VIRA KOTOVYCH

Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, Ukraine
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/ 0000-0001-6370-8135
e-mail: virako@ukr.net

Methodology of Linguistic-Cultural Research of Oikonymic Material

Metodologia lingwokulturologicznego badania materiału ojkonimicznego

INTRODUCTION

In modern linguistics, due to the fact that anthropocentrism is considered to be the key concept and a linguistic personality is in the centre of culture and cultural tradition, the analysis of onomastic material from the point of view of language and culture interaction, within which the onym (proper noun) is treated as an indicator of cultural values, is becoming of great current interest.

Methodology of linguistic-cultural research on oikonymy presupposes definition of methods and techniques of the analysis. Their specific character should be acknowledged as it goes about the following points: 1) methods and techniques of linguistic-cultural studies – an integrated branch of science oriented towards language research via culture; 2) methods and techniques of onomastics – a branch of science dealing with proper names; 3) methods and techniques of oikonyms (place names) analysis – names of human settlements, i.e. names of places created, inhabited and named by people. Such a triple nature of methodological instrumentarium will constitute multilevel foundation of our research.

SCIENTIFIC SOURCES AND PUBLICATIONS REVIEW

Methodological base of linguistic-cultural studies has been defined, to a certain extent, in the works by Mykola Alefirenko, Jerzy Bartmiński, Anna Vežbickaâ, Volodymyr Vorobyov, Iryna Holubovska, Vitalii Zhaivoronok, Vitalii Kononenko, Tetiana Kosmeda, Viktoriia Krasnykh, Valentina Maslova, Liubov Matsko, Anatolii Svidzynskyi, Olena Selivanova, Yurii Stepanov, Veronika Teliia, Viktor Shakleiin and others.

According to Vitalii Kononenko, methods of linguistic-cultural studies are divided into traditional (observation, experiment, modeling, reconstruction, questionnaire) and modern ones, connected to the latest research of frames, gestalts, concepts, metaphors, presuppositions, narratives, "sense → text" models, etc., as well as cultural and sociological techniques: convent-analysis, the means of field ethnography, social-linguistic interviewing (Kononenko, 2008, p. 27).

Mykola Alefirenko claims that at the very core of linguistic-cultural methodology there are the "concepts – words-images" notions which do not turn into abstract notions but are enriched by searching for the sense of life in the facts of culture. Taking this into account, the scholar has singled out the following methods of linguistic-cultural studies: diachronic (comparison of different linguistic-cultural units over time); synchronic (comparison of synchronous linguistic-cultural units); structural-functional (division of an object of culture into parts and identification of the connections between them); historical-genetic (analysis of a linguistic-cultural fact from the point of view of its origin, development and further functioning); typological (identification of the typological closeness of different linguistic-cultural units in historical-cultural process); comparative historical (comparison of unique linguistic-cultural units over time and penetration into their essence) (Alefirenko, 2010, p. 29).

Methodology and methods of onomastics have been deeply analysed by Yurii Karpenko (2009, pp. 238–289). He has singled out two works which concern the methods of analysis of linguistic and, in particular, onomastic material: the article by Oleksandr Melnychuk, which practically all linguists refer to in the methodology chapter of their research, and the work by Andrij Bilec'kij. Karpenko said concerning the latter one that all linguists, in particular, the ones who work in the sphere of onomastics, may be divided into two groups: the first group know about the article *Main Methods of Research in Modern Linguistics* by Bilec'kij, the second one have no idea about it (Karpenko, 2009, p. 283). It is worth mentioning that today methodological base of the research on onomastic material comprises the postulates, formulated in the works by Bilec'kij in onomastics, as well as by other outstanding linguists who work in the sphere of onomastics, namely, Lukiia Humetska, Yurii Karpenko, Volodymyr Nykonov, Vasyl Nimchuk, Yevhen Otin,

Nataliia Podolska, Stanisław Rospond, Oleksandra Superanska, Vitold Tashytskyi, Pavlo Chuchka, and others.

Concerning methodology of proper oikonymic material analysis, in our research we rely on the discrimination of the principles of nomination of place names (oikonyms), on the one hand, and oronyms, microtoponyms, ergonyms, on the other hand, suggested by Dmitro Bučko, Zoriana Kupchynska, Oleh Kupchynskyi, Mykhailo Torchynskyi; differences in methodological backgrounds of characterizing oikonyms and hydronyms, defined in the works by Sviatoslav Verbych, Olha Karpenko, Vasyl Lučik, Viktor Shulhach; different approaches to the analysis of oikonymic and anthroponymic material, described in the works by Iryna Zhelezniak, Rozaliia Kersta, Yulian Red'ko, Svitlana Pokhomova, Mykhailo Hudaš. In addition, in our research we have used specific techniques of analyzing real and fictional oikonymy, borrowed from the works by Liubomyr Belei, Valerii Kalinkin, Nataliia Kolesnyk.

