

UDC 811.161.2'373.2

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32837/2312-3192-2018-11-127-133>

## RESEARCH OF ANTHROPNOMS IN THE CONTEXT OF LINGUOCULTURAL STUDIES (BASED ON THE SURNAMES OF THE DNIPROVSKY PRYPORIZHZHIYA)

Iryna Korniienko<sup>1</sup>

### Abstract

In the article is characterized the methodological foundations of research of the anthroponyms lexical as unique signal system, components of which have particular structure, nomination, specificity of institution production and extension, being subjected to language-wide lexes of beginning and functioning. Each unit of names is a certain, often hidden lingvokulturnyj text decoding of which reveals information about the names of individuals traditions of individual regions and the entire ethnic group.

Culture undoubtedly forms and arranges the thinking of the linguistic personality, language classes and concepts. Language is both a means of creating, developing and preserving culture, its part due to its ability to create real, objectively existing works of material and spiritual culture. Therefore, language signs are capable of performing the function of "language" culture, which is expressed in the ability of the language to reflect the cultural and national mentality of its carriers. The linguoculturalist idea, based on the human-centered philosophy which is characteristic of Ukrainian spirituality, is actualized in connection with the fixation in the language, ethno-texts and discursive practices of the spiritual and material culture of the people; it refers also to proper names of people, recorded in revision and metrical books that reflect civil status acts and evidence the movement of anthroponyms, which are the most culturable signs, as directly related to the person's biography and the history of the land. Anthroponymy has accumulated in itself information available in the most important for a person array of conceptual layers reproduced in the language pictures of the world of various lingvo cultures, first of all, this array captures the information about the culture of the people, his life, customs, beliefs, emotions, in general, the mentality of the carriers of the same linguistic culture. The results of regional anthroponymic research should be considered more closely in the context of national culture and more widely –in the connection to inter-national linguistic and cultural phenomena and processes.

### Keywords

Anthroponym, language, culture, cultural linguistics, linguistic culture of peace.

**1. Introduction.** The **aim** of the work is to highlight the linguistic and cultural foundations of the study of anthroponymic material. The **object** of the research is the anthroponymic vocabulary of the Ukrainian language as a constituent part of the national culture. The **subject** of the study – Linguistic and Cultural Aspect of the Anthroponymic Research of the Dniprovsky Pryporizhziya. Anthroponyms are modeled in the

language based on the actualization of architectural cultural concepts, the internal form of which is significant for the humanities, linguistics in particular, since it "decoding" the specificity of the mentality of each particular nation, points to a universal and peculiar, which are reflected in each particular linguistic culture. Therefore, the question of the research of anthroponyms in the linguocultural aspect is extremely actual and promising.

This relevance is also reinforced by the fact that the philosophical analysis of language and culture was carried out mainly in the Western hermeneutic tradition (J. Diubo<sup>2</sup>, D. Vico<sup>3</sup>, G. Lessing<sup>4</sup>, E. Husserl<sup>5</sup>, M. Khaydegger<sup>6</sup>, V. Diltei<sup>7</sup>, G. Hadamer<sup>8</sup>). Understanding of language as a socio-cultural phenomenon was reflected in the writings of K. Levi-Strossa<sup>9</sup>, E. Kassirera<sup>10</sup> etc.

F. Buslaev<sup>11</sup>, A. Afanasiev<sup>12</sup>, O. Potebnia<sup>13</sup>; L. Vithenshtein<sup>14</sup>, H. Hadamer<sup>15</sup>, M. Heidegger<sup>16</sup> engaged in problems of language, culture, ethnos interrelations; V. Toporov<sup>17</sup>, N. Tolstoi<sup>18</sup>, E. Bartminski<sup>19</sup> devoted their works to the study of culture through language, arguing that language is an instrument for the development and preservation of culture, its share, since with it real, objectively existing models of material and spiritual culture are created.

