

OLEH ANDRISHKO
Independent researcher, Dnipro, Ukraine
ORCID: 0000-0003-1123-7807

ANATOLII POPOVSKYI
Dnipropetrovsk State University of Internal Affairs, Dnipro, Ukraine
ORCID: 0000-0002-8117-2730

Hermeneutic Dimension of Lexical-Syntactic Word Formation (in Ukrainian Language and Literature)

Abstract

The article considers lexical and syntactic word formation based on works of Ukrainian literature. Hermeneutics is closely related to philology, but most often examines the text from the point of view of literary criticism. The linguistic aspect, namely the study of occasionalisms, is much less studied. Attention to Ukrainian culture is growing, and in this context it can be an interesting source of hermeneutic research. This article examines the most interesting examples of occasionalisms, which by their function and non-standard structure are divided into two types – a priori and a posteriori. The difference between coalescences (words formed in a lexical-syntactic way) and similar words and phenomena has also been clarified. Most of these words are related to holophrases, but in Ukrainian literature there are examples that we call a posteriori coalescences, they are formed according to individual authorial models and have almost no analogues in the texts of other writers. We hope that this study will be an important step in the study of Ukrainian language and literature in the world and will draw attention to Ukrainian culture – a culture with millennial traditions.

Keywords: lexical-syntactic word formation, coalescence, Ukrainian language, Ukrainian literature, a priori and a posteriori occasionalisms

Introduction

Man is the creator. Regardless of origin, education, age and talent, everyone can be considered a creator to one degree or another. And the measure of such creativity is language. When we talk about linguistic universals, the language itself is that universal. Every day we communicate with the help of commonly

used words, but at the same time, for example, pronunciation, perception and understanding of them is a deeply individual, creative act.

Does this turn *homo sapiens* into *homo faber*? Can every creator of new words claim originality and perpetuation of their “creations”? Probably not. The universality of language is first and foremost in something else that can be called “*creation-in-itself*”.

Hans-Georg Gadamer reiterates the well-known view that language is constantly changing because it is not a system of inviolable rules (Gadamer 1993: 357). Both the development and the decline of language are connected not only with the “natural selection” of languages, but also with the “creativity” of man himself. One language influences another, changes it, shares new or old words and concepts, which are not always good, but also not always successful or appropriate may be occasionalisms created by a single speaker within one language. It all depends on balance.

Hermeneutics as a science of understanding and interpreting the text focuses on many aspects of human activity: there are hermeneutics theological, literary, legal, historical, political, musical, and so on. At the same time, hermeneutics focuses less on linguistics, although these sciences are as closely related as possible with the help of *word*. Heidegger analyzes the work of Hölderlin, Trakl, Stefan George, Goethe; Gadamer – Hölderlin, Goethe, Mallarmé, Rilke, Kafka, Celan; Jaus – Baudelaire, Goethe, Plenzdorf, Valéry, Rousseau. All these studies focus on the connection between philosophy and literature, but linguistics, especially word formation, also provides wide opportunities for understanding and explaining the world. It is on the linguistic aspect that we will try to focus in this work.

About the nature of words

Where did the words come from? What was the first word? When was it said and under what conditions? What part of the language? In what language is it said and in what part of the world? Has it survived to the present day and what does it mean? On what principle do people create words? It is unlikely that we will have (at least until the invention of the time machine) answers to these questions. Moreover, do we really need to know that? None of the theories of the origin of language has been proven, no Tower of Babel helps us. Therefore, it is advisable to focus on the current stage of word formation and use; at least we can understand and explain it.

The first split on these issues occurred in ancient times. The Platonists believed that the naming of things is not accidental, but due to the nature of these phenomena. Democritus rejected this theory of “compulsion”, “certainty” of naming, because the creation of words is needed only for people to communicate. Hans-Georg Gadamer believed that the primary function of a word in language is *nomination*, which is achieved through the word’s focus on itself (Gadamer 1993: 235).

Fiction also understands the functions of words and word formation, but here the views on word formation are primarily due to the development of the plot. Consider two examples.

