Anna Majewska-Wójcik, The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Poland

Word-forming Creativity of Stanisław Ignacy Witkiewicz in the Structural and Cognitive Approach

ABSTRACT

The aim of the article is to review some selected lexical units appearing in Stanisław Ignacy Witkiewicz's (henceforth also called Witkacy) letters to his wife. For the analysis of these lexemes, the methodological apparatus of traditional structural word-formation was used, enriched with tools taken from Ronald W. Langacker's cognitive grammar (1987, 1995, 2008) and the findings of other researchers remaining in this trend. Thanks to the two-dimensional view, the description of neologisms and textual occasionalisms seems more complete, and Witkacy's word-formation creativity can be viewed through the prism of new qualities – mental spaces and amalgams. The cognitive approach also allows for effective contextual decoding of meanings and brings closer the mechanisms of mental perception of the world by the conceptualizer.

Keywords: word formation, structuralism, cognitive grammar, Stanisław Ignacy Witkiewicz, letters

1. Introduction

Indisputably, since the publication of the successive volumes of Stanisław Ignacy Witkiewicz's (also called by his artistic name Witkacy) letters to his wife and other correspondents (family, friends of acquaintances and the so-called enemies)[1], the interest in the artist has revived. Nonetheless, this recognition of Witkacy has not been reflected in linguistic research. So far, the only monograph devoted to word formation and innovations in the field of lexis in Witkacy's artistic language, and, in fact, based on the research conducted according to the structuralist methodology, is the work of Magdalena Nowotny-Szybistowa (1973), written in the 1970s. Apart from this study, we can find individual linguistic articles on various detailed issues concerning Witkacy's idiolect and idiostyle (cf. Górny, 2014; Majewska-Wójcik, 2014). However, there is no overall discussion of the language of the author's correspondence.

---

[1] Letters to his wife were published in 4 volumes in 2005–2012, while letters to other correspondents were published in 2013–2017 in 2 volumes (the second volume being two-part).

Anna Majewska-Wójcik, Katedra Języka Polskiego, Instytut Językoznawstwa, Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski Jana Pawła II, Al. Racławickie 14, 20-950 Lublin, anna.majewska-wojcik@kul.pl, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0712-3615

The material for this study was excerpted from 1278 letters[2] that Witkiewicz wrote to his wife Jadwiga[3]. Correspondence of the spouses is assumed to be strictly private. At times, the letters are very intimate, which is why Witkacy wanted the letters between him and his wife to be destroyed.

In Witkiewicz's literary and epistolographic work, noteworthy are his experiments on language, which is recognised as a matter of creative potential. Creativity itself, as Renata Grzegorczykowa (1995) notes, "is either opposed to automatism (reproduction), or it means creating new states of affairs"[4] (p. 13). Creativity is bipolar, i.e. subject-object, which means that there is a creative potential in language, which an inventive subject capable of an original act triggers in the conscious act of creating a text with a specific function and purpose (Kudra, 2001, p. 5).

Reading Witkacy's correspondence with his wife, one can conclude that in the letters written to Jadwiga there are many different linguistic innovations, which, following Andrzej Markowski, are understood as new elements in the text, usage, norm or system, and which, for the purposes of this study, are limited to new lexical units, namely neologisms or occasionalisms (cf. Markowski, 2005, p. 4), since Witkacy's creativity is most visible on the level of word formation.[5]

In this light, the aim of the article is to analyse these textual lexical units from two perspectives: the structuralist word formation and cognitive word formation. I will look at what word formation bases Witkacy uses to create new words, with what techniques he does it and whether these innovations are systemic. Next, I will scrutinise some selected examples from the perspective of cognitive word formation. This is a very broad topic, and this study is only a prolegomenon for some deeper elaboration.

2. Witkiewicz's word-formation innovations in a structuralist optics

The structuralist approach to word-formation phenomena, arisen from the theory of de Saussure and the related conceptual apparatus in the context of the evolution of Polish word-formation research, was synthetically discussed a year

---

[2]   It is a 4-volume edition of letters from 1923–1939.

[3]   The marriage of Stanisław Ignacy Witkiewicz and Jadwiga Unrug, concluded on April 30, 1923, was in fact a correspondence marriage, a long-distance relationship, because the Witkiewiczs lived together for a very short time after the wedding. Jadwiga left for Warsaw, Witkacy stayed in Zakopane. They saw each other from time to time, but their marriage was based mainly on the exchange of letters. Stanisław Ignacy wrote to his wife almost every day. Only his letters to Jadwiga have survived, while he destroyed the correspondence from his wife.

[4]   The translation of the original Polish quotes in the whole article is made by the author of this paper.