**2. Methodology:** with the help of the main descriptive-analytical method, theoretical generalizations concerning the interrelation of language and culture, the necessity of studying anthroponyms in the linguocultural aspect were made. Relying on

<sup>1</sup> Korniienko Iryna, Phd, associate professor, Mykolaiv Sukhomlinskiy National University, Nikolska, 24, 54030, Mykolaiv, Ukraine, E-mail: iakorni74@gmail.com, ORCID ID 0000-0002-2991-0476

<sup>2</sup> Diubo, 1976

<sup>3</sup> Vico, 1940

<sup>4</sup> Lessing, 1957

<sup>5</sup> Husserl, 1986

<sup>6</sup> Khaydegger, 1989

<sup>7</sup> Diltei, 1988

<sup>8</sup> Hadamer, 1988

<sup>9</sup> Levi-Strossa, 1983

<sup>10</sup> Kassirer, 1993

<sup>11</sup> Buslaev, 1961

<sup>12</sup> Afanasiev, 1996

<sup>13</sup> Potebnia, 1993

<sup>14</sup> Vithenshtein, 1958

<sup>15</sup> Hadamer, 1988

<sup>16</sup> Heidegger, 1989

<sup>17</sup> Toporov, 1995

<sup>18</sup> Tolstoi, 1995

the western hermeneutic tradition, the special status of onymies in the language structure is emphasized, which is manifested in the fact that the personal names, on the one hand, are part of the lexical composition of the language and are subject to all their laws of origin and functioning, and on the other hand, it is a unique sign system, whose components have a special structure, exclusive purpose, specifics of creation and distribution.

Surnames are one of the most important research sources of questions about linguistic reflection of the cultural history of their carriers and mentality and other characteristic features of the population of a particular region. The basic idea is that culture forms and organizes the thinking of linguistic personality, language categories and concepts.

The source base of the research is the dictionary of the surnames of the Dniprovsky Pryporizhziya by V. Horpynych and I. Korniienko<sup>20</sup>, in which about 20,000 names from the territory of the Dniprovsky Pryporizhziya located on both sides of the Dniro River from Dnipropetrovsk almost to the city of Zaporizhziya, where along the river bed to the construction of the Dnirohes there were ten rapids and thirty stone ridges with a total length of up to 75 km were recorded. The exact boundaries of the Dniprovsky Pryporizhziya have not yet been established. Therefore, this territory includes settlements located from Dnipropetrovsk to Zaporizhziya on both sides of the Dniro to the west and east within the Dnipropetrovsk and partly Zaporizhziya region at a distance of up to 200 km, as well as to the north, northwest and northeast from Dnipropetrovsk, that is, the territory, which has a common history of settlement, which was significantly influenced by its central part – the Pillars, Zaporohy, and in general, Pryporizhziya

in the broad sense. The name of Pryporizhziya (comp. Zaporizhziya) is based on the model of the Zadniproviya – Prydniproviya, Zabuzhziya – Prybuzhziya.

The material of this scientific studio is the Ukrainian surnames received through a continuous sample from work: V. Horpynych and I. Korniienko. Anthroponymy of the Dniprovsky Pryporizhziya and the adjacent regions of Ukraine<sup>21</sup>. The total sample size is 11,526 units.

### 3. Results and Discussion.

Anthroponymic system is perceived as a peculiar synthesis of historical-social and linguistic-cultural information about the nature and meaning of the proper names and surnames, holding anthroponymic researches in the field of language science. Even in the nineteenth century people noted that the proper names reflect the traces of human caprice and fantasy, serve shortly as the history of life and the national spirit<sup>22</sup>.

From the middle of the twentieth century. the research of anthroponyms becomes anthropological. The actual name begins to be regarded as part of the culture of man, the nation as a carrier of cultural and historical information. This was facilitated by the development of linguoculture as a product of the anthropological paradigm in linguistics, the beginning of which was laid back in the nineteenth century. V. von Humboldt, who for the first time formulated the provisions on the relationship between the language and character of the people, noting that different languages in their essence, their influence on knowledge and feelings are different visions of the world, and the originality of the language affects the essence of the nation, therefore, a profound study of the language should cover all that history and philosophy associate with the inner world of man<sup>23</sup>.

The concept in Humboldt found an interpretation in the writings of O. Potebni<sup>24</sup>, Sh. Balli<sup>25</sup>, Boduen De Kurtene<sup>26</sup>, R. Jakobson<sup>27</sup>. Its essence is in the following theses: 1) the material and spiritual culture are embodied in the language; 2) any culture is national, which is expressed through a special worldview, since the language is inherent in the internal form which is specific to each nation; 3) the internal form of speech – is an expression of the people's spirit, its culture; 4) language is the intermediary between a person and the surrounding world. Consequently, the language was considered as a spiritual power<sup>28</sup>.