DISCUSSION

In the construction of culture, a word functions as a brick, but it is a proper name that in a specific way preserves the origins of linguistic culture by embodying a segment of information, aimed at the communicant, in a static form (Antonûk, 1997, p. 8). According to approximate calculations, nowadays there exist more than 400 definitions of culture. American scholars Alfred Kroeber and Clyde Kluckhohn have combined them into six big groups: descriptive, historical, normative, psychological, structural, genetic ones (Matvêêva, 2015, pp. 18–23). Out of them, we have chosen the most succinct one, suggested by Kroeber: "Culture is the totality of a social personality action" (Matvêêva, 2015, p. 21). A social personality is in the centre of scientific paradigm. Anthropocentrism of modern linguistics defines the special status of proper names in the lexical field and the status of inhabited and named places – cities, towns, villages – in the onomastic one.

There appeared more and more supporters of oikonymic data analysis from the point of view of linguistic-cultural studies at the edge of the 20th–21st centuries, in particular, among scholars of Smolensk and Vitebsk onomastic schools. They treat the place name (toponym) as a reduced linguistic-cultural text. The tendency to analyse onyms (proper nouns) from the point of view of linguistic-cultural studies has been defined as *onomastyka kulturowa* by Polish scientists. Ewa Rzetelska-Feleszko points out that this definition was introduced to science in 2004 by Robert Mrózek in the context of literature, social-linguistic, historical or comparative onomastics as an analog of the term *lingwistyka kulturowa*, established in the Polish

linguistics, and predicts promising future for the new cultural-linguistic onomastic research (Rzetelska-Feleszko, 2007, pp. 57–58). Despite considerable experience in the sphere of etymological, lexical-semantic and structural-derivational characteristics of oikonyms in Ukraine, the linguistic-cultural aspect of the analysis of human settlement names has been hardly taken into account. It is caused by both subjective and objective factors. Onomastic research, started in the previous century, was aimed at synchronic-diachronic semantic, structural and etymological analysis of human settlement names and had to result in compiling and publishing of a complete historical-etymological dictionary of human settlement names of our country. Such dictionary is of great importance but it is still being compiled and regional onomasticons together with bigger or smaller dictionaries of toponyms of Ukraine have become its prototypes.

Objective factors are, firstly, the borderline between real and folk etymology which is important not to cross while analyzing oikonyms in linguistic-cultural aspect. Hudaš and Demčuk would talk about the damage to science caused by the so-called folk etymology, emphasizing the importance of proper reaction from scholars who work in the sphere of onomastics on the emergence of amateur etymologies of oikonyms that are based on mythical folk-etymological speculations which mislead a wide circle of readers who are not aware of the fundamentals of onomastics (Hudaš and Demčuk, 1991, pp. 6–7). It is important to keep in mind Bilec'kij's warning that if there are no chronological, geographical, linguistic and cultural-historical definitions or little attention is paid to them, it may deprive onomastic research of scientific value (Bilec'kij, 2012, p. 235). Therefore, linguistic-cultural analysis of oikonyms should be aimed at the selection of data which do not contradict linguistic laws and, at the same time, results from cultural traditions of name-formation.

Secondly, analysis of the language from the point of view of its cultural function presupposes referring to the text as cultural-artistic, cultural-historical, national-cultural phenomenon. In linguistic-cultural research an oikonym should be understood as a text – a reduced one, embodied in one lexical unit, but rich in linguistic, cultural, historical, geographical, ethnographic, encyclopedic and other information.

Thirdly, the basic concept of anthropocentrism theory is the worldview (conceptual and linguistic). The oikonymic system exists in the consciousness of native speakers as an organized fragment of linguistic worldview. Conceptual worldview that may be widely-modeled while analyzing the concepts of "village", "city", "small motherland", "Motherland", etc., has a limited field of expression (interpretation) on the level of oikonymy. Actually, this interpretation field is restricted by onomastic studies, as, on the one hand, so many oikonyms, so many concepts may be suggested, if a concept is treated as an object from the world of the Ideal

that has its name and reflects certain culturally predetermined people's ideas of the world of the Real (Vežbickaâ, 1996, p. 90). On the other hand, the oikonymic model and semantics of emoticon have taken the oikonym in their "net" and the mental image which we can outline analyzing, at least, microtoponyms, in linguistic-cultural studies is restrained by this "net", as if it tries to transform unreal information (myths, legends, folk narratives) into real, scientific one.

So, the question is what the specific character of linguistic-cultural analysis of onomastic material, in general, and of oikonyms, in particular, consists in. Another question concerns the extent to which the analysis of oikonyms from the point of view linguistic-cultural studies is legitimate.