[5]   This is, undoubtedly, facilitated by the informal nature of the texts, colloquial language and the knowledge of the context by both interlocutors.

ago by Iwona Burkacka and Iwona Kaproń-Charzyńska (2022)[6]; therefore, there is no need to present the state of this research. Referring, however, to the cited article and to the section devoted to word formation contained in *Gramatyka współczesnego języka polskiego* [Grammar of Contemporary Polish Language] (Grzegorczykowa et al., 1998)[7], I will mention only those issues that will become crucial in the analysis of Witkacy's word-formation units. Accordingly, structural word-formation focuses on the techniques of creating word-formation units, word-forming means and their functions, showing the seriality of the word-formation model, and – in the case of composition – establishing the relationship between the members of a complex formation. In this methodology, the key value of the word-formation paraphrase is emphasised, in which the word-formation base is indicated, which is the carrier of meaning. A structural-meaning definition is based on the motivational relationship, while the meaning of the derivative unit is determined on the basis of the meaning of its components. Therefore, word-formation motivation is an important concept, signalling the static relationship between the motivating and motivated word. Capturing this relationship, however, becomes complicated when we deal with contaminations, neo-semantisms, analogical structures, contextual uses of a word-formation unit or various types of language plays. There are added contents that are emotionally marked, with an axiological charge or other stylistic devices.

Witkacy's letters to his wife, on the one hand, are of a reporting nature since the author describes in detail the course of his subsequent days referring both to the sphere of his everyday routine activities and social life, as well as to the artistic and the most intimate sphere. On the other hand, the letters are saturated with emotions and axiology. This kind of intimate diary is written in colloquial language, but just like Witkacy's literary work, epistolography is also characterized by the originality of language. It would seem that Witkiewicz treats language as a matter for experimentation and exploration. However, as Nowotny-Szybistowa (1973), the author of the only linguistic monograph on Witkiewicz's artistic language, notices, Witkacy's works are a carrier of ideological content and they convey the author's philosophy of language, which is manifested both in the creation of neologisms and neophraseologisms, as well as in the subjectively expressed directly to the reader judgments about language integrated into the novel narrative or dramatic dialogue. (Nowotny-Szybistowa, 1973, pp. 5–6)

---

[6]   It is worth noting that the article ends with a very rich bibliography, covering both older publications and the latest texts.

[7]   I will use the basic word-formation concepts in the meaning given to them by the editors of the publication.

Numerous word-formation neologisms[8], including occasionalisms[9], neo-semantisms, and other types of linguistic innovations, also appear in the letters to his wife.

From the formal point of view, the group of Witkiewicz's word-formation innovations includes both derivatives, compositions as well as adaptations of foreign words. The word-formation basis of the new units comprises both appellative and anthroponyms, but with a clearly representative group of odonymic units, as Witkacy "was fond of transforming authentic names and surnames" (Degler, 2013, p. 323). Hence, it is the type of base, i.e. the motivating word, that has been chosen as the material for an analysis. However, due to some difficulty in making a consistent division of the material, in some places I was forced to make arbitrary decisions and select groups not based on a common word-formation denominator, but on another criterion imposed by the frequency of occurrence in the research material.

2.1. Onymic neologisms: anthroponymic and toponymic

Witkiewicz's (word)formation creativity could have been seen in his literary works, even before the correspondence to his wife was published. Both the pseudonym adopted by the author (Witkacy = a portmanteau of the surname (Witk) and middle name (acy) as well as the names of literary heroes indicate his preference in this respect (cf. Dudek, 2007).

Among the anthroponymic neologisms, there are forms created by means of various types of derivation: affixing, backwards (including mutilation), interchangeable, but also combinations – backwards with a paradigm shift in terms of the genetic form of the surname and in terms of gender, as presented in (1).

(1)
Malinower (444)[10] [Malinowski]; with **Chwiston** (444) [Chwistek]; to **Piernik** (629) [Piernikowski]; like **Budzia** (206) [Budziszewska]; **Płomieńsio (**945) [Płomieński]; to **Pomiroś** (1049) [Pomirowski]; I taught **Kotuła** to eat (337) [Kotulski]

---

[8]   Understood by me as new lexical units, not stabilized in the language, not listed in general dictionaries of the Polish language, recording the lexical resources of the Polish language at a given stage of development, when the text was written. The lexicon, as recorded in the so-called *Słownik warszawski* [Warsaw Dictionary], edited by Karłowicz et al. (1900–1927) (henceforth: *SW*) and *Słownik języka polskiego* [Dictionary of the Polish Language], edited by Doroszewski (n.d.) (henceforth: *SJPD*), constituted the comparative plane for the verification of the research material.

