

S. S. YERMOLENKO

O.O.Potebnia Institute of linguistics, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine
Kyiv, Ukraine

Email: signum70.1@gmail.com
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1340-0444>

EPONYMY AND DISCURSIVE-FUNCTIONAL CONTEXT

In this paper, which continues the series of his previous publications on theoretical and methodological issues in eponymy research, the author argues for the feasibility of the expansion of his three-component parametric model for description and analysis of this class of linguistic entities by adding to its three principal components, relating to the three parts of eponymic derivational relationship, a fourth part dealing with eponymy's discursive-functional context. It is the author's contention that the relationship between an eponym and the linguistic and extralinguistic cognitive-communicative environment in which it comes to being and/or occurs is the essential, intrinsic and crucial, rather than fortuitous and inconsequential, feature of the former, which therefore should be taken into account in in-depth research. Accordingly, an initial discursive parameter in this research should be tracing down the occurrence of eponyms in various types of discourse distinguished by their cognitive and communicative-functional characteristics, and so identifying items bound to such varieties as different from general-purpose ones. Next comes finding out the nature of relationship between a discourse variety and an eponym co-occurring in it, in particular, the influence of the former on the semantic and functional, and also, possibly, formal characteristics of the latter. An important eventuality that a comprehensive and inclusive eponymy description model should consider is the hierarchy of an eponym's possible discursive contexts, i.e. the possibility of its use in a discourse type other than its original one. Regarding this, the author introduces the concept of inter- and intralinguistic contacts of discourses as linguistic-cultural modes as a framework in which discursive transpositions of eponyms should be elucidated, as well as such instances, in which an underlying proper noun is employed to coin an eponymic entity designed for the use in the discursive-functional environment other than its own. The author illustrated his theses with instances drawn from Ukrainian as well as some other languages, and in these, from the scientific, ideological, folklore, religious, mythological, folk, and everyday discursive varieties.

Key words: eponym, discursive-functional variety, communicative-epistemic orientation, proper name, appellative name

The subject matter of this paper is relations between eponyms and the communicative-functional orientation of discourse in which they emerge and / or occur. The paper continues the series of my publications (see [Yermolenko 2018; Yermolenko 2018a; Yermolenko 2018b; Yermolenko, Zymovets 2018; Yermolenko 2020]), which started in 2018 with an article containing a parametric model for linguistic-cultural description and analysis of eponymy. It will be noted that I use

the term *eponymy* in a double sense, denoting the dynamic derivational relationship between an underlying proper noun and an entity (proper or appellative) formed with its help, as well as the linguistic and cultural background of this relationship [cf. Matthews : 116], and also eponymic nomenclature [cf. Simpson], such as the set of eponyms found in a language (the alternative term specifically denoting an eponym set being *eponymicon*). Since *eponym*, too, is a term with more than one meaning, I would like to reiterate here that I use it and, correspondingly, *eponymy* in the broadest sense possible, as designations of any case of coining a new linguistic entity (which can be a proper or common name, a lexeme or a set expression, such as a phrasal name, an idiom, or a proverb) that involves the use of a proper name, and any such coinage respectively. There is, however, an exception to this definition: excluded from the notion of eponymy are those instances where the meaning of the derived entity reproduces the meaning of the underlying one, so that such deonomastic items, not unlike grammatical forms of a word, only differ from their underlying proper words in their grammatical features and therefore lack any derivational idiomaticity (on derivational idiomaticity, see [Baturina]); cf., e.g., the Ukrainian first name *Михайло* and the possessive adjective *Михайлів* «of, or belonging to, *Михайло*»; or *Warszawa*, a Polish capital name, and the relative adjective *warszawski*. In some monolingual dictionaries, deonomastic items of this kind are only defined as deriving from a corresponding proper name (as in St. Dubisz's «Uniwersalny Słownik Języka Polskiego»: *warszawski* przym. od *Warszawa* [Dubisz]), if not altogether omitted (as in «Словник української мови в 11 т.», where there are no adjectives *варшавський* or *київський*, or, for that matter, no substantives *Варшава* and *Київ*, either).

