

UDC 81'42:808.1:821.161.2 В. Домонтович  
doi: 10.15330/jpnu.8.2.45-55

## Section: WORD AND TIME

### AUTHOR AND STYLE: INTELLECTUALIZATION OF VICTOR DOMONTOVYCH'S ARTISTIC DISCOURSE

VITALIY KONONENKO

**Abstract.** The article highlights the features of the idiosyncrasy of Victor Domontovych, a writer of 1920s, a representative of modernist artistic discourse. The stylistic manner of the author's writing shows his intellectualism, principles of his extraordinary scientifically oriented linguistic thinking. V. Domontovych depicts artistic reality through the prism of the ontological clash of categories of rational and irrational, real and unreal, intellectual and primitive-bourgeois, sexual and asexual. Using the concepts of plausible and implausible, real and conditional, the author characterizes the psycho-behavioral stereotypes of his characters in order to comment and evaluate their actions and decisions; he often uses a descriptive and contemplative manner, and forms of logical conclusions; therefore, a symbiosis of scientific and fictional presentation is formed.

V. Domontovych's texts are full of ironic and mocking intonations in order to expose spirituality, low culture, meanness; the author strongly condemns selfishness, callousness, dishonesty in the behavior of the characters; the sharpness of his critical vision is directed against the arrogance of the intelligentsia, unjustified rationalism, scientific-like thinking, and bourgeoisie. The intellectual novels of the writer can be considered as extended metaphorical constructions, integral figurative and symbolic structures, profound artistic worldview carriers, as well as systems of meaning mythologizing. The author's usage of linguistic and stylistic means is not extensive; they are unusual in their associative-figurative aspect and intended for the domain of cognitively meaningful perception. The expressiveness of texts is achieved through an implicit coded word usage, there is space for the reader to think creatively as the texts rely on the conceptual interaction within the system Author-Text-Reader.

**Keywords:** idiosyncrasy, linguistic thinking, intellectualization, irrationalism, text, artistic discourse, linguistic stylistic means.

#### 1. INTRODUCTION

The linguopoetics of Viktor Domontovych's prose discourse is a complex phenomenon, and not only for its unconventional stylistics, or literary and artistic distinctiveness, but also due to its "mystery" of sub-textual silences, the one that is not written but has to be read in between lines, and due to hidden signs of deep linguistic thinking. In the evaluation of critics "his style is neither eclectic, nor internally contradictory, nor fragmentary" [9], but it poses the question: what kind of style is it really, then? Apparently, it is in this linguistic and stylistic uncertainty, depressurization, where the author's idiosyncrasy purpose lies. According to linguistic and stylistic parameters, Domontovych's texts are

usually included into the modernist discourse, his style of writing corresponds to the avant-garde of the 1920s, but it is hardly fair to unambiguously include his style in the stream of a certain literary movement, to qualify it exclusively as something of the above-mentioned; the fundamental paradigm of his word usage is based on the uniqueness and extravagancy of the writer's creative search.

## 2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

V. Domontovych's texts astonish the modern reader with noticeable differences in the application of literary norms, they catch an eye more effectively, than, say, the manifestations of Ukrainian classical writing. The texts of the author are full of strings of words-concepts: some of them are of abstract meaning or belong to scientific terms, some of them are outdated, or rarely used names, that can be traced back partly to diaspora writers, partly to dialects and borrowings from foreign languages; e.g.: *борлак* (*borlak*) spoken 'upper bulging part of a throat, Adam's apple' [DUL, 1, 218]; *каламар* (*kalamar*) old-fashioned 'inkwell, inkstand' [DUL, 4, 74]; *обол* (*obol*) 'coin' [not recorded in DUL]; *церамовий* (*tseratovy*) - adjective to "tserata" 'oilcloth, oilskin' [DUL, 11, 201], etc.

Words acquire outdated orthoepic indicators [and different spelling leads to different pronunciation], eg: *альомб* (*apl'omb*) [instead of *aplomb*], *мистець* (*mystets'*) [instead of *mytets'*], *пава* (*paava*) [instead of *pausa*], *роля* (*rolia*) [instead of *rol'*], *сильюет* (*syliuet*) [instead of *syliuet*], *сурдука* (*surduka*) [instead of *siurtuka*], *фюевверк* (*fiuieverk*) [instead of *feierverk*], *хемія* (*hemia*) [instead of *himia*]; what is common here is the soft sound [j] in the middle of the word: *ініціатива* (*initsiatyva*) [instead of *initsiatyva*], *піаніно* (*piianino*) [instead of *pianino*], *екваторіяльний* (*ekvatoriial'nyi*) [instead of *ekvatorial'nyi*]. Feminine nouns ending in consonant receive the ending *-и* (*-y*) in their genitive case: *радості* (*radosty*) [instead of *radosti*], *стриманості* (*strymanosty*) [instead of *strymanosti*], *тверезості* (*tverezosty*) [instead of *tverezosti*] etc.; there is also noticeable extended use of [w]; this is a result of the requirements of linguists of that period (one cannot help but take into account that modern publications of V. Domontovich works follow the foreign publication example: V. Domontovych. *Prose. Three Volumes*, Suchanist', 1988., that clearly marked the tastes the publisher's preferences). The external features of Domontovych's writing create the outline of an unusual, encrypted text.

