

Ukrainian Blends-Neologisms as the Reflection of Current Social and Political Situation: a Splendid Prophecy or a 20-years' Collapse

NATALIA GUT

Foreign Languages Department, Pavlo Tychyna Uman State Pedagogical University,
2 Sadova Street, Uman, Cherkasy Region, Ukraine, UA-20300
E-mail: Natalia_gut@mail.ru

IELYZAVETA PANCHENKO

Foreign Languages Department, Pavlo Tychyna Uman State Pedagogical University,
2 Sadova Street, Uman, Cherkasy Region, Ukraine, UA-20300
E-mail: li-zunchik@yandex.ua

OKSANA ZABOLOTNA

Foreign Languages Department, Pavlo Tychyna Uman State Pedagogical University,
2 Sadova Street, Uman, Cherkasy Region, Ukraine, UA-20300
E-mail: oxana.zabolotna@gmail.com

Abstract: The article deals with lexical blends functioning in Y. Pashkovskyi's work "Everyday warder". It is said that a striking picture of Ukraine being on the way of economic, political and social collapse can be seen through neologisms in Ukrainian postmodern literature. The research provides the characteristics of Ukrainian blends, discusses their structure, and examines the development of their constituent parts (splinters) into new morphemes. The different kinds of contexts in which blends tend to occur to characterize current political and social situation in Ukraine are analyzed. The comparative analysis of Ukrainian blends comprehension given as single words and in context has been made.

Keywords: novel-essay, lexical blend, neologism, splinter, context.

Introduction

Neologisms in Ukrainian and probably all languages use the whole spectrum of word-formation devices. Blending, the type of neologisms that will be discussed in this research, has long been considered marginal. However, in the last few decades it has become increasingly common, so much that it is losing its marginal status and more linguists are examining the peculiarities of blends. The question is why blends and other types of neologisms have become increasingly popular functioning mostly in media, advertisements, and produce lexemes to gain our attention.

The research objectives are to provide characteristics of Ukrainian blends, to discuss their structure, and examine the development splinters into new morphemes, to consider how novel blends are processed, the kinds of contexts in which they tend to occur to characterize current political and social situation in Ukraine, and finally, how they are understood by native speakers as single words and in the context. With this in mind we encountered the work *Щоденний жезл (Everyday warder)* (first published in 1999, second edition was in 2001) by Yevgen Pashkovskyi as it gives a striking picture of Ukraine being on the way of economic, political and social collapse. It produces the impression as if it had been written a couple of months ago.

Recent research on blends in the Ukrainian Language

The paper is based on the works by English (J. Algeo, G. Cannon, H. Cuyckens, R. Fischer, M. Kelly, J. Munat, I. Plug, D. Schönefeld) and Ukrainian (Ж. Колоіз, А. Нелюба, А. Шелудько) linguists. The majority of research works on lexical blending

has, until now, concentrated on blends in the English language. Most studies are based on analyses of written blends that were collected from corpora containing written sources. Research on spoken blends has mostly been conducted from a psycholinguistic perspective, by analyzing collections of speech errors resulting in blends, with the goal of providing insight into aspects of word production processes.

Since the beginning of studying blends there have been different approaches to the terminology. So it is important that we should have a precise look at how this phenomenon is viewed in different linguistic traditions. In Western research it has mainly been defined as *blending*, *blends* or *blendings*, *portmanteau words*, *contraction*, *contamination*, *telescoping*; Ukrainian and Russian researchers have mainly addressed it in the scope of *teleskopiya*, *teleskopizmy*, *kontaminatsiya*, *vstavky*, *slova-zlytky*, *slova-spayky*, *slova-amalgamy*. Both groups of researchers use the terms *telescoping* for describing the process of building blends (Арнольд 1986, Тимошенко 1976, Шанский 1969). As Arnold explains the term is based on the metaphor which compares this linguistic process with composing telescope and the way its parts are put together (Арнольд 1986). One of the most popular terms for defining the notion in Ukrainian and Russian linguistics remains *contamination* (*kontaminatsiya*), as *blending* is in Western (Силина 1990, Шведова 1952, Cannon 1986).

The corpora of written and spoken blends analyzed in the literature were produced under different circumstances, generally either in the context of deliberate word-formation in the case of written blends or as slips of the tongue, i.e. unintentional speech errors, in the case of spoken blends. *Ukrainian Blends: Elicitation paradigm and structural analysis* recently published by Susanne R. Borgwaldt, Tetyana Kulish and Arpita Bose in the selection of articles *Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Lexical Blending* (2012) actually shed the light on them from the cross disciplinary comparative perspective (Borgwaldt 2012). The study investigated lexical blending in the Ukrainian language using a hybrid-object naming task designed to elicit neologisms. The purpose of the study was two-fold, first to compare the morphological structure of names for the hybrid objects with data previously collected on German and Hungarian, using the same paradigm and materials, and second, to analyze the structural characteristics of spoken lexical blends that were produced in the naming task.

