MODERN GAME WITH THE NORM: LANGUAGE SPACE OF UKRAINIAN POETRY OF THE END OF THE 20TH AND THE BEGINNING OF THE 21ST CENTURY

Iuliia MAKARETS

National Pedagogical Dragomanov University, Ukraine
E-mail: makarets_iuliia@ukr.net

ABSTRACT: The article tries to analyze the linguistic space of the Ukrainian poetry of the end of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st century. Its purpose is to trace tendencies in the language behavior of the Ukrainian poets of the period, especially in the treatment of the language norm. The new cultural situation caused mixing in texts of linguistic features of different social groups. Poetry, which used to be the sphere of refined language, now is filled with abnormal and deviant units.

Kitsch, chaos, and destruction, which guided the poets of this period, are manifested in the destruction of the norms of literary language. Language deviation is the organic part of the poetic space of the period, one of the means of realizing its multilevel nature. On the one hand, it serves to homogenize, reconcile, and address the mass reader in their language, while on the other hand it is an instrument of irony and additional expression for the intellectual reader. The combination of high and mass cultures leads to the penetration of vernacular, *surzhyk*, obscene, and slang vocabulary in poetry, to the deconstruction of basic linguistic units.

The research proves: the destruction of the generally accepted literary standard, the diffusion of language codes, the collage of stylistically heterogeneous language signs, the deconstruction of words have become part of the language game, an an organic component of the poets' language behaviour, in which deviation becomes the new norm.

KEYWORDS: language norm, postmodernism, deconstruction, poetry, Ukrainian poetry of the late 20th and early 21st century, Ukrainian language, kitsch in language.

Introduction

The spiritual and cultural reorientation of the Ukrainian society in the last decades of the 20th century, which took place against the background of "perestroika" and the achieving of independence of Ukraine, determined the transformation of the formal and semantic characteristics of Ukrainian poetry. The revolt against the Soviet system and ideology, which turned man into the cog of the totalitarian state machine, resulted in the denial of common values and rules, the desire to assert the still discredited ideals of individuality, dissimilarity, and satisfaction. The ideological bias, pathetic seriousness and stamp of authoritarian literature were contrasted with outrage, the variegation of kitsch, and the poetics of "euphoria". Some writers of the time ironized the emptiness of the socialist-realist method, which sought to turn poetry into a mouthpiece for the masses and to invent the mongrel of "totalitarian poetry" written in the regime's language ("novomova"), the vocabulary of which, scribbled and devoid of any figurative meanings, "did not expand, but curtailed the scope of thought"[1] (Гундорова, 2008, p. 217). They also opposed themselves to high culture, which still was a refuge of the intellectual elite and imposed on the artist the duty of serving to the national culture. However, the new writer sought freedom and almost for the first time in the history of Ukrainian literature tried to throw off extra-aesthetic duties (Палий, 2010). The socialist-realist, traditionalist worldview underwent a large-scale metamorphosis, which changed the situation in Ukrainian literature and determined the new language behaviour of a large group of its subjects. The eclecticism of the egalitarian and the elitist eventually led to the creation of a unique language code. The purpose of the article is to analyze some tendencies in the language behaviour of the Ukrainian poets of the late 20th – early 21st century, especially in the treatment of the language norm, formed as a result of the desacralization of the language code, which became one of the essential features of the linguistic dimension of poetic discourse. To avoid random selection, the research material is collected from anthologies of Ukrainian poetry: *Anthology of Ukrainian Poetry of the 20th Century: From Tychyna to Zhadan* (compiled by Ivan Malkovych, who noted during the presentation that in the selection of modern Ukrainian poetry for the volume he worked closely with the Ukrainian poets in order to include some of their most representative works) and editions of the *Ukrainian Poetic Anthology* series. The material of the study includes the poetic texts of authors whose work coincided with the period from the beginning of the "perestroika" (the late 1980s and early 1990s) up to this day, namely: Yurii Andrukhovych, Yur Izdryk,

---

[1] Here and further in the text quotes have been translated in English by the author of the article.

Viktor Neborak, Serhii Zhadan, Ivan Malkovych, Yurko Pozaiak, Oleksandr Irvanets, and Kost Moskalets,[2] etc. The performed linguistic analysis of poetic texts is based on the linguistic-stylistic elaboration of language units of different levels to identify their motivation and aesthetic observation of fragments of poetic texts that violate the established ideas about the word or language norm. Since the authors' speech behaviour cannot be considered outside the socio-cultural background, the elements of discourse analysis are also used, which allows us to better understand the causes of the changes in the perception of language norms.

