

UDC 81'42-024.72'37:82.02:7.037  
doi: 10.15330/jpnuphil.10.6-15

## SEMANTICS OF SUBTEXT: MODERNIST DIMENSION

VITALII KONONENKO, OLEKSII VOROBETS

**Abstract.** Modernist literary discourse structuring determines the interpretations of the "new style" – a system of means employed to refresh the manner of writing, focused on the inclusion of cognitively reformed semantic components into the idiolect paradigm. Subjective author's intentions aimed at text intellectualization, usually in the form of puns and linguistic games, subtextual shifts, innovative destructions, that are included in the context, become a part of a coding system, encryption of the said text, ambivalent meaning in the Author-Text-Reader system. The aspect of the text potential aimed at distinguishing its meaning is a component of deciphering and understanding of literary discourse as a linguistic and aesthetic sign.

Linguistic and stylistic means of encoding and encryption of meaning in the text creation system call for understanding of general characteristics of a potential reader as a participant in the text creation process. The sense-creating function is relevant to the idea of an author as a collective image that recreates a picture of the world, regardless of the language of an abstract individual. Under these circumstances, the subtext code appears to be a source of deep semantics at the level of subconscious thinking. This makes subtext functionality a cognitive level category, a phenomenon of semantic universalism. The subtext is seen as an obligatory component of a literary idiolect, a phenomenon of vertical coding, a product of an author as a bearer of subjective intentions, that becomes a collective homogeneous character.

**Keywords:** text, semantics, subtext, discourse, literary idiolect, linguistic thinking, function, author, reader.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Formation of the semantic structure of modernist literary discourse relies on a search for a new style of writing, rejection of the outdated principles of text and image creation, along with an inclusion of increasingly effective expressions in the artistic idiolect. The paradigm change takes place along with textual transposition, changes and shifts, syntactic deformations within the framework of particular expressions, fragments, and integral linguistic and aesthetic formations, all of which provides basis for an outline of the refreshed and updated literary paradigm (see: Yermolenko, 2009; Kononenko, 2018; Kononenko 2021; Taranenko, 2015; Vorobets, 2022). Transformational processes in the literary forms structuring closely interact with the sphere of integral contextual decisions and result in communicative coding changes and well literary meaning encoding changes (Batsevych, 2009, p. 7). Being verbalised literary subtext reduces roles of both an author and a reader to the level of components of subjective intentions.

The process of clarification of the ways and methods of decoding the "hidden" meaning involves usage of certain semantic mechanisms within the discourse analysis of the pretext and posttext while qualifying ambivalent characteristics of the speech process as a system of "guessing", deconstruction, and inclusion of elements of subconscious thinking. The semantics of subtext as an internal meaning, changed by the addressee-reader reveals itself through the categories of author's intentions and subjective intent, implicated into the text. Despite the pre-programmed orientation to recipients and their perception, in the intersubjective interaction of the author and the reader there might occur "discrepancies" in the understanding of the subtext, ambiguous interpretations of what is said at the level of inner-sense dialogue. On the one hand, the chance of various interpretations of the read material sends a warning message to the reader stopping him from going too far, yet, on the other hand, this ambiguity might be programmed.

Numerous attempts to deconstruct texts semantic depth by encoding it at the level of subtext result in a necessity to introduce a category of "new style" (Kononenko, 2021, p. 5). According to N. Kondratenko, "artistic writing of modern writers is characterised by a tendency to employ linguistic experiments and a focus on an active role of an addressee whom a reader is" (Kondratenko, 2012, p. 276). Modernist authors achieve different goals by means of reproducing "hidden" meanings: they manage to renew the artistic and cognitive paradigm, to go beyond classical examples of the idiolect, to intrigue, and to attract attention with an unusual semantic and formal organization, as well as to create the impression of utmost importance of the cognitive non-standardization of artistic thinking, and to benefit from subconscious ideas of readers (Vorobets, 2022, p. 132).

