture by its natives, the fashion for the Little Russian in St. Petersburg, with attempts to reduce it from the local level to the level of literary codified language. Of course, the language marker is quite indirect, because culture uses mainly *the lingua franca*, which represents the empire. Nevertheless, through the web of assimilation, detached from its linguistic field and conventionally associated with the Russian language, noticeable infusions of Ukrainian break through.

We distinguish literary and cultural components which are in asymmetric re-

relationships in this conflict. The resolution of this conflict is possible in the plane of the “linguistic-literary binomial” (Barabash), an extremely dialectical contradictory phenomenon embodied by Gogol’. He became a classic example of cultural transfer, in which ethnic roots and the old-fashioned atmosphere of the Cossack petty officers’ environment, inherited family bilingualism of Ukrainian and Russian, distance from the motherland and formation of pro-imperial worldview and many other more or less secondary factors intersected. In other words, Gogol’ repeated the scenarios already lived by his compatriots in his own life. He recreated the dominant model of life when “natural Ukrainian consciousness fatally retreated to colonial Little Russian identity in the minds and behaviour of the national nobility” (Barabash 235). Of course, this path of “national breaking of the worldview” resulted in “Gogol’s conscious apostasy in relation to the native language and vice versa—in the glorification of the Russian language” (239). However, in a seemingly trivial way, he was able to represent Ukrainian culture in the general imperial territories precisely because of the “surprisingly flexible and adaptive mechanism of intralingual readjustment, selection of stylistic means to solve a particular artistic task” (236). The Ukrainian way of thinking and the creation of “wrong” Gogol’s Russian phraseology manifested in syntactic constructions, the idiolect of literary language, dichotomy, counterpoint as an infusion of one language into another is the action of mental transference. It is overcoming one’s foreignness in a non-native language with the acquisition of a new linguistic quality, inspiring and enriching influence (241). The mechanism of language transfer was successfully reproduced by I. Orzhytskyj. Y. Barabash refers to him substantiating the phenomenon of Gogol as an agent of influence, movement and representation of the Ukrainian worldview. As the philologist notes, “Ukrainian words and forms were pounding in that genius and unhappy mind, even when he created things that had nothing to do with the Slavic area at all” (237).

Gogol did not become a classic writer of Ukrainian literature, but he inspired it, influenced it, and became a guide for a whole galaxy of writers. According to Y. Barabash, he became one of the key figures in the history of Ukrainian literature and spiritual culture, and in the context of real dialogic relations “Russian-speaking branch of Ukrainian culture, but as a fact of Russian literature. (245). This solves the problem of disproportionate competition between a more universal culture and literature embodied exclusively in the national language. This indirectness and displacement of concepts simultaneously outline an extremely important methodological projection on which the theory of cultural transfer is based. Gogol’s phenomenon is a complex process of Russian-Ukrainian cultural and literature dialogue/interaction/influence during several centuries, and sometimes confrontation (249).

A similar dichotomy is characteristic of Ukrainian writers, who used not only Russian as a direct imperial construct, but the native Ukrainian language as the strongest expression of ethnicity and identity. The coexistence of two languages in the works of I. Kotlyarevskij, P. Hulak-Artemovskij, E. Hrebinka, G. Kvitka-Osnovyanenko completely fit into the fragile schemes of the frontier, the turn of the century, in which the criteria of art and the literary canon were not established. Borderline historical and literary periods do not function as a consistent change of paradigms, but as a fundamentally nonlinear system of readjustment and aesthetic reorientation with a continuous search for new art forms. Therefore, unsteady transients are best attributed to the synergetic study of “games on borders and with borders” (M. Schmitz-Emans). The connection between them is traced in fragmented structural elements, which create intermediate aesthetic phenomena. The turn of the century emphasizes “half-tones,” “intermediate” variants, “artistic and stylistic hybrids” that form an amalgam type of writing (according to the classification of I. Limborskyj). Even internally related compounds and mutually objectionable tendencies persist in this eclecticism. The type of connection is conventional but rather dissipative and selective between them. It also allows us to restore the ancient semantics of the center and the periphery, to consolidate the contrasting meanings of the essential and the secondary through the cross method. Thus, amalgam as a manner of writing, the quality of the art is the key to break false stereotypes and, perhaps, deconstructing imperial ideology at the aesthetic level. It is not only about the interaction between sentimentalism, pre-romanticism, romanticism and classical realism, but also about the attraction and conditionality of the artistic process by the nation-centric Baroque culture. Amalgam types of literature select what they need from past eras, adapting it to their historical conditions and socio-cultural context. I. Limborskyj notes that