## 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The profound structures of the writer's linguistic thinking rely on the perception of artistic reality as a contradictory, ambiguous phenomenon, which is not completely studied and which is determined not so much by the reproduction of processes and actions complexity, but by the dual nature; his texts are coded, his linguistic style is obscure, non-steady in its sketches and postulates, and it is akin to the principles of the subconsciousness. The author's motives are built up on the antitheses of rational and irrational, real and illusory, intellectual and primitive, sexual and asexual. His ontological views and aesthetic preferences find their realization in a system of antinomies, allusions, mythologies, syllogisms, they are structured in idiosyncrasy, which creates a linguistic picture of the world, different from the artistic strivings of the literature of that time.

In this sense, a figurative and symbolic formation based on the concepts of similarity / dissimilarity, an explication into the parallel of *plausible - implausible* appears as a kind of a literary construct; it lingers through the entire textual plane of the novel "Girl with a Teddy Bear". According to the dictionary, *plausible* is 'similar to truth, akin to what it may actually be' [DUL, 7, 500], i.e. one that is not the ultimate truth, but only similar to it, something fragile, amorphous, undefined in its result; consequently, *implausible* should mean 'dissimilar to truth'. The antithesis of *plausible - implausible* becomes the basis of the conceptual and semantic field - the kind of a core of the philosophical thinking of the main characters of the novel. Let's compare:

[1.] — *Ти завжди говориш так, щоб воно ні на що не було подібне <...> Ти повинен знати, що я не переношу подібностей. Я волітиму краще неподібного: за неправдоподібне! [- You always talk in such a way that it wouldn't look like something <...> You should know that I do not tolerate similarities. I will prefer dissimilar: [I am] for the unbelievable! ]* The fragment defines the understanding of the *подібного* as "the one that has common features with someone, something; similar to someone, something" [DUL, 6, 745] as opposed to *неправдоподібному* that is perceived as "similar to the truth". *Неправдоподібне* in the context of the work is the denial of the obsolete, the habitual, it is the assertion of something new, modern, although it is not the whole truth.

[2.] *Я запитую Зину, що може означати ця підкреслена її ворожеча до «подібностей». Чи не знаходить вона, що за останній час ці слова «подібності» й «неподібності» зробились її улюбленими словами. Вони набули для неї значення якогось терміну, вона маніфестує цими словами <...> Звідкіля, хтвів би я знати, Зина засвоїла звичку грати цими протиставленнями правдоподібного й неправдоподібного? [I ask Zyna what this emphasized hostility to "similarities" can mean. Doesn't she find that lately words like "likeness" and "dissimilarity" have become her favorite words? They have acquired a meaning of some term for her, she manifests with these words <...> I wonder, where from Zyna acquired the habit of playing with these oppositions of plausible and unlikely?]* Герой не розуміє витоків вибору Зини на користь *неправдоподібного*, не бачить підстав змінювати поведінку згідно з цими постулатами. The character does not understand the origins of Zina's choice to favor the word *неправдоподібного*, he doesn't see the reason to change behavior because of these postulates.

[3.]— *Я дуже втішена, що ви помітили мою нелюбов до правдоподібного. Ви, Іполіте Миколайовичу, будете за мене, за неправдоподібне, і заперечуватимете всі правдоподібності! - <...> не розумію, чому саме я маю заперечувати правдоподібне? [I am very glad that you noticed my dislike of the plausible. You, Ipolyt Mykolaiovych, will be for me, for the improbable, and you will deny all plausibilities! - <...> I don't understand why it is me who has to deny the plausible?]* The character does not support Zina, in his perspective, judging by the context, the *неправдоподібне* equals to delusion, fiction, a concept foreign to common sense.

[4.]— *Правдоподібне? Ви питаєте, що таке правдоподібне? Треба ненавидіти все правдоподібне, бо воно тільки подібне на правду, але не є правда. Ми ж шукатимемо самої тільки правди, а не її оманних подібностей. [Credible? You are asking, what is credible? We must hate everything that is credible, because it is only similar to the truth, but it is not the truth. We will seek only the truth itself, not its deceptive similarities]* This quote reveals the logical contradiction of the character's statements: striving for the improbable is also not the whole truth, not the search for the truth.

[5.] *«Ми шукали неправдоподібних істин. І ми не найшли їх. Життя зламало нас. Нічого не лишилося для надії. Я гину».* [We have been looking for implausible truths. And we have not found them. Life has broken us. There is nothing left for hope. I'm dying] The existence of implausible truths is denied. Life has rejected them. However, this is far from a return to the *подібного*, there is no answer to the question: where the truth is.

[6.] *Коли так, то навіть ті слова, що їх вона дівчиною любила повторювати, її улюблені слова про істину й оману, про правдоподібне і неправдоподібне? [If so, what are the words for, those words she loved to repeat still being a girl, her favorite words about truth and delusion, about the plausible and the improbable? ]* The character's words about the *правдоподібне* and the *неправдоподібне* turned out to be empty, insignificant, not supported by actions. Another main character generalizes the thesis, which is not proved by action, he makes it sound like life wisdom: *Слова завжди відштовхували мене від себе.* [Words have always chased me away from myself]. However, having rejected verbal formulas, the character does not find anything true or essential to contradict them.

The real and unreal, the rational and irrational go far beyond playing role of the fundamental "unity of opposites" in the author's philosophy; his pessimism relies on the fact that the illusory, fictional, and untrue wins because it reflects reality, because the truth is sacrificed to it. One of the means of irony concerning the "fiction" of life itself is based on the "concept substitution" in the conversations of a scientist with a five-year-old girl ("the lips of a baby speak the truth"). Let's consider fragments of the text of the novel "Doctor Seraficus".