My 2018 model was based on the eponymous relationship and the three components thereof, namely, the eponym, the underlying entity, and the derivational relationship linking them. Proceeding from this scheme, I distinguished sets of parameters associated with each of the three components, also tracing correlations of individual parameters. In a more recent article still in print [Yermolenko in print], this model was extended by adding to it A. Gardiner's dis-/embodied proper name distinction. In the present paper, I am going to discuss the feasibility of introducing a new component to what was initially was a triad of eponymous relationship components, namely, the discursive context of eponymy, i.e. the character and type of discourse within which an eponym emerges and / or occurs, restrictively or otherwise. Intensionally, the concept of discourse as used here pretty much corresponds to the current usage of the term, comprising speech utterance (oral or written) taken together with all relevant extralinguistic factors, both individual and social. At the same time, some features that I associate with this concept are especially significant for the purposes of this particular study. One of these is what I in my 2006 monograph termed the communicative-epistemic orientation of discourse [Yermolenko 2006 : 6–7]. Built on A. F. Losev's conception of communicative meaning [Losev : 309–342], the category of the communicative-epistemic orientation of discourse highlights a specific character of epistemic approach to reality and its interpretation employed in a given instance of discourse as well as in a given functional sphere of communication with the aim of constructing a mental image of a fragment of reality and conveying it to discourse recipients. In other words, the communicative-epistemic discursive orientation is a viewpoint from which reality and its fragments are seen and represented in a discourse, and as such, it has to do with both semantic and anthropocentric-pragmatic properties of the latter. From the perspective of this approach, communicative-epistemic dis-

course varieties can be distinguished as differing from each other by the sphere of their societal functioning (everyday private life, business, politics, commerce, law, religion, art, advertising etc.) as well as the world picture, i.e. interpretation of reality, peculiar to every such variety. Taking into account the sphere of functioning makes the concept of such variety akin to, yet not identical with, that of communicative-functional language style, in that the latter is a purely linguistic, in particular linguistic-functional, entity, whereas the former also incorporates communicative as well as cognitive discursive features.

It is my intention to show in the present paper that there exist correlations or interactions between a discourse's functioning sphere as well as its epistemic-communicative functions, on one hand, and, on the other, properties of eponyms emerging and/or occurring in it. In this, I will proceed on the presumption that the formation and use of eponyms, as well as their discursive semantics, too, are always conditioned pragmatically, reflecting and conveying a particular way of perceiving and conceiving reality by man.

In the final analysis, the role of the discursive parameter in the eponymy analysis and description model is finding out what are relevant discursive features involved in the formation and use of an eponym, and what are the latter's discourse-related features. Purely formally, the following kinds of correlation are *a priori* possible between an eponym and its discursive context: 1. there are no constraints on an eponym being used in any functional type of discourse; 2. an eponym's use is restricted to a discourse of specific type(s). Obviously, the existence of such a restriction or lack thereof is in itself an important feature of an eponym, and a comprehensively adequate model of eponymy description should provide for their determination, yet establishing it is but a first step in the study of the discursive aspect of eponym. Once this first correlation is established, the following questions arise. The first of them is, whether the discursive context in which an eponym has been coined is the same as the one(s) in which it occurs afterwards (in the same language or, as a borrowing, in others). Related to this is the question of whether there is a hierarchy of contexts in which an eponym occurs, i.e. whether an eponym can have a primary and a secondary discursive contexts. Then a similar question of discourse correlation can be posed with respect to the underlying proper name as compared with the item deriving from it. Last not least, still another relevant issue to be addressed is whether there is a correlation between eponym properties and its discursive context, and if yes, what kind of correlation it is.