[9]   For the purposes of this study, I treat *occasionalism* as a word-formation or/and lexical unit that was referred to once, in a given text and has not become fixed in the language. The definitional framework of the term is vague. Chruścińska (1978) and Mierzwińska-Hajnos (2019), among others, wrote on occasionalisms more, and to their works an interested reader is referred.

[10]   The numbers in brackets indicate the number of the letter from which the exemplification comes.

From some surnames, Witkacy creates variant forms – diminutive forms or uses associations with appellatives, as is the case, e.g., of the surnames Piernikarski or Domaniewski, as presented in (2):

(2)
I wrote to them and to **Piernik** (629); **Piernikator** came in the morning (252); Greet the Protassewiczes, **Domka**, Prystorzy (1066); **Domcio** could give you the 500 back (760); Go there with **Domeczek** (1063).

The resulting derivatives are legible, taking into account the epistolographic context, they fit into the word formation patterns of the Polish language.

The surname is often used by Witkacy for language games, it becomes the basis for creating various parts of speech, a source of associations using the sound layer of the -onym, as in the case of paronomasia, illustrated in (3).

(3)
Brzękowski **odbrzękuje** [buzzes] me all the time (45); it's too **bujwidowaty** [bushy] (378) [Odo Bujwid – a doctor]; what is bubbling (381) [Odo Bujwid - doctor]; I'm "**Korfanty-ing**" (496) [Korfanty]; I keep on "**Chwistek-ing"** [whistling] about pussy (636); Dr. Steinberg, **chwistkista** (692) "(…) i **chwistki** wszystkie, i **peipery** [and all the whips and peipers]" (173) [Leon Chwistek, Tadeusz Peiper].

The last two forms in (3) are additionally marked by depreciation by the grammatical form of the non-masculine personal gender.

Foreign names became a source of humorous, even caricatured forms. Witkiewicz's phonetic homonyms and strong sound similarity were associated with Polish common words (part of the body and the verb with the pejorative meaning 'to stink'), which allowed him to play with the meaning. In addition, in the first use there was a paradigm shift in terms of gender, as in the examples presented in (4).

(4)
Kuper [backside] visited me twice (50); Former Miss Cooper (Zadek) [Backside]. I'm sending my attack to **Zasmradnik** [Stinkman] (106) [Jan Zahradnik] [reaction to the unflattering review of *W małym dworku* [In a small manor] by J. Zahradnik].

Toponyms can take an innovative form, although in letters these are single examples. Two are worth noting, listed in (5). 'Gubałówka' mountain reduced by

---

For the purpose of clarity and due to space limit, all Witkiewicz's neologisms are written in bold as nominative in their original Polish version, as well as the names they derive from; while the lexical context in which they occur is translated directly into English.

the elision of an element of a word-formation theme to the form of *Gubałka* and a derivative with a wordplay *Nowe Sączenie się* [New Trickling] (from the city of 'Nowy Sącz'):

(5)
together with **Gubałka** (955), with my **Nowe Sączenie się** [New Trickling] (790).

The word-formation virtuosity of the author of *Letters to my wife* is revealed especially in the signatures under the letters, in autographonyms, the creation of which is motivated by the name of the author of the letters, association with some common word or situational association, as illustrated in the examples in (6).

(6)
Your **Witkosz** (69); Your **Witkaś** (101); Your **Witkasiewicz** (39), Your **Ciupuś** (568); Your **Wypinaszek** (1004); Your **Grzeszkiewicz**, Your **Dziamgoł** ['dziamgać' means to do something slowly, take one's time, cf. *SW*]; Your **Schyzio** [from schizophrenia] (289); Your **Frenek** [from schizophrenic], Your **Skamracy** [Whiners] (741) [dialect 'skamrać' – whine, ask, beg *SW*].

Part of the signature created on the basis of given names and/or two-part names, with characteristic formants, and the basis was not always authentic. Instead, it was often created on the basis of association with a common word, as stated in (7).

(7)
Your **Dech-Zapieralski** (Are you one of those Dech-Zapieralskis?) (640), Your **Więckuchno-Więcejkiewicz-Zasępiewicz-Pierdocheński** (804), **Monetary Sprawunkiewicz S.I. Moczopęd-Witkiewicz** (Are you one of those Moczopęds, like Witkacy?) (563).

"These are usually typically Witkiewiczan, unusual semantically marked neologisms, and therefore closer to nickname forms" (Górny, 2014, p. 391). Additionally, they are carriers of emotions, irony, and caricature, which can be illustrated in the examples in (8).