First, it should be mentioned that if it is about linguistic-cultural aspect of oikonymic material analysis, we mean linguistic-cultural aspect in onomastics, but not linguistic-cultural onomastics as such. In reference to this, Valentina Maslova points out that the results of linguistic-cultural research have been already used in onomastics, but it is too early to speak about formation of linguistic-cultural onomastics proper (Maslova, 2018, p. 29). Moreover, we think that it is not only too early but hardly necessary, especially speaking about oikonyms analysis. Linguistic-cultural studies cannot substitute for onomastic grounding of proper names. It points at cultural foundation and directs theoretical linguistic research into anthropocentric, culture centric, national, spiritual spheres.

About 30 thousand names of human settlements in Ukraine appeared during different cultural-historical epochs. Every cultural formation was marked by the choice of a certain type of human settlement names. Oikonyms of the respective model became dominant, though not the only ones, at the certain stage of society development. The place was named with a word, through which the culture of worldview, understanding of the world, name formation and name perception was reflected. Cultural capacity of an oikonym is different, but every name possesses it, be it *Bolotnya*, or *Radisnyi Sad*, or *Dobrohostiv*, or *Chortkiv*, and it depends upon the tools used by the researcher.

A set of marginal (interdisciplinary) and combined (lingual and extra-lingual) techniques has made it possible to construct the architectonics of methods in our research.

The descriptive method is an essential part of all scientific studies, but this method that includes techniques of inner and outer interpretation is of primary importance for linguistics. Only comprehensive description makes it possible to find the specific character of every oikonym, not only as a linguistic sign, but as a phenomenon of linguoculture. The peculiarity of the descriptive method of human settlement names' linguistic-cultural interpretation consists in the fact that it should not be only about inventory of language units, but about recognition of oikonyms

as some specific reduced texts, around which lingual and extra-lingual discourse is constructed. In this perspective the descriptive method tightly correlates with the method of linguistic-cultural analysis directed at acceptance of linguistic-historical data interpretation, at detection and description of the cultural-national component of the analysed onomastic units semantics (Golovina, 2012, p. 10).

The comparative historical method is a key method in onomastic studies and it has some specific features when used in linguistic-cultural analysis of oikonymic material. On the one hand, we deal with synchronic phenomena: we study and analyse current oikonyms, which are associated with modern human settlements, they are frequently phonetically, morphologically, grammatically modified and corrected, adapted to the norms of the standard language, as a rule. On the other hand, utter neglect of diachrony would have led the scholar to some wrong direction in terms of etymology (acc. to Sviatoslav Verbych). Linguistic manifestation of the comparative-historical method is the reconstruction of archaic models of oikonyms formation, onymic and appellative etymons, analysis of phonomorphic and lexical transformations. Cultural manifestation of this method is research on social-historical conditions of emergence, functioning, changing, decline, transformation, revival of a name.

The structural method, due to which there was a quality breakthrough in the onomastics of the 20th century, is treated as a postulate in linguistic-cultural analysis of oikonymy. Within systemic-structural paradigm immediate-constituents analysis, oppositional, transformational, componential analysis have become formalized to a maximum extent, although synchrony, semiotic and systemic nature of language are treated as a primary system of values, the main aim of which is to define intra-systemic contradictions and correlations (Golubovs'ka, 2016, p. 152). The structural method in our research is the link that helps to recognize onomastics in *linguistic*-part of the definition, and understand culture of name-formation in *cultural studies*-part of the definition of the term *linguistic-cultural studies*. Linguistic-cultural aspect of oikonyms research is explicitly based on lexical-semantic side of an onym (proper noun), but, implicitly, every oikonym has already found its place in the structural word-formation scheme. It means that structure and word-formation of a proper name are treated as such that are *a priori* valid and functional, every oikonym has been recorded within a certain model of oikonym formation, so, the formation of an onym is referred to not to solve some linguistic issues, but as a resource to sort out cultural issues.

The comparative method, in wide sense, makes it possible to analyse names of human settlements in Ukraine compared to other national oikonymic systems, in narrow sense – to characterize specific character of oikonyms, localized in different historical-ethnographic, administrative territorial regions of the

country. This method is closely connected with the issues of language typology and language universals and it allows scholars to define typical principles, ways, motives, means of oikonyms formation; universal nationally and ethnically marked verbalized oikonymic worldviews.

Field research method presupposes modelling of the human settlement linguistic-cultural portrait from the perspective of its name. Four zones have been singled out: the nuclear one (modern name of the human settlement, its localization), close periphery zone (the most credible scientific genesis of an oikonym with explication and characteristics of its etymon), far periphery zone (probable scientific versions of an oikonym origin oriented towards folk-etymological legends and stories), interpretation zone (descriptions; conotonyms; historical terms based on the analysed oikonym; transonymisation processes, etc.) So, the methodology of our research determines the ways to establish the analysed issue: people would name the place (space) inhabited by them from the perspective of their national/ ethnic culture.

Reconstruction of the Ukrainian oikonyms formation culture presupposes the existence of both linguistic and cultural information in an onym. Linguistic information exists due to certain laws of language, cultural one is pre-determined by the culture itself and is objectified via various cultural codes.