The other works contributing to understanding blends deal with their certain aspects touched upon in a wide research spectrum on neologisms and word-building. Thus, K. Britikova in her dissertation *The usual and occasional things in the innovations of the modern Ukrainian language: the tendencies of the person lexical and word-formative category renovation* (Брітікова 2007) came into the usual and occasional phenomena in the innovations and the tendencies of the person lexical and word-formative category renovation on the basis of the modern Ukrainian language in the period of its functioning as a state language (1991-2006). The author defined the main terms needed for the word-formative innovations description. Considerable attention was devoted to the fundamental word-building types, blending among them. She also produced the quantitative representation of these types which served the basis for the conclusion about the word-building type productivity for the formation new words (Брітікова 2007).

In her turn, A. Sheludko in the work *Word-formation peculiarities in the English-Ukrainian and Ukrainian-English translation of fiction* (Шелудько 2008) contributed to our understanding of word-formation specificity of English and Ukrainian in terms of translation for finding the ways of preserving their meaning. The research identifies

productivity of a certain word-formation type typical of either English or Ukrainian that leads to difficulties in translation of language units among which blending has also been mentioned. The systems of the English and Ukrainian word-formation were singled out and compared in terms of translation. Special attention was paid to possible difficulties in translation of fiction texts caused by differences in English and Ukrainian. The investigation determined the ways of overcoming these difficulties (Шелудько 2008).

A. Neluba in the research *Explicit and Implicit Economy in Word Creative Nomination of the Ukrainian Language* (2008) concentrated on the main principles of nomination, criteria of dissociation of word creative nomination and its modes from other types of nomination (Нелюба 2008). And, finally, Zh. Koloiz in her book *Ukrainian occasional derivation* (2007) gave an analysis of occasional word-building, and presented new tendencies in Ukrainian neology through actualized language potential. The author studied new words, blends among them (she addresses blending as telescoping) through their adaptation and producing in both written and spoken Ukrainian. The author suggested systematizing occasionalisms taking into account the categories of usual, lexical, semantic morphological and syntactic derivational processes (Колоїз 2007).

From all the works we can draw a conclusion that in the Ukrainian language blends are not just slips of the tongue and they are used in both spoken and written communication performing nominal, figurative, emotional and expressive functions.

Some reflections on the roots of current political and social situation in Ukraine

The modern Ukrainian literature aims at violating the canons, denies the classical forms, and tends to the interaction of different art forms, styles, genres. The modern prose text is affected by tendencies existing both in everyday conversational speech and in texts of journalistic style (the tendency to save linguistic efforts and the tendency to stereotyping).

On the other hand, the text always contains personality of its creator who has his own vocabulary, grammar and pragmatic features. So any display of a real author must be taken through prism of the writer's consciousness. The author functioning in the work of art causes his role in design and organization of the whole text. So, every factor connected with linguistic selectiveness can not be described without taking into consideration the person's environment. As a result the objective conditions of author's style formation are traditions, esthetic orientations, tight bond of his inner world with the national culture, fiction language state, language fashion and others.

In a work of art all the nationwide language elements can be used in order to describe the reality in general manner. But the author's style studying foresees not only the language means analyses but also the peculiarities which differ it from others and testify his stylistics identity (Gut, 2010: 23-27).

That is why the artistic lexicon is characterized by a large variety of individual words, appearance of these lexemes is due to the direct influence of factors having extralinguistic nature. In the process of creating original neologisms the author foreknows a recipient to have a common fund of knowledge and believes. Understanding the extralinguistic factors is necessary for adequate individual's perception of the author's intention, meanings of separate lexical units and the general content of a work itself. In this research the main condition to interpret novice blends (neologisms) is to pay special attention to cultural and historical events in Ukraine.

The history of Ukraine has never been easy. That is why peculiar attention has always been paid to literature as the only source of truth and real ideology. Only literature

can state the things with their own names. History says “authority” – literature writes “corruption”, under “democracy” we understand “anarchy”, “euro integration” is nothing more than “distribution of spheres of influence”, news says “economic growth” – we hear “crisis”, the word “ecology” is mostly associated with “Chornobyl”, “innovations” are just “using remains of the USSR experience”.

Ukrainian history is ill, as well as the Ukrainian nation, and only literature can treat them if it opens their eyes on real situation. It is not the time to be optimistic – it is high time for changes, and changes have come. Our attitude to different things has changed with time. If some decades ago we thought of wars as just human errors that demanded actions, now we treat them as those inevitably leading to apocalypses.

First world war of 1914-1918, The Ukrainian War of Independence of 1917-1921, The Holodomors (“Hunger-extermination”) of 1922 and 1932-33, Second World War of 1939-1945, Chornobyl catastrophic nuclear accident of 1986, “Orange Revolution” of 2004, culminating in 2014 with the “Euromaydan” uprising and the Crimean Crisis, in which the Autonomous Republic of Crimea voted to detach itself from the Ukraine and seek accession to the Russian Federation, problems in the East of Ukraine – an unnamed war that has already killed many Ukrainians. Human life does not mean much and can be interrupted in a flash. People are getting used to weapon, explosions, death, constant screaming, are not likely to be ready for a normal life, full-time job and kindness. Another day of war is another decade of spiritual, economic, and political crises. These things are discussed and creatively considered by the Ukrainian author Yevgen Paskovskiyi in his works.