Philosophical analysis of language and culture was carried out in the western hermeneutic tradition and by other philosophical scholars (J. Diubo<sup>29</sup>, D. Vico<sup>30</sup>, G. Lessing<sup>31</sup>, E. Husserl, M. Heidegger<sup>33</sup>, V. Diltei<sup>34</sup>, G. Hadamer<sup>35</sup>). Understanding language as a socio-cultural phenomenon was reflected in the works of K. Levy-Strauss<sup>36</sup>, E. Cassirera<sup>37</sup> etc.

Problems of the relationship of language, culture, and ethnicity were studied in the middle of XIX cen-

<sup>19</sup> Bartminski, 1985

<sup>20</sup> Horpynych, Korniienko, 2003

<sup>21</sup> Horpynych, I. Korniienko, 2012

<sup>22</sup> Danilova, 2004

<sup>23</sup> Humboldt, 1984

<sup>24</sup> Potebni, 1993

<sup>25</sup> Balli, 1961

<sup>26</sup> Boduen De Kurtene, 1963

<sup>27</sup> Jakobson, 1996

<sup>28</sup> Humboldt, 1984

<sup>29</sup> Diubo, 1976

<sup>30</sup> Vico, 1940

<sup>31</sup> Lessing, 1957

<sup>32</sup> Husserl, 1986

<sup>33</sup> Heidegger, 1989

<sup>34</sup> Diltei, 1988

<sup>35</sup> Hadamer, 1988

<sup>36</sup> Levi-Stross, 1983

<sup>37</sup> Kassirer, 1993

tury by F. Buslaev<sup>38</sup>, A. Afanasiev<sup>39</sup>, O. Potebnia<sup>40</sup>; in the twentieth century – L. Vithenshtein<sup>41</sup>, H. Hadamer<sup>42</sup>, M. Heidegger<sup>43</sup>.

Scientists are increasingly relying on the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis about the significant dependence of thinking on language. Neo-gumboltianism and the formation of the famous school of Sapir-Wharf were founded on the understanding of the unity of language and culture.

A. Bruckner<sup>44</sup>, V. Toporov<sup>45</sup>, N. Tolstoi<sup>46</sup>, E. Bartminski<sup>47</sup> devoted their works to the ideas of studying culture through language. It is argued that language is an instrument for the development and preservation of culture, its share, because with the help of it real, objectively existing patterns of material and spiritual culture are created.

Culture undoubtedly forms and arranges the thinking of the linguistic personality, language classes and concepts. Language is both a means of creating, developing and preserving culture, its part due to its ability to create real, objectively existing works of material and spiritual culture. On the basis of this idea, the science of linguistic culture was created – the marginal branch of linguistics, which studies the fixation in the language, ethno-texts and discursive practices of the spiritual and material culture of the people, that is, the culturally significant information – the preservation in the collective memory of the people in the symbolic ways of material and spiritual awareness of the world by certain ethnos reproduced in his ideas, patterns of thinking and behavior, a system of ethnic and aesthetic values, norms, customs, rituals, myths, beliefs, superstitions, life, etc<sup>48</sup>. The subject of modern linguocultural studies is the study of cultural semantics of linguistic signs, which is formed during the interaction of two different codes – language and culture, since each language personality is simultaneously a cultural personality. Therefore, language signs are capable of performing the function of "language" culture, which is expressed in the ability of the language to reflect the cultural and national mentality of its carriers. Key concepts of culture occupy an important position in the collective linguistic con-

sciousness. Cultural connotation is an interpretation of the denotative aspect of meaning in the categories of culture. The potential resources of the nominative system of language are realized in the connotation because each word has the ability not only to create, but also to maintain a deep meaning, which is in complex relationships with the semantics of the word, to establish it in the language, thus creating a cultural and national language picture.

It should be noted the commonality of semiotic systems of culture and language, which appears in the following characteristics: and culture, and language are forms of consciousness, reflecting the human worldview; they exist in dialogue with each other; subjects of language and culture – it is always an individual person or society person or society; the common feature of language and culture is normativity and historicism; language and culture is characterized by antinomy "dynamics-statics"<sup>49</sup>. However, language and culture are different semiotic systems, although both are iconic. Language, in contrast to culture, is capable of self-organization and is oriented towards a mass recipient.