1. Douglas Adams *The Hitchhiker’s Guide to the Galaxy*. The materialized sperm whale tries to identify itself and the world around it (Universe): “This is an interesting sensation, what is it? It’s a sort of... yawning, tingling sensation in my ...my ... well, I suppose I’d better start finding names for things if I want to make any headway in what for the sake of what I shall call an argument I shall call the world, so let’s call it my stomach” (Adams [1979])

2002: 120–121). Then he uses the same principle to create the words “head”, “wind”, “tail”, “ground”. He wants to call everything else “when the need arises”. After all, the sperm whale understands: “Now, have I built up any coherent picture of things yet? No. Never mind, hey, this is really exciting, so much to find out about, so much to look forward to, I’m quite dizzy with anticipation...” (Adams [1979] 2002: 121).

In this case, the theory of the Platonists is confirmed: the names arise according to the nature of phenomena, as explained by the creator.

2. Jaroslav Hašek *The Good Soldier Švejk*. A volunteer, editor of *The Animal World* magazine, deliberately invents the names of animals that don’t really exist, such as: the Sulphur-Belied Whale, the Artful Prosperian, the Edible Ox, the Sepia Infusorian, the Faraway Bat, the Irritable Bazouky Stag-Puss, Engineer Khun’s Flea, Underground Olm (Hašek [1921–1923] 1973: 325). Of course, ordinary readers haven’t noticed this fraud, though the Sepia Infusorian, in principle, it should alert anyone with a basic knowledge of biology. It is known that the ciliate is a single-celled organism whose habitat is water. The editor of *The Animal World* points out that his “the Sepia Infusorian” is a species of rat. The only one who draws attention to the illogicality, the inadequacy of these names, is Josef M. Kadlčák, an ornithologist. He starts a discussion about a bird that the volunteer called a “nutcracker”. The name came about because a volunteer used a picture of a bird from a magazine for another fraud. The bird was sitting on a mountain. Mr. Kadlčák argued that the name of this bird is a jay, and “nutcracker” – a literal translation from German, and therefore duplicate the name, when there is already a common equivalent, it is not necessary.

Therefore, this is where the teachings of Democritus work, but with some reference to the Platonists: word formation exists for human communication, although in the case of the jay we also have a connection to the nature of the phenomenon.

Martin Heidegger: “... the word does not give reasons for the thing. The word allows the thing to presence as thing. We shall call this allowing bethinging. The poet does not explain what this bethinging is. But the poet commit himself, that is, his Saying to this mystery of the word” (Heidegger [1957] 1971: 151).

If you say the words “mother”, “home” and “bread” – anyone in the world will easily understand their meaning. And what about occasionalisms, especially complex in structure, which are formed lexically and syntactically? It is very difficult to understand them without further explanation, consideration of the context and ideas put in by the author.

About lexical-syntactic word formation

No matter how rich the language, there are a limited number of word-formation tools. For example, Ukrainian is fusional, with active functioning of affixes, so productive ways of creating new words are affixal, parasyntactic, composition. The lexical-syntactic way of word formation (coalescence) does not belong to the productive ones, but lately its distribution is growing. Whether hermeneutics objects or accepts an ideological factor, but in the case of word formation it is significant.

The traditional structures of lexical-syntactic word formation (which consists in the gradual coalescence of phrases into one word) in the Ukrainian language are as follows: verb in the imperative mood + noun; adverb + adjective; numeral + numeral. This is often the structure of original Ukrainian surnames. Here are some of them that may be known to foreign readers: **Perebyinis** (Yevhen Perebyinis, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Ukraine to the Czech Republic); **Tiahnyb(i/o)k** (Oleh Tiahnybok, politician), **Maiboroda** (Platon and Heorhii Maiboroda, composers); **Kuibida** (Vasyl Kuibida, politician, public figure, writer, scientist) and others.

However, with the restoration of Ukraine's independence in 1991, first of all in fiction, the number of words uncharacteristic of the Ukrainian language – holophrases – increased. This is due to the influence of the English language and the spread of postmodernism, which could not be given by biased socialist realism. In English-language literature, holophrases are widespread and often very complex in structure. Example: “Even the supposedly simple trail of **like-a-drink-fancy-a-dancewalk-you-home-how-about-a-coffee?** involved a bravado I was incapable of” (Barnes 2011: 20). We have no less word in Ukrainian literature: Кудусай дивується твоїй байдужості, котру ти ховаєш за втомою, дивується твоїй втомі, котру **ти-робиш-вигляд-що-ховаєш-за-байдужістю-аби-видатись-люблячим**, дивується твоїй любові, яка зовсім не схожа на його, Магіяша Кудусая, любов до Америки¹ (Izdryk 1997).