(8)
Twój Mężuś-filozofek, dupek i wygłupek
[Your Philosopher Husband, asshole and tomfoolery]

Word formation creativity can also be seen in the attributions of help, an integral component of the autographonym. Typical in them is the prefix signalling the perfect character of the term, as in the examples in (9).

(9)
Your **b. zdetrakowany** [very detracked] W. (1)
Your **zupełnie zmarmeladowany** [totally marmalade] Wit. (1)

2.2. Appellative innovations

In the letters to his wife, as was the case in Witkiewicz's literary works (Nowotny-Szybistowa, 1973, pp. 74–84), the group with formal diminutive and/or hypocoristic exponents is quite numerous. Innovative diminutive forms in letters are created from scratch, which in the general language have only potential diminutive variants. Witkiewicz creates this type of neologisms systemically, using the formants typical of diminutives and hypocorisms: -ik, -ek, -ka, -ko, some of them with second-degree suffixes, which only have a modifying function in relation to the word-formation basis, and additionally serve the expressive function, as exemplified in (10).

(10)
drobne świństewka [little dirty tricks] (1070); for **grypka** [minor influenza] weakness (176); I have **operacyjka** [a minor surgery] (439); very funny **facecik** [cute guy] (165); In the gloomy **Kraik** [small country] (235); your **projekcik** [small project] (338); I had **natchnieńko** [a slight inspiration] (410); there was (…) a small letter **nieporozumieńko** [little misunderstanding] (1065); an unpleasant **awanturka** [a little fuss] (1067); on the higher **poziomek** [smaller level] (1114); both **rzeczułki** [small things] (1098); I will have **parka próśbek w Warszawce** [several small requests in cute Warsaw] (1183); keep this **reklamka** [minor ad] (574); If I don't get **stypka** [a scholarship], it's a disaster. [**stypka** – scholarship??] (1107);

I have a huge **mebelkowaty** [furniture-like] room – (...) one piece of **ubranko**, **sfeterek**, **fetorek** [little clothing, a small jumper, a little stench], because **koszulka** [the little shirt] has not been changed for 5 days) (784);

I burst (…) **mały hemoroidek** [little haemorrhoid] (865);

(I saw a wet **lawinka** [small avalanche] coming towards us – what to do!) (961).

The diminutive neologisms in (10), 'rzeczułka' and 'parka', are the examples of adideation – a kind of wordplay involving the use of phonic similarity between the diminutive form of a word and the almost identical sound of another lexeme. *Rzeczułka* means a thing in this context, and in terms of phonics it is associated with a small river, while *parka* has a quantitative meaning, it means several, a couple, and phonically it refers to the diminutive noun form para (dwoje) – parka.

In the semantic layer, in the diminutives appearing in the correspondence between Witkiewicz and his wife, one can discern the main, categorical meaning of littleness (e.g. **drobne świństewka** [little dirty tricks], **mały hemoroidek** [little haemorrhoid]) – while the stylistic character is clear, strong expressiveness – pejorative overtones, ironic and/or humorous overtones. These derivatives are an exponent of the author's high emotionality, his axiology, but also the linguistic humour (**hemoroidek** [little haemorrhoid]; **fetorek** [little stenchl]).

Apart from a large group of lexemes with a formal exponent of diminutiveness, in Witkacy's lexical material there are formations typical of general language,

with classic exponents of suffixal derivation, e.g. **bażanciość** umysłowa [mental pheasant-ness] (23); opromieniony **wspomnieniowością** [radiant with recollection-ness] (1007), but also created as a result of paradigmatic derivation, sometimes combined with the disintegration of the theme of the word-formation basis or suffixation with less productive formants and a less legible word-formation basis). An example is contained in (11).

(11)
mad **popojka** [poop] at the Star[oniewiczs] (239); Nanny sick with **sprzątwa** [cleaning] (564); About **stypa** [wake] nothing (1115); Pain, fever, **opuchol** [swelling] (774) ['opuchlina' swelling (medic) – *SW*]; weak after **grypona** [flu] (802); he mumbled into the phone about the **portreton** [portrait] (824); (referring to the shirt and **smrodologia** [lit. stinkology; here: used underwear]) (760).

2.3. Composite

"Who said that compound words are against the 'spirit' of the Polish language (...). Now there is a new 'spirit', depending on the needs" – this is how Witkiewicz (1968, p. 135) wrote about the composition in "Jedyne wyjście" [The Only Way Out The only exit]. It was not the need for a nomination that prompted him to create complex structures, but the need for expression and originality, or simply communication. The conviction that language was worn out put Witkacy in a state of creative suspension, when he was overcome by the thought of the impossibility of creating and achieving Pure Form, which was an important point of his philosophy. Words were overloaded with automatically appearing associations, entangled in tradition, and Witkiewicz wanted to free himself from this, hence the originality at the word-formation level, although actually based on traditional nominative techniques. The group of composites includes assemblies, combinations, and contaminations. Witkiewicz's creativity here mainly concerns the juxtaposition of word-formation bases into a complex unit, based on the concept of semantic connection, surprising formations composed of such and no other bases. The crafting scheme is traditional, but the selection of components is unpredictable. In (12) and (13) there are examples of interfix compositions, lists in (14), and contamination in (15).