these types did not become so widespread in the Renaissance Western European individualist mode, but developed the idea of “variability” of the individual, belonging to the corporate consciousness, which was supplemented by the occasional tendency to postulate the idea of nation-centred isolation. (Limborskyj 11)

These guidelines are updated with the greatest force in the border periods, because “a radical restructuring of the macrostructure of artistic thinking in the ways of establishing a new canon occurred” (11).

This duality contributed to bilingualism as an imperial polytheism, which caused the splitting of the linguistic personality of the Ukrainian writer into several

incarnations: family communication, the public image in their community, imaginary or real self-presentation outside region (correspondence and live contacts with Russian writers). In addition, the performed social roles often did not correspond to the high purpose of asserting identity and writing in the national language. There was a gap between them that was filled with excessive attention to Russian literature or coverage of Ukrainian topics and realities in Russian. M. Zerov substantiates the concept of provincialism of writing at the initial stage and connects it with specific social groups—the provincial nobility, middle-ranking officials, the village clergy. According to the scientist, both the nobles (Kvitka, Gogol Sr., Hrebinka), and government officials (Hulak-Artemovskij, Kukhareno, Dumitrashkiv), and the clergy (Pisarevskij, Olexandriv, Korenits'ky) were “small provincial audience,” capable of reproducing only people’s life. These were the manifestations of regional autonomy, regionalism, conservatism, “local patriotism” combined with inclusion in a supranational formation in the circle of imperial culture. This synthesis sometimes proved to be productive in terms of dialogic interaction, in the transfer of Ukrainian themes into Russian literature, helped to enrich the linguistic norm with dialects, to solve the extremely important question of imperial identity through fake multiethnicity. O. Borzenko notes:

Considering this situation in terms of cultural colonialism, we can talk not only about subjugation and resistance but also about a very productive experience of interdependence and symbiosis... Speaking figuratively, the “Ukrainian soul” influenced imperial culture significantly, especially at its stage of supranational life. (Borzenko 24-25)

Such duality, the hesitation between the native and the foreign, the home and the world, the private and the public created a zone of tension between the desire to preserve the authenticity of culture and the hidden denationalization, the loss of identity. This intermediate situation was exacerbated by the fact that Ukrainian society was stratified between the Russified and Polonized gentry, Cossack petty officers, clergy and peasants, the only owners of old patriarchal values, not subjected to external influences and unification. There was a rather rigid division between the official written culture and the speaking tradition accumulated in the people’s memory. Influenced by Herder’s ideas, this conflict was resolved in the literary codification of Ukrainian consciousness in several languages. The asymmetry between the subject and the means of its creation pushes productive cultural models of the frontier, such as the Ukrainian school of Polish romanticism, the Ukrainian

branch of Russian literature, and others. The presence of Polish and Russian narrative traditions is also noticeable in Ukrainian prose (Kvitka, Hrebinka, Kulish). These phenomena of transfer reveal the colonial situation from the bilingual point of view, and sometimes polylingualism which is a reflection of the relationship between the centre and the periphery.

The Ukrainian language map of this period shows territorial dialects, the value of common speech in the formation of literary norms, marking political processes with *surzhyk*, geographical discoveries, development and settlement of new places, border neighbourhoods of various kinds. The interaction of language norms and anti-norms, lexicons of different levels of subordination occurs on the principle of circulation, Brownian motion of language elements, as a result of which idiolects, new varieties and combinations of donor language and recipient language are born. The final approval of a new rule is still far away, there is always a void or the formation of surpluses, which are constantly in motion and prone to development. In this case, Sloboda Ukraine is an example of such a language transfer.