[1.]—А ти, дядю Комахо, людина? <...>

—Усерйоз людина, чи ти тільки кажеш? Зовсім чи тільки настільки? Вона показала кінець пальця.

—Усерйоз, Ірцю! Цілком усерйоз. Така ж людина, я і ти, як і твої тато й мама!

—Не може бути! — сказала роздратовано Ірця й тупнула ногою.

[— And are you, Uncle Komaha [meaning “an insect”], a person? <...>

—Are you really a person, or are you just saying it? Totally or only this much? She showed the tip of her finger.

Really, Irtsia! Quite really. [I am] a person, both me and you, as well as your father and mother!

—No way! Irtsia said irritably and stamped her foot.]

[2.] Коли дядя Корвин настоював, що Комаха — не пунс, Ірця сердилась, насумрювалась і починала бити його кулаками, намагаючися зачепити за пенсне. [When Uncle Corvinus insisted that Komaha was not a doll, Irza was angry, sulky, and began to beat him with her fists, trying to get to the pince-nez]

[3.] — Дядю Пунс, упади.

—Ну, Ірцю, мені не хочеться падати. До того ж, тут насмічено й брудно.

—Та ні! Ти «ніби» впади.

—А, «ніби»? Гаразд! Я «ніби» впав.

[—Uncle Pups [meaning “a doll”], fall down.

—Well, Irtsia, I do not want to fall down. Moreover, it is littered and dirty here.

—Not that! You can pretend “as if” you fall down.

—Oh, “as if”? OK! I fell, “as if”. ]

[4.]«Ніби — улюблена схема слів, думок, вчинків Ірчиних. У ніби, в уявлене «неначе» замкнено всі події, все коло її днів. Вона задовольняється з ніби. Проводячи межу між ніби й тим, що є, вона ясно відчуває різницю, що відокремлює ніби від реальності, але не надає особливого значення цій різниці

[“As if” seems to be Irtsia’s favorite pattern of words, thoughts, and actions. “As if”, an imagined “as if” incorporates all events, the whole circle of her days. She is satisfied with the “as if”. Drawing the line between “as if” and what reality is, she clearly feels the difference that separates the “as if” from the reality, but she does not attach much importance to this difference.]

The fragment [1.] focuses on the incompatibility of the surname *Komaha* (meaning “an insect”) with the human body of the character, who had a *huge body, red, shaved, square face*, which resembled a *pile of meat*. Common sense is powerless against the girl’s perception - *No way!* The substitution of a person with a toy displayed in the fragment [2.] reveals the rejection of her game. In the fragment [3.] the action is expressed through the reproduction of an action that takes place in the imagination (*I fell down, “as if”*). The final “touch” in the reflection is relayed in the “scientific” justification of *as if* - a favorite scheme of words, thoughts, actions.

The discursive word [2.] *as if* not only organizes the textual structure, but also expresses the unreality, hypothetical situations, and fanciful features of the reported. There arises the idea of comprehension of *as if* as the foundation of the imaginary world; it is not an artistic embodiment, but rather a reflection of the environment. The picture of the world is being destroyed, some impressions are being replaced by others, and there is no place of relaxation. There is an ongoing process of establishing instability, variability, inconsistency not only in the mental state of the characters, but also in the system of “real-unreal”.

In the literary reality, the actions of the characters remain unfulfilled, displaced, ridiculous, and inadequate; they replace actions with contemplation, they substitute the awareness of reality with fiction. At the first glance, it doesn’t seem so: the male character of “Girl with a Teddy Bear” is an engineer, a chemist, a working man, but his behavioral stereotypes are vague, confusing, and incorrect: *там, де не було жадних суперечностей, він їх вигадував* [where there were no contradictions, he invented them]. Instead of *щоб мати справу з тим, що єсть, він з кожного життєвого явища утворював якусь потворну вигадку* [dealing with what there is, he transformed each life phenomenon into some ugly fiction] (these observations are actually descriptive, scientific, but not presented by means of real actions or certain behaviour). The main character of “Doctor Seraphicus” would like to have his own child, but he comes up with unrealistic projects concerning its birth; he would like to be loved by a woman, but

limits himself to addressing her unsent letters, in which he asks himself: *Що я повинен зробити, щоб ти була... Я хотів сказати: МОЯ, пам'яті: НІЧИЯ?! [What should I do to make you... I wanted to say: MY, then: NOBODY'S ?!]* (a typical utterance of a person who is unable to act: if not *mine*, then at least a *nobody's*); he dooms himself to failure.

In some speech situations, the unproductive, imaginary behavior of the characters is shown through the images of possible but unrealized actions: *Він [доктор], певно, зовсім забув би запросити сісти. Просто він хотів, щоб вона сіла й більше не рухалась. Безглузда метушня дратувала його [He [the doctor] would probably have forgotten to offer her to have a sit. He simply wanted her to sit down and not move. He found senseless fuss irritating]* ("Doctor Seraficus"): he wanted her to sit down, but forgot to offer it, he wanted her to stop moving, but it was impossible. Here we have a description, a statement confirming a state, but not an enactment of the script. The writer's characters *seem* to live a full life, but in reality it is just something resembling a full life, it is an illusory existence, fiction.

There arises a well-known literary idea of duality as a regular pattern, ontological essence, irrational meaning of existence. Ipolyt Mykolayovych is both an engineer and a dreamer, he is far from reality; Komaha is a professor and a scientist, as well as a confused man incapable of action. In these images Yu. Sheveliov saw the reflection of the writer's personality: "a popular image of a confused scientist includes the features of the author's self-portrait" [9, 28; p.10]; however, the image of the author-analyst, observer of the "duality", confusion, inner turmoil of a man living in a semi-real world, is more complex than the written-off prototype.