(12)
had no **duposkopu** czy **tyłkowglądu** [buttoscope or butt view] (906); Wicked **Snobomędrek** [Snobbish-wiseman] (957); **listowstręt** [letter disgust] (1061); sudden **zęboból** [toothache] (1077).

Witkiewicz is aware of the innovations he creates, which he writes directly about (cf. examples 13, 14).

(13)

I made the words **dziwkojebnia** i **domojebnia** [bitch and home fuck]

(1178)

Domojebnia
Damojebnia } **Jebosklon** [Bitchfuck]
Dziwkojebnia
Kurwojebnia

   I'm turning into some **gównociąg bagdadzko-antołowiecki** [Baghdad-Antołowiec shit pipeline] (1178)

(14)

I coined the concept of **bieda-portretów** [poverty-portraits] and **bieda-dupy** [poverty-ass] (1000); I have influenza (…) **śpiączkowo-bezgorączkową** [coma-afebrile] (353); Concerning **pierdzeńkowo-sraczkowatych [**farting-diarrhoea] experiences (575).

   The way of formal integration of two or more elements, which may be hybrid components: native and foreign ones, is considered to be the characteristic feature of contamination. The procedure consists in associating formally convergent particles, their overlapping, without the need to respect morpheme boundaries (i.e. phonological, morphological and morphological rules).

(15)

I have **Lwistek** with me [Leon Chwistek] (36); **Bystek** is **chwidłowaty** [here: cattle-like], yet. (158).

   Quite often, in Witkacy's letters to his wife, we can encounter *anagrams* – neologisms created by rearranging letters or syllables in words, examples of which are in (16).

(16)

Let **trak szlafił** [the sawmill grind/ the trail hit] this mail (129); The Lady **zchwinęła** [dislocated] her knee (1214); **Dół w bolku** [lit. Down in Bolko; here: pain down there] (621); fall into **niewołapone** [the wrong] hands (821); How **Móg Biły** [dear God] is to me (798).

2.4. Adaptations of foreign language basics

The epistolograph also creates new word-formation units on the basis of foreign-language lexis. The phonetic form of a word or expression becomes the basis for word formation. Some borrowings function in the transcribed version,

without additional word-formation treatments, others in adaptation, being subjected to (paradigmatic or phonological) derivation or other morphological process, and in this shape were included in the Polish paradigm[11], as illustrated in (17).

(17)
from my **etherjer** (179) [Fr. intérieur – inside, here: the inside of the soul]; *żiupajtery* (193) [Eng. jupitery – reflector lamps]; **ferpary** about the wedding (114) [Fr. faire-part – notice]; Dearest Nini: ***chujschu*** is scary. (937) [joking transcription of 'Who's who', a biographical dictionary]; borrow from anyone (…) nęportki (764) [Fr. m'importe qui – no matter whom]; I don't feel any **żuadewiwru** (626) [Fr. joie de vivre – joy of life].

3. Witkiewicz's word-formation innovations in the cognitive perspective

The structural approach shows how rich and internally diverse the research material is. When analysing such units and deciphering their semantic content, it is context, textual and/or situational entanglement which are important. When a given word-formation unit is authorial occasionalism and ephemeral in nature, a broader view is needed. Such tools are provided by cognitive grammar (incidentally, it often corresponds to the findings of structuralists), the most complete lecture of which was written by Ronald W. Langacker (1987, 1995, 2008, 2009), and is continued in Poland, e.g. by Krystyna Waszakowa (2017) (but also Kardela, 2005; Krzeszowski, 1997, 1999, 2012, 2013; Strutyński, 2005; Tabakowska, 1995, 2001; among others), and I will often refer to the findings of these researchers.