About the author and the book

Yevgen Paskovskiyi was born on 19 November 1962 in Zhytomyr region. He studied at industrial technical college, then at Kyiv State Pedagogical Institute (now M. P. Dragomanov National Pedagogical University), worked as an installer, a miner, a loader etc. Since 1987 he had travelled a lot visiting Krasnodar region, Northern Caucasia, Ural and working as a photographer in Rostov region (Russia). In 1990 he came back to Ukraine. Yevgen Paskovskiyi is now a member of the National Union of Ukrainian Writers and a deputy chief editor of the periodical *Неопалыма Курпына*. At present time he lives in Kyiv.

Y. Pashkovskiyi’s works *Свято (Celebration)* (1989), *Вовча зоря (Wolf’s dawn)* (1990), *Безодня (Abyss)* (1992), *Осінь для ангела (Autumn for an angel)* (1993) have got a number of literary awards. In 2001 he became the youngest writer who got Taras Shevchenko National Prize for his work *Щоденний жезл (Everyday warder)*.

Postmodern literature is in constant search, reveals flexibility of the material, and practises interpenetration of genres. Y. Pashkovskiyi created his works using not only the unusual content but also experimenting with the form. The prose by Yevgen Pashkovskiyi belongs to the stylistic stream of consciousness, a stream of thought, a stream of artistic generalizations. The famous Ukrainian writer Pavlo Zagrebelyni once said about his colleague, “Pashkovskiyi is one of the most talented authors not only in Ukraine, but also in the whole Europe. If his works were translated into other world languages, the world would be greatly surprised”, “Pashkovskiyi transforms language in such a way that no other writer can do it. No one has ever written like Pashkovskiyi and no one will ever write in the next hundred years. It is impossible” (Загребельний 1999).

Щоденний жезл is a novel-essay where the main hero is the narrator himself. The chosen literary genre allows the author present his own individual style very well. In his

work Pashkovskiyi does not hide behind created characters but proposes his own vision of the surrounding world. The writer is worried by the present state of things, and therefore decides this time to show the surrounding reality with full determination, sarcasm and ruthlessness. In this novel the writer refers to his contemporaries, pointing them at main problems in the society and warns them against living without any purpose in everyday life.

However, despite the general criticism of the work the book has many pages where the author skillfully presents the beauty of life (including nature), being happy from knowing certain existential truths, pleasure from performing everyday work in the country because Pashkovskiyi's heroes do not like urban life. The reader should be in a constant effort to remember all the novel characters and to understand the interconnection between them. The novel shows the existential problems and demonstrates them in various visions representing reality as a complex and dynamic entity (Пасурых 2014). To convey all his thoughts and feelings Pashkovskiyi uses a variety of stylistic tools, intensify the language of his work with neologisms – blends created by his own.

How do blends work in Щоденний жезл (Everyday warder)

Constructing his text the author consciously chooses appropriate words to convey his own thoughts and ideas. The writer builds up the specific structure of his writing on lexical and syntactic levels. Y. Pashkovskiyi transforms the ordinary language units into individual blends forming neologisms. Among 138 lexemes investigated in *Щоденний жезл* there are 110 nouns (80 %), 20 adjectives (14 %), 5 verbs (4%) and 3 adverbs (2 %). Some of the blends are derivatives in word-building chains Noun → Noun (*чварламент* < *чвари* (*quarrel*) + *парламент* (*parliament*) → *чварламент*), Noun → Adjective (*Чорнзлюбиль* < *Чорнобиль* (*Chornobyl'*) + *зло* (*evil*) → *чорнзлюбильський*), Noun → Verb (*демокрадія* < *демократія* (*democracy*) + *красти* (*to steal*) → *роздемокрасти*), Noun → Adverb (*дивократія* < *диво* (*marvel*) + *демократія* (*democracy*) → *дивократично*). But others have no potential for further development and are included in the novel as a definite part of speech (*спідувати* < *спід* (*wrong side*) + *сповідувати* (*profess*), *тридцятьзленний* < *тридцять* (*thirty*) + *зленний* (*very angry*)).

Practically all studied blends are formed by splinters one of which is a neutral word (bank, country, democracy, deputy, economy, Europe, parliament etc.) and the other usually has negative connotation especially when introduced in the context (to babble, a boar, to disappear, a fool, to glut, mould, to steal etc.). There are only some blends with both splinters of positive meaning but in the novel they express the author's ironical and sarcastic attitude: *демоправдія* < *демократія* (*democracy*) + *правда* (*truth*), *душолюбоби* < *душа* (*soul*) + *любити* (*to love*).

E.g. Все дякуючи духівникам, "орфеям" та ще радіоактивному гетто, де час має схильність до пришвидшення, маніякальний потяг до змін; де, крім заслужених губошльонів та ударних душолюбів, нікому й подбати про вітчизну (Owing to clergy, "Orpheuses" and radioactive ghetto where time is inclined to speed there is maniacal inclination for changes; where there is nobody to develop the country except honoured numblers and single-minded soullovers (lovers of souls)) (Пашковський 1999: 23).

As Y. Pashkovskiyi's blends are phonologically accordant to the words which already are familiar to the reader (*розблудовник* can be read as *розбудовник* (builder), *терогризм* sounds like *тероризм* (terrorism) the writer aims to draw our attention to such lexemes and that is why in the novel the individual blends are italicized.