Theory, **results, and discussion**

It is difficult to define unambiguously the situation in the Ukrainian literature of the last decades of the 20th ant the first decades of the 21st century, correlating it with a certain literary direction. Most domestic literary critics claim that with the "perestroika" in Ukrainian literature postmodernism begins (Kharchuk, Hundorova, Zabuzhko) and associate it with the names of Yurii Andrukhovych, Yur Izdryk, Oles Ulianenko, Stepan Protsiuk, Oksana Zabuzhko, etc. However, this statement remains debatable not only regarding writers but also the "fullness" of the Ukrainian version of postmodernism and even its existence in Ukrainian literature in general. Oksana Pakhlovska calls Ukrainian postmodernism a cult of epigonism (Пахльовська, 2001) and Mykola Ozhevan – a primitive manipulation of culture and a threat to cultures for the national self (Ожеван, 2010). Yurii Andrukhovych believes that postmodernism as such has not existed in Ukrainian literature, but the fashion for it encourages the reference to all modern processes in Ukrainian art (in the 1990s and 2010s) as postmodernism (Андрухович, 2003). Vadym Miroshnychenko's position is also categorical: "What is considered to be Ukrainian literary postmodernism by default is rather its phantasm, we do not have a corpus of relevant texts, but there has formed a discourse about what they are. The illusion has been constructed..." (Мірошніченко, 2016). He affirms: "Not postmodernism, but the belief in its presence and the spread of this belief, the messianic mission of distributors, and the corresponding function of literature, which in no way relates to the phenomenon itself" (Мірошніченко, 2016). Like Andrukhovych, he considers postmodernism a brand the writers identify themselves with in order to be "fashionable". Instead, he argues that "the literature of the 1990s and 2010s is more meaningful than non-normative writing, or what Susan Sontag called the camp" (Мірошніченко, 2016). Despite the uncertainty of the literary model, there are undeniable radical changes in the language behaviour of writers, including poets. "Inadequacy of the still existing language [language of totalitarianism] for the expression of individual meanings and feelings" (Гундорова, 2005, p. 72) gave birth to language games as a power to clear language to its "pre-Adamic state": "It does not matter if it happened as a result of ideological treatment in the crucible of totalitarian statehood, or under the pressure of another, in its own way, no less powerful dictatorship – global advertising and TV lobotomy caused by soap operas, but the words of our language are no longer innocent and harmless, and we will not succeed in distinguishing lies from the truth 'by eye'" (Забужко, 2006, p. 46). So, the poets grabbed the "life jackets" of deconstruction, subjecting it to universal norms of culture (Забужко, 2006, p. 45), which eventually led to the desacralization of language as a cultural and spiritual phenomenon. Violations of language norms and language deviations took a prominent place among poetic language games. In the language space of poems, the basic tenets of linguistics are brought into question, the very nature of the word as a significant and formally integral linguistic sign: the splitting of its sound shell became a new norm, semantics depreciated, the verbal play gained importance and became a goal and means of meaning-making at the same time.

---

[2] It should be clarified that the dimensions of the language game defined in the article are not typical of all poets of this period, because, for example, artists whose formation had taken place in previous periods and who had a different worldview continue to work in the traditional manner. Thus, the language of the 1960s generation remains refined, it is not characterized by kitsch or the desire to shock. We also do not claim that all the following features of language behavior are inherent in the works of each poet, whose works are analyzed, equally. Individual style is based on choice, so poets choose the means that help them to reveal their own artistic intention, so in the poetic work of individual authors only a few of these features may appear. It is also not necessary to look for these language phenomena in each poem of the mentioned poets, because we are talking about tendencies in language behavior, and not about rules. The article tends to be generalizing in nature. A detailed consideration of each isolated phenomenon in the poetic work of each individual poet requires a separate investigation.

The new language reality of the Ukrainian literature of the last decades of the 20th and first decade of the 21st century, naturally attracted the attention of researchers (according to Fokkema (1986), Hutcheon (1988), and Graham, Doherty and Malek (1992) similar transformations are noted in the language behaviour of postmodernists in foreign literature)[3], but it was mentioned mostly in literary studies on postmodernism. Tamara Hundorova, in context of "captive kitsch" and "total banter" in the modern Ukrainian cultural space, speaks of "cultural and linguistic insanity brought to the grotesque", in which postmodern parody sometimes shows itself (Гундорова, 2008, p. 13). Oksana Zabuzhko, writing about the spiritual crisis of today ("the great fall of world literature of the 20th century" (Забужко, 2006, p. 55)) and the post-tragic nature of post-colonial culture, mentions some attempts to return to words, transformed by totalitarianism into one-dimensional stamps, their semantic and aesthetic ability. More attention is paid to the language aesthetics of the Ukrainian literature of the analyzed period by Olena Malenko, who interprets it as one of the stages of poetic language creativity in the Ukrainian literary process, focusing on the desacralization of language and verbalization in modern poetry of the spiritual crisis of humanity (Маленко, 2010, pp. 388 – 458). The language in the perception of Ukrainian poets, who are called "postmodernists", as well as those who began their work in a 'postmodern state' but do not fit into the model of postmodernism, is one of the tools of the psyche formation, an instrument of power. They seek freedom, especially from language oppression and the current language standard. The very concept of a universal norm in modern society is in a state of crisis: the affirmation of the value of plurality has made the norm weak, and monitoring its implementation is increasingly difficult (Лиотар, 1998). In literature, the weakening of norms and rules is manifested particularly significantly. Poetry is a voiced emotion. So, it is most likely to reflect changes in the values of society at the level of motives and forms. Freedom of self-expression, which was replaced by totalitarian restrictions, meant liberation from the dictatorship of language norms. We read in the works of Serhii Zhadan:

