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The article examines the lexico-semantic groups of commonly used and territorially marked vocabulary as a means of stylising the colloquiality in the modern literary narrative and it also describes the qualitative properties and the stylistic potential of the colloquial vocabulary in the aesthetic language plot of the novel Inauguration by Myroslav Lazaruk. The author considers the stylistically marked words and phrases that provide a general background of the novel and give it the status of a regional vocabulary of colloquial language. Of particular importance are the words that mark the identity of the heroes to the Soviet era with characteristic lexical range.
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Introduction

The philological studios of scholars have proved that the territory of Bukovyna is poly-ethnic and distinctive with its traditions, culture and language. The worldview of its representatives is an abundant field for scientific studies, especially linguistic ones, that is why a complex and systematic research is needed to study the language of this region, the contribution of the regional writers and cultural workers in the development of the Ukrainian standard language, the dialectology, the lingua-stylistics, etc. Special attention deserves the language formation of the Ukrainian writers of Bukovyna (the region of oaks – historical area, situated between middle stream of Dnipro river and main Carpathian edge in the valleys of upper stream of Prut and Siret rivers.) at the beginning of the twenty-first century because up to now it hasn’t been the subject of any monographic and scientific research, which confirms the actuality of this article.

In the era of globalisation of the socio-political, economical and cultural life, special attention is given to the linguistic problem of correlation of the written language, which exists on the terrain of a certain region, with the standard written language. In particular, special attention is needed in the study of the correlation of the common language, the regional language and the individual language in the literary text (works of Bilodid, 1986; Bulakhovskiy, 1987; Vynohradov, 1977, 1981; Huivaniuk, 2004, 2009; Zhovtobriukh, 1995; Zahnitko, 2000); Solohub, 2007; Statieieva, 1997, 2009; Cherednychenko,1995 and others). One of the pivotal categories in the linguostylistics of a prose text is the category of the colloquiality, the nature of which is revealed during the interaction of the written language and the spoken language (Greshchuk, 2009; Yermolenko, 2003, 2005; Matsko, 1983, 2003; Ozhyhova, 2003; Siuta, 2007; Tkachenko, 2006; Tsurkan, 2012, 2014 and others).

The specificity of the Ukrainian literary process in Bukovyna, and also the level of its relation with different national literature have gained attention from researchers and literature specialists (Antofiichuk, 2001, 2003; Bunchuk, 2001; Vozniuk, 2003; Ivasiuk, 2001; Kyryliuk, 2001; Kovalets, 2003; Melnychuk, 2001; Melnychuk, 2001; Pylypchuk, 2003; M. Yuriichuk, 2003 and others), and also the linguists who studied the language of the Bukovynian writers in its polygenre expression (Babych, 1984; Herman, 1984, 2008; Huivaniuk, 2012; Kulhabska, 2011, 2014; Prokopenko, 1958, 1963; Rusnak, 2009; Shabat-Savka, 2014; Shatilova, 2010; Zaits (Berehech), 2008, 2010; Kryshtanovych, 2006; Tomusiak, 2011; Franko, 1983 and others).

The aim of our research is to study the means of stylising the colloquiality in the novel Inauguration of Myroslav Lazaruk, where the theme of modern life in the Bukovynian region is reflected, the originality of the people – characters of the book, their language embodiment of commonly used vocabulary and territorially marked vocabulary.