## 2. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Hoping for an uncommon "elite" reader, representatives of modernist trends in writing resort to coded messages and hidden meanings as they see their way of writing as a feature of an intellectual writing, a kind of preprogrammed language game. As a result, readers' minds might have difficulties understanding implied meanings of inadequate perception of the described. One can see a conscious effort on the part of authors writing in a "new style" manner to obscure and hide the meaning of the text by means of making subtextual interpretations unclear. This way of text presentation ensures certain "mystification" of the meaning, opens up the possibility of non-standard reflection. Conscious alluding to historical events, figures of the past, other people's statements, and literary reminiscences, etc. in literary texts without providing a commentary or a hint at their source creates a subtext of understatement, code, and intrigue. The meaning of a reference system like that is hidden, for example, in the author's allusions to the names of famous people in an ironically ridiculous tone: *Можна було просто вимовляти вголос ці імена, ці поняття, ці назви — безумовно, в такий спосіб цілком реально досягти нірвани, чи бодай просвітлення <...> (You could just say out loud these names, these concepts, these names — of course, in this way it is quite possible to achieve nirvana, or at least enlightenment ) <...> (Yu. Andrukhovych. "Perversion").*

One of the noticeable phenomena of modernist attempts at under-expression and silence is the referring to other people's texts that might be unfamiliar to a common person. If the statement goes: *Маленький Дон Жуан так і не зміг перетворитися на Дона Хуана (Little Don Juan [pronounced Zhuan] was never able to become Don Juan [pronounced Huan])* (I. Karpa. "50 minutes of weed"), then only an educated reader knows that it refers to two different literary characters in the works of various writers.

Let's consider the dialogue showcasing linguistic game of the "intellectuals": *До речі, у тебе є Фройд? – Порийся в шафі. Десь мав бути. Але навіщо тобі Фройд – зараз це вже не модно. Візьми Ніцше. Це Мефістофель за плечима людства (By the way, do you have Freud? – Look in a bookcase. It should be somewhere. Yet, what do you need Freud for –it is no longer in trend. Take Nietzsche. He is Mephistopheles peeking from behind the shoulders of mankind)* (I. Rozdobudko. "Escort to death"). The subtextual connotations of the fragment are not aimed at interpretation of what *is in trend* or *is not in trend* in a cultural environment, but in a hidden resentment to arrogance (for the mass reader, information about Freud, Nietzsche, as well as the mention of Mephistopheles may remain "behind the curtains").

Let's consider another example. The choice of names of characters in modern texts results from the classical tradition continuation of using "expressive names", and when combined with the authors' ingenuity in creating subtextual situations it becomes aesthetically justified. The reasoning behind such names is not always clear enough, but their cognitive meaning is not lost. For instance: *На передньому пляні сидить мовчазний і аж ніби закам'янілий добродій у ясно-кавовій мисливській жакеті <...> Роблю відразу припущення, що то і є пан Перфецький, репрезентант України, якого прибуття всі тут з нетерпінням виглядаємо (On the forefront there sits a silent and simingly stoical gentleman in a hunting jacket of a coffee colour <...> Immediately I assume that this is Mr. Perfetsky, a representative of Ukraine, whose arrival we are all looking forward to)* (Yu. Andrukhovych. "Perversion") (the bizarre surname *Perfetsky* becomes a component of further implications). In the prose of V. Shevchuk, for example, one finds characters named according to their characteristics – *утікач (fugitive), характерник (witcher), астроном (astronomer), перехожий (passer-by)* etc., however, their functional significance goes beyond its original purpose and it is outlined step by step, along with the events unfolding. The subtext of such names reveals through a phantasmagoric presentation. For instance, the image of the *перевізник (ferryman)* strikes in his likeness to the mythical Charon, who would transport the dead across the river Lethe: – *Мусиш умерти й ти, Хароне, – прорік, пильно дивлячись на перевізника ("You must also die, Charon," – he uttered, looking intently at the ferryman)* (the author's intentions include elements of the game).

