Advanced Education, 2017, Issue 8, 115-121.
DOI: 10.20535/2410-8286.115448

COMMONLY USED AND TERRITORIALLY MARKED VOCABULARY AS A MEANS OF STYLISING THE COLLOQUIALITY IN THE NOVEL "INAUGURATION" OF MYROSLAV LAZARUK

Maria Tsurkan
Higher State Educational Establishment of Ukraine „Bukovinian State Medical University", Chernivtsi, Ukraine
maria-ts77@ukr.net

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.

Keywords: prose text; literary narrative; category of colloquiality; stylisation; commonly used territorially marked vocabulary; stylistic functions of colloquial vocabulary.

Introduction

The philological studios of scholars have proved that the territory of Bukovyna is poly-ethnical 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; Bulakhovskyi, 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; Kulbabska, 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 south-western 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 Kolomyishchna" (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 dialecticisms 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 Hutsulshchyna. 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 (Bartmińskiy, 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 dialecticisms, 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 consciousness.

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 stylisation 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 *о* [o] to *у* [u]: *Пуйняв*, Гапоне Гапоновичу, дорогий наш друже-ідеологе?! (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 168); the parallel use of words with the sounds (sound combinations) *кв* [kv], *хв* [khv] and *ф* [f]: Був, так би мовити, міським *хвілозофом*, а не якимсь селюком-фабіяном, в якого тільки й друзів, що лаписько круторогий (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 224); the use of the prothetic *й* [j]: … бо хоч я був маленьким і дурненьким, та *їдну* фразу таки пам'ятаю, що маємо йти другім путьом! (p. 168); the pronunciation of foreign words with the denotation of the palatal *л* [l']: *Плян* Жори, геть ще юного, але вже об'їждженого вождя, був геніально простим, підступним, непередбачуваним (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 116); Тільки ж Цяпочка таких речей не *деклярує* вголос, бо ж краще популяризувати іншу приповідку, майже за древніми греками, я вартий того, що нічого не вартий (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 15). Words with the prothetic consonant *г* [h] are found in the novel which is characteristic for the Volynian-Kholmian and Podlachian dialects: Його кулі не беруть. Хіба *гамериканських* фільмів не бачив? (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 67); *Гінтєлігентик* задовбаний, – чув услід від здеклясованих 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 приймальні його очікував хтось із заступників, а з дверей *куценького кабінетика* виглядали перелякані очі помічника (p. 29); На службовому транспорті додому не їздив, але спершу квартиру в центрі, а відтак і *особнячок* вимостив, як пташка гніздо (p. 36). In the language of some characters this is a sign of wheedling into the leaders' favour that are of lower ranks: Гведовичу! *Жартики* 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. Зроби *кавусю,* ну і, звичайно – *грамусик!* (p. 86); to bring out the intimate relationship between individuals: Вибігла Надька з маленькою тацею, а на ній *графинчик, філіжаночка* з кавою, що парувала нетерплячкою, і *шніцельок* для Джулі (p. 87); Ларка йому підігравала. *Хутенько* побігла до мазнички прийняти душ, після роботи ж, і вийшла в *куценькому* заяложеному *халатику* (p. 95); Ніби й нічого не сталося, не змовляючись, повиймали із *тайничків повнісінькі* купюри з Джоржами (p. 132); or disrespect for someone: *Заступнички* ніяково переглядалися, ніби бачилися 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 – *передпенсійник* Вітольд Самійлович Прунін, великий речник (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 157); Ця придибашка легко зійшла з рук новоспеченому *віцикові* (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 29); *food products and drinks*: Інтуїтивно він повернувся до опочивальні, де нанипав півпляшки *перцівки*, яку й засмоктав без перепочинку (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 67); Бувало, як влиє в себе з пів'ящика червоного *"портяшку*", зап'є фірмовою *шипучкою* (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 сякий-такий 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 nineties 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

nouns – names of individuals with gender indications: *Хлопака* ("man" in Zakrevska, 1997, p. 202; Huyvanyuk, 2005, p. 612), *Телевізійник*, ви що, не знаєте його? (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 61); **verbs** with a wide range of semantics, in particular for denoting physical actions*:* І викликали пожежників із драбиною, аби його *здоймити* (1. "to pick up" 2. "to take down" in Huyvanyuk, 2005, p. 160) (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 57); Пишіть і ви, *заким* ("till, until" in Zakrevska, 1997, p. 75) вас не попросили зробити (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 76).