The language forms its bearer, and each national language reflects and forms a national character – a set of specific psychological features, which in one way or another are inherent to the socio-ethnic community in the specific economic, cultural and natural conditions of its development. So, among the surnames of the Dniprovsky Pryporizhzhya 1554 names are fixed, the basis for the formation of which was a certain internal feature of the person: a characteristic action, a habit (830 names): *Задирайко, Цілуйко, Динда, Лежень*; character rice, temperament, feature of temperament (513 names): *Добренько, Занудько, Мацапура, Швидкий, Шлапак*; feature of speech (136 names): *Гаркавенко, Лепетюк, Пискливий*; mental abilities (75 names): *Дурних, Незнайко, Мудрак*. For example, a neat and tidy man was nicknamed as *Шлапак* by Ukrainians, evil and wicked person – *Червак*, that who very loudly speaks – *Лементя*. Fidgety and agile people were named *Жевжиками*, and fools – *Струцями*<sup>50</sup>.

The linguoculturalist idea, based on the human-centered philosophy which is characteristic of Ukrainian spirituality, is actualized in connection with the fixation in the language, ethno-texts and discursive practices of the spiritual and material culture of the people; it refers also to proper names of people, recorded in revision and metrical books that reflect civil status acts and evidence the movement of anthroponyms, which are the most culturable signs, as directly related to the person's biography and the history of the land. At the forefront in the philosophy of language comes the problem of meaning. Elements of the language system ("signs") perform a universal function ("universal function"). The signs carry out the initial processing of material and establish

<sup>38</sup> Buslaev, 1961

<sup>39</sup> Afanasiev, 1996

<sup>40</sup> Potebnia, 1993

<sup>41</sup> Vithenshtein, 1958

<sup>42</sup> Hadamer, 1988

<sup>43</sup> Heidegger, 1989

<sup>44</sup> Bruckner, 1980

<sup>45</sup> Toporov, 1995

<sup>46</sup> Tolstoi, 1995

<sup>47</sup> Bartminski, 1985

<sup>48</sup> Selivanova, 2011

<sup>49</sup> Maslova, 2001

<sup>50</sup> Horpynych, I. Korniienko, 2012

the general outlines for further learning of outspoken space. Consequently, the whole world, all the things that occur in the field of the spiritual vision of man in the field of his consciousness, are for him such that have meaning that is, any subject can be regarded as a sign of a certain content. Thus, in Pryporizkyi region we observe 148 surnames, in the basis of which is the name of a particular subject or reality. For example: *Кожушко*, *Тенетко* (*тенетка* – a very worn shirt), *Сабо* (boots on wooden soles), *Шубенко*. 76 surnames come from the names of buildings, structures and their parts (*Бараков*, *Димарів*, *Хатина*), 310 lexemes – from the names of food products (*Бринза*, *Пироженко*, *Маслов*, *Колбасюк*, *Гречка*)<sup>51</sup> etc.

Consequently, language, thinking, and culture form a single entity which components can not exist without one. Together they relate to the real world, depend on it, reflect and simultaneously form it. The world surrounding the person is represented by three forms: the real picture of the world, the cultural and social picture of the world, the language picture of the world.

The real picture of the world is an objective tribute that surrounds a person. Cultural painting is a reflection of a real picture through the prism of concepts formed on the basis of representations of a person, obtained through the senses and formed through collective or individual consciousness. Different peoples have different cultural pictures due to various factors: geography, climate, natural conditions, history, social system, level of scientific knowledge, beliefs, traditions, way of life, etc. This can be traced on the example of many surnames, for example from anthroponyms derived from the names of household items and domestic equipment (675 lexemes): *Коромислячено*, *Казанок*, *Сокирко*, *Соха*, *Бодня*, *Держак*, *Лопата*, *Барда* (ax, knife), *Байбара* (long whip); from the names of plants (560 lexemes): *Грaб*, *Слива*, *Ольховий*, *Верба*, *Редька*, *Лобода*, *Березін*<sup>52</sup> etc.