The semantic subtext reveals its ambivalent features in the system of masks-images, in the processes of preprogrammed carnivalization of the story; we are talking, in particular, about the phantasmagoric description of figures in the form of animals, reptiles, fish, insects, monsters, etc. The presence of "real" characters in the fictional reality (game) opens up prospects for unusual collisions, fantastic events, which, in turn, complicates internal semantics and encodes meanings. Characters-masks have signs of both a fictional prototype and an acting character at the same time, and, therefore, they acquire features of preprogrammed doubles. For example, the character of V. Drozd's novel "Werewolf (lone wolf)" shares features of both a wolf and a man; in the novel of I. Rozdobudko "Escort to Death" the female character reveals herself as the *Vixen*, and her textual separation from the animal becomes only conditional: *Орест повернувся до столика, і Лисиця поклала м'яку лапку йому на плече. (Orest returned to the table, and Vixen put her soft paw on his shoulder.)*

It is noteworthy that in V. Shevchuk's mask images like *проява (apparition), сновида (sleepwalker), Чорний чоловік (Black Man)*, etc. become embodiments of the idea of universal horror, death, and suffering; their actions are irrational; and the context only enhances the functions of terror. Changes and shift the beast-characters undergo do not change their cognitive nature; the abundance of shifts and changes, as well as werewolves in the texts call for the connotations of overcoming horror as element of subtextual creation of meaning. Let's compare: *Проява сміялася. Сміялася бриджим, вкритим лускою*

*тілом і біла об підлогу лискучим хвостом <...> І вихід є, якого бажаєш. Він зветься просто й зрозуміло. Він зветься – С-м-е-р-т-ь! (The apparition was laughing. It was laughing with its ugly, scaly body and its glossy tail was hitting the floor <...> And there is the way out you want. Its name is simple and clear. Its name is D-e-a-t-h!)* (V. Shevchuk. The Last Day)

Subtextual reminiscences focused on the author's intentions contribute to the achievement of the relevant meaning created by verbalized units. On the way to understanding them there might occur polysemical interpretations of the given information in the minds of recipients, even among the "elite" part of readers. Nowadays modernist subtext not only does not exclude, but calls for possibilities of different ways of intentional interpretations created by a reader.

The abundance of "stylistic figures of mystery" in the text, a big amount of hints that require "guessing" contributes to the creation of different forms of metaphorization, cognitive polysemy, and writer's innovation. Let's consider: *Стоїть і дивиться на себе. / Крізь себе. / Крізь себе – на мене. / Крізь мене – кудись далеко-далеко, куди не можна дійти ногами. / А лише так: по канату місячного світла* ([he] *Stands and looks at himself. / Through himself. / Through himself – and at me. / Through me – at something faraway, so far that you cannot get there on your feet. / But only by a rope of moonlight*) (I. Rozdobudko "Once..."), where semantic structuring appears to be an expressive means with a metaphor of its pinnacle *by a rope of moonlight*.

To illustrate the point let's consider the following example: *християнську кров пролляш / заки калину підняли* (*Christian blood is shed/ until the red guelder rose is raised*) (I. Kalynets), the subtextual meaning of the phrase reveals itself through the correlation with the words of the song *А ми тую червону калину підіймемо, / а ми нашу славу Україну розвеселимо* (*And we will raise the red guelder rose, and we will cheer up our glorious Ukraine*). Any text encoded with the future contextual reasoning in mind calls for various semantic interpretations, even under conditions of possible ambiguous interpretation. Let's compare: *Ти чуєш – в кімнаті говорять / але ти знаєш – там нікого нема / ті що в кімнаті говорять / знають так треба як знають і ті / що їх в кімнаті нема / і ти знаєш – так треба / і чуєш що в кімнаті говорять / і знаєш що там нікого не треба* (*You hear – talking in the room / but you know – there is no one there/ those who are talking in the room / know that that's how it should be done as well as those / that are not in the room/ and you know – that's how it should be done / and you hear talking in the room / and you know that there's no need for someone there*) (V. Tsybulko) (*what does not happen is depicted as an action; no one is there is depicted as a hidden presence*).