But before tackling all these questions in a comprehensive and systemic way rather than concentrating on disparate individual cases, it is necessary to establish the exact extent of entities and phenomena to be subsumed under the heading of eponym and eponymy, on one hand, and of discourse, on the other. In terms of extension, the concept of discourse, as used in the present study, will take into account all manifestation types of discursive contexts to which eponymy is related, as well as their actual communicative-epistemic specificity, which in its term presupposes establishing relevant discourse variety typology. Thus, for instance, assuming that there is always a discourse event whenever something is said or written, then the secondary use of a proper name as an eponymic ergonym, i.e. a business name, (or a part thereof) written on a table or plate at the entrance to a venue, enterprise, or institution, is to be considered a self-contained discourse (at the same time, such ergonyms constituting a street's aggregate, if coincidentally fortuitous, signage can be regarded as a kind of text representing some megadiscourse). Also, such folklore items as proverbs, as different from, say, folk songs,

can be employed within the everyday colloquial discourse, so that, while retaining their initial discursive characteristics, they are incorporated in the extension of the latter discourse type. As proverbs in themselves belong primarily to the folklore discourse, so when it comes to eponyms occurring in proverbs, the latter's treatment as basically folklore entities will, as I intend to demonstrate, provide a framework within which some properties of such eponyms can be explained as related to those of the folklore discourse.

In what regards eponyms and eponymy, it should be emphasized that delineating the range of such entities and phenomena contained under these terms is not just a formal matter of notion's definition; instead, it is the question of having a clear and adequate picture of the capacity of proper names to generate new linguistic items and of the specific role(s) the former play in this. This, in its turn, presumes a comprehensive approach to the study of eponymy within the framework of a theory postulating all possible kinds of eponym entities, something which I argued for in one of my previous papers (see [Yermolenko 2018a]. Yet as of now, such an approach largely remains a *pium desiderium*. There appear to be two reasons for this situation. Firstly, not all structural types of linguistic entities originating through deonomastic derivation (in the most general meaning of this term) and, accordingly, the secondary use of proper names are covered by current eponym investigations, and this, of course, precludes tracing comprehensively all possible correlations between various eponym types, on one hand, and discursive types, on the other. The typical object of eponymy studies (not necessarily called so) is technical as well as more commonly used cultural terms, and also secondary proper names deriving from proper names (see, e.g., [Karpenko 1973; Karpenko 1990] or articles in the «Onomastyka i apelatyvy» periodical published in the city of Dnipro from 1998), the former items often belonging to the international stock and therefore having the status of loan-words in Ukrainian; structurally, they are either words or phrasal names (*Гайморова порожнина*, *Адамове яблуко*, *земля Франца-Йосифа*).

This, however, leaves us with the question of how to deal with items of other syntactic structure formed with the help of proper names. For instance, should we classify as eponyms phraseological units containing proper names but having other syntactic structure if their formation has involved reinterpretation of the initial meaning of a proper name? These coinages can be of fairly various nature, including idioms *sensu stricto*, e.g. Ukrainian *від Адама; не до Петра, а до Різдва*, quotations and aphorisms, or winged expressions, e.g. Ukrainian *Авгієві стайні*, speech formulas, e.g. Ukrainian *у Сірка очей позичити*, English *by Jove*, proverbs and sayings, e.g. Ukrainian *пройшов Крим, Рим і мідні труби*). And if yes, then should we apply the term *епоним* to these derivative items or only to proper names occurring in them and obtaining in them a new phraseologically conditioned meaning, or to both? For instance, in the Ukrainian idioms *На городі бузина, а в Києві дядько* and *Язик до Києва доведе*, which contain the toponym denoting Kyiv, this proper name serves metaphorically to expresses the idea of entities not linked in any logical way in the first of them, and of getting crucial information by asking for it in the second. In doing so, *Київ* as an element of these idioms' inner form conveys the meaning of a disparate entity and a distant yet reachable goal respectively. Whatever the answer to the latter question may be (personally, I would opt for a third solution, treating both of them, a proper name within an idiomatic composite item and such an item as eponyms), it is my

contention that, somehow or other, such cases should find their place within the scope of eponymy research.