Vasyl Lučik points out that from the point of view of the connection between oikonyms and extralingual factors, the principle of nomination is considered to be the most general category in modern onomastics. This principle is based on taking into account determinative realia which influence oikonyms formation. According to the scholar, these realia consist in four extralingual factors: 1) anthropological; 2) territorial; 3) inner; 4) ideological ones (Lučik, 2007, pp. 193–194). Bučko and Bučko have offered a strict break-down of them: human settlement nomination via presentation of the connection with names of a person or a group of people in its name; connection with names of other geographical places; individual peculiarities of the human settlement itself; economic and production, social-political factors and landmarks (Bučko and Bučko, 2013, p. 348).

Oikonyms formed according to each of the mentioned principle explicate various linguistic and cultural information:

1. Human settlement nomination via presentation of the connection with names of a person or a group of people in its name:

– linguistic information: possessiveness as the main way to express relation of a person to the name of a place and suffixes, such as *-*jь* (*-*j-a, -*j-e*), *-ів, -ин, -івк -а, -(щ)ин-а, -их-а, -к-,* Genitive Case, to some extent *-ець, -овець, -инець* suffixes as the means to express possessiveness in the Ukrainian oikonymy; relativity as an additional way to express the relation of a person to the name of a place and

suffixes, such as *-івк-а*, *-(щ)ин-а*, *-их-а*, *-к-*, *-ськ* as the means to express relativity in the Ukrainian oikonymy; patronymic, family, local-ethnic, ethnic, professional names of communities and semantic transfer of such names onto names of human settlements; affixes, such as *ич-і*, *-івц-і*, **-инц-і**, *-ан-и* / *-ян-и*, *-и* / *-і* as the means to reflect indirect participation of a person in naming a particular human settlement;

    – c u l t u r a l information: the character of anthroponymicon of Ukrainians (Slavonic autochthonous composites, derived from composites and derived from appellatives names; church Christian names; nicknames; surnames); national peculiarities of patronymic, patrimonial, family, local-ethnic, ethnic, professional names of communities formation.

    2. Nomination of a human settlement via presentation of connection with names of other geographical places in its name.

    – l i n g u i s t i c information: affixes as markers of oikonyms derived from hydronyms or hydronyms derived from oikonyms; affixes, such as **-к-а**, *-ок*, *-ець* as the means of formation of diminutive oikonyms; prefixes, such as *за-*, *під-*, *по-*, *між-* / *межи-* as the means of formation of names-landmarks.

    – c u l t u r a l information: water features as factors of human settlements' names motivation; landscape features of the territory and their influence on the land colonization; objects of phytonymy and dendrological objects, artifacts and their relation to human settlements nomination; the role of migration processes in naming human settlements; integration and fragmentation of human settlements.

    3. Nomination of human settlements via presentation of the features of the settlement itself in their names.

    – l i n g u i s t i c information: lexical-semantic groups of etymons of oikonyms derived from appellatives; substantivized adjectives in singular and plural forms; oikonymic attributes as the means of naming human settlements.

    – c u l t u r a l information: presentation of a place (space), time, size, qualitative and quantitative features of the human settlement in its name.

    4. Nomination of human settlements via presentation of economic and production, social-political factors and landmarks in their names together with names, specially designed.

    – l i n g u i s t i c information: affixes to form oikonyms functioning as formal oikonymic markers; lexical-semantic groups of specially selected vocabulary.

    – c u l t u r a l information: presentation of economic and production relations, politics and ideology in the name of the human settlement, commemoration of outstanding people; ideology of society; the role and place of the ideological factor in the culture of name-formation.

    Linguistic-cultural analysis of oikonyms presupposes the emergence of new or clarification of the meaning of the already existing terms. The terms such as

linguocultureme, *the concept of national culture*, *the linguistic-cultural concept*, *the linguoculturological concept*, *the culturally marked unit*, *the word with national-cultural constituents of semantics*, *the linguistic-aesthetic sign of national culture*, *the language sign of culture*, *the sign of national culture*, etc. have become widely-known in the field of cultural linguistics (Mac'ko, 2009, p. 358). Linguistic-cultural approach to the analysis of onymic material in modern linguistics has been marked with the appearance of a new term – *topocultureme*, which is treated by scholars (Zabelin, 2007, p. 9) as a specific type of *onomastic linguocultureme* – a complex, inter-level unit, which constitutes dialectic unity of lingual and extra-lingual content, or as *onomacultureme* as a prototype of the *appellative cultureme*.