…надто сильна залежність від словників,
від лексем і усіх цих дифтонгів
("Словники на службі церкви", Антологія, 2018, p. 1863).

Поезія – це Ісус,
якого розпинають на хресті орфографії
("Люби, люби своє ремесло", Жадан, 2017, p. 28).

There is a reproach for excessive standardization and assertion of the right to verbal expression and variability. However, it does not mean denying the norm. The modern Ukrainian poet has an excellent command of the literary language, but refuses to be a model, relieves himself of the obligation to serve the Ukrainian people by cultivating the language, as was the case in the Ukrainian literature of previous epochs. Freedom, a life without ornaments, with the naturalistic language code in which it exists, are landmarks of Ukrainian post-totalitarian poetry. The poet seeks to stop looking back not only at ideological censorship but also at dictionaries and stereotypes about the permissible and the inadmissible. Finally: "…The brutal openness of 'Ham's nudity' shocks the reader with its verbal textual representation, in which the phenomena of a very real, moreover, recognizable life are adequate, unveiled nominated… Neglect of traditions, rules of language etiquette, destruction of the hierarchy of any values is a phenomenon fully justified and motivated by postmodern consciousness…" (Маленко 2010, p. 429).

1. *Surzhyk* and colloquialisms

Since the times of the "perestroika", the Ukrainian poet has not so much defended certain ideals as sought compromise, ways of unification, including mass and elite literature. And "kitsch is perceived as an opportunity for non-confrontational erasure of national and cultural differences, and then it performs the functions of social and cultural therapy, facilitating the entry of strangers into another environment, adapting otherness and translating it in a form that is generally understandable and

---

[3]In the study of the language of postmodernism and postmodernism in language in western European studios, the work "On Grammar" by Jacques Derrida played an important role, and it rethought the very nature and role of language: it is no longer an objective data, its ability to provide a universal understanding of the world is called into question because words can have an infinite number of meanings and interpretations (Деррида, 2000).

acceptable to all" (Гундорова, 2008, p. 251). Obscene vocabulary in a poetic text becomes one of the means of averaging tastes, values, and, above all, cultures. As a means of homogenizing the language space, *surzhyk* also penetrates poetry. This language hybrid, which emerged as a mixture of Ukrainian and Russian linguistic codes (*surzhyk*), found its way into the literary text in previous periods (since Ivan Kotliarevskyi) as a means of characterization, the contrasting of the educated with the uneducated, and the patriotic with the marginal. However, hitherto *surzhyk* speech by default meant a negative assessment of the speaker because Ukrainian writers took on the role of planners of the Ukrainian language. During the "perestroika" and in the post-totalitarian period, the situation changed. The poets did not consider themselves obliged to adhere to the "correct" style and write in refined language, did not recognize the voluntarily assumed responsibility to carry the national idea strictly under the banner of the literary word. The post-totalitarian consciousness of the Ukrainian poets is determined by something else: introspection, mystical truths, the cultural suggestion of myths, and the liberation from outdated taboos. They do not cease to be a patriot, on the contrary, they are deeply aware of being Ukrainians, but for them the right to speak as they feel it right is more important than the national issue. They realize that *surzhyk* is not only means of irony, but also the sublanguage of the readership, the language game, and also the linguistic reality of today. This language hybrid is becoming one of the signs of non-conflict, a means of erasing the division into Ukrainian-speaking and Russian-speaking, those who speak using *surzhyk* and those who speak a literary language. Together with *surzhyk*, dialecticisms, colloquialisms, and parasitic words also poured into the poetic lines – all the elements of everyday communication that were still "not worthy" of either a dictionary or even of poetry:

горобці несуть ахінею
із усіх своїх голосів
ну там *промені і струмочки*
ну там дамочки цок-цок-цок
ну дощі та інші примочки…
(Taras Fediuk, "ось весна. що робити з нею?..", Антологія, 2018, p. 1312).