E.g. яка крадіина! які тупажі! які благородні звичаї; скільки гаманізму виказує тут кожна чиновна сопля з високим польотом мислі! (what a stealtry (county where everybody steals)! what noble traditions; and every little bureaucrat if having a thought in the head shows a lot of pursemanism (humanism depending on money)) (Пашковський 1999: 103).

But the author applies other graphical methods to show the changed words: чмопозиція, терогризм, пропагандиський, мас-ко-медія, футурдристи, давократія, см радіо – см радіо – смрадіо.

Such lexical units appear in the text not only to show the author's creativity but to convey the individual attitude of the writer in detail, and therefore it can not be done by other linguistic means. That is why blends are used to help the author avoid monotony in writing and perform a variety of stylistic tasks. In this research blends of *Щоденний жезл* are grouped to investigate the author's attitude to Ukraine's democracy, economic upturn and political changes, state government functioning, Soviet heritage in the country and feeling of the narrator himself.

The author critically considers the modern civilization where the meaning of fundamental social categories and forms were transformed. It is seen through the novice words formed by splinters. Thus, *білібералізм* comes as combination of two splinters *бі* (*bi-* meaning *two*) + *лібералізм* (*liberalism*). The author uses this lexical unit in ironical and bitter context and the reader can understand such unit comparing it with the same in structure but with positive meaning like *bilingualism*, *bilinear* etc.

E.g. що сповідує: білібералізм чи просту, простолюдну давократію? чи він затурканий, в кожусі й чоботях, етнографічний хуторянин? (what does he believe in: biliberalizm (double liberalism) or simple and common suffocracy (suffocating democracy)? or is he a stupefied ethnographical farmer having a sheepskin coat and boots on?) (Пашковський 1999: 150).

The same linguistic method of writing is used in other lexical units in which *демократія* (*democracy*) is always one of the splinters. E.g.: *демокрадія* < *демократія* (*democracy*) + *крадій* (*thief*), *демохрякія* < *демократія* (*democracy*) + *хряк* (*boar*), *диократія* < *дикий* (*wild*) + *демократія* (*democracy*), *жебрократія* < *жебрак* (*beggar*) + *демократія* (*democracy*), *дивокрадія* < *диво* (*marvel*) + *демократія* (*democracy*), *підлократія* < *підлий* (*mean*) + *демократія* (*democracy*), *смертократія* < *смерть* (*deth*) + *демократія* (*democracy*).

E.g. Коли гроші і підлократія приневолять собою все – від нацююрників до виборів – в поколіннях наступних зродиться інша полярність ... (When money and meanocracy (mean democracy) take hold of everything – from boss's pets to elections – new generations will give the beginning to the new extreme...) (Пашковський 1999: 49); *Ти запідозрив, що прифургонені сюди гасла, піддемокративши попередньо закатований ґрунт, здатні плодоносити незгірше притарактареної сюди в кайзерівських вагонах комунії, — приходь і збирай, все обрушене, все лежаче, немов покинуті райські сади, забур'янені вище пояса, приходь і бери, тут кругом демокрадія (you may suspect that slogans loaded by trucks to the land having been democratized and tortured to death, are able to give profits even bigger than communism brought here in Kaiser's carriages, – come and pick up because everything is ruined, lying like forgotten paradise gardens, with wild grass higher your waist, come and take,*

stealocracy (misappropriating public property) is everywhere) (Пашковський 1999: 14).

In the modern social life the ancient concepts of liberalism, democracy, and socialism lost their original meaning. They became the means of hiding economic and political expansion. Yevgen Pashkovskiy's text reveals it in the blends like *хрюформа* < *хрюкати* (to grunt) + *реформа* (reform), *розблудовник* < *розбудовник* (builder) + *блуд* (fornication).

E.g. Доки розблудовники й літорфеї жебрацьки скоромовили «відродження, культура, духовність», суспільство ввергалося в прірву нових смертологем, у безіменну, безлику, презервативно розраховану на загал, виблювану наркоманськими бруклінами мас-культуру (While lascibuilders (false reformers) and litorpheuses (false authors) miserably tonguetwistered 'renaissance, culture, and spirituality' the society fell into the abyss of new deathledge (knowledge about death), into the anonymous, featureless, condomly aimed at masses, and mass culture vomitted by drug addicted Brooklyns) (Пашковський 1999: 35).

The author uses the blends *банковіп* < *банк* (bank) + *старовіп* (believer), *наркоінвещур* < *наркотики* (drugs) + *інвестиції* (investments) + *щур* (rat) showing his rejection of investment machinations which lead the country to poverty:

E.g. вкотре перепродалось приватизоване «емзеес» — знайшовся пристойний наркоінвещур, що вклав копійчину в нашу зовнішню палітику — та все одно не було порядку, все тривало собі як і раніше (not for the first time the privatized MFA (Ministry of Foreign Affairs) was resold – as there appeared a presentable dratvestor (mean investor gaining his money from selling drugs) was found and he invested a coin in our foreign meanlicy (rotten policy) – still there was no order, everything was going on as before) (Пашковський 1999:177–178); *а грошки обшвейцарювали, словом, як дзявкає преса, інвестували захід і зокрема банковіпів, які оце раптом довідалися до нас (and coins were taken from Switzerland banks, ie as the press was yapping, we invested into West economy and into banklievers (bankers believing only in money) who unexpectedly visited us)* (Пашковський 1999: 102).