Related to the selectiveness in eponymy research is another factor hindering the latter, which is the lack of uniform, general, and generally accepted terminology identifying these entities as a separate class. This disparity, while possibly highlighting the difference in eponyms, tends to obfuscate their similar and common traits, even when items and phenomena under analysis for all intents and purposes are of the same concrete kind (see my discussion of this plurality in terminology in [Yermolenko 2018a]). Among these more or less equivalent designations, some are fairly recent, such as *конотативні імена, конотоніми, прецедентні імена, (від)прізвищеві терміни, деонімізація, апелятивізація, трансонімізація*, while others are very old, for instance, *антономазія* or, for that matter, *епонім*. Consequently, this lack of uniformity in nomenclature can obstruct tracing down correspondences or differences in, say, eponym discourse appurtenance if one's object of study is the semantic and communicative-functional potential of a proper name and therefore one should take into account the whole gamut of its derivatives and discursive contexts. All this results in the lack of a comprehensive and inclusive approach to studying secondary usages of proper names, such an approach also prerequisite for comparing proper and appellative lexis in this respect.

As it is, current research in eponymy, on the whole, takes into account discursive un-/markedness (not to mention other, less obvious but nonetheless important discourse-related features of items under analysis, relevant for their description and analysis) very selectively, inconsistently, not comprehensively, or otherwise insufficiently. The exception is eponymic terms, lexical as well as phrasal ones (see, e.g., [Pryimak; Dziuba 2011; Mykhailyshyn; Mykulchuk]); as different from general-purpose entities, these are *per definitionem* referred to the scientific style or other technical varieties of language. Scholars dealing with eponymy in terminology somehow or other take into consideration the factor of the scientific discourse with the latter's functional and other exigencies (it should be added that terminology in question is modern and prescriptively standardized rather than traditional or folk one). M. M. Dziuba, who explored eponyms in Ukrainian scientific terminology in her Philology Candidate thesis and a number of articles, specially devoted one of the latter to linguistic-cognitive properties of these units (see [Dziuba 2018]). In it, she relates the emergence of eponymic terms with the anthropocentricity of human thought and of its approach to the understanding of reality [ibid. : 31]. She also regards such terms as, apart from being a traditional and at the same time original means of naming, convenient as practical as well [ibid.] It will be noted that both these linguo-cognitive features mentioned by Dziuba (i.e. anthropocentricity and practicality) can be considered as pragmatic ones as well, the first relating eponyms with the way human mind perceives the world, and the second having to do with the efficiency of the use of eponymic designations as analytical tools). In fact, Dziuba does employ the concept of pragmatics in her research as an aspect of what she calls a semiotic approach to the systematic treatment of material under scrutiny; the other aspects being syntactic and semantic (cf. Charles Morris's trichotomous classifications of relations sustained by linguistic signs). In her dissertation, however, she uses this concept rather restrictively, applying it to phrasal terms' metaphoric motivation, which she regards as a salient manifestation of their pragmatic properties. This motivation can involve the metaphorical reinterpretation 1) of an underlying common

name, as in *митра Гіппократа* (a medical term denoting a kind of head bandage and literally meaning 'a Hippocrates miter (i.e. a kind of head-dress)'), *слимак Паскаля* (a mathematical term); or 2) of an underlying proper one, as in *синдром Арлекіна*, *синдром «Аліси в Країні Чудес»*, *синдром Іо* (all medical terms) [Дзюба 2011 : 15].

At the same time, e.g., when studying eponyms in such nomenclature sets where traditional designations can be found alongside scientific ones, e.g., in plant or bird names, the traditional folk terminology is associated with the informal everyday discourse, while the scientific one can be related to the both discursive environments, i.e. to scientific communication and everyday vernacular. This is how the idea of discourse/eponym correlation finds its way into studies of eponymy. For instance, the concept of discourse was selected by O. P. Kovalchuk as one of the analytical tools to be used in her Philology Candidate dissertation on specific semantic and structural features of eponyms in Ukrainian and English [Kovalchuk]. She substantiated her choice as necessary to identify and analyse the cultural component of eponym meaning ([ibid. : 63]. Focusing mainly on eponymic items found in the everyday informal discourse, she argued that eponyms occupy an intermediate place between proper and common names, representing a transitive stage of appellativization. Kovalchuk also claimed that taking into consideration discursive context was relevant for the study of eponyms within the framework of semantic field (or group) approach, in that it was feasible to establish entities with a common semantic feature that occurred in the same specific type of discourse, rather than irrespective of such occurrence [ibid. : 65]. As an example, she cited the eponyms *Aaron's rod* та *Aaron's beard*, on one hand, and *begonia*, on the other: all of these are plant names, but *Aaron's rod* and *Aaron's beard* are folk vernacular items, whereas the епонім *begonia* (named after Michel Bégon 1638-1710, a French governor of the Santo Domingo colony, now Haiti, and a promotor of botany¹) is used in the scientific discourse as well. Importantly, Kovalchuk noted that this discursive difference is accompanied by the difference in their inner form, i.e. motivation model [ibid. : 66]. Elsewhere in her dissertation, however, she somewhat attenuated her claim by subscribing to an opinion advocated by O. Malash, according to which, the opposition between folk names and standard language ones seems untenable, since the former, besides dialects, can occur in literature, popular science, media, and everyday informal communication [ibid. : 103; Malash : 18].