The writer seeks to scientifically comprehend and evaluate the worldview of his characters in order to express his philosophical guidelines in the process of analysis, as well as to express the principles of their linguistic thinking in the intellectual projection. Let's compare, for example, the author's intentions: *Передо мною Зина, яка, відчувши в собі жінку, в передчутті кохання, що ще не родилось, помацки блукає по стежках свого ще не знайденого й непізнаного кохання («Дівчина з ведмедиком»)* [*There I can see Zina, who, having felt herself a woman, is in anticipation of love that has not yet been born, and she gropes the paths of her yet undiscovered and unknown love*] ("Girl with a Teddy Bear"). The text is built of rather dry, sensible characteristics, despite the fact that they are the words of a character in love with a girl; at the same time it is a psychosomatic self-assessment of the character – an unemotional intellectual person capable of analyzing and weighing arguments; his reflections include a variant of Freudian psychoanalysis [see: 1, 14]; the only "literary" element in the fragment one can find is the dead metaphor *ponders the paths of love*.

Domontovych's texts are characterized with an ironic and mocking intonation of an intellectual who perceives his surrounding through the prism of a critical vision of the comic, even if it is about drama or even tragedy. The ironic effect can be traced not so much in the explicit context, as in the implicit one, in the deep structures of the subconscious. There is a kind of coded irony in the character's contemplations after a sexual intercourse: *Того вечора Зина віддалась мені... Як звичайно припускають, шлюб є натуральний вихід, котрий розв'язує, або ж, принаймні, повинен розв'язувати усі життєві й літературні ускладнення. Традиції белетристичного роману XVIII-XX ст. стверджують, що для романіста немає кращого способу закінчувати твір, як одруживши «його» й «її»* [*That evening Zina gave herself to me ... It is commonly believed that marriage is a natural solution that solves, or at least should solve, all difficulties of life and literature. Traditions of fiction novel of the XVIII-XX centuries state that the best way for a novelist to finish his work is to marry "him" and "her"*] ("Girl with a Teddy Bear"). These statements are a ruthless debunking of the character, showing his unprecedented cynicism, callousness, lack of spirituality; an intimate meeting with his beloved makes him come with empty "thoughts" (*marriage is a natural solution*), his reference to the fiction novels of the XVIII-XX centuries is the pinnacle of heartlessness, selfishness, and blasphemy. It is a devastating satire, a mockery at the "intellectual" in his secret pride.

The writer is indignant, full of contempt and repulsion, concerning the character's artificially insightful instructions he utters after the death of his once beloved woman: *Зина обернулася у повію, тільки в повію <...> Вона не захотіла жити творчим життям, вона не повірила у творчу міць щоденної праці, у працю, що визволяє.* [*Zina turned into a tart, just a tart <...> She did not want to lead a creative life,*

she did not believe in the creative power of daily work, inspiring work ]. The character masks his guilt with pompous words (*creative life, creative power of daily work, inspiring work*). Satire reaches its highest register. These statements condemn not so much an arrogant person, but a character who views the unfolding horrific events only as reason to come up with "thoughtful" comments.

An undisguised irony of the comic is the thought of Another intellectual, Professor Seraficus, who is "seriously" considering the prospects of solving the "problem" of childbearing, is full of ironic thoughts that evoke a comical effect: *Коли б людство було культурно розвиненіше, воно давно подбало б про те, щоб примітивний і некультурний спосіб дітонародження заступити іншим [If humanity were more culturally developed, it would have already changed the primitive and non-cultural way of birthgiving for something more sophisticated]* ("Doctor Seraficus"). Here sarcasm is even more prominent, considering the fact that these "theoretical" musings belong to the scientist.

The mocking and contemptuous tone of Domontovych's discourse goes beyond his novel prose. His stories are also full of connotative overlays of irony and sarcasm. We see the devastating mockery at the new masters of life in a comical poem with the conspicuous title "Princes": — *Партія, — зазначає повчально тов. Портянко, оптимістично ототожнюючи в своїй уяві себе й партію, — я за науку!.. За природу!.. [“Party,” said comrade Portianko in a teaching manner, optimistically identifying himself and the party in his imagination, - I am for science! ..For nature!..].* The insulting name *comrade Portyancko* [meaning “pants”], the primitivism of his illiterate statements (*I am for science, for nature*), the ridiculous *teaching manner, optimistically, in his imagination* show the position of an intellectual who observes social processes "on the sideline". Compare: — *Ти, каже, Пилипе, шпикуюлянт!.. Предатель соціалізму!.. Несвідомий, буржуазний клас!.. Відрижка капіталізму!.. [ - Philip, he says, you are a speculator! .. A traitor of socialism! .. Unconscious, bourgeois class! .. Burp of capitalism! .. ]* ("Trypillia tragedy") (the incompetence, rudeness, and ignorance prompt the writer's effect of categorical rejection).

