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

NATALIA GUT, IELYZAVETA PANCHENKO, OKSANA ZABOLOTNA

Foreign Languages Department, Pavlo Tychyna Uman State Pedagogical University,
2 Sadova Street, UA-20300 Uman, Cherkasy Region
E-mail: Natalia_gut@mail.ru, li-zunchik@yandex.ua, oxana.zabolotna@gmail.com

Abstract: The paper deals with lexical blends functioning in Y. Pashkovskyi's work *Що-денний жезл* [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 post-modern literature. The study provides the characteristics of Ukrainian blends, discusses their structures, and examines the development of their constituent parts (the so-called splinters) into new morphemes. The different kinds of contexts in which blends tend to occur characterizing the current political and social situation in Ukraine are analyzed. The comparative analysis of Ukrainian blends as single words and in contexts has also been made in this research.

Keywords: novel-essay, lexical blends, neologisms, splinters, 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 been considered a marginal phenomenon for a long time. 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 the media and in advertisements, and producing lexemes that gain our attention.

The research objectives are to provide the characteristics of Ukrainian blends, to discuss their structure as well as examine the development of splinters into new morphemes, to consider how novel blends are processed, the kinds of contexts in which they tend to occur to characterize the 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 have encountered the work *Щоденний жезл* [Everyday warder] (first published in 1999, the second edition 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 and Ukrainian linguists (CANNON 1986, KELLY 1998, КОЛОЇЗ 2007, НЕЛЮБА 2008, ШЕЛУДЬКО 2008, etc.). 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*, or *telescopy*. Ukrainian and Russian researchers have mainly addressed it in the scope of *телескопия*, *телескопизмы*, *контаминация*, *вставки*, *слова-слитки*, *слова-спайки*, or *слова-амальгамы*. Both groups of researchers use the term *telescopy* for describing the process of building blends (cf. 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 examined notion in Ukrainian and Russian linguistics remains *contamination* (i.e. *контаминация*), while in Western research, mainly the term *blending* is preferred (СИЛИНА 1990, ШВЕДОВА 1966, 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. A paper published by Susanne R. Borgwaldt, Tetyana Kulish and Arpita Bose shed a light on them from a cross-disciplinary comparative perspective (see BORGWALDT–KULISH–BOSE 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 twofold. Firstly, 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 secondly, to analyze the structural characteristics of spoken lexical blends that were produced in the naming task.

Other works contributing to understanding blends deal with their certain aspects touched upon in a wide research spectrum on neologisms and word building. Thus, in her dissertation, K. Britikova studies the usual and occasional phenomena in the innovations and new tendencies in the reformation of the lexical and word-formative category of person names on the basis of the modern Ukrainian language in the period of its functioning as a state language (1991–2006) (БРІТІКОВА 2007). The author defined the main terms needed for the description of word-formative

innovations. Considerable attention was devoted to the fundamental word-building types, including the phenomenon of blending. 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 of new words (Брітікова 2007).

In her turn, A. Sheludko contributed to our understanding of word-formation peculiarities of English and Ukrainian in terms of translation for finding the ways to preserve the meaning (Шелудько 2008). The research identifies the 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. English and Ukrainian word-formation systems were singled out and compared in terms of translation. Special attention was paid to possible difficulties arising during the translation of fiction texts caused by differences in English and Ukrainian. The investigation determined the ways of overcoming these difficulties (Шелудько 2008).

In his research, A. Neluba concentrated on the main principles of nomination, the criteria of dissociation of word-creative nomination and its modes from other types of nomination (Нелюба 2008). And finally, in her book, Z. Koloyiz gave an analysis of occasional word building, and presented new tendencies in Ukrainian neology through the actualized language potential. The author studied new words, including blends (addressing the process of blending as telescopy) through their adaptation and production in both written and spoken Ukrainian. The author also suggested a systematization of occasionalisms, taking into account the categories of the usual, lexical, semantic, morphological, and syntactic derivational processes (Колоїз 2007).

On the basis of these 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, having 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, and genres. The modern prosaic text is affected by tendencies existing both in everyday conversational speech and in journalistic-style texts (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. Thus, any display of a real author must be taken through the prism of the writer's consciousness. The author functioning in the work of art causes his role in the design and the organization of the whole text. Thus, every factor connected with linguistic selectiveness cannot be described without taking into consideration the person's environment. As

a result, objective conditions of the author's style formation are traditions, esthetic orientations, a tight bond of his inner world with national culture, the state of language of the fiction, 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 studying the author's style supposes not only the analysis of language means but also the peculiarities differentiating it from others, and testify the identity of his style (GUT–SHUMAYEVA 2010).