розмови наші фіг перекажеш
а танці наші просто порнушні
на що не глянеш – усе як казус
кому не скажеш – усі сміються
ну бо кохання таке комічне
як клоунада як цирк на дроті
хоч шал любові – сюжет одвічний
де рулять *світом потреби плоті*
потреби плоті – сум'яття духу
гормони грають – притомність гасне
і з адекватністю зовсім глухо
(Yur Izdryk, "Jarsagumba", Іздрик, 2018, p. 130).

2. Slang and jargon

Slang and jargon are elements of the poetic language code because the new worldview lifted the ban on topics that were previously considered obscene. It is not just about youth or subcultural sociolects. This is often a mixture of declassed and anti-social elements, the prevalence of which in language practice today is a legacy of the first decades after the "perestroika", when banditry became an everyday reality, and racketeering and criminals became the "heroes of modern times":

Хто буде супроводжувати його
в темних печерах чистилища?
Тьолки, *– говорять усі, –* тьолки,
йому потрібні будуть тьолки…
(Serhii Zhadan, "Лукойл", Жадан, 2017, p. 142).

Він був листоношею в Амстердамі,
слухав аббу, сидів на трамі,
дивився порно у вихідні.
Друзі його, пияки-радикали,

говорили: 'Ми все провтикали,
ми, можна сказати, по вуха в лайні.
В країні стагнація і мудацтво,
лібералізм і продажне ліваутво…'
(Serhii Zhadan, "*Він був листоношею в Амстердамі*", Жадан, 2017, p. 96).

In the musical projects of Serhii Zhadan (who is the frontman and songwriter of *The Zhadan and Dogs* and *The Mannerheim Line* alternative rock music bands), the gangster motif occupies a prominent place, which determines the linguistic features of his lyrics.

3. Borrowed words

Contemporary Ukrainian poetic discourse is pluralistic and fragmentary. National cultural universals have given way to a multicultural mosaic, which at the linguistic level is manifested in the active introduction of precedent signals of other cultures and the use of not only internationalism and exoticism but also barbarism:

*як же волику-*сан *подібна земля до пляцка*
О скільки сенсей-*круторогий на пляцку тім плутанини*
По сей бік курили *рили по той бік* аляска *ляска*
А поруч із хвиль і піни здіймаються хвиліпіни
Я марю тут за сахаліном *(хоч нащо він взагалі нам)*
Та змащую вазеліном тобі чиряка за коліном
Тутейші аборигенші так дивно зовуться – "ґейші"
(Oleksandr Irvanets, "Чумак Хокайдо", Антологія, 2018, p. 1573).

The use of foreign language vocabulary is inherent in modernism, but now its meaning is different. With the spread of the ideas of cosmopolitanism, the dominance of foreign language vocabulary is mostly associated with the ideology of world citizenship. However, this approach is simplified. For the poet, the alienation of the language code is part of the linguistic game, a manifestation of the chaos and particularism inherent in the era, and not a systematic implementation of ideological guidelines. The poets introduced *surzhyk* (Ukrainian-Russian linguistic hybrid, a legacy of the colonial past) into the poetic text. But they also create new mixed language (Ukrainian and English, German, French, etc.):

Миднайт. *Лиш байдужий* мун
Замок, Ай, *самотні кроки.*
Лунко б'є холодні клоки
Старовинний пендулум.
Сто століть і сірий стоун...
Хто там?! Незнайомий ґест*?!*
Ноубоді... *Тисне* чест,
Колд *віків проходить в* боун…
(Yurko Pozaiak, "Англійська балада", Антологія, 2018, p. 1428).

The differences in the alphabets are often levelled and the words are assimilated graphically, resembling *surzhyk*. Often there is a switching of not only language but also of graphic codes, which increases the fragmentation of the text:

…от розтане світ мов обман
от усе розлетиться вщент
"Run, – скажу тоді, – Forrest! Run!"
"Rennt, – скажу тоді, – Lola, rennt!"
(Yur Izdryk, "Трансгресія", Іздрик, 2018, p. 42).

я не вірю поетам сенсеям філософам
польовим командирам
розкрученим брендам
в рецептурі у них – кокаїн і кокоси
в космогонії – карма фен-шуй і big bang
(Yur Izdryk, "Credo", Іздрик, 2018, p. 169).

A lot of poems by Yur Izdryk, written in Ukrainian, have English names: "Wait-wait-wait", "Zoom", "Be like bee", "Dog styleworld music", "Manual", "Simple pleasure", "All in all", "Bitter-sweet", "Seasong", "Adult youth", "Winnershow about 'no'", "Sleep time", "Amnesty", "Last trip", "Windmind", "Change", "Steelstyle", "Doyouremember", etc.

4. Tautology

Tautology becomes an integral feature of ironic language behaviour. We are talking about the repetition of the root in monosyllabic words, and about similar phonetic fragments:

одверто
отвір
отвори
проникливо
проникну
никну
ну

(Nazar Honchar, "Загравка", Антологія, 2018, p. 1726).