The discourse demonstrates the changes in the connotations of indignation and denial to admiration, elation, and joy, when the writer-intellectual talks about works of art, or lists the brush masters; literary allusions sometimes take over the narrative of depicted events and situations, but these passages are often accompanied by several layers of ridicule and mockery. In the records of the "semi-intellectual" Ver one reads: «*Коли Толстой пише: «Я живу добре! Три роки не читав і тепер не читаю жодної газети», чи не мусимо ми радіти: він — ми, ми — він?..» [“When Tolstoy writes:” I live well! I haven't read a newspaper for three years and now I don't do it now”, shouldn't we be happy: he is us, we are him? ..]* (the stupidity and naivety of statements like that do not need additional explicit comments on the author's part). According to N. Kondratenko, Domontovych's prose contains numerous intertext parallels; in particular, there is an allusion to A.Blok's words: *Чорний вітер, білий сніг!.. Подух вітру революції виніс його з села <...> [Black wind, snow white! .. The gust of wind of the revolution got him out of the village <...> ]* ("Without foundation") [4, 193]; one cannot but notice the ironic intonation of the author in the metaphor, the *gust of wind of the revolution got him out of the village*. Compare: *На кожній плитці підлоги в кав'ярні, куди його примушував іти Корвін, Комаха вже читав написа з Дантового некла: Lacsiate ogni speranza — Згасить вогні сподіванки, входячи! [On every floor tile of the coffee shop Corvyn forced him to go to, Komaha could easily read an inscription from Dante's Hell: Lacsiate ogni speranza - Extinguish the lights of hope, those who enter!]* ("Doctor Seraficus") (one sees the word play around the incompatible concepts of *floor tiles* and elaborated Dante's poetry; this "similarity" hides the intellectual-bookworm's smile).

Domontovych's intellectual romantic prose can be presented in the form of extended metaphorical constructions, integral figurative-symbolic structures, which are united by a complicated philosophical vibe, deep sub-textual meaning; it is a mythologized manifestation of an intention [see: 4, 177]. There appears an idea that the discursive plane can be covered by a single common metaphor of contradiction, the permanence of the world picture of the world, the dichotomy of man, the errancy of deeply ingrained truths. This approach allows viewing the writer's characters like living individuals with their psychosomatic traits, but rather as mannequins, representatives of a certain idea, self-concept, or a mythologem. In this sense, there is no longer need for a mandatory selection of partial

metaphors, comparisons, hyperboles, or symbols, etc.; it is general descriptions and reflections that prevail.

Such stylistic guidelines prompt readers to fall back on the linguistic and stylistic devices based on cognitive principles; a metaphor becomes internal and hidden, a comparison is obtained from the context, a symbol is perceived as a code, and an epithet acquires the features of an associative word [see: 5; 6; 7; 8]. For example, the hyperbolic exaggeration in the description of sturdy Seraficus is accompanied by the humorous name of the character – *Комаха* (meaning “an insect”) (— *Комаха* (— *А чому ти такий дуже великий, якщо ти — комаха? Адже ж комахи бувають маленькі?* [- *Why are you so very large, if you are an insect? After all, insects are small, aren't they?*]) (“Doctor Seraficus”): semantic parallels *very large* and *insect* are elements of the carnivalization, a linguistic game). Consider the hidden litotes characterizing the character as a self-critical but simultaneously funny and miserable person: — *Ви бачите: я — злидений і ніщо! Що я можу віддати, коли в мене нема нічого?* [- *You see: I am pathetic and nothing! What can I offer when I have nothing?*]. The encoded symbolism is embedded in the images of the *girl with a teddy bear* and *girl Irtsia*; the first of them is the embodiment of the idea of change, transformation, potential gradual growing up, infantilism, and naivety (it is no coincidence that Zyna promises the male character to *gift away the teddy bear*, thus, saying farewell to children's games forever); the second image is a symbol of naivety without borders, life in a fictional world, unchanging childhood; e.g.: — *Скільки тобі років, Ірцію? — Торік було десять, а цього — п'ять; — Я скоро стара буду* [- *How old are you, Irtsia? - Last year I was ten, and this year I am five; - I will be old soon*] (“Doctor Seraficus”) (age changes do not interfere with the frozen naivety and primitivism of the worldview).

Consider cognitive comparisons: *Корвин зробився Серафікусом, Серафікус — Корвином, із тією, хіба, різницею, що Корвин — більше Серафікус, а цей останній — далеко менше Корвином, — чи, може, і зовсім ним не став* [*Corvyn became Seraficus, Seraficus became Corvyn, with only the difference that Corvyn was more of a Seraficus, and the latter was far less of a Corvyn, or, perhaps, not at all*] (this assimilation does not become a full-fledged comparison, the degree of similarity of one character to another is relative, it is not so much a comparison but carnivalization - a change of masks). What is exemplary is the use of several seemingly bland adjectives that evoke soothing connotations, feeling of slow self-understanding, but at the same time they bring on the atmosphere of a boring provincial existence, a blind alley: *Комаха дивився на викривлені лінії цієї сухої, спаленої сонцем, зелено-брунатної місцевості, і його охоплювало почуття спокою і ясності <...>* («Доктор Серафікус»); *Із лівого боку йшли зелено-брунатні горби, порослі сухим і шорстким бур'яном* [*Insect looked at the uneven lines of dry, green-brown terrain scorched by the sun, and he was flooded with a sense of calmness and clarity <... >*] (“Doctor Seraficus”); *On the left side there were green-brown hills overgrown with dry and rough weeds* (attributes *dry, green-brown, uneven, scorched, rough* are ironic symbols of the professor's feelings).