What do these structures have in common, apart from the complex structure? At first glance, they are not words at all, because they are difficult to perceive as such and just as difficult to imagine in a dictionary.

What they have in common is that all the components lose their original meaning, and together they are understood as something new that you can try to replace with one, shorter word. Most often, an indication of this meaning is already in the text itself. For example, Barnes has the word “trail”, Izdryk – “втома” (“fatigue”).

The presence of such values that makes the text hermeneutically valuable. Probably one of the disadvantages is that holophrases and related phenomena are difficult to hear as one word. The contradiction between what is said and what is written can be seen as a semantic dispute, which makes these words extremely interesting objects for research. The most important thing is to find an explanation of such words in the written one; otherwise, they will be just an unsuccessful experiment of the author.

Samuel Beckett writes about James Joyce's novel *Finnegans Wake*:

Here form is content, content is form. You complain that this stuff is not written in English. It is not written at all. It is not to be read – or rather it is not only to be read. It is to be looked at and listened to. His writing is not about something; it is that something itself [...] When the sense is sleep, the words go to sleep. (See the end of 'Anna Livia'). When the sense is dancing, the words dance. (Beckett 1929: 10)

Therefore, the task of both commonly used and occasional words, including those formed by lexical and syntactic methods, is to combine form and content so that the seemingly awkward, overloaded construction actually concentrates the simple and clear meaning of the author. Then the text and word formation can be considered outstanding.

1 English translation (unless otherwise indicated, translations are those by the authors): Kudasai is surprised by your indifference, which you hide behind fatigue, is surprised by your fatigue, which **you-pretend-what-you-hide-behind-indifference-to-appear-loving**, is surprised by your love, who is not at all like him, Matthias Kudasai, love for America.

About coalescence, metaphor, epithet and untranslatability

What are the special conjunctions compared to “ordinary” words? One of such specific features is untranslatability, which we will see later. Although many holophrases of the Ukrainian language are modeled on English or German, national identity plays an important role, especially with regard to occasionalisms based on a different principle. Of course, the length of the word and the number of elements in it are also important. We understand from the above quotations from Julian Barnes and Yuriy Izdryk that these can be very complex constructions.

Göran Kjellmer notes that “all realised words have been potential words, whereas not all potential words will be realized” (Kjellmer 2000: 207). Is there a limit to such words? The longest possible word today – the full name of the protein titin – more than 180 thousand letters. Of course, the author’s occasionalisms are shorter, but still usually difficult to perceive. Probably, the limit of understanding such words is *an epithet* and *a metaphor*. You can write at intervals at least the entire text of an elegant book, but then it will turn into just a set of letters. The probability of adequate perception of such a word is not more than the probability of a large asteroid falling to Earth. Therefore, metaphor is one of the drivers of perception of coalescence.

Paul Ricoeur writes about the phenomenon of semantic innovation and emphasizes that both in metaphor and in narrative, human creativity must be different when something new, not yet known, appears in language (Ricoeur 1986: 20-21). According to Jean-Luc Nancy, speech is corporeal, but what is said is incorporeal and manifests itself in the world as appearance (Nancy 1996: 108). What about writing? Coalescences are clear to us when we see them. It is difficult to “hear” them as one word. Perhaps, the situation is similar to speech: there is something that enlivens the word, in spite of the structure. It is an act of creativity, common form and meaning and along with such creativity – the problem of untranslatability, especially holophrasis, which can’t always be successfully solved.

About a priori and a posteriori word formation

In 1817 Jean-François Sudre published the idea of a universal language, which he called “solresol”. Its uniqueness was that all its words consist of the names of seven musical note. Moreover, if in natural languages we are accustomed to common root words, affixes, then there is no such thing: the order is arbitrary, as well as meaning. Solresol belongs to the a priori languages, grammar and vocabulary of which are created from scratch, based on the imagination of the author or on certain calculations. This is how they differ from artificial a posteriori languages, the elements of which are borrowed from natural languages. The same with word formation. By analogy, most occasionalisms that are formed lexically and syntactically can be called a posteriori, because they are formed on more or less established models. For those occasionalisms that are formed by familiar, well-known schemes, we propose to use the definition of *a posteriori*. For those splices that are formed atypically, thanks to the author’s search primarily for the form, we offer *a priori* definitions. Consider these varieties below. Let’s start with *a posteriori* occasionalisms.