Be it as it may, the recognition of eponymy/discourse correlation is just the beginning. Specific patterns of such correlation, however, can be not uniform or otherwise complicated. For instance, the aforementioned eponymic terms with metaphorically reinterpreted proper names (*синдром Арлекіна*, *синдром «Аліси в Країні Чудес»*, *синдром Іо*) are, on one hand, technical language items belonging to the medical and, more generally, scientific discourse, yet they, on the other hand, manifest the way of the onomasiological interpretation of the underlying proper name that is at variance with the typical patterns found here: the latter are generally metonymical and feature proper names associated, sometimes in a fairly broad sense, with term denotata and those branches of science and technology they belong to (cf. [Dziuba 2010 : 55–63]).

¹ The name *begonia* was coined as a scientific term by the French botanist father Charles Plumier [Simpson].

One may say that the inner form of these eponymous entities conforms with the scientific discourse in being, on the whole, logical and thus avoiding metaphorical imagery, which is, on the contrary, proper to artistic language and discourse (but by no means to them alone, since metaphor can also be used in analogous reasoning and «lateral» thinking (on the analogical mind, see the eponymous monograph [Gentner, Holyoak, Kokinov (Eds.)]). The metaphorical eponym terms cited by Dziuba represent essentially different strategies of naming; besides, their underlying entities, *Арлекін* (*Harlequin* 'a mute character in traditional pantomime, typically masked and dressed in a diamond-patterned costume; a stock comic character in Italian commedia del'arte' [NOAD]), the English word also denoting a breed of spotted dogs and a species of duck with variegated plumage [Simpson]), L.Carrol's novel name «*Аліса в Країні Чудес*» (cf. also the English adjective *Alice-in-Wonderland* 'not logically explicable or predictable' [NOAD]), and *Іо* (*Io* 'a female character in Greek mythology' [ibid.] come from discourse types other than medical or, for that matter, scientific in general.

The formation of an eponym, can be accompanied by its simultaneous transition into a new discursive environment different from that of an underlying item. Derivation of this kind can be considered a case of discourse contact resulting in the borrowing of a linguistic entity from one discourse type and introducing and adapting it into another. Similarly to the situation commonly found in language contacts, where the adoption of a loan word or any other linguistic entity by a receiver language tends to involve the adaptation of the former to the latter, so borrowings from one discourse to another, too, may involve interface, which can be fairly complicated, as the following will demonstrate. In the liturgical calendar (or year), for example, such as that of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, celebrations of saints, along with other feasts, are prescribed to be observed at fixed dates. Saints as well as their names come to be associated with corresponding days of the calendar, so that these names become eponymous designations of the latter. The language of the confessional discourse of Eastern Orthodox churches used to be, and partly still is, Church Slavonic, and with Western Catholics, it was Latin, both languages confined to this discourse and not spoken outside of it. In the same areas, however, the church calendar was used by the traditional folk calendar. This borrowing of a calendar with its structure and nomenclature was accompanied by the adaptation of the latter, in particular, eponymous date designations, to the oral vernacular and its discourse. Some of these transformations had effect upon the outer form of calendar terms, including phonetic changes (*Пётра* < *Петра́*), substitution of a vernacular name variants for that used in the ecclesiastic discourse (*Меланки* < *Меланії*), the reduction of composite feast designations (*Іван Головатий* < *Третє знайдення чесної глави Предтечі й Хрестителя Господня Йоанна*) and some other. At the same time, the meaning of the date's patron name in the folk calendar could essentially change as well due to the emergence of secondary Christian calendar mythology associated with him or her: in these myths, the saint ceased to be just a means of marking a calendar date as well as coincidental natural phenomena and social activities, and became an integral part of the natural and social environment of the calendar's users instead, influencing (positively or negatively) phenological and meteorological events, sanctioning various kinds of works and feasting, or even participating in them, cf. the lyrics of the traditional Ukrainian New Year carol *Ходить Ілля на Василя, носить пугу житяную, куди махне, жито росте...* In this way, a saint could turn into a figure very much different from the one in the Church canon. These mythological