As noted by Waszakowa (2017, pp 113–114),

> word-formation considerations about the cognitive inclination are not limited to what results from the relationship between the derivative and the basic word, or from presenting semantic-formal relations between word-formation-related words (e.g. within the word-formation nest), but also take into account analysis and description of conceptual structures, both the word-formation base and the derivative, as reflecting human cognitive abilities and conceptualization skills.

and perception. This means that the creation of conceptual content is based on the general human knowledge of the world, and the reading of meaning on the basis of reference to the so-called cognitive domains in which this general knowledge is contained. In both approaches – the structuralist and cognitive ones – a word-formation motivation is mentioned, which reveals the relationship between the meaning of the derivative word and its word-formation base. However, in the

---

[11] The opposite phenomenon also occurs, i.e. stylization of native words into foreign words by adding a characteristic (quasi-)suffix: "Fucking every week like Flaubert. **Kurważ** [Fucker] must be increased like voltage, litre and mileage (and mileage!) (1047)."

cognitive approach, both units are anchored in cognitive domains – the source domain shapes the target domain, and this was shaped by the source domain (Langacker, 1995, p. 164). The conceptual content takes a specific form thanks to the word-formation means that language has at its disposal.

The new concepts are based on two compatible cognitive processes: comparison and viewing. A *comparison* is possible thanks to the so-called scanning, i.e. a conceptual analysis of the comparison pattern (directing our attention to the source domain) and the comparison object (target domain), i.e. juxtaposing them in order to read the differences between them (Waszakowa, 2017, p. 43). This procedure is also used in extracting patterns and categorizing, decomposing expressions into components and determining their functions, and in determining semantic convergence between the elements of various conceptual structures (p. 43). Langacker (as cited in Waszakowa, 2017, p. 44) associates the other of the cognitive processes – viewing – with the mental ability of man "to view the perceived situation in many different ways." From the elements of viewing distinguished by the cognitive scientist, revealing how a person perceives a given situation or event mentally, in the context of the material obtained from letters written by Witkacy to his wife, the following should be mentioned. First, profiling, i.e., according to Langacker's theory, highlighting, emphasizing in a given cognitive structure some element(s) which, in the conceptualizer's assumption, deserves to be in the foreground for some reason. It is the construction of the event in terms of "figure/ground" - foreground and background elements. Second, the adopted perspective, a subjective or objective point of view that translates into the way the situation is constructed (cf. Waszakowa, 2017, p. 44).

Comparing as an ability of the human mind together with the ability to combine structures allows for the "operation of conceptual integration (i.e. merging, fusion of concepts), as described by Gilles Fauconnier and Mark Turner (1998), as a result of which, at the cognitive level, a new structure emerges from two or more concepts in an amalgam, irreducible to its components" (Waszakowa, 2017, pp. 36–37). We deal with amalgam formed as a result of mental process, e.g. in the case of compositions that appear in Witkiewicz's letters.

However, it is impossible to analyse all the individuals excerpted from the correspondence from a cognitive perspective, so I had to make an arbitrary choice. I will limit myself to three units representing different techniques of creation: the derivative **smrodologia** [lit. stinkology] and the contamination **chwidłowaty** [here cattle-like], as illustrated in (18).

(18)
Miracles of St. Witkacy (...) I will tell orally (about the shirt and **smrodologia** [lit. stinkology] (760); **Bystek** is **chwidłowaty** [here: cattle-like] though (158).

We believe that these are dynamic speech events, the meaning of which can be read from usage, taking into account the extra-linguistic context. The

conceptualizer created these units on purpose, while the receiver's task is to read the intention of the sender.

In the first neologism, **smrodologia** [lit. stinkology], one can see the mental operation of the subject of the two input spaces, between which he notices the relationship of correspondence, creates the third semantic quality, which has not existed so far. Mental space arose from associations evoked by a specific use of language in a specific (non-)linguistic context. The used suffix –(o)logia [-ology] is characteristic of specialist and scientific structures. Witkacy juxtaposed it – in a manner characteristic of the idiostyle of the writer-epistolographer – with a stylistically contrasting lexeme. Language users, on the basis of comparison and analogy, will be able to recreate the scheme following the pattern this lexeme was created in. The apparent structural transparency, however, does not guarantee proper decoding of the meaning of the derivative. In Witkiewicz's letter, as can be seen after taking into account the context of the use of the lexeme, cultural elements and knowledge of epistolography, this word by no means refers to a field of science, but on the basis of association and joke, it is a term for used/dirty men's underwear. The key to correct mental decoding is therefore knowledge of the matrix, but also the recipient's knowledge of reality and the knowledge of the situational context.