The narrator does not believe in European and world political and economic values. This attitude is conveyed through meaning of such blends as *Єврогроб* < *Європа* (Europe) + *гроб* (casket), *гребономіка* < *гребти* (to rake) + *економіка* (economics).

E.g. сторонній, якби його не мучила грижа і підвівся зір, розпізнав би в своїх вавілонських бригадирах замашки тих, що марою і привидом пройшлись по Євзробі (an outsider, if he were not tormented by hernia and his sight were clear, would recognize in his Babylonian foremen the manners of those who walked along Euroffin (European integration which is unlikely to be of any use to Ukraine) like a shadow or a ghost) (Пашковський 1999: 19); *суспільство розділилося на виробників сировини і торговців завезеним крамом, великі податки збільшили тіньовий капітал і також спливи на Захід, і через тамтешні банки працюють на їх гребономіку (society was divided into primary producers and traders of imported merchandise, high taxes increased shadow capital and were floated to the West too, and through banks they work for their rakonomics (economics of saving up))* (Пашковський 1999: 122).

The political parties always lack the mutual understanding and it resulted in several political crises in Ukraine. Y. Pashkovskiy's novel conveys the critical attitude through

some neologisms. They are *чварламент* < *чвари* (*quarrels*) + *парламент* (*parliament*), *бедламент* < *бедлам* (*chaos*) + *парламент* (*parliament*), *смада* < *смердіти* (*to stink*) + *рада* (*council*). The same attitude is shown speaking about politicians: *депутякали* < *депутати* (*deputies*) + *паякати* (*to babble*), *гавканалітики* < *гавкати* (*to bark*) + *аналітики* (*analysts*).

E.g. це не могло не сподобатись: хоч і під тиском, тебе підтримали і є з чим прийти на вибори! вся влада смадам (*what you can not help liking is that even because of your pressure you were supported and you have the reason to take part in the election! all power is for stincouncils (corrupted councils)*) (Пашковський 1999: 102); *і, засвоївши по закордонах, що варто лише в думках десь голосніше лайнутися, як тебе миттю, як стій та дивись, звинуватять у людиноненависництві, ти наказав по всіх закапелках встановити динаміки і транслювати бедламент*— нехай сікаються до депутякал— *а в перервах між роздумами та біографічним нотатством ти приймав делегації* (*and, having learned abroad that if once you curse loudly even in your mind you are sure to be immediately treated as a man-hater, so you ordered to install loudspeakers in every nook to broadcast chaolament (parliament in chaos, mess) – let deputiakaly depubabblers (deputies who are always babbling) listen to all their claims – and between reflections and writing biographical notes you received the delegations*) (Пашковський 1999: 119).

But in his novel the author thinks globally. In Ukraine as well as in the world dishonest persons are at the head of main transnational, inter-state and state organizations. It is *глобандизм* < *глобальний* (*global*) + *бандитизм* (*banditism*) and this makes the people be indifferent and lose faith in positive changes in Ukraine.

E.g. гикали, гикали, кавкали, кавкали, та не окаялись; пошилися в глобандизм, зубами й всіма кінцівками утверджувати добробут (*you hiccupped and hiccoughed, screamed and screeched, but did not regret; you entered globanditism (global banditism) to develop well-being with all your teeth and extremities*) (Пашковський 1999: 32).

When state officials are enmeshed in corruption the nation is dying. State-owned assets plundering is expressed through such blends as *фітьлософ* < *фітькати* (*to whistle*) + *філософ* (*philosopher*), *розкрадіїна* < *розкрадати* (*to plunder*) + *країна* (*country*).

E.g. та холод котив звідусюди; їхні фітьлософи за маслинами і вином просторікували, пофітькували, що смерть скоро щезне, безвідносно, чи стане людина кращою і знайде кращий, правдивіший від втечі в зарозум, порятунок (*and it was cold blowing from everywhere; whistlosophers (philosophers-demagogues) drinking wine with olives were idly talking that the death would disappear soon, regardless of whether a human would be better or find better rescue, more honest than escaping to depth of his mind*) (Пашковський 1999: 28).

The author worries about the common people who live in the country where injustice and poverty kill them and where to live means to steal. And the new-born state is ruled by *єресіархи* < *єресь* (*heresy*) + *олігархи* (*oligarchs*), who thinks only about their saving up.

E.g. того вечора охорона замість звичних панцерів отримає жилети з пластиковою вибухівкою, а мікрофони гавкатимуть в пельки єресіархів, зірки політичної естради з підвивом, напів присівши в сяєві прожекторів,

зриватимуть з себе труси і запахатимуть ними співучі уста, щоб не лопнути від ніжного крику й жаху (*that night the security men will be given the vests with plastic explosives instead of the usual breastplates, and the microphones will be taken by the heregarchs (oligarchs expressing heresy), political pop stars with overstrain and in half-squat sparkling under the spotlights will tear their underpants off and close melodious mouths not to burst out because of tender scream and terror*) [Пашковський 1999: 74].