Myroslav Lazaruk is a Bukovynian writer, whose written works are abundant with lexemes of the southwestern dialect. The master of the word was born on October 13, 1956 in the Korolivka village of the Kolomyia District of the Ivano-Frankivsk Oblast. He lived and studied in Chernivtsi from the age of thirteen. In 1979 he graduated from Ivan Franko National University of Lviv, but his professional and creative writing unfolded in Bukovyna (in the Department of Culture and Arts of the Chernivtsi Oblast State Administration, and as the editor in chief of the journal Bukovynskyi Zhurnal). B. Bunchuk believes that the works of
M. Lazaruk pierce the motive of the native motherland – Ukraine, which “begins for him in Kolomyishchyna” (Mel'nychuk, 2003, p. 335). He doesn’t plunge into the regional ethnography motives, but M. Lazaruk shows his connection with the Pokuttian-Bukovynian language region like so:

“Whoever has read at least some of my poems, prose or essays couldn’t have noticed this. I haven’t broken the genetic, the dialecticsisms or the locutions in me. All of this is from Prykarpattia, with the specific name – Pokuttia. Pokuttia is a remote corner in Sniatyn, part of the Kosiv District and part of Kolomyia District. It is in that place where Pokuttia borders with Hutulschyna. If one were to dig deeper, it could be claimed that I am half Hutsul because my mother’s roots come from there (Pylypy village of the Kolomyia District) and my father is from Matiivtsi from the other side of the Prut River. These two elements have been fighting in me from the day I was born till today.” (Interv’yu z Myroslavom Lazarukom, 2010)

In general, the problem of studying the phenomena of colloquiality in the written prose is linked first of all to the research of the quantitative and the qualitative features of the colloquial vocabulary in the aesthetic language plot of the novel. In the last decade, the idea that the colloquial units of a language are the phenomena of culture and reflect “the colloquial image of the world” is spreading (Bartmiński, 2010, p. 79). It is on the lexico-semantic features of colloquiality that Yermolenko (1999) accents, when she states that “the category of colloquiality […] is closely connected with the category of dialecticsisms, regional differences of the national language” (p. 227). This thought corresponds with the views of Pylynskyi (1982), who stated that the level, the quality of colloquiality of this or that vocabulary depends on: a) the level of fixedness of the norms of the modern written styles; b) how the expressive features of the colloquial lexemes transform in different styles; c) how the colloquial word is used automatically or constructively according to the standards of a style (Pylyns’kyy, 1982, pp. 26, 28-35). Lexicologists, dialectologists and stylistic scholars differently formulate the valuation of the role and the functions of modified colloquial lexemes in texts, however, they agree that they serve a communicative function, ethnographic function and an expressive function (S. Yermolenko, 1990; Zelenko, 1983; Hrytsenko, 1990, 1998 and others).

Method
The specificity of the topic caused an integrated approach to the use of research methods, including: narrative – for selecting, ordering and interpretation of factual material; comparisons – for analysis, synthesis and synthesis of scientific theories and methods of linguistic observation, classification and systematisation – to separate linguistic phenomena into separate groups based on the differential characteristics. The methods of stylistic and semantic analyses helped to establish the semantic content of text harvester styling language means of colloquiality. Using the method of functional and stylistic analysis of the language of prose texts describe the stylistic rate of one period in the history of literary and linguistic process and expression of the author's individual style rules in the works of writers united territory which formed their linguistic consciousnes.

Results and discussion
In the following paragraphs we will focus on the phonographic, the word forming and the lexical fundamentals of the stylisation of colloquiality in the novel Inauguration by M. Lazaruk.