It is clear that the national culture of the world is primary in relation to language. It is richer, more complete and deeper than linguistic. However, it is the language that implements, verbalizes the national cultural image of the world, preserves it and transfers from generation to generation. Although the language does not fix everything that is in the national vision of the world, it is capable to describe everything. So, any word is not just the name of an object or phenomenon. This fragment of reality passed through human consciousness and in the process of reflection

acquired the specific features inherent in this national social consciousness, due to the cultural experience of the nation. Anthroponomy has accumulated in itself information available in the most important for a person array of conceptual layers reproduced in the language pictures of the world of various linguistic cultures, first of all, this array captures the information about the culture of the people, his life, customs, beliefs, emotions, in general, the mentality of the carriers of the same linguistic culture. Paramées, linguistic archetypal images, verbal symbols, and anthroponyms – they are above all, the units that actually primarily model the originality of the national language picture of the world of each people. It is the anthroponyms which are modeled in the language on the basis of actualization of archetypal cultural concepts, the internal form of which today maybe have lost its topicality, importance for ordinary citizens, but it is significant for the humanities, linguistics in particular, because it "decrypts" the specificity of the mentality of each particular people, points to a universal and peculiar, which are reflected in each particular linguistic culture. For example, 207 studied names originate from names of persons for social state. So, the poor were called *Батрак*, *Бурлака*, *Голота*, *Голошівець*, *Наймит*, *Холопченко*<sup>53</sup>.

Franko pointed out on the topicality of the study of anthroponymy from the review of diachrony, noting that "... the historian finds from them (anthroponyms) the traces of certain historical walks, colonization and mixture of nationalities, and the ethnologist follows them by developing of certain national and public institutions and preferences, the evolution of family and social life, knowledge, crafts and the appropriate customs and beliefs"<sup>54</sup>. Thus, the reason the emergence of surnames that derive from the names of nationalities is, apparently, the migration of people from one ethnic territory to another, but not always. For example, anthroponym *Москаль* could be a name for both a Russian and a Ukrainian soldier who served in the royal army. In 240 studied surnames the connections of other nations with Ukraine, different demographic processes, etc (*Бойко*, *Молдаванець*, *Литвинчук*, *Ляшко*, *Полуциган*, *Лях*)<sup>55</sup> have found their reflection.

Surnames are known to be one of the richest and most authoritative sources for studying the history of native land, language and culture. In the Ukrainian linguistic culture, we trace the names of the Cossack origin, which also have a highly motivated character, verbalize the positive or negative features of their carriers, for example: *Пробийголова*, *Лихобабин*, *Вернигора*, *Вовкодав*, *Перебийніс*, *Вершиволя*, *Рябоштан*, *Скоробагатько*, *Боголюбчик*, *Дериглазов*, *Дармограй*<sup>56</sup> and others. Similar Cossack surnames have no analogues among anthroponyms of other Slavic languages. They point to the preference of the Cossacks, but, moreover, as we see, the concept of "negation" was actualized, verbalized

<sup>51</sup> Норгуньч, І. Корнієнко, 2012

<sup>52</sup> Норгуньч, І. Корнієнко, 2012

<sup>53</sup> Норгуньч, І. Корнієнко, 2012

<sup>54</sup> Франко, 1982

<sup>55</sup> Норгуньч, І. Корнієнко, 2012

<sup>56</sup> Норгуньч, І. Корнієнко, 2012

by the "no", volitional intentions was represented, the imperative, verbalized by the grammatical form of the verb of the imperative method contained in the first part of the anthroponime, the second part of the nickname or surname contains an indication of the subject of action that it can be as a specific object, even part of the human body, and abstract name, which nominate predominantly negative categories. In addition, according to the nickname (surname) given on the Sich, it was possible to obtain pragmatic information about the widespread crafts and handicrafts in Ukraine, for example: *Пушкар, Титаренко, Чоботар, Ковальчук*<sup>57</sup>. Так, *Пушкар, Гармаш*<sup>58</sup> are the nicknames of the Cossacks who served or made the named kind of weapon. In the anthroponimicon of the Dniprovsky Pryporizhzhya 734 surnames originate from the names of persons by profession and kind of activity. These lexemes provide a wealth material for the study of the state-administrative system and economic life of the country (industry, crafts, trade, agriculture, etc.). On such names, the names of military professions (*Хорунжий, Сотниченко, Капралов*), church positions (*Паламарчук, Дяконов, Титар*), names of persons who cared for pets (*Чабанюк, Овчаренко*), names of persons who were related to weaving and sewing of clothes (*Кожухар, Швець, Чоботар, Ткачук*), the names of artisans that processed metals (*Коваленко, Котляр, Токар*), names of official posts (*Комендант, Виборний, Писарев*) names of persons involved in wood processing (*Столяр, Тесленко, Бочкар, Тертишник*), names of persons engaged in agriculture (*Косар, Мельник, Мірошник*), produced and sold food products (*Бражник, Шинкар, Прасоль, Винник, Кухарчук*)<sup>59</sup> etc.