In Y. Pashkovskyi's novel-essay the nation does not seek to be cleansed of harmful Soviet past, it is destabilized and this state is passed from generation to generation. The author presents the current situation using sarcastic tone. By his blends *мавзоленінний* < *мавзолейний* (*mausoleum's*) + *Ленін* (*Lenin*), *смердяньський* < *смердіти* (*to stink*) + *радянський* (*Soviet*), *шмарксизм* < *шмарклі* (*snivel*) + *марксизм* (*Marxism*) he tries to reveal the horrible situation which can lead to moral degradation and self-destruction of the Ukrainian society.

E.g. всі ті, хто, надихнувшись непродихним, мавзойленінним труп'яком, ішов ним захоплюватися з кафедр і газетних шпальт, ішов закликати на риття траншею під чорногробиль-станцію (everybody who was inspired by unbreathable Mausolenin's (Lenin's mausoleum) rotten smell used to admire it from chairs and newspaper columns, used to call for digging trenches for Destrobyl (destroying Chornobyl') station) (Пашковський 1999: 50); *вітрами й гольфстрімаами привид шмарксизму- людодізму дістане кожного, хто попустительствував йому і прийняв його в душу; дістане їх і їхніх нащадків – скрізь! (by winds and Gulf streams the ghost of cannibalistic marksnivelsism (humiliating and unhuman Marxism) will go and catch up with everybody who contributed to it and let it into the heart; will catch up with every human and his offsprings – everywhere!)* (Пашковський 1999: 47).

Blends *кегебісівський* < *КГБ* (*Committee for State Security*) + *бісівський* (*devil's*), *кегезбісеній* < *КГБ* (*Committee for State Security*) + *збіститися* (*to become mad*) are also used by the writer to show the evil origin of state security services originating in Soviet Ukraine.

E.g. виховані, чемні відмінники катувань, знущань, дізнань, всі як один з ягнячим, лагідним, притаманним всякому постояльцю кегебісівської "контори", голосом і поглядом; красотулічки такі (educated, polite excellent masters of torture, abuse, and inquests, everybody has the lamb tender, little voice and eyes characteristic of every clerk at KGBvil (evil Committee for State Security) "office"; what sweet people) (Пашковський 1999: 12).

Щоденний жезл reveals an attitude to the war explanation as socio-political phenomenon. The war is treated not as a way for solving contradictions but killing people and furthermore creating violence to achieve political goals by force. Except *громадянська війна* (*civil war*) the author uses *громадянська війна* < *гроб* (*coffin*) + *радянська* (*Soviet*) revealing the purposelessness of armed conflicts by the Soviet Union against other countries. The lexical meaning of other splinters emphasizes the reader's feelings: *чреволюція* < *чрево* (*belly*) + *революція* (*revolution*), *жрїйна* < *жертви* (*to glut*) + *війна* (*war*)

E.g. де наше все? куди ви його зникали? ви фінансували чреволюції і контрреволюції, чреволюції і гробадянські війни <...>, війни і жрїйни, війни і переговорні процеси, військові перевороти і їхнє присмиріння (where is our

property? where did you hide it? you financed *Bellylutions (revolutions for the sake of people interests)* and counterrevolutions, *Bellylutions and coffiet wars (wars started by Soviet Union leading to killing millions of people)* <...>, wars and *glutwars (wars for the sake of glutting)*, wars and negotiation processes, military coups and their resolutions) (Пашковський 1999: 101).

Even mass media and modern literature do not play a vital role in the development of democratic society any more. They are influenced by politics, security services, and oligarchs and produce only the bureaucratism and corruption. The author can not help showing it in his work. Such lexemes as *ліньтература* < *лінь (laziness)* + *література (literature)*, *смадіо* < *смердіти (to stink)* + *радіо (radio)* mock his colleagues who have no their own point of view.

E.g. яка вона звізда умной ліньтератури, як бере й дає, кому схоче, яка вона найсвободніша – від глузду й сорому – лічність! як нею зачитуються скрізь по преріях, як множиться на всіх мовах, геть на шумерських клинописах, сага про її обездмертнілий подвиг (what a star of the clever lazirature (literature produced by people unable to work deeply and profoundly) she is if she gives to and takes from whoever she wants, what a free – of intelligence and shame – personality she is! How readable sagas of her immortal deeds are everywhere, even in prairies, how intensively they are multiplied in different languages, even in Cuneiform scripts) (Пашковський 1999: 131).

In *Щоденний жезл* many neologisms refer to crazy experiment in Chornobyl which resulted in explosion at the atom station and death of hundreds of people. But in his work the author presents this event first of all as a disaster that undermined the moral state of the nation. This situation is presented through the lexical meaning of such blends as *Комунобиль* < *комуна (commune)* + *Чорнобиль (Chornobyl')*, *Чорнгробиль* < *Чорнобиль (Chornobyl')* + *гробити (destroy)*, *чорнобопошесть* < *Чорнобиль (Chornobyl')* + *пошесть (epidemic)*.