Domontovych's discourse revolves around the distinct motive of Kyiv - the center of gravity for thoughts and feelings, the city-mystery, the mythologem. The unexpected, often unfathomable, events and situations, described by the author, could take place only in this ancient city with its churches, monasteries, bizarre buildings, and steep mountains: *У своїх нічних блуканнях вони пройшли повз будинок із химерами Notre-Dame, що звис над проваллям. У фіалкових присмерках на густій синяві неба чорно-сірі гігантські потвори розкинули свої крила. Від збудження, що ще тремтіло в них обох, нічні потвори прокинулися, щоб справити відьомський шабаш* [*In their nocturnal wanderings, they passed Notre-Dame, a house with chimeras, hanging over the abyss. In the violet twilight against the thick blue sky, giant black and gray monsters spread their wings. The excitement still reverberating in both of them made the night monsters wake up to perform their witches' sabbath*] (“Doctor Seraficus”) (the hyperbole *giant black and gray monsters*, metaphors *monsters spread their wings, night monsters wake up*, the mythologem *the witches' sabbath*, all that darkens the subtext of the fragment, mystifies it).

In the mind of the writer figurative representations of Kyiv are deeply connected with the history of the city, mostly with the baroque culture period, they are overflowed with the spirit of Ukrainian antiquity, its former greatness: *Захоплення бароко входило, як обов'язковий складовий елемент, у світогляд Вер та її приятелів. Весняна прогулянка в теплий березневий день оберталась у паломницьку мандрівку до барокових пам'яток Києва XVII- XVIII віків. Блакитне небо, голі дерева, мереживо*

барокових вигинів, білі хмарки й втома від прогулянки пішки з Печерського через Поділ до Кирилівської церкви [The worldview of Ver and her friends incorporated their interests in baroque as a mandatory component. The spring stroll on a warm March day turned into a pilgrimage to the baroque monuments of Kyiv of the XVII-XVIII centuries. Blue skies, bare trees, laces of baroque curves, white clouds and fatigue from walking from Pechersky and to the St. Cyril's Monastery, including Podil] ("Doctor Seraficus"). Fascination by Baroque art is a clear evidence of sophistication the author's spiritual interest; the mentions of the constructivist-style buildings in the text of the novel are accompanied by connotations of alienation and internal rejection, if not condemnation.

The background of the story is gradually expanding; the author describes the cultural situation on the "turn of the epochs"; the romanticized description of Kyiv's streets changes into a journalistic, dry story. Reflections on the events of the 1920s became a fundamental analysis on the part of an attentive observer, a scientist capable of making a conclusion: *Студентська молодь у своєму складі була аморфна, дезорієнтована, малокультурна. Курсистки читали графа Аморі, Вербіцьку й Брешко-Брешковського, у кращому разі — Винниченка, Андреева й Купріна. Інтелектуальний рівень був дуже низький* [In general student youth were amorphous, disoriented, and uncultured. The female students read Count Amori, Verbitska and Breshko-Breshkovsky, at best - Vynnychenko, Andreiev and Kuprin. The intellectual level was very low]; the keywords *intellectual level* become a fundamental principle of authorial axiology.

Besides the novel prose, when we pay attention to the writer's stories and essays, we can single out the establishment of mental activity as the highest human vocation; the antithesis - "intelligence" versus "low culture" - falls into the stylistic reserve of the author as a credo, a testament; e.g. characteristics of the character: *Він філософ, і, як філософ, він намагається усвідомити те буття, що він його веде, знайти для нього раціональне визначення, підпорядковувати його абстрактно загальній формулі* [He is a philosopher, and as a philosopher, he tries to understand the being that he leads, to find a rational definition for him, to subordinate it to an abstract general formula] ("Enamel Bowl").

The stylistic devices in the text of the stories are used to a limited extent, their selection is dosed and weighed, verified by strict authorial preferences, it is determined by a principle "better less but purposeful"; one can witness the desire to minimize the usage of bright paths, elaborate metaphors, colorful comparisons, and, thus, get rid of excessive "beautification", ornamentation, and artificially heated emotions. Let's consider some examples. The story on biblical themes contains a number of actualized epithets in the form of adjectives of the highest degree of comparison: *Ввечері того дня й наступного їх [апостолів] приймали найповажніші люди в місті. Частували найдорожчими винами й годували найвишуканішими стравами. Найгарніші жінки мили їм ноги й мастили дорогими ароматами. З найвіддаленіших кутків країни надходили все нові й нові юрби народу, збудженими чутками про Месію* [In the evening of that day and the next day, the most respected people in the city welcomed them [apostles]. They were treated with the most expensive wines and fed the most exquisite dishes. The most beautiful women washed their feet and treated them to expensive fragrances. From the farthest corners of the country there were coming bigger and bigger crowds of people, excited by rumors of the Messiah] ("Apostles"). The key point of the fragment - the *Messiah* in his theological interpretation defines the elevated tone, epithets *most respectful, most expensive, most exquisite, most distant* add some expressiveness to the text. In this context, there are few means of actualization: *У цьому таки контексті наведено нечисленні засоби актуалізації: Народ заповнив усі майдани, усі ринки в місті, і з вулиць доносилися, як глухе гуркотіння моря, радісні крики. Народ вітав Ісуса, обітованого пророками Месію* (ibid.) [The crowd filled all the squares, all the markets in the city, and from the streets, like the deafening roar of the sea, one could hear joyful cries. The people greeted Jesus, the promised prophet of the Messiah]. Both comparisons like the *deafening roar of the sea* and the bookish *promise* ('promised, cherished') [DUL, 5, 507] support the creation of connotations of highness, solemnity.