Universality of Oksana Zabuzhko's holophrases

54

Usually the author uses occasional mergers in only one genre, if he writes in several. However, there are cases when mergers are available in all genres in which the author works. A striking example is Oksana Zabuzhko, whose holophrases are in prose, poetry and non-fiction.

Може, справді єдиний вихід із цієї в'язниці – виходити вечорами, низько ослонивши лице каптуром плаща, сідати в проїжджі авта, не називаючи імені, рука водія на коліні, низький, захриплий смішок, гарячковий шурхіт зайвої одежі, не треба вмикати світла, не треба розплющувати очей, слухати лиш клакїт крові, чоловічу партію ударних і своє, **чи-вже-не-своє**, розчинення-розступання...² (Zabuzhko [1996] 2011)

Here, the holophrasis **no-longer-your-own** is connected with the words “one's own” and “dissolution” and is an element of the stream of consciousness, expediently used by the author to convey a certain mood. This compresses the description of a casual acquaintance, and helps to more accurately convey the emotions of the heroine. Compare: “no longer your own” and “no-longer-your-own”. The difference in meaning is obvious, although it is clearly expressed only in writing.

Here is a quote from *Ballad about Offside*: “Де ж та межа, летюча і хистка, той **крок-в-ніде**, що душу рве на спайки?”³ (Zabuzhko 1985: 21).

The same obvious difference in the perception of the concepts of “step”, “step in nowhere” and “step-in-nowhere”. “In-nowhere” simultaneously indicates the direction (where?), defines (which?) and clarifies the word-appendix (what?), and is associated with the concept of “limit”, because it is obvious that this “step-in-nowhere” begins where the border ends. The poetess emphasizes the existentiality of being. This is the concentration of meanings and concepts in one word. “Step-in-nowhere” – the greatest tragedy of the lyrical hero, his pain.

He is a footballer, a forward, beats half the team, gives a spectacle, but every time he scores a goal, he is offside. When he finally gets a chance to score “correctly”, he hits at random, thinking he is out of the game again, which makes the coach angry. For the lyrical hero “step-in-nowhere”, offside – decisive on the way to achieving the goal. Anyone who has played football at least once and found himself in an offside position must understand the hero's despair, because there may not be another opportunity to score a goal. Similarly, this “step-in-nowhere”, even a millimeter, not immediately visible to the human eye, can be painful for fans.

In the essay *The Ithaca Complex*, the famous island from *the Odyssey* is defined not only as “parental home”, but also as “a place-where-you-can-return”:

Коротко, якщо для гомерівського грека безсумнівною була сама наявність Ітаки як незмінної духовної вітчизни, дому, “отчого порога”, себто **місця-куди-можна-повернутися**, – то Одиссей

2 English translation (by Halyna Hryn [(1996) 2011]): Perhaps, really, the only way out of this prison is to go out at night, hiding your face deep in the hood of your coat, to get into strangers' cars without giving your name, the hand of the driver on your knee, a low, husky chuckle, a feverish rustle of excess clothing, no need to turn on the lights, just listen to the rumble of your blood, the male percussion part and your **no-longer-your-own** dissolving, dispersing....

3 English translation: Where is the limit, volatile and shaky, the **step-in-nowhere** that tears the soul to pieces?

кінця 20-го століття, кидаючи, нарешті, якір біля омріяного рідного берега, ризикує не тільки бути невпізнаним – він ризикує сам не впізнати Телемаха.⁴ (Zabuzhko [1999] 2009: 92)

Odysseus, the ancient Greek prodigal son, as his biblical brother and essayist, a man repressed by the Soviet authorities, returns to their home, but both Odysseus and the prodigal son are recognized at home, while the repressed is forgotten. Therefore, there is a “place-to-return”, but the result of the return may be different.

Futuristic experiments of Mykhailo Semenko

Hans-Georg Gadamer emphasized that a three-year-old child behaves better than an adult and that only some poets can express the unspoken by violating the rules of the language. (Gadamer 1993: 254–255).

An illustrative example is the memoirs of Nobel laureate Richard Phillips Feynman. When during the banquet he decided to entertain the children and recited a poem in a fictional language similar to Italian. There was a dispute between the adults over whether it was Latin or Italian, but only the children guessed the truth (Feynman [1985] 1997: 42–44).