The nature of repetition is twofold: it can be thought of both as a stylistic figure and as a manifestation of the insufficient language culture. The peculiarity of tautology in the language of the poets of the studied period is that it becomes an imitation of stylistic incompetence, a parody of the tautology of Soviet ideological propaganda, which exploited mottos like "Peace to the World" ("Миру – мир"):

з любов'ю і напівлюбов'ю *але більше з* нелюбов'ю
вся з молока ледацтва і образ
вся суть метелик бабка й оска
суть бджілка

(Volodymyr Tsybulko, "Чорна корова", Антологія, 2018, p. 1732).

Ліжко моє –
моя поетична майстерня
Ліжко моє –
мій найщиріший друг
Ліжко чиєсь –
do you sleep English?
Ліжко чиєсь –
schlafen Sie Deutsch?
Ліжко моє –
ліжко моє українське
Ліжко моє –
то мій вселюдський борг

(Nazar Honchar, "Ода до ліжка або Колискова для себе", Антологія, 2018, p. 1718).

5. Obscene vocabulary

Literary critics sometimes call Ukrainian literature of the second half of the 1980s and the early 21st century *"paraliterature"* (Наєнко, 2011, p. 92) and its language code – paralanguage. The poets of this period moved from a totalitarian radical ideology to an ideology of compromise and mixing. It is also applied to language. It, first of all, attracts attention with its outrageous dominance of abusive, obscene, "pornographic" (Наєнко, 2011, p. 96) vocabulary, which has always remained outside the Ukrainian fiction and, what is more, it was inconceivable for poetic discourse. For example, Yurko Pozaiak, the beginning of whose work dates back to the mid 1980s, often resorted to it:

Під грушею цією
Мене робив мій батько
Тепер тут песик сцить

("Хоку", Антологія, 2018, p. 1438).

Я був в Ленінграді,
Я пив там вино –
Вино в Ленінграді

Це справжнє гівно*!*
("Я був в Ленінграді", Антологія, 2018, p. 1443).

According to Olena Malenko, the introduction to the poetic text of such language material is conditioned by "the desire to get out of the aestheticized linguistic and artistic experience with its guidelines for the 'beautiful' word, the attempt to look at language as at a flexible philological material, and is not a manifestation of other value dominants in the linguistic and communicative sphere" (Маленко, 2010, p. 428). The researcher believes that this is a desire to portray the brutal reality with its inherent brutal language code. Despite the insistent statements of linguists about the uncharacteristic Ukrainian language of obscene vocabulary, which is called "mat" (created based on grassroot names of genitals and physiological processes; the word "mat" itself is often considered indecent), in Ukrainian poetry, it becomes an element even of meditative and romantic love texts. This detailing is due to communicative realities: the poetic text has an emotional basis, and the reality of daily communication of marginalized groups has become typical verbalization of emotion through profane language, it is unaesthetic and obscene, and therefore in research the fact of communicative behaviour is often omitted. But the post-totalitarian poets, who seek freedom and honesty in the motives and means of creativity, do not reject such vocabulary, for them it is an organic component of reality, which entered poetry with previously unacceptable motifs: banditry, drug addiction, alcoholism, prostitution, etc. (we see this in works by Pozaiak, Zhadan, Izdryk, Irvanets, etc.). And even if obscene language shocks the conservative bearer of old values and ideas, it only makes it more attractive to the writer. Showing real life in real language, poets practice different ways of introducing obscene language into the text. For some, its direct use is not a problem:

...всім доводилось чути тверде биття сердець,
коли вони стоять біля домовини
і витирають скупі сльози й соплі об своє
дольче й габана,
і хуячать геннесі
з одноразового
посуду
(Serhii Zhadan, "Лукойл", Жадан, 2017, p. 142).

Others resort to phonetic and lexical euphemisms:

Письменник Торвік – то такий чоловік –
Не втоне нігде в наш нахімовський вік.
Бо вірує твердо у зірку свою.
Чорнобиль, „Челенджер" йому – по бую
Під вечір виходить на вулицю він. Дівчата ридають йому навздогін.
Дівчата ридають: „Торвік! Боракне-е!
Невже він з нас жодної... не... боракне?!"
(Oleksandr Irvanets, "Пісенька для друга", Антологія, 2018, p. 1576).

Or, as if embarrassed, they stop in time, leaving the reader to choose the appropriate token, but bringing it situationally and rhythmically to play a familiar verbal script from everyday communication, such as Ihor Rymaruk, for whom, albeit implicit, but still, an appeal to obscene language, is generally atypical (but the very fact of such a fixation in the work of the poet, who embodied the professionalism and erudition of the "eighties" (Малкович, 2016, p. 1946) indicates a shift in the boundaries of what is permissible in verbal behaviour):

Тож погамуй свій древній переляк,
Радій світанкам і годуй собак,
І Пані Смерть у себе не закохуй –
Бо дивиться на тебе з висоти
Крізь лінзи хмар (о Господи, прости)
Старенький Бог, якому все це по...
(Ihor Rymaruk, "Пейзаж", Антологія, 2018, p. 1471).