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: Погрожують 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, вивалюй звідси! Я тобі не *шмаркач* (offensive, "a young, uneducated person in Slovnyk ukrayins'koyi 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'koyi movy, Vol.9, p. 372), бо ще хто почує (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 5); *Тріпач* (colloquial, not found in the dictionary word, created by a widely used model for creating names for people with the suffix – *ач*) твій Кастьорович (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 4);

– by mental peculiarities: Для таких *ахламонів* (охламон: colloquial – characterising a fool and a do-nothing person in Busel, 2005, p. 692), як ти, може, й усе одно, а для шефа – ні (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 23); Ая-акже, він же тут баль править, а не ці *охламончуки* (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 34);

– by the lively character of a person*:*Ну, хоч би той *жевжик* (colloquial, "a restless, active person" in Slovnyk ukrayins'koyi movy, Vol. 2, p. 517), як його, – знову надпив коньяку, – Жора Шмалець, хоч і гарячий, зате заповзятий, як баран некерований, лупить лобом в одну точку (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 25);

– by the peculiarities of behaviour, physical condition or habits: Вони частенько виносили вироки найбільшим *хапугам* (colloquial, "a person who takes bribes in Slovnyk ukrayins'koyi movy, Vol. 11, p. 22) *і кормонякам* (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 40);

Colloquial names of people, used for denoting their occupation, are found in the modern language of the novel, as they stylise 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 будуть (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 25); as a result of shortening the stem of a word and adding *віцик* (spoken colloq. "vice-"): Жоржик, наприклад, щодня наполегливо оббивав пороги *"віциків"* (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 133); Свою приреченість мормони-*віцики* відчули давно (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 155).

Colloquial names of people according to their occupation that have been formed through reinterpretation of the semantics in the spoken colloquial language have also been identified, for instance: Вільготно почувалися тільки *"десятники"* ("the eldest in charge of a group": Busel, 2005, p. 217), це ті, в кого ранг службовця сягав десятого і нижче (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 19); Він же – провідник демократії у краї, на нього рівняються правителі інших земель. *Гарант!* ("warrantor": Busel, 2005, p.173) Доводилося терпіти (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 203); Потрібен тільки ваш підпис, а в столиці *хлопці* (figurative "name of men": Busel, 2005, p.1348), in the text a situational nomination of smart managers) вже поклопоталися (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 121).

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

– "friendship": *Братва* (collective, familiar – "companions, friends": Slovnyk ukrayins'koyi movy, Vol. 1, p. 227), а в мене тост (Lazaruk, 2006, p.63);

– "alienation": Та процес переставав бути керованим, у кабінеті почали з'являтися *чужаки* (colloquial – "an unfamiliar person": Slovnyk ukrayins'koyi movy, Vol.11, p. 377) – представники громадськості, інтелігенція (Lazaruk, 2006, p.158);

– "roughness": Та 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 "adependent, false person who sponges off someone materially and mentally in Slovnyk ukrayins'koyi movy, Vol. 9, p. 470) і кар'єристи, політичні *прихвосні* (offensive "one who worms oneself into favour of someone": Slovnyk ukrayins'koyi 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 *вихаркнутому* (from the word харкати "to expectorate": colloquial "to spit phlegm" in Slovnyk

ukrayins'koyi movy, 11, p. 142) з ночі драконіську байдужісінько (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 48);

– Та я-а-ак ти смієш, парашутисте *нещасний!* (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 6). Spoken – used for expressing disrespect (Slovnyk ukrayins'koyi movy, 5, p. 352);

– Та де вона, та *драна* (1. "tattered" 2. "with a hole"; here: "useless" – Slovnyk ukrayins'koyi movy, 2, p. 289) інтелігенція? (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 225)

Adjectives also intensify the irony and even the sarcasm in evaluation, as in: Можу навіть відмовитися від *зачумленої* ("infected with a plague, stupefied", here – "unfortunate": Busel, 2005, p. 343) пенсії (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: I вчасно схаменувся. Бо якраз Орко зі *склянкою-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 *стовбичив* (colloquial – "to stick around": Slovnyk ukrayins'koyi movy, 9, p. 718) Ласьо Забральський із типовим азійським обличчям (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 59);

– sound utterance, speech of different intensity, emotional expressiveness, in particular – *шушукатися*, colloquial: to whisper secretively (Slovnyk ukrayins'koyi movy, 11, p. 569), *лементіти,* colloquial: to talk very loudly (Slovnyk ukrayins'koyi movy, 4, p. 175), *цвікати,* colloquial: to whine (Slovnyk ukrayins'koyi movy, 11, p. 185). Із розгону налетів на величезні двері, натиснув на клямку. Вона невдоволено *рявкнула* (colloquial – to shout in an angry or abrupt way) (Lazaruk, 2006, p.16);