In his program poem *City* (there are five poems with this title) Mykhailo Semenko, the founder of Ukrainian futurism, uses the word “автомобілібілі”:

візники – люди
трамваї – люди
автомобілібілі
бігорух рухобіги
рухливобіги⁵
(Semenko 2010: 34)

Here the coalescence of “автомобілібілі” is both a subjunctive phrase (white cars), and a deliberate repetition of syllables (bili-bili), and sound imitation (bili-bili). All this successfully conveys the worldview of the futurists: the city, the metaphor of movement, technological progress. Futurists and dadaists, on the one hand, seek to renew language and, on the other, declare the triumph of form, not content, although content is still present in their latter, no matter how much they try to say otherwise. For example, “bilibili” will still have a certain meaning, although it is not easy to say unequivocally which of the three. On the one hand, “bili-bili” (sound imitation) seems the most logical. On the other hand – white car be composed of several other colors, white car is considered massive, standard, many of which are on the streets. Collage, combination – a common artistic technique of futurists and dadaists. But the

4 English translation: In short, if for the Homeric Greek there was no doubt about the very presence of Ithaca as an unchanging spiritual homeland, home, “father’s threshold”, that is, a **place-where-to-return**, – then Odysseus of the late 20th century, finally dropping anchor near the dream home, risks not only being unrecognizable – he risks not recognizing Telemachus himself.

5 English translation: drivers – people
trams – people
automobilibili
running-movement movement-runnings
agile-running

sound imitation of “bili-bili” is also similar to children’s language, so the poet, perhaps without suspecting it, confirmed Gadamer’s thesis.

A priori word formation: Ostap Vyshnia

In the diary of Ostap Vyshnia we read:

Мені дуже страшно дожити до того моменту (чи часу), коли дзвінкосерйозний Малишко, або лютодотепний Воскрекасенко, чи неспіливо-спіливий Смілянський, чи колючий Маківчук, чи **ййбогужялюблюприроду** Новиченко, чи **авиколінебудьяган** Гончаренко, чи **недайбогхтонебудьдізнаєтьсящояспінінгіст** Вільховий, чи **ййбогуятоваришіобов’язковопоідуаяжжеж** Копиленко, чи **татамдвіщучкийодинокуничик** Дорошко, чи **поїхалябачилинестрілялякстріляліневлучили** Рильський, чи **можеайбожеябпоїхавтаквонаякстріляетакбахкаеаптикажвонахочезити** Тичина, чи **івменебуаасучечкаойсучечкачорнахорошаіаййбогумисливець** Корнійчук, чи **ойщовименіговоритябільшефутболіст** Смолич, чи **ойохотавонаменепродменамочить** Яновський, чи **словочестіубившістсотнайшоводну** Чалий, чи **івменепесгавкаеаяжодинавменехазяїн** Склярєнко, чи **нащоменімисливськарушницяколятойщогреблірвав** Воронько, чи **австалинградемынеохотились** Палійчук, чи **актоегознаетстреляетнестреляет** Ушаков, чи **ярославмудрийтежходивналови** Кочерга, – от коли ці всі коли-небудь скажуть: “Остап Вишня – старий!” – І, збираючись на полювання, додадуть: “Не турбуйте його!” – Я того ж часу – візьму й помру!⁶ (Vyshnia 1989: 447)

Ostap Vyshnia (real name and surname – Pavlo Hubenko) was not only a famous humorist and satirist, but also loved nature. He often went hunting, but never killed an animal: hunting helped him to be closer to nature, to freedom. Although the Soviet government partially compensated the author for the damage she did as a minister, it is unlikely that the satirist was completely satisfied with it (he was arrested three times, exiled to camps, including the Gulag). One of Ostap Vyshnia’s closest friends was the well-known modernist poet, translator, linguist, and literary critic Maksym Rylskyi. It is known that hunting was their common hobby. Other writers, especially Petro Doroshko, often hunted them. Ostap Vyshnia, with his inherent sense of humor, endows each of them with epithet characteristics that differ in their structural complexity. In these occasionalisms, the author not only conveyed the most common statements of these