If contrasting of *onomacultureme* to the *appellative cultureme* is quite reasonable, inner resources of *onomacultureme* are much deeper than the ones of *topocultureme*. The latter definition could be analysed into some more concrete ones, namely, *hydrocultureme*, *micro-topocultureme*, *orocultureme*, *ergocultureme*, *oikocultureme*, etc. However, in our research the oikonym has been comprehensively analysed in linguistic-cultural aspect, its extralingual characteristics represents culture of the principles and ways of name-formation, its lingual characteristics points at the means of human settlement name derivation, specific character of its etymon, and, therefore, we offer to use the term *oikocultureme*.

In reference to this, one more question arises whether all oikonyms are oikoculturemes, or there exist any criteria to discriminate oikonyms from oikoculturemes.

On the one hand, as it has been mentioned above, cultural capacity of every oikonym is different. The examples are the names of human-settlements of *Самбір* and *Бір*. From the point of view of folk etymology and semantic approximation of appellative and onymic vocabulary, both oikonyms seem to rely on the geographical term *бір / сам бір* ("coniferous forest / coniferous forest only"). But actual etymological, structural-derivational analysis proves that *Самбір* (*Самборъ*) is a name derived from an anthroponym, the possessive form of the proper name *Самбір* (*Самборъ*) ending in **-jь* (Moroškin, 1867, p. 171) with the original meaning *Самборъ дворъ* ("Sambor yard"), that is, a yard that belonged to Sambor (Kotovych, 2015, pp. 57–58). *Бір* is a derivation from an appellative or, perhaps, from a microtoponym, which is based on the appellative or on the geographical term *бір* – a pine forest or any other coniferous forest; also mixed wood in which pine-trees prevail (*Slovnyk ukraïns'koï movi*, 1971, p. 188). So, in both first and second cases, linguistic information is projected on cultural one. The structure and semantics of *Самбір*, the oikonym, explicates: 1) the probable time of the settlement foundation (before the 13th century, as it was the period when the suffix **-jь* was still productive as the means to form possessive oikonyms; 2) wide usage of the Slavonic autochthonous proper name-composite – *Самборъ* (< *Сам- "сам"*

"on one's own"), -*боръ* "*боротися*; *битва*", "to fight; a fight"), preserved only as a surname nowadays. Different information is received as a result of the analysis of the oikonym *Бір*: the settlement was founded in the pine forest (*бір*), and the name of a noticeable place in this territory has become the name of the human settlement. But both oikonyms are oikoculturemes, as both *Самбір* and *Бір* reflect the norm of the language of a certain period and render respective cultural information: the culture of name-formation of a person naming the places was exactly like this at the stage of their naming.

So, the term *oikocultureme* is a synonym to the term *oikonym*, but to analyse the latter one we carry out linguistic (onomastic) research, while to study the first one not only the linguistic aspect of the human settlement name analysis should be taken into account, but cultural aspect as well.

Among basic concepts in the analysis of oikonyms as linguoculturological units or of oikoculturemes the term of *linguistic-cultural code* has been singled out. The code is a universal means to represent, store and transmit information. Language is a verbally objectified code, a basic one in the semiotics of culture.

The linguistic-cultural aspect of onomastic research makes it possible to define a wide hierarchy of specific linguistic-cultural codes. The linguistic-cultural code is a tool which is used to encipher (to encode) and decipher (to decode) cultural information in language signs / from language signs.

In onomastics, the onomastic code (first introduced by Nikita Tolstoj) is on the top of the hierarchical code structure (model, theory, system). According to Tolstoj and Tolstaâ, this code is part of verbal (language) code of traditional folk culture, proper names take a specific place in it creating their own independent onomastic code (Tolstoj and Tolstaâ, 1998, p. 88).

At the second level of the hierarchical model onymic codes are situated, namely, anthroponymic, microtoponymic, oikonymic, hydronymic, ergonymic, urbanymic ones, etc.

The oikonymic code is interpreted as the way of decoding lingual and extralingual information in the name of an inhabited place, and, consequently, reading it. Every oikonym is a phenomenon of culture, verbal storage of cultural record of the world properly executed according to the laws of a certain language. Besides, the research on modern oikonymicon incorporates a lot of linguistic-cultural problems, which always arise while analyzing onymic lexical units, as well as appellative lexical units. The example may be the analysis of the oikonyms *Надорожна*, *Надорожнів*. As far as the name of the *Надорожна* human settlement is concerned, the fact that the variants *Дорожне*, *Дорожна* are recorded in the documents of the 15th–17th centuries and, beginning of the 18th century, the variant *Надорожне* can be found, makes it possible for scholars to consider the modern

name to be structurally modified: the original oikonym derived from the adjective *дорожне* ("near/by the road"), and then substantivization took place along with adding the prefix *на-* (Âcìj, 2015, p. 210). The earliest-known mentions of the oikonym *Надорожнів* are found only in the documents of the 18th century known to us. The suffix *-ів* in the oikonym suggests that originally it was a possessive of the anthroponym **Надорожень*. From the point of view of linguistics, such a way of name-formation is absolutely obvious. But the anthroponym **Надорожень* has not been recorded in any onomasticon we know. We can accept the hypothesis of Hudaš and Demčuk (1991, p. 136), that originally it was a nickname of a person due to their settlement *на дорозі* ("on/at the road"), but we should also take into account another assumption that *Надорожнів*, as well as *Надорожна*, are oikonyms, that objectify information on a territorial culture code: the settlement has been founded "on the road", "at the road", "near the road", "along the road". The possessive suffix in this oikonym is a secondary phenomenon, the name of the human settlement is only finalized with this affix due to the wide usage of the oikonymic possessive model ending in *-ів*.