– mental actions and processes, especially *обдурити* – "to lie" (Slovnyk ukrayins'koyi movy, 2, p. 438), *дутися* – colloquial: to get upset (Slovnyk ukrayins'koyi movy, 2, p. 442); Компанія миттю *скисла* (colloquial, no notes), надто Улас (Lazaruk, 2006, p.64);

– mental activity: Він що, геть *збаранів* (not found in the dictionary, brings out the meaning of *тупішати* "to become dumber" a citation from the Internet). Від інтернету трохи *бараніти* (colloquial, no notes) починаю, якась заклиненість 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 *хряпнути* (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 stylise 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! Якимсь *неуправляємим* став (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 43); – *Нікада!* Я зараз, – Лавруша рушив до телефону, скомандував якомусь Михайлу Михайловичу. – Але махом. Через п'ять хвилин. Ти де *работаєш* і на кого? Не *поняв*. Багато *болтаєш* (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 79); Сам *понімаєш*, як я для тебе багато роблю (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 104); З *дєтства* не трималися в голові різні дати, *фамілії,* ще *женські* імена куди не йшло (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 104); – Ні, черговий *учьонийступень*, *кажись*, *дохтор* чи *профф'єсор* (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 23);

b) unceremonious party figures (Ану посторонись*! Ідьом* свого *товаріща поздравлять* (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 158);

c) easy women (Я сьогодні ж цим займусь. До Альки дзвякну. Вона ж по *заграницям* шастає (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 10);

d) secondary actresses of a ballet company (Кому ролі дістаються. Ой, *ужас* якийсь. А *званія*? На гастролі за *границю 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 вчити. Стеж за своїм язиком (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 9); – Шо-шо? Який *захід? Міроприємство*? – Ага! *Міроприємство*, як зволили сказати (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 23); – Ти мене не пойняв… – Не *пойняв*, а *зрозумів*. – Ну, та *понятно*, що *зрозумів* (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 32).

This non-literary vocabulary is also characteristic for the language of "the narrator of the people", which

performs the function of a means of stylisation "as one of their own", a means of self-identification: Заступники порпалися в паперах, як кроти у землі, дрібніші *клєрки*, ну, всілякі там зави відділками, секторами та іншими "ами", трусилися, як у пропасниці чи епілепсії, шукаючи невідь-чого (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 19); Розсаджуючи майбутню команду у *члєновоз*, Жоржик, не спускав пильного ока з Кола Коловича (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 152); Вирішили навіть по воду не йти, а просто – до *кахве* (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 151); – Бур-р-р-а-а-а!!! – зірвався на крик Льонька-*камсамолець* (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 174), etc.

Special means of stylisation of colloquiality in the novel are jarogonisms, which create a sociocultural setting, stylising the communicative habits of the members of certain subcultures. The saturation of micro-contexts 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: Бо тамки возсідало все керівництво і ті. Хто при ньому: *"шістки"* (criminal jargon: Stavyts'ka, 2005, p. 376), *"стукачі"* (criminal, offensive: Stavyts'ka, 2005, p. 314) або ж 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 second most represented group – elements of the youth subcultures, for example: А якби хоч зо дві *"тьолочки"* (youth jargon: Stavyts'ka, 2005, p. 330) (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 62); Остаточно споївши *дружбана* (youth jargon: Stavyts'ka, 2008, p. 130) (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 180). 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) – рявкнув Гапоша (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-nominative 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 (Petryshcheva, 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 ukrayins'koyi 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 намулі, *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: Нуяйому, цьому *гівнюкові* (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 owning to an adjective with low semantics, which has a low social evaluation of certain characteristics, signs, etc., for instance: А то привикли чуже пійло муляти, *патріоти довбані* (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 216); Що не чуєте? То ви ще й поглохли, *амеби безмозглі*. А-а-а! Так-так берхребетні (Lazaruk, 2006, p.20); *Боягузе* ("coward"; "a very timid and fearful person: Slovnyk ukrayins'koyi movy, Vol.1, p. 274) *безплотний*! Та ж цигани ніч розкрадають, а ти про честь мундира розпатякався (Lazaruk, 2006, p. 4); А з Чавагою ми розберемося. Ая-а-а-кже. Він мені штрикатиме моїм минулим. А сам, *тарган* ("cockroach": Slovnyk ukrayins'koyi movy, Vol.10, p. 127) *полохливий*, втікає від світла, аж за ним курява не встигає (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, оце перед твоїм приходом дзвонить *якесь одоробло* (disdainful, "a clumsy person", abusive: Slovnyk ukrayins'koyi 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 M. 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 stylise the family-domestic, the ritual and ceremonial colouring of the Hutsulian-Pokuttian-Bukovynian land cultures.