That is why the artistic lexicon is characterized by a large variety of individual words. The 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 beliefs. Understanding the extralinguistic factors is necessary for an adequate individual perception of the author's intention, the meanings of several lexical units, and the general content of a work itself. In this research, the main condition to interpret novice blends (or 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 call the things by their own names. History says "authority" and literature emphasizes "corruption", by "democracy" we understand "anarchy", "European integration" is nothing more than "the distribution of spheres of influence", news say "economic growth" and we hear "crisis", the word "ecology" is mostly associated with "Chornobyl", "innovations" are just "using the 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.

The First World War in 1914–1918, The Ukrainian War of Independence in 1917–1921, The Holodomors ("Hunger-extermination") in 1922 and 1932–1933, the Second World War in 1939–1945, the disastrous Chornobyl' nuclear accident in 1986, the "Orange Revolution" in 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 weapons, explosions, death, constant screaming, and they are not likely to be ready for a normal life, a 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 Paskovskyi in his works.

About the author and the book

Yevgen Paskovskyi was born on 19 November 1962 in the 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 has travelled a lot, visiting the Krasnodar region, Northern Caucasia, and Ural, also working as a photographer in the Rostov region (Russia). In 1990, he came back to Ukraine. Yevgen Paskovskyi is now a member of the National Union of Ukrainian Writers and a deputy chief editor of the periodical *Неопалима Купина*. Presently, he lives in Kyiv.

Yevgen Pashkovskyi's works *Свято* [Celebration] (1989), *Вовча зоря* [The wolf's dawn] (1990), *Безодня* [Abyss] (1992), *Осінь для ангела* [Autumn for an angel] (1993) have received a number of literary awards. In 2001, he became the youngest writer to get the Taras Shevchenko National Prize for his work *Щоденний жезл* [Everyday warder].

Postmodern literature is in constant search, it reveals the flexibility of its material and it practises the interpenetration of genres. Y. Pashkovskyi created his works using not only the unusual content but also experimenting with the form. Y. Pashkovskyi's prose belongs to the stylistic stream of consciousness, a stream of thought, a stream of artistic generalizations. The famous Ukrainian writer Pavlo Zagrebelnyi once said about his colleague, "Pashkovskyi 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". "Pashkovskyi transforms language in such a way that no other writer can do it. No one has ever written like Pashkovskyi and no one will ever write in the next hundred years. It is impossible" (ЗАГРЕБЕЛЬНИЙ 1999: 1–2).

Щоденний жезл is a novel-essay where the main hero is the narrator himself. The chosen literary genre allows the author to present his own individual style very well. In his work, Y. Pashkovskyi 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, this time he decides to show the surrounding reality with full determination, sarcasm, and ruthlessness. In this novel, the writer refers to his contemporaries, calling their attention to the main problems of society and warning 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, having pleasure from performing everyday work in the country because Pashkovskyi's heroes do not like urban life. The readers should make a constant effort to remember all the characters in the novel 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 (ПАСТУХ 2012). To convey all his thoughts and feelings, Pashkovskyi uses a variety of stylistic tools to intensify the language of his work with neologisms. These elements are mainly blends created by himself.

How blends work in *Щоденний жезл*

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 work on lexical and syntactic levels. Y. Pashkovskyi transforms the ordinary language units into individual blends forming neologisms. Among the 138 lexemes studied 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: *Чорнзлобиль* < *Чорнобиль* 'Chornobyl' + *зло* 'evil' → *чорнзлобильський*; 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: cf. *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 first used 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. In the novel, however, they express the author's ironical and sarcastic attitude: *демоправдія* < *демократія* 'democracy' + *правда* 'truth', *душолюби* < *душа* 'soul' + *любити* 'to love'.

> …все дякуючи духівникам, «орфеям» та ще радіоактивному гетто, де час має схильність до пришвидшення, маніякальний потяг до змін; де, крім заслужених губошльопів та ударних *душолюбів*, нікому й подбати про вітчизну […owing to the clergy, it is "Orpheuses" and radioactive ghettos where time is inclined to speed up there is a maniacal inclination for changes; where there is nobody to develop the country except for honoured mumblers and *single-minded soulovers* 'lovers of souls'] (ПАШКОВСЬКИЙ 1999: 23).

As Pashkovskyi'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 the individual blends are italicized in the novel.

> …яка *крадіїна*! які типажі! 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: ***чмо**-позиція*, *теро**гриз**м*, *пропа**гадиський***, *мас-ко-**медія***, *футу**д**ристи*, *давокра-ті**Я***, ***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 cannot be done by other linguistic means. That is why blends are used to help the author to avoid monotony in writing and perform a variety of stylistic tasks. In this paper, blends found in *Щоденний жезл* are grouped to analyze the author's attitude to Ukraine's democracy, economic upturn and political changes, the functioning of the government, the Soviet heritage in the country and the narrator's feelings.