The texts metaphorization is what distinguishes Domontovych's system of artistic thinking against the background of imagery traditional for the Ukrainian literature. His use of stylistic devices is original and unique, his symbolism has hidden depth, there are not many epithets, but they are well-calculated and accurate in associative relations. For example, reading audience is familiar with numerous descriptions of the Dnipro (starting from T.Shevchenko's description and up to the



M.Gogol's one), but Domontovych found new linguistic and stylistic colors; therefore, there comes forward an illusory impression that the writer perceives the unique image of the main river of Ukraine in a different way.

Consider: *Дніпро блищить на сонці лускою якоїсь величавої срібної риби. Роздріблюючись на променисті краплі, сонце пливе в тремтінні хвиль. Очі сліпнуть від нестерпного сяйва* [*the Dnieper shines in the sun with the scales of some majestic silver fish. Crushing into radiant drops, the sun floats in the trembling waves. The unbearable radiance blinds the eyes*] ("Girl with a Teddy Bear"). The visual perception of the river's radiance with the help of the image of the sun is refined by an "unexpected" comparison with the scales of silver fish (both *fish* and the *Dnipro* are associatively close images); the impression from sunshine is intensified by means of the metaphor that the *sun floats in the trembling of the waves* (the *trembling of the waves* is an internal metaphor). Thus, a number of logically connected descriptive components (*Dnipro, sun, radiance, fish scales, waves*) create a holistic conceptual and semantic field.

In continuation of the line of figurative perception, there comes another river description in a different prose text: *О третій годині сонце ще являло картину дикої оргії. Річка засліплювала очі в тремтячому миготінні струмків тим, що за швидкість цього вогненного коливання не можна було стежити. Тисячі сонць у скаженому коловороті полум'яніли, крутились, променювали. Палке блищання берегового піску було таке ж нестерпне, як і ця фантасмагорія сонць у хвилях річки. Мозок божеволів, природу трясло в полум'ї гарячки* [*At three in the afternoon the sun was still a picture of a wild orgy. The river blinded the eyes in the trembling flicker of the streams as the speed of this fiery oscillation could not be clearly followed. Thousands of suns in a mad whirlwind were blazing, swirling, radiating. The wild glitter of the shore sand was as unbearable as this phantasmagoria of suns in the waves of the river. The mind went berserk, as the nature shook as if in the flames of fever*] ("Doctor Seraficus"). Notably, the fragment includes associations similar to the ones found in the previous text: the central image - the *sun*, a reference to radiance expressed through the *wild orgy of the sun, blinded eyes*, the flickering waves are shown with the help of *flickering streams, fiery oscillations*. However, these similarities and echoes are not repetitions; they are more of the author's expression of the same linguistic picture, a component of the holistic perception of the image. At the same time, the fragment proves the strengthening of the connotations of expression (the previous fragment deals with the summer day observation, while the latter one tells the story of a meeting at the beach). The hyperbolic images of the second fragment (*wild orgy, blinded eyes, fiery oscillations, unbearable radiance; phantasmagoria of suns*) are only logical; the sun becomes so striking that it is perceived as a thousand suns.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