Zaporozhtsi also were highlighted the ability to jocular-humorous or ironically sarcastic linguistic-creative ability to give nicknames, which were later known to be transformed into surnames that could indicate the characteristic trait, a feature that was inherent in the relation to nature of a certain Cossack, the opposite of the real one, in particular *Малий*<sup>60</sup> was the name of a high man, and *Величко*<sup>61</sup> – the name of a Cossack of small height.

Among the Ukrainian surnames we find those which verbalize the funny character, revealed in the specifics of the communicative ability of Ukrainians, in fact their ability to joke over themselves, to model humor. Ability to pronounce as negative, of-

fensive, humiliating, problematic, and also beautiful, good, high quality due to humor is a mental feature of Ukrainians, a Ukrainian national character, which is distinguished by specialists in ethnology, proved by ethnolinguistic research. In the atroponimicon of Ukrainians, this is appropriately verbalized in the surnames, for example: *Нетудихата, Лихобабин, Дідобориц, Кривобок, Дериглазов, Дурноляп, Хайло, Дерило, Головаха, Бубело, Дригола*<sup>62</sup>. This is especially clearly seen in the surnames derived from the names of individuals for their internal properties (1554 lexems) and external features (1315 lexems): *Цілуйко, Занудько, Ломака, Кульгейко, Жирій, Миришавка, Кривуля*<sup>63</sup>.

The appearance of nicknames / surnames as generic names of human activity is primarily related to the satisfaction of the need for a certain identification of a person. A feature of identification is often the corresponding characteristic features of some personality parameters. However, the concept of etimation, a positive or negative characteristic of a person by certain features which indicate mental ability, physical characteristics, description of moral and ethical behavior, that by the way, was represented as the opposite to the really available the particular ability to perform qualitatively or poorly professional duties, more gradually verbalized in anthroponies of Ukrainian linguistic culture. Consequently, the nicknames / surnames, in fact, is one of the important sources of obtaining information of a region-specific nature, information on history, ethnology, ethnography, culture.

**4. Conclusions.** Due to the linguistic analysis of the nature of the motivation (internal form) of the nicknames / surnames of Ukrainian linguistic culture, we completely logically observe the connection between the origin of the surname and certain historical events, cultural traditions, the ability to evaluate, characterize their dignities and defects, mentality, and peculiarities of the national character. During the analysis of anthroponymic units in the linguocultural aspect in the center there is a linguistic and cultural personality with its national peculiar vision of the world, that is, mentality. Considering the specificity of anthroponymic vocabulary, the complete dependence of its origin and existence on cultural traditions and society, it should be noted that there was a need to find new approaches for the study of onymams. The results of regional anthroponymic research should be considered more closely in the context of national culture and more widely – in the connection to inter-national linguistic and cultural phenomena and processes. The prospects for the development of anthroponymy are in the anthropocentric understanding of the anthroponymic subsystem of language in terms of ethno, psycho, socio- and cognitive linguistics, and other aspects of the theory of linguistic communication.

