

Bondarchuk J.,
PhD, associate professor of Foreign languages department
Kyiv National University of Technologies and Design
(Kyiv, Ukraine)

UKRAINIAN-ENGLISH LITERARY DIALOGUE: HISTORY, STATE, PROSPECTS

The perception of one national literature by another national literature can be considered as the transformation of a receptive action into a communicative act. Communicativeness is, on the one hand, a cornerstone, on the other - one of the main functions of interliterary interaction. Communication is often supplemented by regulation; the communicative function of reception is a regulatory function. Reception is always communication and as such presupposes information and value exchange between subjects, i.e. "dialogue". The way from the reception of non-national literature in a non-national cultural environment to its interpretation in it lies precisely through interliterary dialogue. The possibility of the existence of a dialogue between literatures outside the receptive discourse, which would form a common space for them, is questionable.

Dialogism, as an inherent intention of each culture to cooperate with another culture or with other cultures, should be considered as an integral part of culture. The tendency of national cultures and literatures to perceive each other, the willingness to contact and communicate is one of their fundamental principles, one of the key signs of self-identification. A self-contained national culture or literature is doomed to lag behind others, those who are included in intercultural, interliterary dialogue. A cultural system that does not receive signals from the outside for a long time, in the end, risks reaching the point where the only possible algorithm for its continued existence will be degradation. National culture is a product not only of its own development, but

also the result of its interaction with other national cultures and with world culture.

Dialogue of literatures today is not "naked" contact for the sake of contact, but also the establishment of specific relations, which reveals the possible exchange of nationally specific meanings by adapting each of the cultures that enter into dialogical relations, other people's meanings to their own needs; or creating the preconditions for achieving such interpenetration and adaptation in the future.

In the field of reception of Ukrainian literature in England there is a clear tendency of gradual transition from pre-dialogic state (or "zero-dialogue") to dialogic state, later - to dialogue with elements of cross-culture as signs of equality and equivalence. The interaction of cultures of Western Europe and Eastern Europe is an example, on the one hand, of the presence of substantive dialogue between actors from different civilizations, its success, on the other hand, of focusing more on the external elements of different cultures than on their penetration into the world. In the conversation, Ukraine, Ukrainian culture and literature as participants in intercultural dialogue with their traditional spatial and civilizational connection to Eastern Europe, should consider the borderline nature and the transitional nature of these phenomena. The Ukrainian state and national worlds should be considered not only as a component of the Eastern European world, but also from the point of view of their distinctly marginal character, considering the place and role of Ukraine as a civilizational and cultural bridge between Eastern and Western Europe.

In Ukrainian-English literary relations and the reception of Ukrainian literature in England, the "zero" stage can be considered clearly and distinctly expressed both from a chronological point of view and in essence. "Pre-literary" information about Ukraine and Ukrainians, which was based mainly on previous, largely superficial, approximate ideas about them, further simplified due to the dominance of their stereotypical principles, later played the role of a powerful stimulus, without which the perception of Ukrainian folklore and

literature at the next stage of receptive interaction between England and Ukraine would have a different character, different intensity and effectiveness.

The number of works of Ukrainian literature translated into English is less, on the one hand, than English texts into Ukrainian, and, on the other hand, less than the total amount that remains unnoticed by English translators. From England to Ukraine there is more literary material than in the opposite direction, moreover, the nature of interpretation and assimilation of material coming from them to us is more effective in terms of inclusion in the national literary process than the interpretation and assimilation of our literary materia. The process of acquaintance, on the one hand, of Ukrainian literature with English, on the other hand, of English literature with Ukrainian can be considered as a movement in two directions, a mutual action, but asymmetric. Counter flows of material are different in volume, differ in quality and consequences. This circumstance affects both the quantitative parameters that characterize the current state of the Ukrainian-British dialogue, and the prospects for its development.

A full-fledged dialogue between English and Ukrainian literature at the moment remains a matter of the future. Having successfully passed the initial stage, the Ukrainian-British dialogue stopped at the stage of gradual accumulation of potential for the transition to a qualitatively higher level. This process is currently underway, gaining momentum. The statement that the dialogue has already been established seems to outline a certain perspective, but is not entirely relevant to the characterization of the current affairs. At the same time, there is hardly any serious reason to deny that the dialogic characteristic is an integral part of both Ukrainian and English literature and culture, so the formation of dialogic relations between them should be considered as an objectively determined and real perspective.

Another manifestation of the asymmetry of conditionally defined Ukrainian-English dialogism in the field of literary relations is the fact that modern Ukrainian literature takes from English literature for the reception and subsequent interpretation of both synchronous and diachronic phenomena, while

modern English literature takes from Ukrainian literature mostly synchronous phenomena (perhaps the only exception is the works of Taras Shevchenko, who traditionally attracts the attention of English writers, translators, publishers, audiences).

For the perception of Ukrainian literature in England more characteristic and widespread should be considered a divergent component, which determines the preservation and consolidation of those elements in each of the literatures - on the one hand, in the perceiving, on the other, in the perceived - which determine the mismatch of their worldviews and attitudes. In Ukrainian literature, the British, according to a tradition that has lasted more than a decade, prefer to look for and see first of all what distinguishes it from what takes place in their own literature. That or the vast majority of what is common to Ukraine, England, Europe, with such an approach is pushed to the background, almost losing the chance to be noticed and marked as something that deserves attention.

Thus, the "meeting" according to M. Buber between English and Ukrainian literature took place and brought significant positive results. As for the dialogue, it is too early to talk about its full functioning. Dialogism is presented in Ukrainian-English literary relations. It is gaining momentum in quantitative terms, showing a tendency to change the character to "intracultural". We mean, one that takes place not within different cultural and civilizational arrays - English as European, civilized and Ukrainian as peripheral to European, exotic, "barbaric" - but one and the same, common to Ukrainian and English cultures - European not only from a geographical and geopolitical, but also from a civilizational point of view.

This state of affairs in the intercultural dialogue determines the content and nature of receptive actions and interpretive strategies of English literature in relation to Ukrainian.