The contamination **chwidłowaty Bystek** [here: cattle-like] was created from the intersection of two words: the surname *Chwistek* (originally Witkacy's friend, and then fierce enemy) and the adjectival derivative *bodłowaty*, formed from the noun 'cattle' with the suffix -*owaty*. On the formal level, this was done by exchanging word particles without respecting morphological boundaries. On the mental level, conceptual integration takes place and an amalgam is created – a new concept derived from two source (input) spaces and creating a third one, independent of the roots, but based on the elements selected by the conceptualiser. The first input space – Chwistek – Leon, a person known to Witkacy, evoking ambivalent emotions in him, the second input space – bydłowaty [cattle-like] – having animal features or behaviour, livestock. In this case, we have elements integrated into one formation with a clear adjective component. Having two input spaces, a common meaning denominator should be found and a generic space should be created, which consists of: 'a subject, a specific real person, with an individual character, habits, behaviour', 'appearance and behaviour of animals / cattle' and 'a feature with an immanent assessment of behaviour, an axiological element'. The amalgam acquires a specific content as a result of the associations of the content included in the constituent lexemes and on account of the creative activity of the conceptualizer, in this case we are very sure that it was Witkiewicz. The intersection of words is a kind of comparison of the behaviour of a specific person (Leon Chwistek) to the behavior of animals. The friend's depreciation was hidden in the amalgam. The lexeme is occasional, unique, it shows a play on

words, it is not structurally transparent outside the context in which it was brought to life. The emergence of the contamination expression was provoked by the behaviour of Leon Chwistek, who dared to criticize Witkacy's work. Witkiewicz's wife – Jadwiga – knew the background of the event, since Witkacy shared the details of his life in the letters; thus, assumingly, the conceptual amalgam was clear to her as well.

Looking at this occasionalism only from the structural side, we see only the contamination of elements (if we know the broader context), while we are able to extract the content / concept only when we combine this perspective with the cognitive analysis.

4. Concluding remarks

The richness of structures created from various word-formation bases confirms the thesis of great linguistic creativity, which was demonstrated by Witkiewicz in his letters to his wife. The variety of techniques and forms can be seen both in appellatives and onyms. From the formal point of view, innovations arose as a result of affixation, composition, contamination, borrowings (with accompanying procedures) and various types of wordplay, i.e. classic word-formation mechanisms, but the epistolographer's ingenuity can be seen at the level not of technique itself, but of language. Witkiewicz often posted comments from the author, in which he expressed his distance to the linguistic matter he used, but which he considered worn out; hence, he was looking for new forms, new lexemes. As a result, he created a lot of neologisms and occasionalisms, which are a characteristic feature of the artist's idiolect and idiostyle. The new word-formation structures allowed Witkacy to express irony, mockery, parody, jokes, and, at times, sarcasm. They were also a carrier of jokes and puns.

One of the driving forces of Witkiewicz's linguistic activity is the pursuit of language individualization, achieved in various ways, that is, making language capable of expressing metaphysical feelings and experiences of Individual Existence (cf. Nowotny-Szybistowa, 1973, p. 19) and he managed to achieve this uniqueness. A structural look at word-formation structures has allowed us to identify the technique by means of which a new word-formation unit was created, while the cognitive perspective has allowed us to understand the relationships between the constituent elements, and what symbolic content the source domains acquire after consolidation (cf. Kłaczyńska, 2017).

References

Burkacka, I., & Kaproń-Charzyńska, I. (2022). Metodologia synchronicznego słowotwórstwa strukturalistycznego – przeszłość w polskich badaniach słowotwórczych czy ich trwałe zaplecze? [The methodology of synchronous structuralist word-formation – the past in Polish word-formation research or its permanent background?]. *Język Polski, 1*, 5–25.

Chruścińska, K. (1978). O formacjach potencjalnych i okazjonalizmach [On potential formations and occasionalisms]. In M. Szymczak (Ed.), *Z zagadnień słownictwa współczesnego języka Polskiego* (pp. 69–79). Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.

Degler, J. (2013). *Witkacego portret wielokrotny* [Witkacy's multiple portrait]. Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.

Doroszewski, W. (Ed.). (n.d.). *Słownik języka polskiego*. https://sjp.pwn.pl/doroszewski/lista

Dudek, P. (2007). Wizja świata Witkacego w nazwach własnych jego powieści [Witkacy's vision of the world in the proper names of his novels]. *Onomastica, 70*, 267–283.

Fauconnier, G., & Turner, M. (1998). Conceptual Integration Network. *Cognitive Science, 22*(2), 133–187. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0364-0213(99)80038-X

Górny, H. (2014). Nazwa własna w tekście epistolarnym a osobliwości idiolektalne Witkacego – na przykładzie Listów do żony z lat 1923–1939 [A proper name in an epistolary text and Witkacy's idiolectal peculiarities – on the example of Letters to my wife from the years 1923–1939]. *Język Polski, 5*, 385–398.

Grzegorczykowa, R. (1995). Jak rozumieć kreatywny charakter języka [How to understand the creative nature of language]. In A. M. Lewicki, & R. Tokarski (Eds.), *Kreowanie świata w tekstach* (pp. 13–24). Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.