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, *біліберадізм* comes as a combination of two splinters *бі* 'two' + *лібералізм* 'liberalism'. The author uses this lexical unit in an ironical and bitter context, and the reader can understand a word like that by comparing it to structurally analogical elements with a positive meaning like, for instance, *bilingualism*, *bilinear*, etc.

> …що сповідує: *біліберадізм* 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 *suffocrasy* '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. For example, *демокрадія* < *демократія* 'democracy' + *крадій* 'thief', *демохрякія* < *демократія* 'democracy' + *хряк* 'boar', *дикократія* < *дикий* 'wild' + *демократія* 'democracy', *жебрократія* < *жебрак* 'beggar' + *демократія* 'democracy', *дивократія* < *диво* 'marvel' + *демократія* 'democracy', *підлократія* < *підлий* 'mean' + *демократія* 'democracy', *смертократія* < *смерть* 'death' + *демократія* 'democracy'.

> Коли гроші і *підлократія* приневолять собою все – від нацюцюрників до виборів – в поколіннях наступних зродиться інша полярність… [When money and *meanocrasy* 'mean democracy' take hold of everything – from boss's pets to elections – new generations will give the start to a new extreme…] (ПАШКОВСЬКИЙ 1999: 49).

> Ти запідозрив, що прифургонені сюди гасла, піддемокративши попередньо закатований грунт, здатні плодоносити незгірше притарахтареної 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, *stealocrasy* 'misappropriating public property' is everywhere] (ПАШКОВСЬКИЙ 1999: 14).

In modern social life, the ancient concepts of liberalism, democracy, and socialism have lost their original meanings. They became the means of hiding economic and

political expansion. Yevgen Pashkovskyi's text reveals it in the blends like *хрю-форма* < *хрюкати* 'to grunt' + *реформа* 'reform', *розблудовник* < *розбудовник* 'builder' + *блуд* 'fornication'.

> Доки *розблудовники* й літорфеї жебрацьки скоромовили «відродження, культу-ра, духовність», суспільство ввергалося в прірву нових смертологем, у безімен-ну, безлику, презервативно розраховану на загал, виблювану наркоманськими брукілінами мас-культуру [While *lascibuilders* 'false reformers' and litorpheuses 'false authors' miserably tongue-twistered 'reneissance, culture, and spirituality' the society fell into the abiss of new deatholedge 'knowledge about death', into the an-onymous, featureless, condomly aimed at masses, and mass culture vomitted by drug-addicted Brooklyns] (Пашковський 1999: 35).

The author uses the blends *банковір* < *банк* 'bank' + *старовір* 'believer', *нар-коінвещур* < *наркотики* 'drugs' + *інвестиції* 'investments' + *щур* 'rat' showing his rejection of investment machinations which lead the country to poverty:

> …вкотре перепродалось приватизоване «емзеес» – знайшовся пристойний *нар-коінвещур*, що вклав копійчину в нашу зовнішню падлітику – 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* 'a mean investor gaining his money from selling drugs' 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 грошики обшвейцарювали, словом, як дзявкає преса, інвестували захід і зо-крема *банковірів*, які оце раптом довідалися до нас […and coins were taken from Switzerland banks, i.e. as the press was yapping, we invested into Western economy and into *banklievers* 'bankers believing only in money' who unexpectedly visited us] (Пашковський 1999: 102).

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

> …сторонній, якби його не мучила грижа і підвівся зір, розпізнав би в своїх ва-вілонських бригадирах замашки тих, що марою і привидом пройшлись по *Єв-гробі* […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 кра-мом, великі податки збільшили тіньовий капітал і також спливли на Захід, і че-рез тамтешні банки працюють на їх *гребономіку* […the 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 *rako-nomics* 'economics of saving up'] (Пашковський 1999: 122).

The political parties have lacked the mutual understanding and it resulted in several political crises in Ukraine. Pashkovskyi's novel conveys the critical attitude through some neologisms. They are *чварламент* < *чвари* 'quarrels' + *парламент* 'parliament', *бедламент* < *бедлам* 'chaos' + *парламент* 'parliament', *смрада* < *смердіти* '*to stink*' + *рада* 'council'. The same attitude is demonstrated when speaking about politicians: *депутякали* < *депутати* 'deputies' + *патякати* 'to babble', *гавканалітики* < *гавкати* 'to bark' + *аналітики* 'analysts'.