Another example is oikonyms *Бортники, Дуліби, Сосни, Зайці, Хоми*. From the point of view of linguistics, these names of human settlements are formed according to the same oikonymic-derivational model: multiple derivations from family names with the original meaning, respectively, *родина Бортника* (*Bortnyk* family); *родина Дуліба* (*Dulib* family); *родина Сосни* (*Sosna* family); родина *Зайця* (*Zayets* family); *родина Хоми*(*Khoma* family). From the cultural studies perspective, names of these human settlements explicate different codes of culture, namely, the professional one (*Бортники* "wild-hive beekeepers"), the ethnic one (*Дуліби* "the Slavonic tribe of Dulibs"), the dendrological one (*Сосни* "pine-trees") and only the last two names, namely *Зайці* and *Хоми*, explicate anthroponymic codes of culture. Unfortunately, we cannot state categorically which opinion is closer to the truth. Historical sources give no information: whether Ivan and Vasyl *Bortnyks* (*Бортники*) founded the settlement or the settlement was named by Ivan and Vasyl who were wild-hive beekeepers (*бортники*); whether Dulibs (*дуліби*) settled in Volyn or Petro *Dulib* with his family settled there and founded the settlement; whether Kostya *Sosna* ("pine tree") family gave the name to the settlement or the settlement was founded near some high pine trees (*сосни*). There exist a lot of parallel opinions like these.

It is known that among all classes of onyms, names of human settlements have undergone and are still undergoing a lot of changes throughout the period of their existence. The human settlements have been founded and destroyed, have been rebuilt and have become dilapidated. Their names have been attributed, changed, modified, assimilated, adapted, distorted, ideologically coloured, have become

culturally meaningful, noble, have been revitalized, returned. Modern scientific etymological dictionaries of oikonyms mainly rely on synchronic-diachronic research. Having analysed known written records of the names of human settlements in historical sources, scholars frequently come up not with one, but with several hypotheses about the origin of a certain oikonym. This is logical as the first written record of the oikonym in the documents after some time of active scientific research or even accidental area study might have become not the first one; the oikonym derived from the appellative was treated as the one derived from anthroponym or, *vice versa*, etymologically complicated units have become etymologically transparent, the scientific hypothesis has been substituted with the pseudo-scientific one, etc. Besides, formation of human settlement names has been treated as a special type of linguistic-cultural information encoding and its decoding requires both traditional, onomastic approaches and innovative, linguistic-cultural ones.

CONCLUSIONS

The issue of language-culture interaction is one of the most urgent in modern scientific paradigm, as the language creates culture and, at the same time, develops in it. One of the aspects of linguistic culture is culture of name-formation, namely the process of people naming a settlement, founded and inhabited by them.

The codes of culture, based on reality symbolization, are most clearly realized in onyms: they represent people's worldview and world perception, historical, social, cultural factors, which cannot be found in appellatives any more. Linguistic-cultural research on oikonyms presupposes usage of the methods and techniques of linguistic-cultural studies and onomastics.

Diversity of modern oikonymy, traditions and innovation of Ukrainian name-formation, richness of principles, motives, ways and means of naming are solid grounds to treat names of human settlements as reduced linguistic-cultural texts which represent language and culture, history and geography, national traditions and natural mentality, social ideology and live and original soul of a person naming the settlement.

Translated into English by Diana Kalishchuk

REFERENCES

Alefirenko, Nikolaj Fedorovič. (2010). *Lingvokul'turologiâ. Cennostno-smyslovoe prostranstvo âzyka*. Moskva: Nauka. [Алефиренко, Николай Федорович. (2010). *Лингвокультурология. Ценностно-смысловое пространство языка*. Москва: Наука.]

Antonûk, Olena Vìktorìvna. (1997). Ìm'â korablâ – porodžennâ lûds'koï ìstorìï ì kul'turi. In: Volodimir Oleksandrovič Gorpinič (ed.), *Pitannâ sučasnoï onomastiki: stattì ta tezi VÌÌ Vseukraïns'koï onomastičnoï konferencìï* (pp. 8–10). Dnìpropetrovs'k: [b. w.]. [Антонюк, Олена Вікторівна. (1997). Ім'я корабля – породження людської історії і культури. У: Володимир Олександрович Горпинич (ред.), *Питання сучасної ономастики: статті та тези VII Всеукраїнської ономастичної конференції* (с. 8–10). Дніпропетровськ: [б.в.].]