features get fixed in folklore, in particular, in folk calendar proverbs (Ukrainian *Перша Пречиста жито засіває, друга Пречиста дощем поливає, а третя Пречиста снігом покриває*), in a calendar saint's traditional folk epithet used in apposition to it (Ukrainian *теплий Миколай*), and also in the magical (more specifically, prognostic or prescriptive) perception of the phonetic or inner form of a date name (Ukrainian *Як на Макрини буде дощ, то осінь буде мокра; Покрова всю землю листом покриває*). All this points to the mythological component in the traditional folk mind set of the period and its representation in, and influence upon, the everyday discourse through folklore discourse and its items [Yermolenko 2006 : 103–116; Yermolenko 2017 : 6–12].

As we see, eponym coining which takes the form of the borrowing of items from a discourse of one type into another and their adaptation to the latter can entail interaction with discourses of still other type(s). Results of the massive transdiscursive borrowing of a whole set of items can be considered this set's creolization. At the same time, however, such transposition can be carried out on a much lesser scale, and the process of transdiscursive derivational transposition in such a case can be qualified as intentional and forceful implantation rather than borrowing. Take, for instance, the following case of discursive interference from the history of the Lunar toponymy. In 1959, after the Soviet space probe Luna 3 returned with the first-ever pictures of the far side of the Moon, a commission of Soviet scientists named some of the surface features [XIth General Assembly : 19]. The list of proposed names is in itself a telling example of how close were the scientific discourse and the discourse of ideological-political propaganda in the Soviet Union. One of the choices, for instance, that of Cu Chongzhi, an obscure ancient China mathematician and astronomer, was made due to the demand of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union Central Committee that a Chinese be included in the list. Mao Tse-Dung's People Republic of China was at that time the most powerful Communist ally of the U.S.S.R., and a candidature was supplied by the Soviet embassy in Peking (Chertok : 302–303). For the most part (with the exclusion of the *Mare Ingenii* 'The Dream Sea'), the list consisted of eponyms, and these were mostly coined from the surnames of scientists and cultural figures, both Soviet and other. Only one of them was derived from a toponym, and that was the *Mare Moscoviense* 'the Moscow Sea' (Lunar «seas», or *maria*, are large dark basaltic plains). This name contradicted the tradition according to which Lunar surface features of the *maria* kind were designated after mental states, such as the *Mare Tranquillitatis* 'the Sea of Tranquility' or the *Mare Serenitatis* 'the Sea of Serenity'. The issue was resolved by a French astronomer who suggested that «Moscow» mentioned in the proposed toponym was in fact a state of mind [The name game]. Whatever he meant by that, the truth is that in the discourse of the Soviet ideology and propaganda, «Moscow» indeed was a mental construct heavy with symbolic connotations. Within the Soviet totalitarian and overcentralized empire, Moscow was the centre of virtually everything (administration, politics, economy, science, culture, education, sports, army, etc.). At the same time, it was also represented in the public discourse as the centre of the whole world, leading the «progressive» mankind to the victory of communism (cf., for instance, the designation of the Soviet capital as *порт пяти морей* 'a port of five seas' coined by Joseph Stalin on the occasion of the Moscow ship channel opening in 1936 [Shmagun], the phrase *столиця світу* 'the capital of the world' used by Ukrainian Soviet poet Maksym Rylskyi with reference to Moscow, Russian poet V. Mayakovskiy's lines *Начинается земля, как известно, от Кремля* and

other numerous examples projecting the same ideological mythologeme [Kornienko : 2; Sarnov 447–450]). Therefore, if one considers the aforementioned list of lunar toponyms as a linguistic micromodel of the world, then *Mare moscovense* would be its nuclear element.

