

Yelyzaveta Nikitina

Kyiv National University of Technologies and Design (Kyiv, Ukraine)

Scientific supervisor – PhD in Philology, associate professor

Julia Bondarchuk

TRANSCULTURAL IDENTITY AS A WAY OF NATIONAL SELF-AWARENESS

In modern cultural studies, the term “transculture” is used to characterize a specific model of cultural development, which consciously opposes itself to both universalism (global culture) and particularism (the concept of multiculturalism). According to M. Epshtein, transculture is a universal system of signs (semiosphere), which is higher than the specific variety of limited historical, national, racial, gender, professional, religious cultures and which simultaneously accumulates in itself all available variations and impossible possibilities. Within transculture, a person is at the crossroads of cultures and at the same time belongs to them all, absorbing them into himself and remaining himself. M. Epshtein assigns a key role in the formation of the transcultural model of human existence to cultural studies, which arose and developed as a tradition of comparative analysis of cultures as a result of awareness of their plurality. The transcultural way of existence gives a person a kind of “double” liberation: from nature thanks to culture and from culture (primarily “native” national culture), thanks to cultural studies.

The result of a person’s involvement in transculture is a transcultural identity, which is a dialectic unity (identity of opposites) of Self and Other, universal and particular, ethnic and cosmopolitan principles according to the triad from Self (Author) to Other (Reader), and from Other to renewed and enriched through interaction. Transcultural identity is neither personal, nor group, nor universalistic, nor particularistic, nor monocultural, nor multicultural. Transcultural identity does

not involve either the individualization of the subject by separating it from the social whole (group), nor the mass syndrome - the unified identification of oneself with a certain community. Such an identity is neither ethnocentric nor cosmopolitan, as it overcomes the extremes of both excessive patriotism and excessive internationalism. It is the result of mutual balancing of universal and particular beginnings, individualism and collectivism, cosmopolitanism and ethnocentrism, solidarity and pluralism, and at the same time - belonging to traditional national culture and freedom from it.

A characteristic feature of transcultural identity is dialogic openness to the Other in combination with the right to one's own identity. The history of Ukraine provides vivid examples of carriers of transcultural identity. Often these are authors, educated individuals who, being natives of one culture, were brought up or experienced personal development in another (third, fourth) and looked at ethnic genocodes through the prism of the worldview of the Other and/or themselves as the Other. They arbitrarily combined symbolic and spiritual borrowings from various cultures in their work, building them into an original image-associative series. It is not for nothing that different cultures argue over their attribution. For example, writer M. Gogol, sculptor O. Arkhipenko, painters M. Vrubel, O. Kokel and others. These transcultural figures are often the object of cultural condemnation, they are relegated to the periphery of society or, on the contrary, the object of equally unrestrained canonization in the interests of “internationalism”.

REFERENCES

1. Habermas, Y. (2005) Engaging the Other: Studies in Political Theory. Lviv: Astrolabia. 416 p.
2. Girtz, K. (2001) Interpreting Cultures. Selected essays. K.: Spirit and Letter. 300 p.

3. Campbell, J. (1997) *The Hero with a Thousand Faces: A Myth. archetype unconscious* Joseph Campbell K.: "Sofia", Ltd. 336 p.

4. Ricker P. (2002) *Self as Other*. Paul Ricker. K.: Spirit and letter. 458 p.