Âcìj, Vasil' Oleksandrovič. (2015). *Ojkonìmìâ Ìvano-Frankìvs'koï oblastì: Ìstoriko-etimologìčnij slovnik*. Kiïv: Naukova dumka. [Яцій, Василь Олександрович. (2015). *Ойконімія Івано-Франківської області: Історико-етимологічний словник*. Київ: Наукова думка.]

Bilec'kij, Andrij Oleksandrovič. (2012). *Osnovy ètimologičeskih issledovanij onomastičeskogo materiala. Vibrani praci*. Kiïv: Vidavničij dim Dmitra Burago. [Білецький, Андрій Олександрович. (2012). *Основы этимологических исследований ономастического материала. Вибрані праці*. Київ: Видавничий дім Дмитра Бураго.]

Bučko, Ganna Êvgenìvna, Bučko, Dmitro Grigorovič. (2013). *Ìstorična ta sučasna ukraïns'ka onomastika*. Černìvcì: Bukrek. [Бучко, Ганна Євгенівна, Бучко, Дмитро Григорович. (2013). *Історична та сучасна українська ономастика*. Чернівці: Букрек.]

Golovina, Lûbov' Sergeevna. (2012). *Russkaâ onomastika v lingvokul'turologičeskoj reprezentacii dlâ inoâzyčnogo adresata*. Pskov: PGU. [Головина, Любовь Сергеевна. (2012). *Русская ономастика в лингвокультурологической репрезентации для иноязычного адресата*. Псков: ПГУ.]

Golubovs'ka, Ìrina Oleksandrìvna. (2016). Sučasna ukraïns'ka lìngvokonceptologìâ: stan ì perspektivi rozvitku. *Aktual'nì problemi fìlologìï ta perekladoznavstva*, *1*, pp. 151–159. [Голубовська, Ірина Олександрівна. (2016). Сучасна українська лінгвоконцептологія: стан і перспективи розвитку. *Актуальні проблеми філології та перекладознавства*, *1*, с. 151–159.]

Hudaš, Mihájlo Lukíč, Demčuk, Marìâ Oleksïïvna. (1991). *Pohodžennâ ukraïns'kih karpats'kih ì prikarpats'kih nazv naselenih punktìv (vìdantroponìmnì utvorennâ)*. Kiïv: Naukova dumka. [Худаш, Миха́йло Луки́ч, Демчук, Марія Олексіївна. (1991). *Походження українських карпатських і прикарпатських назв населених пунктів (відантропонімні утворення)*. Київ: Наукова думка.]

Karpenko, Ûrìj. (2009). Pro metodologìû ta metodiku onomastiki âk nauki. *Zapiski z ukraïns'kogo movoznavstva*, *18*, pp. 292–289. [Карпенко, Юрій. (2009). Про методологію та методику ономастики як науки. *Записки з українського мовознавства*, *18*, с. 292–289].

Kononenko, Vitalii Ivanovych. (2008). *Ukrayins'ka linhvokul'turolohiya*. Kiïv: Vyshcha shkola. [Кононенко, Віталій Іванович. (2008). *Українська лінгвокультурологія*. Київ: Вища школа.]

Kotovych, Vira Vasylivna. (2015). *Pokhodzhennya nazv naselenykh punktiv Sambirshchyny (naukovi versiyi)*. Drohobych: Posvit. [Котович, Віра Василівна. (2015). *Походження назв населених пунктів Самбірщини (наукові версії)*. Дрогобич: Посвіт.]

Lučik, Vasil' Vìktorovič. (2007). Pozamovnì činniki j kategorìï ojkonìmnoï nomìnacìï. *Studìï z onomastiki ta etimologìï*, pp. 193–201. [Лучик, Василь Вікторович. (2007). Позамовні чинники й категорії ойконімної номінації. *Студії з ономастики та етимології*, с. 193–201.]

Mac'ko, Lûbov Ìvanìvna. (2009). *Ukraïns'ka mova v osvìtn'omu prostorì*. Kiïv: Vid-vo NPU ìmenì M.P. Dragomanova. [Мацько, Любов Іванівна. (2009). *Українська мова в освітньому просторі*. Київ: Вид-во НПУ імені М.П. Драгоманова.]

Maslova, Valentina Avraamovna. (2018). Onomastika skvoz' prizmu lingvokul'turologii. In: Anna Mihajlovna Mezenko (ed.), *Regional'naâ onomastika: problemy i perspektivy issledovaniâ* (pp. 27–31). Vitebsk: VGU imeni P.M. Mašerova. [Маслова, Валентина Авраамовна. (2018). Ономастика сквозь призму лингвокультурологии. В: Анна Михайловна Мезенко (ред.), *Региональная ономастика: проблемы и перспективы исследования* (с. 27–31). Витебск: ВГУ имени П.М. Машерова.]