6 English translation: In the diary of Ostap Vyshnia we read: “I am very scared to live to the moment (or time) when a clinking-serious Malyshko, or a very-jestful Voskrekasenko, or a shy-brave Smilyanskiy, or an arrowy Makivchuk, or a **byGodIlovenature** Novychenko, or a **haveyoueverpulled** Honcharenko, or a **GodforbidanyonefindsoutI’mspinner** Vilkhoviy, or a **byGodIcomradeswilldefinitelygoaswell** Kopylenko, or a **buttherearetwopikeandoneperch** Doroshko, or a **wewentsawdidn’tshootasweshotdidn’thit** Rylskyi, or a **maybeIwouldgotooobecauseitshootsitsbangandthebirdwantstolive** Tychna, or an **andIhadabitchdogohbitchdogblackgoodandI’mbyGodahunter** Korniiichuk, or **oanhyou’retellingmeI’mmoreofasoccerplayer** Smolych, or an **ohhuntingitwillblowmeawaywetme** Yanovskyi, or a **bymyfayIkilledsixhundredfoundone** Chalyi, or an **andmydogbarksandI’maloneandIhaveamaster** Skliarenko, or a **whydoIneedahuntingriflwhenI’mtheonewhorentthedikes** Voronko, or an **andinStalingradwedidnothunt** Paliichuk, or an **andwhoknowshimshootsdoesnotshoot** Ushakov, or an **YaroslavtheWisealsowentfishing** Kocherha, – that’s when all these people will ever say: “Ostap Vyshnia is old!” – And, going on a hunt, they will add: “Do not disturb him!” “I will take it and die at the same time!”

writers during the hunt, but also left indications of their work or hobbies. For example: Ivan Kocherha – the author of the play *Yaroslav the Wise*; Platon Voronko – the author of the poem *I'm the one who rents the dikes* (The one who rents the dikes – a mythological character from the work of Lesia Ukrainka *Forest Song*), also a poet during World War II was a demolition worker; the theme of nature is the main one in the early works of Pavlo Tychyna (an outstanding symbolist); children's writer Olexandr Kopylenko also wrote a lot about nature; Yurii Yanovskyi was in poor health; Yurii Smolych, one of the most ambiguous writers of the Soviet era, played football for the *ZhKF* team (Zhmerynka football team) in his youth, which he mentioned in his book *I Choose Literature*.

Vasyl Stus: against the system

The twentieth century is the century of the development of dystopias. The two world wars, the formation and fall of totalitarian regimes, the development of technology and bureaucracy. No wonder George Orwell in the novel *1984* created a newspeak – the language of the totalitarian regime, based on Nazi and communist documents: “Newspeak was characterized by the elimination or alteration of certain words, the substitution of one word for another, the interchangeability of parts of speech, and the creation of words for political purposes. The word has caught on in general use to refer to confusing or deceptive bureaucratic jargon” (Merriam-Webster 2022).

Vasyl Stus, an outstanding poet, Nobel Prize contender, dissident, and prisoner of the Soviet regime, begins his poem with an official statement:

**Вперіодрозгорнутогобудівни-
цтвакомунізмунавсьомуфронті**
я вийшов уранці за ворота –
бачу: крізь штахетини
коза пробує дістати цибулю
з палісадника
(у цибулі багато вітамінів,
отож її садять замість квіток)⁷
(Stus 1990: 72)

“Extensive construction of communism” is a widely used term of the 1960s, associated with Khrushchev's speech at the regular congress of the CPSU in 1961, where he stated that in ten years the Soviet Union would be ahead of the United States in economic terms. Vasyl Stus reflected the absurdity of both this aspiration and party directives with the help of his “newspeak”, combining the communist

7 English translation: **During the period of extensive construction-
communism on the whole front**

I went out the gate in the morning –
I see through the fences
goat tries to get onions
from the front garden
(onions are rich in vitamins,
so it is planted instead of flowers).

slogan in one word. The merger is reminiscent of both the impossibility of implementing the plan and the attempt to persuade society through the constant repetition of party directives.

Vasyl Stus uses a similar artistic technique in the poem *Escaping from Doubts...* Occasionalism combines the speech of party secretaries with sharp sarcasm about Soviet reality. This sarcasm is complemented by writing the party abbreviation in lower case:

Рятуєчись од сумнівів,
 б'ю телеграму собі самому:
вчасколивесьрадянськийнарод
івсе прогресивнелюдствоготується
гідно зустріти черговий з'їзд кпрс
 бажаю тобі великих успіхів,
 щиро заздрю, що ось уже тридцять років
 ти живеш у найщасливішій у світі країні⁸
 (Stus 1990: 45)