6. Word transformations

Linguistic anormative in the poetry of the mid 1980s and the first decades of the 21st century is an organic artistic element, and one of its sources is a play on words. This is not a traditional pun, although puns fit organically into the modern linguistic worldview. The point is in the deconstruction of the word as a formal-semantic unit, generated by the desire to find out how independent the language relating to mental content embedded in it is. "Deconstruction is associated with attention to structures and at the same time with the procedure of stratification, disassembly, decomposition of linguistic, logocentric, phonocentric structures. It is not so much about destruction but about reconstruction to understand how certain integrity was constructed" (Маньковская, 2010, p. 614). Its linguistic aspect is the disclosure of the source of meaning in the game of language form (Алексеева, 2002, p. 292). The word as the basic semantic unit of language is at the center of the structural experiment. Its universality, certainly recognized by logocentric linguistic theories, is questioned because it is a unit-sign that refers to another sign. Linguistic deconstruction involves parsing the word in search of the first principle. We are not talking about finding a generative base, but about mechanical splitting into smaller sound complexes, about formal reduction to the point beyond which the trace of the original meaning can still be seen:

> *Ляля-Бо*
> *хоче повну свобо*
> *і летіти за об*
> *рій зірок безтурбо*
> *тно-на-дно*
> *доно уно і вино*
> *бо душа в Лялі-Бо –*
> *українська*

(Viktor Neborak, "Пісенька про Лялю-Бо", Антологія, 2018, p. 1592).

Post-totalitarian poets do not exist in a clearly defined semantic space. Therefore, by dividing the word, they create new meaning and rhythm, sometimes likening the text to the babbling of an infant or imitating compound reading, breaking graphically the integrity of the word:

> *Приходьте до мене завтра!*
> *Я розкажу вам правду!*
> *Приходьте до мене автра!*
> *Я розкажу вам равду!*
> *Пи одьте о мее авра!*
> *Я оза жу ам аву!*
> *Пи о те о мее ава!*
> *Я оа жу а ау!*
> *И о е о ее аа!*
> *Я оа у а ау*!

(Yurko Pozaiak, "Приходьте до мене завтра!", Антологія, 2018, p. 1426).

> *...ти йдеш одна між*
> *лілій*
> *сорочки носиш білі*
> *малюєш очі* де
> ревам
> *ти королева* де
> білів
> *коли заходиш у храми*
> *за ними валяться брами*
> *вони шкребуть* пазу рами
> *дебіли на* ве сіллі...
> *спадає в* ду ші *морок*
> *густе вино* га ряче
> *а* короле ва *плаче*

над рилом по ро сячим…⁴

(Viktor Neborak, "Вона", Антологія, 2018, p. 1594).

The impenetrability and integrity of the word are questioned (a striking example is Nazar Honchar's collection "PROmeneVIST" (it is a transliteration; in Ukrainian it can be read as "променевість" ['radiation'] and as "вість про мене" ['news about me']), the multilevel nature of its name is based on the game with the formal integrity of the word: it is both a message to the reader from the author and the radiance of his poetry. The ability to read and understand a text depends on whether the reader can add the deleted or omitted items. Ultimately, linguistic deconstruction leads to word distortion to the point of losing recognizability and coherence, which, however, is only an artistic technique, not the goal. One of the first theorists of deconstruction Jacques Derrida noted that this concept should not be reduced only to negative, destructive forms, "her letter is not just effective, it creates new rules and conventions for the sake of future achievements, not content with theoretical confidence in simple opposition a result – a statement. The course of deconstruction leads to the assertion of a future event, the birth of an invention. To do this, it is necessary to destroy the traditional status of the invention, conceptual and institutional structures. This is the way to reinvent the future only" (Деррида, 2000, p. 250). For philosophers of deconstruction, writing is the first language, for Ukrainian post-totalitarian poets, graphics is another dimension of the generation of meaning. The content reality of the text is also created at the level of writing, which encourages some authors to discard many of its traditional rules, for example, to abandon punctuation or a number of spelling norms, especially the use of a capital letter (which is the most common manifestation of playing with the language norm). Consistent rejection of many punctuation and spelling rules is found in the texts of Yurii Andrukhovych, Yur Izdryk, Oleksandr Irvanets, Viktor Neborak, Kost Moskalets, Ihor Malenkyi, Ivan Malkovych, Natalka Bilotserkivets, Taras Fediuk, Ivan Nehriuk, Vasyl Starun, etc. The dash is often the only punctuation mark recognized by the poets when they want the reader to make a longer pause:

холодний падолист вологі пасма диму
сурма над водами проклятими і міст
далеко в небі сяє аметист
розкішного утраченого риму
далеко рідний край стрункі його собори
і сніг далеко – чистий золотий
і триєдине втілення мети
і вічні голоси дітей знадвору

(Kost Moskalets, "холодний падолист вологі пасма диму", Антологія, 2018, p. 1673).