<sup>57</sup> Horpynych, I. Korniienko, 2012

<sup>58</sup> Horpynych, I. Korniienko, 2012

<sup>59</sup> Horpynych, I. Korniienko, 2012

<sup>60</sup> Horpynych, I. Korniienko, 2012

<sup>61</sup> Horpynych, I. Korniienko, 2012

<sup>62</sup> Horpynych, I. Korniienko, 2012

<sup>63</sup> Horpynych, I. Korniienko, 2012

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Афанасьев А. Н. Происхождение мифа / А. Н. Афанасьев. – М., 1996.  
 Балли Ш. Французская стилистика / Ш. Балли. – М., 1961.  
 Бодуэн Де Куртэне И. А. Избранные труды / И. А. Бодуэн Де Куртэне. – М., 1963. – Т. 2.  
 Буслав Ф. И. Исторические очерки русской народной словесности и искусства / Ф. И. Буслав. – М., 1961. – Т. 1.  
 Вико Дж. Основания новой науки об общей природе наций / Дж. Вико. – Л., 1940.  
 Витгенштейн Л. Логико-философский трактат / Л. Витгенштейн. – М.: Иностран. лит-ра, 1958.  
 Гадамер Г. Истина и метод / Г. Гадамер. – М.: Прогресс, 1988.  
 Горпинич В. О. Антропонимия Дніпровського Припоріжжя і суміжних регіонів України: монографія / В. О. Горпинич, І. А. Корнієнко // Ономастика і апелятиви. – Дніпропетровськ-Миколаїв: КВІТ, 2012. – Вип. 38. – 232 с.  
 Горпинич В. О. Прізвища Дніпровського Припоріжжя: словник / В. О. Горпинич, І. А. Корнієнко. – Дніпропетровськ: Пороги, 2003. – 272 с.  
 Гумбольдт В. О. О развитии строения человеческих языков и его влияния на духовное развитие человечества. [1830 – 1835] / В. О. Гумбольдт // Избранные труды по языкознанию. – М., 1984.  
 Гуссерль Э. Кризис европейского человечества и философия / Э. Гуссерль // Вопросы философии. – 1986. – № 3.  
 Данилова И. В. Система личных имен Смоленского региона в XX веке (Динамический аспект): автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. філол. наук: спец. 10.02.01 «Українська мова» / И. В. Данилова. – Смоленск, 2004.  
 Дильтей В. Наброски к критике исторического разума / В. Дильтей // Вопросы философии. – 1988 – № 4.  
 Дюбо Ж.-Б. Критические размышления о поэзии и живописи / Ж.-Б. Дюбо. – М., 1976.  
 Кассирер Э. Теория знаков / Э. Кассирер // Сознание и действительность. – С.-П., 1912. – С. 379–391.  
 Леви-Стросс К. Структура и форма. Семиотика / К. Леви-Стросс. – М.: Радуга, 1983.  
 Лессинг Г. Э. Лаокоон, или о границах живописи и поэзии / Г. Э. Лессинг. – М., 1957.  
 Маслова В. А. Лингвокультурология: Учеб. пособие для студ. высш. учеб. заведений / В. А. Маслова. – М.: Издат. центр «Академия», 2001. – 208 с.  
 Потебня А. А. Мысль и язык / А. А. Потебня. – Киев: СИНТО, 1993.  
 Селіванова О. О. Лінгвістична енциклопедія / О. О. Селіванова. – П.: Довкілля – К, 2011. – 844 с.  
 Толстой Н. И. Язык и народная культура: Очерки по славянской мифологии и этнолингвистике / Н. И. Толстой. – М., 1995.  
 Топоров В. Н. Миф. Ритуал. Символ. Образ: Исследования в области мифопоэтического / В. Н. Топоров. – М., 1995.  
 Франко І. Причини до української ономастики / І. Франко // Іван Франко. Збір. тв.: У 50 т. – К., 1982. – Т. 36. – С. 391–427.  
 Хайдеггер М. О сущности истины / М. О. Хайдеггер // Философские науки. – 1989. – № 4.  
 Якобсон Р. Язык и бессознательное / Р. Якобсон. – М., 1996.  
 Bartmiski E. Stereotyp jako przedmiot lingwistyki / E. Bartmiski // Z problemow frazeologii polskiej i slowianskiej. – Wroclaw, 1985.  
 Bruckner A. Mitologia slowianska i polska / A. Bruckner. – Warszawa, 1980.