> …це не могло не сподобатись: хоч і під тиском, тебе підтримали і є з чим прийти на вибори! *вся влада смрадам* […what you cannot 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* – нехайсікаються до депутякал – а в перервах між роздумами та біографічним нотатством ти приймав делегації […and, having learned abroad that if once you curse out 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).

In his novel, the author thinks globally. He claims that in Ukraine and in the world, dishonest persons are at the head of the main transnational and state organizations. It is *глобандизм* < *глобальний* 'global' + *бандтдизм* 'banditism' and it makes the people indifferent and lose faith in positive changes in Ukraine.

> …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 your extremities] (ПАШКОВСЬКИЙ 1999: 32).

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

> …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; the *whistlosophers* 'philosophers-demagogues' drinking wine with olives were idly talking that death would disappear soon, regardless of whether a human would be better or find a better rescue, more honestly than escaping to the 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 *єресіярхи* < *єресь* 'heresy' + *олігархи* 'oligarchs' who think only about their own savings.

> …того вечора охорона замість звичних панцерів отримає жилети з пластиковою вибухівкою, а мікрофони гахкатимуть в пельки *єресіярхів*, зірки політичної естради з підвивом, напів присівши в сяєві прожекторів, зриватимуть з себе труси і запихатимуть 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 Pashkovskyi's novel-essay, the nation does not seek to be cleansed of the 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* 'of a mausoleum' + *Лєнін* 'Lenin', *смердянський* < *смердіти* 'to stink' + *радянський* 'Soviet', *шмарксизм* < *шмарклі* 'snivel' + *марксизм* 'Marxism' he is trying to reveal the horrible situation which can lead to moral degradation and the self-destruction of the Ukrainian society.

> …всі ті, хто, надихнувшись непродихним, мавзой*лєнін*ним труп'яком, ішов ним захоплюватися з кафедр і газетних шпальт, ішов закликати на риття траншей під чорнгробиль-станцію […everybody who was inspired by the unbreathable Mauso*lenin'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 гольфстрімами привид *шмарксизму*-людоїзму 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 mark*snivel*sism 'humiliating and umhuman 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', *кегезбісений* < *КГБ* 'Committee for State Security' + *збіситися* 'to become mad' are also used by the writer to show the evil origin of the state security services originating in Soviet Ukraine.

> …виховані, чемні відмінники катувань, знущань, дізнань, всі як один з ягнячим, лагідним, притаманним всякому постояльцю *кегебісівської* «контори», голоском 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 explanation of war as a sociopolitical 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. Apart from *громадянська війна* 'civil war', the author uses *громадянська війна < гроб* 'coffin' + *радянська* 'Soviet' revealing the aimlessness of armed conflicts started by the Soviet Union against other countries. The lexical meaning of other splinters emphasizes the reader's feelings: *чреволюція < чрево* 'belly' + *револю-ція* 'revolution', *жрійна < жерти* 'to glut' + *війна* 'war'.

> *…де наше все?* куди ви його заникали? ви фінансували ч*революції* і контррево-люції, *чреволюції* і *гробадянські* війни…, війни і *жрійни*, війни і переговорні процеси, військові перевороти і їхнє присмирення [*…and 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 bureaucratism and corruption. The author cannot help showing it in his work. Such lexemes as *ліньтєратура < лінь* 'laziness' + *література* 'literature', *смрадіо < смердіти* 'to stink' + *радіо* 'radio' mock his colleagues who do not have their own points of view.

> *…яка вона звізда умной ліньтєратури*, як бере й дає, кому схоче, яка вона най-свободніша – від глузду й сорому – лічность! як нею зачитуються скрізь по пре-ріях, як множиться на всіх мовах, геть на шумерських клинописах, сага про її обезсмертнілий 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 the crazy experiment in Chornobyl' which resulted in the explosion at the nuclear station and the 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', *чор-нобопошесть < Чорнобиль* 'Chornobyl' + *пошесть* 'epidemic'.

> *…початок великого захиріння,* – від всхлості легень, – призвів до закостенін-ня дух і до скелетності тіло; вихід з проспіваної землі, до запаморки забивши подих, привів до історіядухи; комуномор обернувся *чорнобопошестю*; *кому-нобиль* 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 a poisoned history; the devastation of the community turned into *chornobidemy* 'epidemy caused by Chornobyl'; *communobyl* into *desrobyl*] (ПАШКОВСЬКИЙ 1999: 32).

Щоденний жезл was written to pay the attention of readers to the painful reality of every person. But in spite of the fact that the writer loves his country he is disappointed and disillusioned. He used to believe in it like millions of other people, but in vain. Time has passed but nothing has changed: *дармоліття* < *дарма* 'in vain' + *століття* 'century'.