It is characterized by a colourful local language as a product of the cross-connection of many regional dialects. The policy of colonization contributed to the creation of Polish and Russian languages mixed with Ukrainian words. The influence of these language hybrids was so powerful that “even immigrants from Russia switched here to the local version of the Russian language with Ukrainian words” (Sherekh 411). The local Ukrainian elite willingly Russified in exchange for noble titles and positions. Complete Russification did not take place, especially because the old people showed a special sentiment towards their native language. We should not forget that the idea of national revival, first formulated in the concept of messianism and associated with the discovery of a new quality and wider expressive possibilities of the Ukrainian language does not disappear from Kharkiv romantics’ minds.

The peculiar exclusivity of Sloboda Ukraine with its mixing and crossing influences allows us to notice the enclave in it, within which parallel plots of “German conquest of territory,” Polish-Latin presence in writing and culture in general, and the most powerful main dialogue, where “Ukrainian and Russian plots of Kharkiv literature are generally mixed” (Ushkalov 90). At the same time, this unity is not stable as provided by the laws of the transfer. And later it begins to disintegrate by distancing the two pieces of literature against the background of the popular in Europe at the time the idea of identity, ethnic differences, the individuality of national self-expression. As if deliberately created at the turn of the XVIII-XIX centuries, this rage broke down, playing its explosive role in the emergence of modern

Ukrainian literature. L. Ushkalov considers this fusion of pieces of literature with the founding of Kharkiv University a manifestation of imperial policy. It marked the beginning of “national self-knowledge” because in the wake of early romanticism the new Ukrainian literature was born in Kharkiv” (94). This circumstance led to the fact that from the second half of the 1820s Russian literature in Ukraine ceased to play the role it played in the first quarter of the nineteenth century. The transfer shift that led to the independent literature is formed by many factors: German idealist philosophy, Herder’s national-historical doctrine, typological proximity of Rousseau intentions to the psycho-emotional world of the Ukrainian simple peasant. It is not just about a new starting point in the history of writing, but also about the formation of a fundamentally different paradigm of thinking, based on the historical development of organic art forms. D. Chyzhevskij summarized this set of factors:

Modern literature, mainly Russian and Polish, religious problems and German philosophy lead them (Kharkiv romantics) to consider the problems of the philosophy of history, and ethnographic interest, especially Sreznevskij, brings them directly to study and fascinate Ukrainian folk poetry. (Chyzhevskij 372)

The internalization of history naturally affected linguistic processes in the literature. The use of the common speech and its regional features had an ideological and cultural meaning, it became a sign of belonging to the national movement. The common speech without grammatical and logical correctness is precedent in the author’s text, in opposition to the official speech trained by the empire. It was a strategy that was reduced to “later inclusion of the common speech in the collective memory not only in the status of literature but also national” (Borzenko 54).

Conclusion

The theory of nation and narration explains the Ukrainian-Russian bilingualism, manifestations of diglossia, multilingualism, which developed in the first half of the XIX century. By analogy with the classical model of resistance to colonialism, the language of the empire becomes an instrument of veiled national struggle in Ukrainian literature, and a counter-discourse used to break down stereotypes and developed imperial images such as Little Russian identity. The subject of speech speaks from the standpoint not of domination, but of enslavement, and discursive appropriation and cultural assimilation. However, Ukrainian literature develops asymmetrically instead of Western European pieces of literature. It seems to avoid acute political issues, and global topics by actualizing the language factor, instead

of resorting to a kind of escapism, the inner life of characters, ethical issues integral from corporate and Christian morality.

The revival of the resources of tradition, Cossack heroism which became an indirect source of anti-colonial resistance occurs against the background of idyllic serenity and limited worldview of the domestic sphere. Accentuation of speech participants optimizes communication, therefore, helps to identify the human sphere in it. Creolized variants of a language in which the binary oppositions of Saussurean linguistics are only auxiliary against the background of unpredictability and multidimensionality of human behaviour are being created. The anthropologization of speech contributes to the understanding of various models of nation-building and rather flexible identities. At the same time, the cultural situation of bilingualism reaches the level of metatext. It is explained by the ways of self-determination of Ukrainian literature, the emergence of the national language against the policy of unifying a special version of the Russian language, subversive and anti-canonical to imperial writing.