*E.g. початок великого захиріння, — від всохлості легень, — призвів до закостеніння дух і до скелетності тіло; вихід з проспіваної землі, до запомороки забивши подих, привів до історієядухи; комуномор обернувся чорнобопошестю; комунобиль в чорнгробиль (the beginning of great depression – because of the dried lungs – led the spirit to stiffening, and the body to ossifying; leaving the glorified land, with the suffocated breast resulted in poisoned history; commuodevastation turned into **chornobidemty (epidemy caused by Chornobyl)**; **communobyl into desrobyl**)* (Пашковський 1999: 32).

Щоденний жезл is written to pay attention to painful reality of every person. But in spite of the fact the writer loves his country he is disappointed and disillusioned. He used to believe like million other people but in vain. The time (*дармоліття* < *дарма (in vain)* + *століття (century)*) passed but nothing changed.

*E.g. десь запропав Д.Фаулз, почувши, що в заплавах Прип'яті бачили перламутрових метеликів, завбільшки з лелек, екземпляри, про які він і не підозрював, пишучи свого «Колекціонера» – подався за трепетною красою, та і його поглинуло дармоліття (J. Fawles could not be found anywhere as he had heard that pearl storksized butterflies had been seen in the Pryp'yat's floodplains, excellent species he could not even dream about when writing "The Collector" – he headed for anxious beauty and even he was engrossed in **vaintury (vain century)**)* (Пашковський 1999: 49).

The narrator does not believe in his country any more. He presents the blends in which the neutral splinter *країна* (*country*) is combined with splinters of negative connotation: *гиблокраїна* < *згиблій* (*ruined*) + *країна* (*country*), *проклятіїна* < *проклятий* (*cursed*) + *країна* (*country*), *зникраїна* < *зникати* (*to disappear*) + *країна* (*country*).

E.g. нові позички, інвалідські кредити, новий, ще тісніший зашморг зобов'язань і їх треба виконувати, інакше про вас нашенчуть, наплетуть, покажуть фальшиву довідку з диспансерів вашої гиблокраїни, вашої проклятіїни! (*new loans, invalid's credits, new and closer noose of commitments and they must be fulfilled, or you will be earwigged, slandered, they will show a false certificate from the clinics of your ruintry (ruined country), your cursetry (cursed country)!*) (Пашковський 1999: 85).

Comparative analysis of Ukrainian blends comprehension, given as single words and in the context

Blends generally make comprehension more difficult because the hearer or reader has to figure out their meaning, as they are typically presented without glosses or explanations. Like other neologisms, such as rimes and allusions, blends are often cute and amusing. They work as a form of word play, which Kelly describes as "lexical teases" (Kelly 1998). In the Ukrainian language blends are widely found in newspapers, magazines, radio, TV and thousands of advertisements. Therefore, using a novel clever word is likely to catch our attention and get us to read or listen to what is being presented.

In studying Ukrainian blends we have paid attention to the fact how they are understood by speakers, both as single words and in the context. Participants were 15 native Ukrainian speakers, 2 men, 13 women. All participants had already finished their studies, with Philology as their major.

The participants were tested face to face through the questionnaire. At first, they were given 31 above analysed Ukrainian blends as single words. The task was to figure out the splinters of these blends and explain the meaning of the new word. The next step was to introduce the above mentioned blends in context and suggest that the same respondents should explain their meaning. No further feedback was given during the task. All the data were included in the analysis:

N	Ukrainian blends	as single words		In context	
		% of respondents who guessed both source words	% of respondents who gave a close explanation	% of respondents who guessed the source words	% of respondents who gave a close explanation
1	душолоуб	100	90	100	99
2	крадіїна	100	100	100	100
3	гаманізм	72	50	83	70
4	білібералізм	90	90	100	90
5	давократія	78	55	98	98
6	підлократія	78	55	82	82
7	демократія	100	100	100	100
8	розблудовники	85	70	100	95

9	падлітика	100	100	100	100
10	наркоінвещур	100	100	100	100
11	банковір	55	55	94	94
12	єврогроб	100	50	100	95
13	гребономіка	61	52	61	52
14	смирада	15	15	51	51
15	бедламент	65	50	65	65
16	депутякали	95	95	100	100
17	глобандизм	100	100	100	100
18	фітьлософ	82	75	98	98
19	єресіярх	5	5	10	10
20	мавзойленіний	100	90	100	100
21	чорнгробиль	100	100	100	100
22	шмарксизм	95	90	100	100
23	кегебісівський	100	50	100	72
24	чреволюція	5	0	50	50
25	гробадянський	100	92	100	92
26	жрійна	2	0	52	52
27	ліньтература	100	100	100	100
28	комунобиль	96	56	96	56
29	дармоліття	100	95	100	97
30	гиблокраїна	100	100	100	100
31	проклятіїна	100	100	100	100
		79,9%	70,3%	88,3%	84,4%

So, as the table above shows, respondents have guessed both source words of Ukrainian blends much better when they can see them in the context than as single words (88,3% and 79,9 % respectively). The same tendency prevails in explaining their meaning (84,4 % and 70,3 %). This can be attributed to the fact that author's context makes understanding easier. The blends analyzed were taken from the relatively recent source. Thus, they are quite often heard on TV and read both in Internet materials and literature.