The hidden meaning comes to the forefront through the qualification of the functions of certain words-concepts in their metaphorical contexts. In the speech situations like that the fragment boundaries helping to decipher the "secret" message of a linguistic-aesthetic sign expand, they cover larger fragments, and sometimes even the whole encoded discourse. Such figurative elements get understood at the deep semantics level, by means of intentional comprehension on the part of the reader, while his awareness of the cognitive component of such images-words can seem ambivalent and somehow subjectively interpreted.

When a concept-word of metaphorical depth becomes a part of the text it serves as an explication in the meaning of the cyphered internal polycode, which in its turn correlates with the programmed context through the subjective comprehension of a reader. This kind of literary image-creation makes it possible to present conceptual solutions, in particular, forms of destructive decoding. For example, in the the phantasmagoric work of V. Shevchuk one finds an image of a *red fox* that makes it through the text; it

doesn't take part in the unfolding events as a character but its appearance creates a coded message of anxiety, danger, and fear: *Лисиця вже зовсім близько, майже доходить до старого, вже навіть звів він угору пацюче лице, аж раптом розлунюється сухий тріск – лисиця спалахує високим і рівним вогнем* (*The fox is pretty close, it is almost near the old man, he has even lifted up a ratty face, when suddenly there sounds a dry crack – the fox flares up with a high and even flame*) (synonymous phrases like *red flame, red colour* strengthen the connotations of threat and horrors that are described in general context) (see: Pavlyshyn, 1977).

O. Zabuzhko author's monologue includes a repetitive address *леді й джентльмени* (*ladies and gentlemen*). On one hand, at least at first glance, it serves to attract a wider range of participants to the conversation, on the other hand, however, it is a self-ironic expression emphasising a mocking style of the discourse. For instance: *Леді й джентльмени, мені трохи мультко зачіпати цю тему, – розуміється, вона надається радше для проповіді, ніж для солідного наукового виступу <...>; Леді й джентльмени, в цій країні, котра від початку була людським творивом <...>; Дайте мені мікрофона, і я скажу: леді й джентльмени, ми створили пречудовий світ <...>* (*Ladies and gentlemen, I feel hesitant addressing this topic, – it seems it is better suited for a sermon than for a serious scientific speech <...>; Ladies and gentlemen, in this country that has always been a human creation <...>; Give me the microphone and I will say: ladies and gentlemen, we have created a wonderful world <...>*) ("Field Research on the Ukrainian Sex") (the author sees herself as an embodiment of the representative artificial philosophicality of the reported).

It is worth mentioning that recent modernist texts provide examples of figurative symbolization rethinking as a manifestation of the internal subtext action; symbolic words as a means of expressing polysemantic semantic connotations make it possible to reveal the hidden symbolic meanings in the framework of an unusual associative basis (see: Kondratenko, 2021; Vorobets, 2022). Both lack or absence of stereotypical symbols such as *зозуля, рушник, тополя etc.* (*cuckoo, embroidered cloth, poplar, etc.*) give room to the development of the ambivalence of the author's newly created symbolic meanings. Such changes call for a new reader's interpretation; at the same time, creation of a new symbolic picture serves as a tool for a new-style manner of writing.

For instance, in the text of I. Rozdobudko "Escort to Death" there appears a coded symbolic message in a form of a symbol-image of *подушечка* (*a cushion*). It has a layered hidden meaning that finds its beginning in the description of everyday routine: *Вона [Лана] розправила на колінах складки своєї чорної сукні й поклала на них свою улюблену маленьку подушечку, вишиту бісером. Його [Романа], як і минулого разу, заворожив рух її тонких пальців – вона ніби пестила ними оксамитову поверхню.* (*She [Lana] flatted the folds of her black dress and put on her lap her favorite little cushion, embroidered with beads. He [Roman], like the previous time, was mesmerised by the movement of her thin fingers – she seemed to caress the velvet surface*). The symbol-word *подушечки* (*cushion*) seems to acquire certain negative connotations: *Зависла довга пауза, протягом якої Роман знову спостерігав за рухами її пальців, що гладили подушечку. Чомусь ці рухи раптом здалися йому непристойними* (*There was a long pause, and Roman was watching her fingers again, the fingers were stroking the cushion. Somehow those movements seemed inappropriate to him <...>*). The hidden purpose of the *cushion* discloses itself in the following metaphorical reading: *Роман машинально потягнув «блискавку» <...> на її коліна, просто перед його обличчям, як клубок змії, виповзло переплетене клоччя білявого та рудуватого волосся* (*Roman absent-mindedly pulled a "zipper" <...> on her lap, just before him, like a tangle of snakes, there fell tousled strands of blond and reddish hair*) (the cushion contained the hair of the murdered men as an embodiment of the subtextual idea of revenge, hatred, and