1. The phonographic stylistisation of colloquiality. It is common for a writer to save the peculiar sound form of a dialect word, its systematic and unsystematic changes: the sound syllable, the grouping of sounds, the sounds’ connection, interchangeability and sound changes, which as a rule are qualified in linguistics as features of Hutsulian-Bukovynian-Pokuttian dialects: the changing of the sound o [o] to u [u]: Пуйняв, Гапоне Гапоновичу, дорогий наш друже-ідеологе?! (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 168); the parallel use of words with the sounds (sound combinations) кх [kv], кх [khv] and ф [f]: Був, так би мовити, міським хвілозофом, а не якимсь селюком-фабіаном, в якого тільки й друзів, що лаписько крутогоргій (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 224); the use of the prothetic у [ju]: ... бо хоч я був маленьким і дурненьким, та інду фразу таки нам’ятаю, що маємо йти другим путьом! (p. 168); the pronunciation of foreign words with the denotation of the palatal ь [ь']: Плян Жори, геть ще юного, але вже об’єдженого вождя, був геніально простим, підступним, непередбачуваним (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 116); Тільки ж Ціпочка таких речей не декларувала воголос, бо ж краще популяризувати іншу проповідь, майже за древніми греками, я варти того, що нічого не вартий (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 15). Words with the prothetic consonant з [h] are found in the novel which is characteristic for the Volynian-Kholmian and Podlachian dialects: Його кулі не беруть. Хіба гангреківських фільмів не бачив? (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 67); Гінтелігентик задовбаний, – чу в услів від здекласованих сусідів (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 224).
2. Word creation markers of colloquiality. A wide group of colloquial vocabulary, recorded in the novel, are word-formative nominations of colloquiality. Moreover, these features are present not only in commonly spoken vocabulary, but in vocabulary which is as a rule marked in dictionaries as dialectic, jargon, i.e. words of narrower sphere of usage. In a literary text the units of the colloquial style sphere become expressive units with the feature of “colloquiality” (or as Boiko (2006) puts it “the image of colloquiality” (p. 36). The word creation of colloquiality is inseparable from the lexical and is reasoned by the existence of the characteristic formants in the lexico-grammatical classes of words – nouns, adjectives and verbs which create the colloquial shade of the semantics (Rusanivs’kyy, 1977, p. 51-55).

In M. Lazaruk’s novel (2006) the nominations with the suffixes of a subjective evaluation form the basis for irony and mockery of moral or psychological defects of supervisors-managers, for example: У прийманні його очікував хтось із заступників, а з дверей кущенько кабінетика виглядали переланяні очі помічника (p. 29); На службовому транспорті долому не їздив, але спершу квартиру в центрі, а відтак і особливо вимостив, як пташка зійдо (p. 36). In the language of some characters this is a sign of wheedling into the leaders’ favour that are of lower ranks: Гведовичу! Жартники у вас, – з недовір’ям глянув лівим оком Кольцьо (p. 32); Даремно ви, Миколо Миколайовичу, трубочку кидаєте (p. 202); as a means to signify the pronouncedly positive mood to a conversational partner: Не чекала? Ну, та байдуже. Зробі кавусю, ну і, звичайно – грамусик! (p. 86); to bring out the intimate relationship between individuals: Вибігла Надька з маленькою тацею, а на ній графічник, філіжаночка з кавою, що паруvala нетерплявою, і інші нюанси для Джулі (p. 87): Ларка йому підігравала. Хутенько побігла до мазниця прийняти душ, після роботи ж, і вийшла в кущенької заявленийому халатику (p. 95); Ніби й нічого не сталося, не змовляючись, повільніма із тайничків повнісількі купори з Джорджами (p. 132); or disrespect for someone: Заступниці ніякою переглядалася, ніби бачилася вперше (p. 187).

Many univerbates are observed in the language of the novel that are created in the spoken colloquial language on the basis of word combinations and fixed in stylised expressions of novel characters, and in the emotional evaluations of the narrator. These are the names of individuals: Наперед виступив перший заступник – передпенсіонер Вітольд Саміліович Прунін, великий речник (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 157); Ця придибаюча легко зійшла з рук новоспеченому віцікові (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 29); food products and drinks: Інтуїтивно він повернувся до опочивальни, де напивав півляпляки перцівки, яку й засмоктав без перепочинку (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 67); Бувало, як вліє в себе з пів’яких червоного “портишку”, зап’є фірмою шипучку (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 83).

Thus, vocabulary with features of word creation of colloquiality, which, depending on the textual stylised situation, renders different spectrums of emotionality and expressiveness, has been recorded in the novel.