Sometimes not only the rules of punctuation are reconsidered, but also their purpose, as a result of which they transform from a means of graphic marking of rhythmic articulation of speech flow into an equivalent letter element of the graphic system, which can be placed not only between words but also enter into them, arbitrarily, breaking them:

Ой розкажи-но, Яри,и, и, но
(це ніби сповідь моя)
– ча-чá –
яка полюбе дівчи, и, и, на
такого кретина, як я?
яка полюбе Іва, а, а, на? –
на тім'ї – душе, е, вна
ра-а-а-на;
в руці – маю ружу,
язик – за оружжа,
а в серці / якась
коляда

---

⁴ The deconstruction of the word gives rise to new readings. For example: 'де рева' translated as 'where roar' (lit. ukr. *де* – eng. *where*, ukr. *рева* – eng. *roar*), but written together 'дерева' corresponds to eng. 'tree'. The same with 'де білів' translated as 'where white', but written together 'дебілів' translates as 'morons'.

(Ivan Malkovych, "Пританцьовування на одній нозі", Антологія, 2018, p. 1627).

Conclusions

In the last decades of the 20th and the first decades of the 21st century, poetry ceases to be an intellectual category constructed by erudite people, which requires a refined language: it becomes eclectic and intensively absorbs what previously was considered incongruous with it and perceived as the opposite to poetic. The language dimension of poetry is organized following the worldview guidelines of its authors. Kitsch, chaos, and destruction, which guided the poets of this period, are manifested in the destruction of the norms of literary language. Language deviation is an organic part of the poetic space of the period and one of the means of realizing its multilevel nature. On the one hand, it serves to homogenize, reconcile, and address the mass reader in their language, while on the other hand it is an instrument of irony and additional expression for the intellectual reader. The symbol of the new cultural situation is the combination of high and mass cultures, their averaging, which directly caused manifestation in the text of the features of the language of different social groups. Poetry, which used to be the sphere of refined language, is filled with vernacular, *surzhyk*, and obscene and slang vocabulary. The destruction of the generally accepted literary standard, the diffusion of language codes, the collage of stylistically heterogeneous language signs, the deconstruction of words have become part of the language game, an organic component of the poets' language behavior, in which deviation becomes the new norm.

REFERENCES

Алексеева, Е., Тузова, Т. (2002) Деконструкция. // *История философии. Энциклопедия.* Минск: Интерпрессервис; Книжный дом, с. 292 – 293. (*Alekseeva, E., Tuzova, T.* Dekonstruktsiya. // *Istoriya filosofii. Entsiklopediya.* Minsk: Interpresservis; Knizhnyi dom, s. 292 – 293.)

Андрухович, Ю. (2003) Час і місце, або Моя остання територія. // *Дезорієнтація на місцевості.* <http://www.ukrcenter.com/library/read.asp?id=684&read=true> (28.03.2021). (*Andrukhovych, Yu.* Chas i mistse, abo Moia ostannia terytoriia. // Dezoriientatsiia na mistsevosti. <http://www.ukrcenter.com/library/read.asp?id=684&read=true> (09.11.2021))

Антологія (2018) Антологія української поезії XX ст.: від Тичини до Жадана. Київ: А-ба-ба-га-ла-ма-га, 2014 с. (Antolohiia ukrainskoi poezii XX st.: vid Tychyny do Zhadana. K.: A-ba-ba-ha-la-ma-ha, 2014 s.)

Гундорова, Т. (2005) Післячорнобильська бібліотека: Український літературний постмодерн. Київ: Критика, 344 с. (*Hundorova, T.* Pisliachornobylska biblioteka: Ukrainskyi literaturnyi postmodern. Kyiv: Krytyka, 344 s.)

Гундорова, Т. (2008) Кітч і література. Травестії. Київ: Факт, 284 с. (*Hundorova, T.* Kitch i literatura. Travestii. Kyiv: Fact, 284 s.)

Деррида, Ж. (2000) О грамматологии. <http://opentextnn.ru/old/man/index.html@id=3849> (09.11.2021). (*Derrida, Zh.* O grammatologii. <http://opentextnn.ru/old/man/index.html@id=3849> (09.11.2021))

Жадан, С. (2014) Динамо Харків. Вибрані вірші. Київ: А-ба-ба-га-ла-ма-га, 240 с. (*Zhadan, S.* Dynamo Kharkiv. Vybrani virshi. Kyiv.: A-ba-ba-ha-la-ma-ha, 240 s.)