Works Cited

- Azarova, N. Поэтический билингвизм как средство межкультурного трансфера Лингвистика и семиотика культурных трансферов: методы, принципы, технологии. [*Poetic Bilingualism as a Mean of Intercultural Transfer. Linguistics and Semiotics of Cultural Transfers: Methods, Principles, Technologies*]. Cultural Revolution, 2016, pp. 255-307.
- Barabash, Y. Малоросійство і західнорусизм: сіамські близнюки. Не відверну лица. Штрихи до літературної автобіографії. [*Little Russian Identity and Western Russification: Siamese Twins. I will not turn my face away. Touches to the Literary Autobiography*]. Tempora, 2013.
- Barry, Peter. *Beginning Theory. An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory*. 2nd ed., Manchester UP, 2002.
- Borzenko, O. Сентиментальна «провінція» (Нова українська література на етапі її становлення). [*Sentimental "Province" (New Ukrainian Literature at the Stage of Its Formation)*]. Kharkiv UP, 2006.
- Chyzhevskij, D. Історія української літератури (від початків до доби реалізму). [*History of Ukrainian Literature (From the Beginning to the Era of Realism)*]. Femina, 1994.
- Hrebinka, E. Твори у 3 томах [*Works in 3 Volumes*]. Scientific thought, 1981.
- Gogol, N. Собрание сочинений в шести томах [*Collected Works in Six Volumes*]. 3-rd volume. Goslitizdat, 1937.
- Zerov, M. Українське письменство [*Ukrainian Literature*]. Kyiv: Solomiya Pavlychko's Osnovy PH, 2002.
- Pluyskyj, O. Роздуми про "культуру" в імперії: (3 перспективи російсько-українських

- взаємин, 1850–1850). Постколоніалізм. Генерації. Культура [*Reflections on “Culture” in the Empire: (From the Perspective of Russian and Ukrainian Relations, 1850-1850). Post-colonialism. Generations. Culture*]. Laurus, 2014, pp. 17-25.
- Kappeler, Andreas. *Mazepins, Little Russians, Hohols: Ukrainians in the Ethnic Hierarchy of the Russian Empire*. *Antiquity* 5, 2001.
- Kołodziejczyk, D. “Język(i) Postkolonialności – Historia Studiów Postkolonialnych w Zarysie” [Language(s) of Postcolonialism-History of Postcolonial Studies in Outline]. *Porównania [Comparison]*. 15, 2014, pp. 19-32.
- Limborskyj, I. Парадигматика західноєвропейського та українського Просвітництва: проблеми типології та національної ідентичності. [*Paradigmatics of Western European and Ukrainian Enlightenment: Problems of Typology and National Identity*]. Abstract of the dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philology, 2006.
- Malanyuk, E. Малоросійство. [*Little Russian Identity*]. *Ukrainian Priority*, 2015.
- Pavlyshyn, M. Канон та іконостас: Літературно-критичні статті [*Canon and Iconostasis: Literary-Critical Article*]. *Time*, 1997.
- Said, Edward W. *Culture and Imperialism*. 1st Vintage Book, Knopf, 1993.
- Ushkalov, L. “Національні світи слобідської літератури” [“National worlds of Sloboda Literature”]. Актуальні проблеми слов’янської філології. [*Current Issues of Slavic Philology*]. no. 20, 2009, pp. 87-96.
- Sherekh, Y. “Пролегомена до вивчення стилю та мови Г. Сковороди” [“Prolegomen to Study the Style and Language of H. Skovoroda”]. Пороги і запоріжжя: Література. Мистецтво. Ідеології [*Thresholds and Beyond the Thresholds: Literature. Art. Ideologies*]. *Folio*, 1998, pp. 364-412.