3. The lexical markers of colloquiality (household nominations, the names of individuals, features, actions and processes, south-western dialecticisms). The analysis of the given material shows the author’s use of such lexical means of stylisation of colloquiality as household nominations – words with a concrete material meaning which represent the language “image” of the mode of life of a certain people, ethnos or social group. So, household vocabulary is commonly used for denoting:
- technical devices: колгоспник (a member of a collective farm), definition not found in the dictionary – “radio receiver”; “Колгоспник” давно охрип, тільки зрідка у нього повертався свіжий голос (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 147);
- food: А для Джулі – шніцельок (p. 69);
- beverages: шампусик (bubbly, with features of word creation of colloquiality): Він геть скромно пригубив шампусик (p. 184);
- vehicles and their secondary expressive nominations (definitions not found in the dictionary): З носатого автобуса, якого в народі називають “черевичком”, позіхаючи і тручи очі, ледачкувато виходили духовики (p. 51).

The language of the analysed text is deeply social, oriented on representing an individual in the spatio-temporal and socio-cultural coordinates (in the nineteenth of the twentieth century and the beginning of the twenty-first century). At the core of these historical changes there is a group of names of individuals, representing the base of relations common to mankind and to gender in the daily life, and those who in the real life and in the literary and figurative plot of the prose give the ability to map out the axiological parameters of relations, the reaction of the characters to actions and events.

Among the means of stylisation of colloquiality in the literary narration of M. Lazaruk the territorial units of language – the dialecticisms draw the attention to their communicative, ethnographic and expressive functions. They indicate the community of processes and situations in which the language consciousness of the writers was formed. Hence, in the analysed text lexical dialecticisms were recorded, among which are

The colloquial names for women are presented in the text by the writer through nominations that define people of the female sex in general, for instance: Порожують її коханому Коцекові через якусь бабегу (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 214); Та за яких таких баб-с, – ще більше розлютився Гапон Гапонович (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 64).

When it comes to the colloquial names for men, they have a lot of expressive components with negative connotations. So, let’s differentiate the nominations for defining individual:

− by age: Доста, доста, вивалить звідси! Я тобі не щаркач (offensive, “a young, uneducated person in Slovnyk ukrayins’koi movy, Vol.11, p. 198): я т-тобі, – він почав розмахувати руками так смішно й хаотично (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 122);

− by language: Тс-с-с, не патякай. Словоблуде (offensive, “a person for who it is characteristic to talk foolishly” in Slovnyk ukrayins’koi movy, Vol.9, p. 372), бо ще хто почує (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 5); Трінацько (colloquial, not found in the dictionary word, created by a widely used model for creating names for people with the suffix – ач, тьй Касторович (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 4);

− by mental peculiarities: Для таких охламонів (окхамон: colloquial – characterising a fool and a do-nothing person in Busel, 2005, p. 692), як ти, може, й усе одно, а для шефів – ні (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 23); Ая-яже, він же тут баль править, а не ці охламончики (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 34);

− by the lively character of a person: Ну, хоч би той же ватник (colloquial, “a restless, active person” in Slovnyk ukrayins’koi movy, Vol. 2, p. 517), як його, – знову надпив коньяк, – Жора Шмалець, хоч і гарячий, з тієї запозичити, як баран некерований, увійти лобом в одну точку (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 25);

− by the peculiarities of behaviour, physical condition or habits: Вони частенько вносили вироки найбільшими хапугам (colloquial, “a person who takes bribes in Slovnyk ukrayins’koi movy, Vol. 11, p. 22) і кормочкам (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 40);

Colloquial names of people, used for denoting their occupation, are found in the modern language of the novel, as they stylistise different social classes of a society. Most of these nominations have word creation features of colloquiality because they are created with suffixes which give a word the expression of offensiveness (-ак): З таких служак люди ще будуєть (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 25); as a result of shortening the stem of a word and adding в’іцьк (spoken colloq. “vice-“): Жорж, наприклад, щодня наполегливо оббивав пороги “в’іців” (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 133); Свою приреченість мормони-в’іцики відчули давно (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 155).