There is common idea that blending is more characteristic of analytical languages, and that Ukrainian blends are just borrowed from English under the influence of globalization. Nevertheless, we clearly see that Ukrainian words formed by blending are easily understood, and have some expressive meaning.

Conclusions

Novel blends have become increasingly common in the Ukrainian language, so common that they should no longer be considered as a marginal word-forming device. Some of the data collected by researchers a decade ago involved less common kinds of blends such as those with complete overlap and embedded elements, but these have increased in frequency more recently.

Lexical blending is a complex morphophonological process. In the Ukrainian language blends are formed by contamination as the way to combine splinters fully or partially. More often, one or both source words appears as a splinter, a truncated form that contains enough material to identify the original source word and allow a new-created word have a potential for further word-building chain development.

In the written communication they often perform nominal, figurative, emotional and expressive functions. All the examples presented above were formed in the written medium. In *Щоденний жезл (Everyday warder)* the author wants to call attention of his readers to social and political situation in Ukraine by using author's neologisms (mostly nouns) sometimes with some graphical distinguishing. The author's blends usually are created in such a way to produce blends phonologically accordant to the words which already are common to the reader. Practically all neologisms have negative connotation especially when introduced in the context. In the studied material blends function in a variety of contexts to express the author's ironical and sarcastic attitude to all phenomena of human life such as liberalism, democracy, socialism, investment machinations, European integration, Ukrainian parliament functioning, corruption, Soviet heritage, wars and revolutions etc. His blends warn the readers revealing the horrible situation which can lead to moral degradation and self-destruction of the Ukrainian society.

The readers can understand the message the author wants to convey through his individual neologisms in two ways: retrieving the etymological source words of a blend, just as they can figure out the connection between the literal and metaphorical meanings of words, or guess the meaning of the blend from the context. The research showed that people who are more accustomed to encountering blends have no difficulty to figure out the meaning of blends but they respond to novel blends with greater speed and accuracy when they can be seen in the context.

References

Арнольд 1986 = Арнольд И. Б. *Лексикология современного английского языка*. Москва : Высшая школа, 1986.

Брітікова 2007 = Брітікова К. В. *Узуальне та оказіональне в інноваціях сучасної української мови: тенденції оновлення лексико-словотвірної категорії назв особи*: автореф. дис. ... кандидата філолог. наук : 10.02.01. Харків, 2007.

Загребельний 1999 = Загребельний П. Передмова П. Загребельного до «Щоденного жезлу». В кн. Пашковський Є. *Щоденний жезл*. Київ: Генеза, 1999. 1–2

Колоїз 2007 = Колоїз Ж. В. *Українська оказіональна деривація*: Монографія. Київ: Акцент, 2007.

Нелюба 2008 = Нелюба А. М. *Експліцитна й імпліцитна економія в словотвірній номінації української мови*: автореф. дис. ... доктора філолог. наук 10.02.01. Київ, 2008.

Пастух 2014 = Пастух Т. Життя та доля у романістиці Євгена Пашковського. *Слово Просвіти*. <http://slovoprosvity.org/2012/11/23/життя-та-доля-у-романістиці-євген>. Accessed November 20, 2014

Пашковський 1999 = Пашковський Є. *Щоденний жезл*. Київ: Генеза, 1999.

Силина 1990 = Силина Б. Б. Контаминация Текст. В кн. *Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь*. Москва : Советская энциклопедия, 1990. 113.

СТИШОВ 2013 = СТИШОВ О. А. Особливості словотворення оказіоналізмів – композитів у мові українських ЗМІ кінця ХХ – початку ХХІ століть. *Динамічні процеси в граматиці і лексичному складі сучасних слов'янських мов*. Київ, 2013.198–195.

Тимошенко 1976 = Тимошенко Т. Р. *Телескопия в словообразовательной системе современного английского языка*: автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук: спец. 10.02.04 «Германские языки». Киев, 1976.

Шанский 1969 = Шанский Н. М. *Очерки по словообразованию*. Москва: Наука, 1969.

Шведова 1952 = Шведова Н. Ю. *Активные процессы в современном русском синтаксисе*. Москва, 1965.

Шелудько 2008 = Шелудько А. В. *Труднощі словотвірного характеру в англо-українському та українсько-англійському художньому перекладі*: автореф. дис. ... кандидата філолог. наук 10.02.16 – перекладознавство. Київ, 2008.

Borgwaldt 2012 = Borgwaldt S., Kulish T., Bose A. Ukrainian Blends: Elicitation paradigm and structural analysis. In book *Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Lexical Blending*. Berlin : Walter de Gruyter, 2012. Renner 2012 = Renner V., Maniez F., Arnaud P. *Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Lexical Blending*.

Cannon 1986 = Cannon G. Blends in English word formation. *Linguistics*. №24(1986): 725–753.

Gut 2010 = Gut N. V., Shumayeva S.P. Idiostyle and text. *International Science Ukrainian Edition*. V.2. (2010): 23–27.

Kelly 1998 = Kelly M. H. To "brunch" or to "brench": some aspects of blend structure. *Linguistics*. Vol. 36. № 3 (1998): 579–590.