Matvêêva, Lûdmila Leonìdìvna. (2015). *Kul'turologìâ*. Kiїv: Libìd'. [Матвєєва, Людмила Леонідівна. (2015). *Культурологія*. Київ: Либідь.]

Moroškin, Mihail Žanr. (1867). *Slavânskij imenoslov ili sobranie slavânskih lìčnyh imën v alfavitnom porâdke*. Sankt-Peterburg: [b. i.]. [Морошкин, Михаил Жанр. (1867). *Славянский именослов или собрание славянских личных имён в алфавитном порядке*. Санкт-Петербург: [б. и.].]

Rzetelska-Feleszko, Ewa. (2007). Onomastyka kulturowa. In: Aleksandra Cieplikowa, Barbara. Czopek-Kopciuch, Katarzyna Skowronek (eds.), *Nowe nazwy własne – nowe tendencje badawcze* (pp. 57–62). Kraków: Wydawnictwo PANDIT.

Slovnik ukraїns'koї movi. (1971). Kiїv: Naukova dumka. [*Словник української мови.* (1971). Київ: Наукова думка.]

Tolstoj, Nikita Il'ič, Tolstaâ, Svetlana Mihajlovna. (1998). Imâ v kontekste narodnoj kul'tury. In: *Problemy slavânskogo âzykoznaniâ* (pp. 88–125). Moskva: RAN, In-t slavânovedeniâ, Nacional'nyj komitet slavistov RF. [Толстой, Никита Ильич, Толстая, Светлана Михайловна. (1998). Имя в контексте народной культуры. В: *Проблемы славянского языкознания* (с. 88–125). Москва: РАН, Ин-т славяноведения, Национальный комитет славистов РФ.]

Vežbickaâ, Anna. (1996). *Âzyk. Kul'tura. Poznanie*. Moskva: Russkie slovari. [Вежбицкая, Анна. (1996). *Язык. Культура. Познание*. Москва: Русские словари.]

Zabelin, Nikolaj Ûr'evič. (2007). *Moskovskaâ gorodskaâ toponimiâ: strukturno-semantičeskij analiz toponimičeskoj sistemy*. Moskva: Moskov. gosud. lingvist. un-t. [Забелин, Николай Юрьевич. (2007). *Московская городская топонимия: структурно-семантический анализ топонимической системы*. Москва: Москов. госуд. лингвист. ун-т.]

ABSTRACT

The article deals with the methodology of analysing the oikonymic material in the linguistic-cultural aspect; the basic methods and techniques of such investigation have been determined. The author has emphasised that the descriptive method serves to consider oikonyms as specific encyclopaedic texts; the comparative historical method helps to study social-historical conditions of name formation; the structural one assists in finding the position of every oikonym in the system and structural paradigm of the language; the comparative method is determined to consider the place of the oikonyms of Ukraine among the names of human settlements of other national systems; the method of field investigation of the material involves modelling of linguistic-cultural portraits of oikonyms. There are four principles of naming human settlements and it has been discovered out which linguistic and cultural information the names formed according to each of these principles comprise. The term *oikocultureme* has been suggested, and the national specificity and linguistic-cultural universality of onyms (proper nouns) marked with this term have been analysed. The author has proved that studying oikonyms in the linguistic-cultural aspect presupposes the usage of methods and techniques of linguoculturology and onomastics.

Keywords: methodology / methods of research, the linguistic-cultural aspect, principles of naming, oikonym, oikocultureme, onomastics

ABSTRAKT

W artykule opisano metodologię analizy materiału ojkonimicznego w aspekcie lingwokulturologicznym; określono podstawowe metody i techniki takich badań. Podkreślono fakt, że metoda opisowa służy do traktowania ojkonimów jako rodzaju tekstu; metoda porównawczo-historyczna – do badania społeczno-historycznych warunków tworzenia nazwy; strukturalna metoda pomaga odnaleźć pozycję każdego ojkonimu w paradygmacie systemowo-strukturalnym języka; porównawcza – rozważyć miejsce ojkonimów Ukrainy wśród nazw miejscowości innych systemów narodowych; metoda badań terenowych polega na modelowaniu portretów lingwokulturologicznych ojkonimów. Zadeklarowano cztery zasady nominacji osadniczej oraz określono informacje językowe i kulturowe zawarte w nazwach utworzonych zgodnie z każdą z tych zasad. Zaproponowano termin *ojkokulturonim*, zbadano specyfikę narodową i uniwersalność językowo-kulturową onimów, oznaczonych tym terminem. Udowodniono, że badanie ojkonimów w aspekcie lingwokulturologicznym oznacza stosowanie metod i technik lingwokulturologii i onomastyki.

Słowa kluczowe: metodologia / metody badań, aspekt lingwokulturologiczny, zasady nominacji, ojkonim, ojkokulturonim, onomastyka