despair). One can remember a double symbol *рожевий Мерседес – смітник* (*pink Mercedes – is a trash can*) from the novel of I.Karpa that serves as an embodiment of subtextual exposing of internal ugliness hidden by external beauty.

Differences in the interpretation of semantic discrepancies depend on individualized intentions, as they can be interpreted by readers in their cognitive accessibility. Reproduced in different parts of the text situations find a common line of plot development or connotative components, becoming a literary tool of "cementing" the text. When one of the fragments receives the function of a semantically complete unit it also gets a status of a pretext regarding a second fragment as a subtext. For example, the story of O. Zabuzhko about the conflict of two sisters which resulted in a murder because of jealousy has an introduction story about Cain killing Abel (O. Zabuzhko. "The tale of the Guelder-rose Flute". The allusion to the biblical plot has a stylized fairy tale form, which enables finding cognitive parallels.

Let's compare the fragments: on the one hand, one sees the allusion to the folk poetic interpretation of the biblical story: <...> *тату, що то таке на місяці темніється?.. А, – сказав Василь, – то брат брата підняв на вила, два брати було, Каїн і Авель, от Бог їх і поставив угорі над землею, щоб люди бачили й не забували гріха <...>* (<...> *Dad, what is it that shadow on the moon?.. | Oh, – says Vasyl, – that is a brother who pierced his brother with a pitchfork, there were two brothers called Cain and Abel, and God placed them up above so that people could see them and not forget about their sin*), and, on the other hand, the reader notices the tone of intimidation as the episode describes the sister's execution: <...> *вона крикнула в зашморгом розкручене взгорі небо, що посвистіло невідь-куди, теж, либонь, від жаху, пірвавши, як смерчем, за собою крони дерев, – до Того, Хто там сидів, ніколи не даючи зазирнути собі в лице, і луна її переможного реготу застугоніла лісом <...>* (<...> *when in a noose she cried out up into the sky, something was whistling up above, perhaps from horror, plucking at tree crowns like a tornado, - addressing the One, Who was up there, never allowing to see His face, and the echo of her victorious laughter boomed in the forest*).

Creative cognitively secretive texts authors may not expect readers to decipher them, authors may aim at mystery remain unsolved; their purpose is to achieve the effect of surprise, the "sacramentality" of the delivery in order to further develop events. According to the author's plan, such subtexts are supposed to play their role in the dramaturgy of a complicated plot; they create coded mystery pictures that are not for the reader to crack. For example, in the introduction of her story I. Karpa lets the reader see what's going on "behind the scenes"; there is no internal cohesion of such fragments with post-text: – *Мені так страшно... – Євка нервово потяглася за сигаретою. Та миттю впала їй з рук. Коханий байдуже дивився в інший бік. – От ти знаєш, що вони з нас зроблять? – провадила вона далі. – Е ні, ти просто не хочеш знати... Бо тобі страшно, так?! <...> – Ти боїшся так, як не боявся ніхто з нас. Ти ВМІЄШ боятися, правда, Даню? Він, здавалось, з неприємністю помітив її присутність, але заговорити не спробував* ("I'm so scared..." *Yevka nervously reached for a cigarette. She dropped it in a moment. Her beloved was looking indifferently in the other direction. "Do you know what they'll do to us?" She continued. "No, you just don't want to know..." Because you're scared, right?! < > – You are afraid so much, more than than any of us ever waswere. You KNOW HOW to be afraid, don't you, Dania? He seemed to notice her presence, with some kind of reluctance, but he did not try to answer*) (I. Karpa. "50 minutes of weed"). In the following lines there are no answers to the information hidden in the text; thus the encrypted subtext is created as a tool meant to set readers' cohesion into motion.