V.Domontovych's artistic discourse stands out against the background of the culturological search of the 1920s due to the uniqueness of its linguistic and stylistic manifestations based on the principles of intellectualization of the text as well as on its representation in linguistic and aesthetic signs of culture [3, 8-9]. Being the writer of deep philosophical thought, he creates a mono-paradigm of means that reproduce artistic reality as a system of contradictions, antitheses and mythologems. Various phenomena of the rational and irrational, the real and unreal, conditional appear in the author's intentions as a reflection of the ontology of existence and categories of essence. Ironically and mockingly the writer addresses the issues of human spiritual existence, intolerance to selfishness, arrogance, and meanness. The writer's idiosyncrasy reflects his desire not so much to depict events and situations, but to analyze, reflect and evaluate. The originality and specificity of V.Domontovych's intellectual prose found a wide resonance in the texts of modernist writers, in particular in postmodern discourse.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Агеева В. Переднє слово. В. Домонтович. *Дівчина з ведмедиком. Доктор Серафікус*. Комора, Київ, 2019.  
[Aheieva V. Perednie slovo. V. Domontovych. *Divchyna z vedmedykom. Doktor Seraficus*. Komora, Kyiv, 2019. Foreword. *V. Domontovich. Girl with a teddy bear. Dr. Seraficus*]. (in Ukrainian)
- [2] Бацевич Ф. С. Части української мови як дискурсивні слова. ПАІС, Львів, 2014.  
[Batsevych F. S. Chastky ukrainskoi movy yak dyskursyvni slova. Lviv: PAIS, 2014. Parts of the Ukrainian language as discursive words]. (in Ukrainian)
- [3] Єрмоленко С. Я. Мовно-естетичні знаки української культури. Ін-т української мови НАН України, Київ, 2009.  
[Yermolenko S. Ya. Movno-estetychni znaky ukrainskoi kultury. In-t ukrainskoi movy NAN Ukrainy, Kyiv, 2009. Linguistic and aesthetic signs of Ukrainian culture]. (in Ukrainian)
- [4] Кондратенко Н. В. Синтаксис українського модерністського і постмодерністського художнього дискурсу. Вид-ий Дім Д. Бурого, Київ, 2012.  
[Kondratenko N. V. Syntaksys ukrainskoho modernistskoho i postmodernistskoho khudozhnoho dyskursu. Vyd-yi Dim D. Buraho, Kyiv, 2012. Syntax of Ukrainian modernist and postmodernist literary discourse]. (in Ukrainian)
- [5] Кононенко В. І. Лінгвокогнітивна інтерпретація гіперболічних і квазігіперболічних утворень. *Українська мова: Ін-т української мови НАН України*. 2017. №2 (62). С. 14-26.  
[Kononenko V. I. Linhvokohnityvna interpretatsiia hiperbolichnykh i kvazihiperbolichnykh utvoren. Ukrainska mova: In-t ukrainskoi movy NAN Ukrainy. 2017. №2 (62). S. 14-26]. (in Ukrainian)
- [6] Кононенко В. І. Категорія порівняння у лінгвокогнітивному вимірі: постмодерністський художній дискурс. *Українська мова: Ін-т української мови НАН України*. 2019. №3. С. 17-28.  
[Kononenko V. I. Katehoriia porivniannia u linhvokohnityvnomu vymiri: postmodernistskyi khudozhnii dyskurs. Ukrainska mova: In-t ukrainskoi movy NAN Ukrainy. 2019. №3. S. 17-28]. (in Ukrainian)
- [7] Кононенко В. І. Словесна символіка в сучасному українському художньому дискурсі: лінгвокогнітивний вимір. *Лінгвістичні дослідження*. Харків, 2019. Вип. 51. С. 84-95.  
[Kononenko V. I. Slovesna symvolika v suchasnomu ukrainskomu khudozhnomu dyskursi: linhvokohnityvnyi vymir. Linhvistychni doslidzhennia. Kharkiv, 2019. Vyp. 51. S. 84-95]. (in Ukrainian)
- [8] Кононенко В. І. Прагматика асоціативного епітета: сучасний поетичний дискурс. *До глибин сутності мови: зб. наук. праць*. Івано-Франківськ: Вид-во Прикарпатського ун-ту, 2000. С. 171-179.  
[Kononenko V. I. Prahmatyka asotsiatyvnoho epiteta: suchasnyi poetychnyi dyskurs. Do hlybyn sutnosti movy: zb. nauk. prats. Ivano-Frankivsk: Vyd-vo Prykarpatskoho un-tu, 2000. S. 171-179.] (in Ukrainian)
- [9] Шевельов Ю. Віктор Петров, як я його бачив. «Україна». Париж, 1951. С.423-429.  
[Shevelov Yu. Viktor Petrov, yak ya yoho bachyv. «Ukraina». Paryzh, 1951. S.423-429]. (in Ukrainian)
- [10] Шевельов Ю. Шостий у гроні. В. Домонтович. *Без ґрунту: повісті*. Київ: Гелікон, 2000.  
[Shevelov Yu. Shostyi u hroni. V. Domontovych. *Bez hruntu: povisti*. Kyiv: Helikon, 2000]. (in Ukrainian)

## Dictionary

Словник української мови (СУМ); гол. редкол. І. К. Білодід. Т. 1. Київ: Наук. думка, 1970; Т. 4. Київ: Наук. думка, 1974; Т. 6. Київ: Наук. думка, 1975; Т. 7. Київ: Наук. думка, 1976.// *Slovnuk ukrainskoi movy (SUM)*; hol. redkol. I. K. Bilodid. T. 1. Kyiv: Nauk. dumka, 1970; T. 4. Kyiv: Nauk. dumka, 1974; T. 6. Kyiv: Nauk. dumka, 1975; T. 7. Kyiv: Nauk. dumka, 1976.// *Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language (DUL)* [in Ukrainian]

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

**E-mail:** vitalii.kononenko@pnu.edu.ua

**Received:** April 01, 2021; **revised:** April 05, 2021.

---

Кононенко Віталій. «Автор і стиль: інтелектуалізація художнього дискурсу Віктора Домонтовича. Журнал Прикарпатського університету імені Василя Стефаника, 8 (2) (2021), 45–55.

У статті висвітлено особливості ідіостилю письменника 20-х років ХХ ст. Віктора Домонтовича як представника модерністського художнього дискурсу. Стильова манера письма автора відтворює його інтелектуалізм, засади його неординарного науково орієнтованого мовомислення. Домонтович зображує художню дійсність через призму онтологічного зіткнення категорій раціонального й ірраціонального, реального й нереального, інтелектуального й примітивно-міщанського, сексуального й асексуального. Через тлумачення понять правдоподібного й неправдоподібного, дійсного й умовного автор характеризує психоповедінкові стереотипи персонажів із метою прокоментувати, оцінити їх дії та вчинки, нерідко в описово-розсудливій формі, шляхом умовисновків; утворено симбіоз науково-белетристичного викладу.

Домонтовичеві тексти пройнято іронічно-глузливим інтонуванням задля викриття бездуховності, малокультурності, ницості; автор гостро засуджує егоїзм, черствість, непорядність у поведінці героїв; гострота його критичного бачення спрямована проти зарозумілості інтелігенції, невинного раціоналізму, наукоподібного мислення, міщанства. Інтелектуальні романи письменника можуть розглядатися як розширені метафоричні побудови, цілісні образно-символічні структури, носії глибинного художнього світорозуміння, системи міфологізації смислу. Мовностилістичні засоби, до яких вдається автор, обмежені у використанні, незвичні за асоціативно-образним спрямуванням, розраховані на когнітивно осмислене сприймання. Експресія текстів досягається за рахунок імпліцитного закодованого слововжитку, з урахуванням можливого домислення з боку читача, на засадах розв'язання концептної взаємодії в системі Автор-Текст-Читач.

**Ключові слова:** ідіостиль, мовомислення, інтелектуалізація, ірраціоналізм, текст, художній дискурс, мовностилістичний засіб.