## REFERENCES

- Afanasiev, A. N. (1996). The origin of the myth. Moscow.  
 Balli, Sh. (1961). French stylistics. Moscow.  
 Boduen De Kurtene, I. A. (1963). Selected Works. Moscow. V. 2.  
 Buslaev, F. I. (1961). Historical essays of Russian folk literature and art. Moscow. T. 1.  
 Viko, Dzh. (1940). The foundations of a new science of the common nature of nations. L.  
 Vithenshtein, L. (1958). Logico-philosophical treatise. Moscow: Foreign lit-ra.  
 Hadamer, H. (1988). Truth and method. Moscow: Progress.  
 Horpynych, V. O., Korniienko, I. A. (2012). Anthroponymy of the Dniprovsky Priporizhzhya and the adjacent regions of Ukraine: monograph. Onomastics and Appellatives. Dnipropetrovsk-Mykolaiv: KVIT. Publ. 38.  
 Horpynych, V. O., Korniienko, I. A. (2003). Surnames of Dniprovskiy Priporizhzhya: dictionary. Dnipropetrovsk: Porohy.  
 Humboldt, V.O. (1984). About the development of the structure of human languages and its influence on the spiritual development of mankind. [1830 – 1835]. Selected Works on Linguistics. Moscow.  
 Husserl, E. (1986). The crisis of European humanity and philosophy. Issues of Philosophy. № 3.  
 Danilova, I.V. (2004). The system of personal names of the Smolensk region in the XX century (Dynamic aspect): author's abstract of dissertation for gaining scientific degree Candidate of Philological Sciences: spec. 10.02.01 "The Ukrainian language". Smolensk.  
 Diltei, V. (1988). Outline to the Critique of Historical Mind. Questions of philosophy. № 4.  
 Diubo, Zh.-B. (1976). Critical thinking about poetry and painting. Moscow:  
 Kassirer, E. (1912). Theory of signs. Consciousness and reality. St.P. Pp. 379–391.  
 Levi-Stross, K. (1983). Structure and form. Semiotics. Moscow: Rainbow.  
 Lessing, G. E. (1957). Laocoon, or about the boundaries of painting and poetry. Moscow.  
 Maslova, V.A. (2001). Cultural linguistics training manual for stud. of higher educational institutions. Moscow: Publishing Center "Academy".  
 Potebnia, A.A. (1993). Thought and language. Kyiv: SINTO.  
 Selivanova, O. O. (2011). Linguistic Encyclopedia. Kyiv.  
 Tolstoi, N. I. (1995). Language and Folk Culture: Essays on Slavic Mythology and Ethnolinguistics. Moscow.  
 Toporov, V. N. (1995). Myth. Ritual. Symbol. Image: Research in the field of mythopoietic. Moscow.  
 Franko, I. (1982). The Causes for Ukrainian Onomastics. Collected Works: 50 t. Kyiv, T. 36. Pp. 391–427.  
 Heidegger, M. (1989). About the essence of truth. Philosophical sciences. № 4.  
 Jakobson, R. (1996). Language and the unconscious. Moscow.  
 Bartmiski, E. (1985). Stereotyp jako przedmiot lingwistyki. Z problemow frazeologii polskiej i slowianskiej. Wroclaw.  
 Bruckner, A. (1980). Mitologia slowianska i polska. Warszawa.

**Анотація**

У статті охарактеризовано методологічні засади дослідження антропонімної лексики як унікальної знакової системи, компоненти якої мають особливу будову, призначення, специфіку творення та поширення, підпорядковуючись загальномовним законам виникнення й функціонування.

Кожна ономастична одиниця являє собою певний, часто прихований лінгвокультурний текст, декодування якого дозволяє виявити інформацію про традиції найменувань індивідумів окремих регіонів й цілого етносу. Культура формує й організовує мислення мовної особистості. Мова є одночасно і засобом створення, розвитку й зберегання культури, її часткою завдяки своїй властивості створювати реальні, об'єктивно існуючі витвори матеріальної і духовної культури. Мовні знаки здатні виконувати функцію „мови” культури, що виражається у здатності мови відображати культурно-національну ментальність її носіїв. Лінгвокультурологічна ідея, заснована на людиноцентричній філософії, властивій українській духовності, актуалізується у зв'язку з фіксацією в мові, етнотекстах і дискурсивній практиці духовної та матеріальної культури народу; стосується це й власних назв людей, записаних у ревізьких та метричних книгах, що відбивають акти громадянського стану й засвідчують рух антропонімів, які є найбільш культуроносними знаками, оскільки прямо пов'язані з біографією людини та історією краю. Антропоніми накопичили в собі інформацію, наявну в найбільш важливому для людини масиві концептуальних пластів, відтворених в мовних картинах світу різних лінгвокультур, насамперед цей масив фіксує відомості про культуру народу, його побут, звичаї, вірування, емоції, загалом про ментальність носіїв тієї чи тієї лінгвокультури. Результати регіональних антропонімних досліджень необхідно тісніше розглядати у контексті національної культури й ширше – у зв'язку з міжнаціональними лінгвокультурними явищами та процесами.

**Ключові слова**

Антропонім, мова, культура, лінгвокультурологія, мовна картина світу.