Verbal reminiscences without a reliable interpretation rarely coincide with traditional "lyrical digressions" aimed at setting a right tone of classical expression. Those fragments in the modernist texts

evidently intertwined with the main storyline, are usually perceived as a parallel presentation, brought in not so much in the framework of associative imagination but by means of a deep structure and subconscious inclusion that are not directly related to the context. The linguopoetic purpose of such inclusions is recognized not through the subtext interpretation but through an indirect semantic connection with a rather wide context; basically, this is kind of a motivation hidden from outside and not always clear enough in its semantic nature. Let's look at the example of a fragment that interrupts the author's dialogue with the reader: *Я лежу спиною на дуже зимному дні колодязя. Згори залетів протяг і просто завис наді мною, заповзвяхшись мене повсякчас холодити. Простягаю руку до слизької стіни, забиваю під нігті якусь підступну парость <...> Все мене полишило, геть усе. А я навіть й не казав отому всьому «Геть!»* (I lie with my back on the very cold bottom of the well. A draft has flown in from above and just hovers over me, aimed at cooling me down. I stretch my hand against a slippery wall, some unexpectedly cunning twig gets under my nails <...> Everything has left me, all of it. And I haven't even told it all "Get out!") (I. Karpa. "50 minutes of weed") (the image-symbol of an abandoned well embodies the subtextual motivation of loneliness and oblivion).

Deeply rooted in the reader's mind, the use of metaphoric words as a means of literary comprehension of reality is usually characterised by the ambivalence of the fleeting meanings, and it does not create problems for the interpretation of subtextual knowledge. However, in modernist texts, literary images can hide their secret meanings and require readers' efforts in decoding them; in such circumstances the hidden meaning semantics is revealed in the framework of a vertical context, deep mechanisms of guessing. The cognitive-stylistic content of such metaphorical expressions are not difficult to comprehend, yet it is far from easy to include them in the close context, therefore this function often remains inactive. There occur certain speech situations, both predicted and unpredicted by the author, which may leave the subtext not fully relevant, which might have been the author's plan all along.

To illustrate, let's consider the example: *<...> Земля лежала чорна, безмежно чорна од краю до краю, як і небо, перетята вузенькими каналами, трубочками вулиць, закутів; вода змивала всі нечистоти, всю гідь; шиби будинків, наче вибрані птахами очі покійників, свистіли у порожнечу площ, вулиць, де вітер ганяв поодиноких перехожих та набухлі газети <...> The earth was black, jet-black from one side to another, like the sky, it was criss-crossed by narrow canals, straws of streets, and corners; the water washed away all the dirt, all the filth; the windows of houses, like empty eye sockets feasted on by birds, whistled into the emptiness of squares, streets, where the wind was lashing after random passers-by and crumpled newspapers* (O. Ulyanenko. The Capital). Against the vast background of the earth and the sky, references to narrow canals, straws of streets and corners feel like an act of contempt and rejection of the world picture. The context does not call for metaphoric simily *windows of houses, like empty eye sockets feasted on by birds*; this simily is result of the desire to strengthen the expressive force of the narrative.

Numerous allusions and associative parallels in the modern authors' texts acquire their hidden meaning as they are aimed at the well-read reader's understanding. If a reference to somebody's statement in the text episode is unclear, it does not bother the author: the content of the given fragment contributes to the general semantic background. Such allusive references serve as tools to create hints, sometimes even mystery of narrative fragments, and they are perceived as a word play, language game, conscious secrecy of the narrative; they contribute to the development of ironic and humorous intonations, reduce pathetic and exalted tones of the text.