Colloquial names of people according to their occupation were formed through reinterpretation of the semantics in the spoken colloquial language have also been identified, for instance: Вільготно почувалися тільки найбільшим членам (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 64); in the text a situational nomination of smart managers) вже поколотилися (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 121).

In the story structure, colloquial names of individuals for denoting relationship are found with the se:menes:

− “friendship”: Брати (collective, familiar – “companions, friends”: Slovnyk ukrayins’koi movy, Vol. 1, p. 227), а в мене тос (Lazaruk, 2006, p.63);

− “alienation”: Та процес перестав бути керованим, у кабінеті почали з'являтися чужаки (colloquial – “an unfamiliar person”: Slovnyk ukrayins’koi movy, Vol.11, p. 377) – представники грамадської, інтелігенції (Lazaruk, 2006, p.158);

− “roughness”: Ти лихо з нею, тією орієнтацією, все одно у мазничці самі мужлани (p. 64) – not found in the dictionary, but widely used in spoken language. Його вже дістали сосунки (colloquial, here: figurative “an independent, false person who sponges off someone materially and mentally in Slovnyk ukrayins’koi movy, Vol. 9, p. 470) і кар’єристи, політичні приховки (offensive “one who worms oneself into favour of someone”: Slovnyk ukrayins’koi movy, Vol. 8, p. 79), відщепенці, цироністи (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 185).

Another means of stylisation in the novel is colloquial attributive vocabulary – adjectives, as a rule, which make the offensive perception, evaluation, the character of real things more expressive:

− Та виаркнутому (from the word харкати “to exectorate”: colloquial “to spit phlegm” in Slovnyk
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ukrayins'koi movy, 11, p. 142) з ноті дракониську байдужісіньку (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 48);

– Ta я-а-я ти смісця, парашутніще нецісний! (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 6). Spoken – used for expressing disrespect (Slovnyk ukrayins'koi movy, 5, p. 352);


Adjectives also intensify the irony and even the sarcasm in evaluation, as in: Можу навіть відмовитись від зачумленої (“infected with a plague, stupefied”, here – “unfortunate”: Busel, 2005, p. 343) пенсій (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 109).

Attention is also drawn by the apposition structure used for the denotation of modern realia – a disposable cup, where the meaning is expressed by a colloquial noun with a subject word creation meaning: Вічно схаменував. Во якраз Орко зі скликано-одноразиком обходив соратників і добирався аж до нього (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 232). Thus, attributive lexemes create an expressive range of evaluation of people, things and phenomena from the neutral spoken colloquial to the vulgar-offensive, ironic, familiar.

In the language of the analysed text, the verbal colloquial vocabulary, illustrating first of all the image of the person-doer in general and its socio-cultural environment in particular, is represented. These colloquial verbs are of the main semantic variety used, namely for denoting:

– physiological actions, process: Біля нього стовбічива (colloquial – “to stick around”: Slovnyk ukrayins'koi movy, 9, p. 718) Лась Забральський із типовим азійським обличчям (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 59); sound utterance, speech of different intensity, emotional expressiveness, in particular – шушікутися, colloquial: to whisper secretively (Slovnyk ukrayins'koi movy, 11, p. 569), лементити, colloquial: to talk very loudly (Slovnyk ukrayins'koi movy, 4, p. 175); шумати, colloquial: to whistle (Slovnyk ukrayins'koi movy, 11, p. 185). Из розгогу палетив на величезні двері, натиснув на клямку. Вона невдоволено ряваця (colloquial – to shout in an angry or abrupt way) (Lazaruk, 2006, p.16);

– mental actions and processes, especially оббудути – “to lie” (Slovnyk ukrayins'koi movy, 2, p. 438), дуться – colloquial: to get upset (Slovnyk ukrayins'koi movy, 2, p. 442); Компанія митю скигла (colloquial, no notes), надто Улас (Lazaruk, 2006, p.64);

– mental activity: Він що, геть збараців (not found in the dictionary, brings out the meaning of тупіштити “to become dumber” a citation from the Internet). Від інтернету трохи баранітися (colloquial, no notes) починав, якесь заспічення на себе (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 214).