Grzegorczykowa, R., Laskowski, R., & Wróbel, H. (Eds.). (1998). *Gramatyka współczesnego języka polskiego. Morfologia* (Vol. 2). [Grammar of the contemporary Polish language. Morphology]. Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Kardela, H. (2005). Schemat i prototyp w gramatyce kognitywnej [Schema and prototype in cognitive grammar]. In H. Kardela, Z. Muszyński, & M. Rajewski (Eds.), *Kognitywistyka. Problemy i perspektywy* (pp. 179–207). Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.

Karłowicz, J., Kryński, A. A., & Niedźwiedzki, W. (Eds.). (1900–1927). *Słownik języka polskiego* (Vols. 1–8). Nakł. prenumeratorów i kasy im. Mianowskiego.

Kłaczyńska, A. (2017). Poza strukturalizm. Hybrydy leksykalne w świetle gramatyki kognitywnej [Beyond structuralism. Lexical hybrids in the light of cognitive grammar.]. *Investigationes Linguisticae, 34*, 124–142. https://doi.org/10.14746/il.2015.32.7

Krzeszowski, T. (1997). *Angels and Devils in Hell: Elements of Axiology in Semantics*. Energeia.

Krzeszowski, T. (1999). *Aksjologiczne aspekty semantyki językowej* [Axiological aspects of linguistic semantics]. Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika.

Krzeszowski, T. (2012). *Meaning and Translation*. Peter Lang Verlag.

Krzeszowski, T. (2013). *Time Works Wonders. Selected Papers in Contrastive and Cognitive Linguistics*. Peter Lang Verlag.

Kudra, B. (2001). *Kreatywność leksykalna w dyskursie politycznym polskiej prasy lat osiemdziesiątych i dziewięćdziesiątych* [Lexical creativity in the political discourse of the Polish press in the 1980s and 1990s]. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.

Langacker, R. W. (1987). *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar* (Vol. 1). Stanford University Press.

Langacker, R. W. (1995). *Wykłady z gramatyki kognitywnej: Kazimierz nad Wisłą* (Trans. J. Berej et al.; Ed. H. Kardela). Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.

Langacker, R. W. (2008). *Cognitive Grammar. A Basic Introduction*. Oxford University Press.

Langacker, R. W. (2009). *Gramatyka kognitywna* [Cognitive Grammar]. Universitas.

Majewska-Wójcik, A. (2014). Skróty i szyfry w "Listach do żony" Stanisława Ignacego Witkiewicza [Abbreviations and language codes in S. I. Witkiewicz's *Letters to wife*]. In R. Bizior, & D. Suska (Eds.), *Mechanizmy ekonomizacji języka* (pp. 203–214). Wydawnictwo im. Stanisława Podobińskiego Akademii im. Jana Długosza w Częstochowie.

Markowski, A. (2005). Językoznawstwo normatywne dziś i jutro: zadania, szanse, zagrożenia [Normative linguistics today and tomorrow: tasks, opportunities, threats]. *Postscriptum, 1/2*(48/49), 126–139.

Mierzwińska-Hajnos, A. (2019). Amalgamaty pojęciowe w dyskursie politycznym. Kognitywne studium przypadku [Conceptual amalgams in political discourse. A cognitive case study]. *Prace Filologiczne, 73*, 629–647. https://doi.org/10.32798/pf.509

Nowotny-Szybistowa, M. (1973). *Osobliwości leksykalne w języku Stanisława Ignacego Witkiewicza* [Lexical Peculiarities in the Language of Stanisław Ignacy Witkiewicz]. Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.

Strutyński, J. (2005). *Gramatyka polska* [Grammar of Polish language]. Wydawnictwo Tomasz Strutyński.

Tabakowska, E. (1995). *Gramatyka i obrazowanie, Wprowadzenie do językoznawstwa kognitywnego* [Grammar and Imagery, Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics]. PAN.

Tabakowska, E. (Ed.). (2001). *Kognitywne podstawy języka i językoznawstwa* [Cognitive foundations of language and linguistics]. Universitas.

Waszakowa, K. (2017). *Kognitywno-komunikacyjne aspekty słowotwórstwa. Wybrane zagadnienia opisu derywacji w języku polskim* [Cognitive and communicative aspects of word formation. Selected issues of derivation description in Polish]. Wydział Polonistyki Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Witkiewicz, S. I. (1968). *Jedyne wyjście* [The Only Way Out] (Ed. T. Jodelka-Burzecki). Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.

Witkiewicz, S. I. (2005–2012). *Listy do żony* [Letters to my wife]. Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.