Conclusions

Thus, occasional coalescence are an interesting subject of study. Thanks to such words a person not only has the opportunity to express his creative essence, but also to understand the limitless possibilities of language, as far as possible for the human mind. We can assume that some similar in structure “occasionalisms” – or the results of typographical errors, or human negligence, illiteracy, but in the creation of coalescences, the author invests the unity of content and form. Trails such as metaphor and epithet play an important role in this. Only in this case we can talk about a successful experience of word formation. Sometimes untranslatability and comprehension (if there are no hyphens) are the main obstacles in understanding such words. All languages are different, have different word-formation means, so in the case of translation, either the form or the content of the union can often be lost, and in some cases (see: examples from Ostap Vyshnia [1989] or Vasyl Stus [1990]) a full translation is hardly possible. We proposed to divide the splices into a priori (formed with the help of individual author's models) and a posteriori (formed according to standard schemes). In both cases, the occasionalism shows that the potential word can surprise anyone.

8 English translation: Escaping from doubt,
 I send a telegram to myself:

at a time when the entire soviet people
and all progressive humanity is preparing
worthy to meet the next congress of the cpsu

I wish you great success,

I sincerely envy that for thirty years you live in the happiest country in the world.

References

- Adams, Douglas ([1979] 2002) [Original title: *The Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy*. London: Pan Books]. *The Ultimate Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy*. New York: Del Rey / Ballantine Books.
- Barnes, Julian (2011) *The Sence of an Ending*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Beckett, Samuel (1929) *Dante... Bruno. Vico.. Joyce / Our Exagmination Round His Factification for Incamination of Work in Progress*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Feynman, Richard, Ralph Leighton (contributor), Edward Hutchings (ed.) ([1985] 1997). *Surely You're Joking, Mr. Feynman!: Adventures of a Curious Character*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg (1993) *Gesammelte Werke – Bd. 8: Ästhetik und Poetik. – 1. Kunst als Aussage*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Heidegger, Martin ([1959] 1971) [*Unterwegs zur Sprache*. Pfullingen: Verlag Günther Neske]. *On the Way to Language*. Translated into English by Peter Hertz. New York: Harper & Row.
- Hašek, Jaroslav ([1921–1923] 1973) [*Osudy dobrého vojáka Švejka za světové války*. Praha]. *The Good Soldier Švejk and His Fortunes in the World War*. Translated into English by Cecil Parrott. London: William Heinemann.
- Izdryk, Yurii (1997) Воццек. [Latin transcription: *Wozzeck*]. Ivano-Frankivsk: Lileia-NV.
- Kjellmer, Göran (2000) "Potential words." [In:] *Word*. Volume 51:2; 205–228.
- Nancy, Jean-Luc (1996) *Être singulier pluriel*. Paris: Galilée.
- Ricoeur, Paul (1986) *Du texte à l'action. Essais d'herméneutique II*. Paris: Le Seuil.
- Semenko, Mykhaïl (2010) Вибрані твори. [Latin transcription: *Vybrani tvory*]. Kyiv: Smoloskyp.
- Stus, Vasyl (1990) Веселий цвинтар [Latin transcription: *Veselyi tsvyntar*]. Warsawa: Zakład Wydawniczy Związku Ukraińców w Polsce.
- Vyshnia, Ostar (1989) Вибрані твори. Т. 4. [Latin transcription: *Vybrani tvory*. Issue 4.] Kyiv: Dnipro.
- Zabuzhko, Oksana ([1996] 2011) [Польові дослідження з українського сексу. *Kyiv: Zhoda*]. *Fieldwork in Ukrainian Sex*. Translated into English by Halyna Hryn. Las Vegas: Amazon Crossing.
- Zabuzhko, Oksana (1985) Травневий іній [Latin transcription: *Travnevyy inii*]. Kyiv: Molod.
- Zabuzhko, Oksana (1996) Польові дослідження з українського сексу. [Latin transcription: *Polovi doslidzhennia z ukrainskoho seksu*]. Kyiv: Zhoda.
- Zabuzhko, Oksana ([1999] 2009) Хроніки від Фортінбраса. [Latin transcription: *Khroniky vid Fortinbrasa*]. Kyiv: Fact.

Internet source

Merriam-Webster Dictionary (2022) [At:] <https://www.merriam-webster.com> [date of access: 15.04.2022].

Received:
16.04.2022
Reviewed:
09.05.2022
Accepted:
19.07.2022