Забужко, О. (2009) Хроніки від Фортінбраса. Київ: Факт, 344 с. (*Zabuzhko, O.* Khroniky vid Fortinbrasa. Kyiv: Fakt, 344 s.)

Іздрик, Ю. (2018) Ліниві і ніжні. Вибрані вірші. Київ: А-ба-ба-га-ла-ма-га, 352 с. (*Izdryk, Yu.* Linyvi i nizhni. Vybrani virshi. Kyiv: A-ba-ba-ha-la-ma-ha, 352 s.)

Лиотар, Ж.-Ф. (1998) Состояние постмодерна. Санкт-Петербург: Алетея, 159 с. (*Liotar, Zh.-F.* Sostoyanie postmoderna. Sankt-Peterburh: Aleteyya, 159 s.)

Маленко, О. (2010) Лінгво-естетична інтерпретація буття в українській поетичній мовотворчості (від фольклору до постмодерну). Харків: Харківське історико-філологічне товариство, 488 с. (*Malenko, O.* Linhvo-estetychna interpretatsiia buttia v ukrainskii poetychnii movotvorchosti (vid folkloru do postmodernu). Kharkiv: Kharkivske istoryko-filolohichne tovarystvo, 488 s.)

Маньковская, Н. (2010) Деконструкция. // *Новая философская энциклопедия,* т. 1. Москва: Мысль, с. 614 – 615. (*Mankovskaya, N.* Dekonstruktsiya. // *Novaya filosofskaya Entsiklopediya*, vol. 1. Moskow: Mysl, s. 614 – 615.)

Мірошниченко, В. (2016)	Капітан Очевидність, або Про український постмодернізм. // ЛітАкцент. <http://litakcent.com/2016/06/08/kapitan-ochevydnist-abo-pro-ukrajinskyj-literaturnyj-postmodernizm/> (09.11.2021) (*Miroshnychenko, V.* Kapitan Ochevydnist, abo Pro ukrainskyi postmodernizm. // *LitAktsent* <http://litakcent.com/2016/06/08/kapitan-ochevydnist-abo-pro-ukrajinskyj-literaturnyj-postmodernizm/> (09.11.2021))
Наєнко, М. (2011)	Про помежів'я літератури й паралітератури. // *Слово і Час,* № 5, с. 92 – 101. (*Naienko, M.* Pro pomezhivia literatury y paraliteratury. // *Slovo i Chas*, № 5, s. 92 – 101.)
Ожеван, М. (2000)	Українська національна ідея та культурополітика наздоганяючої модернізації. // *Стратегічна панорама*, № 1, с. 162 – 182. (*Ozhevan, M.* Ukrainska natsionalna ideia ta kulturopolityka nazdohaniaiuchoi modernizatsii. // *Stratehichna panorama*, № 1, s. 162 – 182.)
Палий, О. (2010)	Постмодернизм в украинской и чешской прозе: восточнославянская и западнославянская версии. // *Slavia*, № 3 – 4, с. 366 – 378. (*Paliy, O.* Postmodernizm v ukrainskoy i cheshskoy proze: vostochnoslavyanskaya i zapadnoslavyanskaya versii. // *Slavia*, № 3 – 4, s. 366 – 378.)
Пахльовська, О. (2001)	Український постмодернізм як клонування без правил. // *Ситуація постмодернізму в Україні. КіноТеатр,* № 6 (38), с. 2 – 6. (*Pakhlovska, O.* Ukrainskyi postmodernizm yak klonuvannia bez pravyl. // *Sytuatsiia postmodernizmu v Ukraini. KinoTeatr,* № 6 (38), s. 2 – 6.)
Селіванова, О. (2006)	Сучасна лінгвістика: термінологічна енциклопедія. Полтава: Довкілля-К, 716 с. (*Selivanova, O.* Suchasna linhvistyka: terminolohichna entsyklopediia. Poltava: Dovkillia-K, 716 s.)
Харчук, Р. (2008)	Сучасна українська проза: Постмодерний період. Київ: ВЦ „Академія", 248 с. (*Kharchuk, R.* Suchasna ukrainska proza: Postmodernyi period. Kyiv: VTs „Akademiia", 248 s.)
Fokkema, D. (1986)	The Semantic and Syntactic Organization of Postmodernist Texts. // *Approaching Postmodernism.* Amsterdam, Philadelphia, p. 81 – 98.
Graham, E., Doherty, J., Malek, M. (1992)	Introduction: The Context and Language of Postmodernism. In: – *Graham, E., Doherty, J., Malek, M.* Postmodernism and the Social Sciences. London, pp. 1-23.
Hutcheon, L. (1988)	A Poetics of Postmodernism: History, Theory, Fiction. London, New York: Routledge, 268 p.