In the novel household verbal vocabulary is found that is used for denoting processes which are characteristic for daily life, for instance: Та поки все почнеться, можемо коньяку зняти (colloquial, no notes) порційку (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 244).

The stylistics of the analysed text shows that such peripheral elements of communicative situations like expressions with Russianisms are also characteristic. They fulfil first of all the function of denoting the status of a character by the national, ethnic characteristics and their belonging to a village or a regional subculture. Russianisms are mostly used in a text because they help to style the social portrait of a character by ridiculing his/her low level of language culture and behaviour. We are discussing such sociotypes by their language features:

a) chief officers (Наро-о-д! Хто тільки вигадав його! Якимся неуправляемим став (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 43); – Нікада! Я зараз, – Лавруша рухив до телефону, скомандував якомусь Михайлу Михайловичу.

b) easy women (Я сьогодні ж цим займусь. До Альки дзвякну. Вона ж по...)

c) secondy actresses of a ballet company (Кому ролі дістаються. Ой, ужас якихий. А звання? На гастролі за граніцю літ п’ять не їздили (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 96).

As it is seen in this source under study, people who belong to a city society, officials, may in the everyday conversation carry out a cultural-language control. In this case, situations are built on a word play “incorrect – correct”, for example: – Ну, ти й сумашедший! Думала наскрізь проткнеш. – Не сумашедший. А божевільний! Скільки тебе вчить. Стеж за своїм язиком (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 9); – Що-що? Який захід? Міроприємство? – Ага! Міроприємство, як зволили сказати (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 23);

This non-literary vocabulary is also characteristic for the language of “the narrator of the people”, which
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performs the function of a means of stylisation “as one of their own”, a means of self-identification: 


Special means of stylisation of colloquiality in the novel are jargonisms, which create a sociocultural setting, stylising the communicative habits of the members of certain subcultures. The saturation of microcontexts with these units in combination with barbarisms, vulgarisms produces the effect of an ironic evaluation of the influence of globalisation on the language culture of the new generation.

They are the jargonisms that focus the reader’s attention on the language psychological images of the members of varied subcultures. In particular, criminal jargon: Во тамки возсяла все керівництво і ті. Хто при ньому: “шістки” (criminal jargon: Stavyts’ka, 2005, p. 376), “ступкі” (criminal, offensive: Stavyts’ka, 2005, p. 314) аб а претенденти на виліт за межі управи (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 16); And “putting these words” into the mouths of non-members of the underworld: they start to represent the so-called colloquial jargonised language, in other words, when these jargonisms are used by leaders, officials, military men, etc. The double social notes witness the process of the widening of the sphere of usage of separate words and expressions.


The emotive-expressive means of stylisation of colloquiality in the novel are profane, offensive, vulgar and low colloquial units of language which perform in the narrative a characterological-nominate function and at the same time they serve as a means of showing the feelings and emotions of a speaker. Their function in a literary narrative is to stylise the language liveliness inherent in a natural conversation situation in all its vastness of emotive evaluative complex of expression and situation of colloquiality in the novel are jargonisms, which create a sociocultural setting, stylising the communicative habits of the members of certain subcultures. The saturation of microcontexts with these units in combination with barbarisms, vulgarisms produces the effect of an ironic evaluation of the influence of globalisation on the language culture of the new generation.

The third element comprises the examples of jargonised colloquial language, i.e. vocabulary that is commonly used: Ти що, оборзів?!? (colloq. jargon: Stavyts’ka, 2008, p. 65) – рякнув Іваноша (Lazaruk, 2006, p.60).