References:

Bartmińskiy, J. (2010). *Współczesny język polski*. [Contemporary Polish]. Lublin, Poland.

Boyko, N. I. (2006). *Ukrayins'ka ekspresyvna leksyka: problemy semantyky i funktsionuvannya.* [Ukrainian expressive vocabulary, the semantics and functioning problems]. Unpublished candidate dissertation, Kyiv, Ukraine.

Busel, V. (Eds.) (2005). *Velykyy tlumachnyy slovnyk suchasnoyi ukrayins'koyi movy* [Great Dictionary of Modern Ukrainian]. Kyiv, Ukraine: Perun.

Formanova, S. V. (2012). *Invektyvy v ukrayins'kiy movi*. [Invectives in the Ukrainian language]. Kyiv, Ukraine.

Huyvanyuk, N. V. (Eds.) (2005). *Slovnyk bukovyns'kykh hovirok*. [Dictionary of Bukovynian dialects]. Chernivtsi, Ukraine: Ruta.

Interv'yu z Myroslavom Lazarukom [Interview with Myroslav Lazaruk] (March, 2010). Retrieved 15 March 2017 from http://litprostir.cv.ua/dialohy-ta-monolohy/nathnennya-%E2%80%93-tse-vyhadka-lyudyna-povynna-pratsyuvaty.htm

Lazaruk, M. (2006). *Inavhuratsiya*. [Inauguration]. Chernivtsi, Ukraine: Knyhy-XXI.

Mel'nychuk, B. I., & Yuriychuk, M. I. (2003). *Pys'mennyky Bukovyny druhoyi polovyny XIX – pershoyi polovyny XX stolittya. Khrestomatiya* [The writers of Bukovina second half of XIX – first half of XX century. Reader]. (Part 2.). Chernivtsi, Ukraine.

Petryshcheva, E. F. (1987). *Stilisticheski okrashennaya leksika russkoho yazyk* [Stylistically colored vocabulary of Russian]. Moscow, Russia.

Pylyns'kyy, M. M. (Eds.) (1982). *Vzayemodiya usnykh i pysemnykh styliv movy* [The interaction of oral and written language style sheet]. Kyiv, Ukraine.

Rusanivs'kyy, V. M. (Eds.). (1977). *Mova i chas: rozvytok funktsional'nykh styliv suchasnoyi ukrayins'koyi literaturnoyi movy*. [Language and time: the development of functional styles of modern Ukrainian literary language]. Kyiv, Ukraine.

Slovnyk ukrayins'koyi movy v 11-ty tomakh [Ukrainian language dictionary in 11 volumes] (1970 – 1980). Kyiv, Ukraine.

Stavyts'ka, L. (2003). *Korotkyy slovnyk zharhonnoyi leksyky ukrayins'koyi movy* [Concise Dictionary of slang lexicon of the Ukrainian language]. Kyiv, Ukraine: Krytyka.

Stavyts'ka, L. (2005). *Ukrayins'kyy zhargon: slovnyk* [Ukrainian lingo: Dictionary]. Kyiv, Ukraine: Krytyka.

Stavyts'ka, L. (2008). *Ukrayins'ka mova bez tabu. Slovnyk netsenzurnoyileksyky ta yiyi vidpovidnykiv. Obstsenizmy, evfemizmy, seksualizmy* [Ukrainian language without taboo. Dictionary of foul language and its equivalents]. Kyiv, Ukraine: Krytyka.

Yermolenko, S. (1999). *Narysy z ukrayins'koyi slovesnosti. Stylistyka ta kul'tura movy* [Essays of Ukrainian broadcast. Stylistics of language and culture]. Kyiv, Ukraine.

Zakrevska, Ya. (Eds.). (1997). *Hutsul's'ki hovirky. Korotkyy slovnyk* [The hutsul dialects. Concise Dictionary]. Lviv, Ukraine: Ukrainian Institute named after I. Krypyakevych of NAS of Ukraine.

Received: April 19, 2017
Accepted: November 17, 2017