Normally the absence of commentary on some of the literary texts allusions does not interfere with the the general understanding of the statement, however it reduces the effect of subconscious parallels. For example, the statement *Рукописи не горять а гниють-таки порядно* (*Manuscripts do not burn but they do rot*) (I. Karpa. "50 minutes of weed") is pretty clear to well-educated readers due to the allusion in first part of the statement (*manuscripts do not burn*), but a motivated reference to the solemn circumstances, in which the original statement has been made, could have provided as a holistic understanding of the expression that would have acquired deeper semantics. Allusions might rely on historical events, or political situations, and this fact complicates their proper comprehension by a modern reader; yet, even in these circumstances, commentary is rarely provided. To illustrate: *навіть якби ти, якимось дивом, устругнула в цій мові що-небудь «посильнее "Фауста" Гете», як висловлювався один знаний в історії літературний критик, то воно просто провакувалось би по бібліотеках нечитане* (<...> *even if you, somehow, by miraculous chance, came up with something in this language that was "stronger" than Goethe's "Faust", as one well-known literary critic put it, it would simply be lost in libraries unread*) (O. Zabuzhko. "Field research on Ukrainian sex") (an ironic mention of a ridiculous evaluation does not have a commentary and may remain beyond the understanding of some readers).

The use of fragmented speech, where communicative connections in the narrative are so weakened that it may account for the loss of holistic meaning understanding, with the purpose of describing the artistic world becomes a source of semantic shifts; under these conditions, the subtext resembles a coded structure, and the chance of its deciphering plummets down. This kind of intentional unclarity of modernist context leads to possibilities of various interpretations, yet this does not hinder a holistic "comprehension" of the narrative meaning. For example, the "connectors" missing from the following dialogue give different readers options to "complete" the "conversation without words": – *А знаєш, здається, я в тебе закохався...* – *Приємна новина... Дякую...* – *Це все, що ти можеш мені сказати?* – *А ти хотів почути щось інше?* – *Вибач. Я пішов.* – *Заклацнеш двері.* – *Гаразд* (– *You know, I think I have fallen in love with you...* – *Good to hear... Thank you...* – *Is that all you can tell me?* – *Did you expect to hear something else?* – *Sorry. I'll leave.* – *Bolt the door.* – *All right*) (I. Rozdobudko. "Escort to death") (declaration of love goes hand in hand with rejection, refusal, and disappointment).

At the same time, there have become popular texts with completely broken semantic connections within fragmented structures; there might be different objectives behind such a choice of words: description of the feelings of anxiety and confusion, description of a critical situation, internal monologue, etc. For instance: *Амбал як має бути – ну амбал де твоя інтуїція – за що тобі бабки – ну добре – мама я снайпера люблю – моліться помоліться – десять – дев'ять – вісім – сім – шість – п'ять – три – яких там три – чотири – аж тепер три – два – їден – амінь* (*A big guy like he should be – well, big guy, where is your intuition – what have you done to get dough – well, well – mom, I'm in love with a sniper – pray and finish praying – ten – nine – eight – seven – six – five – three – why is it three – four – and now three – two – one – amen*) (Yu. Andrukhovych. "Perversion") (it is not clear what it is all about – there's no explanation to why one should pray – we don't know anything about the numbers given – it is unknown, etc.; the fragment recreates the subtext of uncertainty and lack of motives).

### 3. CONCLUSIONS

Syntactic destructualism, changes in the arrangement of text fragments as well as their graphic forms along with other innovations, primarily in postmodern writing, lead to deformations of meaning, and