The emotive-expressive means of stylisation of colloquiality in the novel are profane, offensive, vulgar and low colloquial units of language which perform in the narrative a characterological-nominate function and at the same time they serve as a means of showing the feelings and emotions of a speaker. Their function in a literary narrative is to stylise the language liveliness inherent in a natural conversation situation in all its vastness of emotive-expressive meaning, taking into account the activity of the peripheral elements of the everyday language. The negative emotions in a stylised spoken colloquial communication are only a pretext for using profane vocabulary (Petrystcheva, 2003, p. 176). Besides, as Formanova (2012) remarked, “invectives form the emotional-evaluative complex of expression and they arrange certain accents” (p.175).

Colloquial obscene vocabulary has the expression of: a) disrespect: Та що вони, гади (means “viper”, figurative, disdainful– about an evil, false person, used as a profane word: Slovnyk ukrain’s’koi movy, Vol.2, p. 15), приварили її? (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 4); Викликав селектором свого заступника, вічно заспаного Пічкуря. Того ще не було “Ага! Дрихлить у намилу, гад ползучий” (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 17); b) vulgarity, especially by employing spoken colloquial everyday realism, these writers don’t go round invectives, they break the language culture taboo and give thereby certain micro-contexts an emphasised vulgarity. The scale of these nominations differs by the level of the expression of vulgarity, compare: Нуййому, цьому гіноквіві (means “turd”, vulgar-common language, contemptuous, abusive; “good-for-nothing person”: Stavyts’ka, 2008, p. 135), все скажу (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 238).

Often the word combination for denoting a person may acquire invective signs, aggressive connotation to an adjective with low semantics, which has a low social evaluation of certain characteristics, signs, etc., for instance: А то привики чува пійло мулити, патріот дивбані (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 216); Що не чуєте? То ви ще й погохлохи, амеби безмозглі. А-а-а! Так-так берхребні (Lazaruk, 2006, p.20); Боягусе (“coward”; “а very timid and fearful person: Slovnyk ukrain’s’koi movy, Vol.1, p. 274) безлотний! Та ж китані ніч розкривають, а ти про честь муниди розпятилися (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 4); AZ чаваю ми розберемся. Ая-а-а-кже. Він мені штрикатиме моїм минулим. А сам, тархан (“cockroach”: Slovnyk ukrain’s’koi movy, Vol.10, p. 127) полохливий, втікає від світла, аж за ним курява не встігає (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 9).

In spoken unconstrained communication these pejorative nominations of people may be intensified through selected particles, indefinite pronouns, for example: То я кажу, ощє перед твоїм приходом дзьонить якесь одоробло (disdainful, “a clumsy person”, abusive: Slovnyk ukrain’s’koi movy, Vol. 5, p. 237), і погрожує (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 215). They are also used as a means of stylisation of colloquiality.

In the language of the analysed prose of М. Lazaruk there have been detected many adjectives with obscene semantics, directed on the aggressive axiology as in the socio-political reality and in the objects of the surroundings: Досі десь пилом припадає, якщо скурві миші не погризли (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 195).
Conclusions

Thus, the means of stylisation of colloquiality in M. Lazaruk’s novel *Inauguration* is commonly used and territorially marked colloquial vocabulary (household nominations, the names of people, colloquial attributes, the names of actions and processes, southwestern dialecticisms, in particular the elements of Bukovynian-Pokuttian, and Hutsulian dialects, seldom – Volynian), the peripheral elements of the colloquial everyday vocabulary (Russianisms, elements of social dialects), through which social territorial and socio-cultural parameters of colloquiality are fixed. In general, territorial vocabulary is used not only as a means of language content stylisation, the lingua-psychological stylisation, the socio-territorial stylisation, but also as a means of phonological stylisation. The recorded lexical units informatively enrich the analysed text and help to style the family-domestic, the ritual and ceremonial colouring of the Hutsulian-Pokuttian-Bukovynian land cultures.
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