…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» – подавсь за трепетною красою, та і його поглинуло *дармоліття* […J. Fawles could not be found anywhere as he heard that pearl-sized butterflies had been seen in the Prypyat's floodplains, excellent species he could not even dream about when writing "The Collector", as 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* < *згиблий* 'ruined' + *країна* 'country', *проклятіїна* < *проклятий* 'cursed' + *країна* 'country', *зникраїна* < *зникати* 'to disappear' + *країна* 'country'.

…нові позички, інвалідські кредити, новий, ще тісніший зашморг зобов'язань і їх треба виконувати, інакше про вас нашепчуть, 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).

A comparative analysis of the comprehension of Ukrainian blends

Blends generally make comprehension more difficult because the listener or the reader has to figure out their meaning because they are typically presented without glosses or explanations. Just like other neologisms such as rhymes and allusions blends are often cute and amusing. They work as a form of word play, which M. H. Kelly describes as "lexical teases" (KELLY 1998: 580). In the Ukrainian language, blends are widely found in newspapers, magazines, radio and television programs, and thousands of advertisements. Therefore, the use of 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. Among the participants there were 15 native Ukrainian speakers: 2 men and 13 women. All the participants had already finished their studies, with philology as their major.

The participants were tested face to face through the questionnaire. At first, 31 Ukrainian blends analyzed above were presented to them as single words. Their 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 the 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:

	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.	душолюб	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.	демокрадія	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.	смрада	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.	мавзойлєніній	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.	ліньтєратура	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%

Thus, as the table above shows, respondents have guessed both source words of Ukrainian blends much better when they could see them in the context rather 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 the author's context makes understanding easier. The blends analyzed were taken from a relatively recent source. Therefore, they are quite often heard on TV and can be read both in Internet materials and literature.

There is a 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.

Conclusion

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 a 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 a way to combine splinters fully or partially. More often, one of the source words (or both) appears as a splinter, a truncated form that contains enough material to identify the original source word and to allow a newly created word to have a potential for further word-building chain development.

In 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*, the author wants to call the attention of his readers to the social and political situation in Ukraine by using author's neologisms (mostly nouns) sometimes with some graphical distinction. The author's blends usually are created in such a way to produce blends phonologically accordant to the words which are already common to the reader. Practically, all neologisms have negative connotation, especially when first used in a context. In our corpus, blends function in a variety of contexts to express the author's ironical and sarcastic attitude to all fenomena of human life such as liberalism, democracy, socialism, investment machinations, the European integration, the functioning of the Ukrainian parliament, corruption, the Soviet heritage, wars and revolutions, etc. The author's 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.

Our 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 find them 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*. АКД. Харків, 2007.

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

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

Нелюба 2008 = Нелюба А. М. *Експліцитна й імпліцитна економія в словотвірній номінації української мови*. АДД. Київ, 2008.

Пастух 2012 = Пастух Т. Життя та доля у романістиці Євгена Пашковського. *Слово Просвіти*. http://slovoprosvity.org/2012/11/23/життя-та-доля-у-романістиці-євген.

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

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

Тимошенко 1976 = Тимошенко Т. Р. *Телескопия в словообразовательной системе современного английского языка*. АКД. Киев, 1976.

Шанский 1969 = Шанский Н. М. *Очерки по русскому словообразованию и лексикологии*. Москва: «Высшая школа», 1969.

Шведова 1966 = Шведова Н. Ю. *Активные процессы в современном русском синтаксисе*. Москва: «Просвещение», 1966.

Шелудько 2008 = Шелудько А. В. *Труднощі словотвірного характеру в англо-українському та українсько-англійському художньому перекладі*. АКД. Київ, 2008.

Borgwaldt–Kulish–Bose 2012 = Borgwaldt S., Kulish T., Bose A. Ukrainian Blends: Elicitation paradigm and structural analysis. In: *Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Lexical Blending*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2012. 75–92.

Cannon 1986 = Cannon G. Blends in English word formation. *Linguistics* 24 (1986): 725–753.

Gut–Shumayeva 2010 = Gut N. V., Shumayeva S. P. Idiostyle and text. *International Science Edition* 2010/2: 23–27. http://dspace.udpu.org.ua:8080/jspui/bitstream/6789/995/1/Idiostyle_tekst.pdf.

Kelly 1998 = Kelly M. H. To "brunch" or to "brench": some aspects of blend structure. *Linguistics* 36 (1998): 579–590.

Renner 2012 = Renner V., Maniez F., Arnaud P. *Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Lexical Blending*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2011.