therefore uproot conventional norms of understanding the content, increasing the functional power of implications. When texts are used without punctuation marks it opens up the possibility of ambivalent interpretation; implication and subtext reveal themselves being semantically poly-coded.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Batsevych, F. (2009). *Basis of communicative linguistics*. [2nd edition]. Kyiv. (in Ukrainian)
- [2] Kondratenko, N. (2012). *Syntax of Ukrainian modernist and postmodernist literary discourse*. Kyiv. (in Ukrainian)
- [3] Kononenko, V. (2012). *Text and meaning*. Kyiv-Ivano-Frankivsk. (in Ukrainian)
- [4] Kononenko, V. (2018). *Linguopoietic etudes*. Kyiv-Ivano-Frankivsk. (in Ukrainian).
- [5] Kononenko, V. (2021). *Pragmatics of literary text: in search of new style*. Kyiv-Ivano-Frankivsk. (in Ukrainian)
- [6] Kononenko, V. 2022. Author and Style: Intellectualization of Victor Domontovych's Artistic Discourse. *Journal of Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University*. Vol. 8, № 2, 45–55. <https://doi.org/10.15330/jpnu.8.2.45-55>.
- [7] Pavlychko, S. (1999). *Modernism discourse in Ukrainian literature*. Kyiv. (in Ukrainian)
- [8] Pavlyshyn, M. (1977). *Canon and iconostasis*. Kyiv. (in Ukrainian)
- [9] Perelomova, O. (2008). *Linguo-cultural codes of intertextuality of Ukrainian literary discourse: diachronic aspect*. Sumy. (in Ukrainian)
- [10] Taranenko, O. (2015). *Working models in the system of word formation of the modern Ukrainian language (late XX – early XVI centuries)*. Kyiv. (in Ukrainian)
- [11] Vorobets, O. (2022). Functional and Semantic Extension of the Sentence of the Modern Ukrainian Literary Language. *Journal of Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University*. Vol. 8, № 2, 131–136. <https://doi.org/10.15330/jpnu.8.2.131-136>.
- [12] Yermolenko, S. (2009). *Linguistic-aesthetic signs of the Ukrainian culture*. Kyiv. (in Ukrainian)

Vitaliy Kononenko, Doctor of Philology, Honorary Rector, Full Professor Head of General and Germanic Linguistics Department of Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University, Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine.

**ORCID ID:** 0000-0002-5522-674X

**Address:** Vitaliy Kononenko, Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University, 57 Shevchenko St., Ivano-Frankivsk, 76025 Ukraine.

**E-mail:** [vitalii.kononenko@pnu.edu.ua](mailto:vitalii.kononenko@pnu.edu.ua)

Oleksii Vorobets, PhD, Associate Professor of General and Germanic Linguistics Department of Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University, Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine.

**ORCID ID:** 0000-0002-3530-2581

**Address:** Oleksii Vorobets, Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University, 57 Shevchenko St., Ivano-Frankivsk, 76025 Ukraine.

**E-mail:** [oleksii.vorobets@pnu.edu.ua](mailto:oleksii.vorobets@pnu.edu.ua)

**Received:** May 02, 2023; **revised:** June 03, 2023.

---

Віталій Кононенко, Олексій Воробець. Семантика підтексту: модерністський художній вимір. *Журнал Прикарпатського університету імені Василя Стефаника. Філологія*, 10 (2023), 6–15.

Структурування модерністського художнього дискурсу визначає інтерпретації "новостилю" – системи засобів оновлення манери письма, орієнтованої на включення в ідіолектну парадигму когнітивно переформованих семантичних складників. Включення в контекст суб'єктивних авторських

інтенцій задля інтелектуалізації викладу, на кшталт мовної гри, підтекстових зрушень, іноваційних деструкцій входить у систему кодування, шифрування повідомлюваного, розрахованого на амбівалентність смислу в системі Автор–Текст–Читач. Смислорозрізняльний потенціал тексту є компонентом дешифрування, розуміння художнього дискурсу як мовноестетичного знака.

Мовностилістичні засоби шифрування, закодованості смислу в системі текстотворення передбачають визначення образу читача, учасника процесу текстотворення. Смысловірна функційність окреслює автора як колективного образу, котрий відтворює картину світу, незалежно від мовомислення абстрактного мовника. За цих умов підтекстовий код постає як джерело глибинної семантики на рівні підсвідомого мислення. Функційність підтексту стає категорією когнітивного рівня, явищем семантичного універсалізму. Підтекст усвідомлюється як облігаторний складник художнього ідіолекту, явище вертикального кодування, чинник автора як носія суб'єктивних інтенцій, котрий стає колективним гомогенним персонажем.

**Ключові слова:** текст, семантика, підтекст, дискурс, художній ідіолект, мовомислення, функція, автор, читач.