While the case discussed above is a clear-cut instance of the ideological-political discourse intentionally superimposed, by the choice of the underlying proper name for an eponym designation, on the scientific one, examples of the opposite, i.e. the choice of eponym's underlying inadvertently leading to discourse mixing, too, can be found, e.g., in the present situation around the nomenclature of COVID variants. This nomenclature being messy due to the lack of a recognized naming system, both officials and researchers are fairly unanimous in their desire to avoid terms deriving from place names, such as *the Kent variant* as well as analogous formations mentioning *Brasil* and *South Africa* (South African researchers are reported to avoid including the country in its name at the request of that country's president and health minister), since geographical associations can trigger geopolitical issues by stigmatizing countries and so discouraging surveillance [Callaway].

Arguably, taking into consideration an underlying item's discursive-functional markedness can be instrumental in establishing factors motivating its choice as well as the discursive-functional markedness of an eponym coined with its help. Therefore such markedness can and should be ascribed to an eponym seen as a systemic (or, to use A. Gardiner's term, disembodied) onomastic item (to the extent the latter is linked to a certain discursive type even at this level of abstraction). Similarly, such markedness should be identified when actualized in a minimal discursive context consisting of this eponym alone, for example, as an inscription on the plate or elsewhere near the entry to institutions and establishments. In the latter case, correlating an eponym with, and including it in, a notion of discourse of a certain type (or types, if a discourse is of a hybrid epistemic and functional nature) will not only broaden the scope of study of this discursive type's possible manifestations; also, and consequently, it will lead to a better understanding of its nature.

For instance, naming more or less important enterprises, institution, ships, state decorations and prizes as well as cities, streets, and even people (cf. such period names as Russian *Влад(и)лен* < *Владимир Ленин*, *Сталина* < *Сталин*, *Ким*, an acronym for *Коммунистический интернационал молодежи*) etc. after Vladimir Lenin as well as lesser ideological and political icons was a common naming practice in the Soviet Union. The preponderance of these eponyms sometimes produced funny results in cases when identical ideologically loaded components co-occurred within the same composite eponymic item, such as *Ленинградский ордена Ленина городской метрополитен имени В. И. Ленина* (yet, significantly, people then saw nothing funny or, for that matter, special in such names). Since eponyms of this kind were so many, their ideological components could not in every case indicate some distinctive features of their *denotata* that linked them to the underlying proper name (indeed, Lenin could not use the underground bearing his name, nor there was any meaningful relation between the two). This is why the repeated use of such components in forming eponymic proper names is generally, and doubtless rightly, explained by their bringing a honorific and commemorative component to the composite meaning of such names, enabling them to perform corresponding functions in addition to their principal one of individualizing and identifying their unique referent [Yermolenko 2018a : 5–7;

Yermolenko, Zymovets : 110–113]. From this perspective, they can be compared, *mutatis mutandis*, with choosing a disembodied first name for a new-born, when its choice is regulated by religious considerations and conventions, and is believed to provide its bearer with a patron saint or a guardian angel. I will confine myself to mentioning this analogy without developing it here.

As to instances of the former kind, treating them within the framework of discursive approach can highlight some of their other essential properties, in particular, their mixed discursive markedness. On one hand, these eponyms were all officially registered (and approved) and, used in official communication, were therefore part of the official administrative discourse. In addition, owing to their ideological message, they also were part of the ideological megadiscourse, otherwise realized on a far bigger scale in politics, economics, natural sciences and humanities, media, art, literature etc., these ideological designations being its minimal actualizations. From the viewpoint of this ideological megadiscourse and the totalitarian regime behind it, the monotonous similarity of these onomastic minidiscourses did not require any stylistic justification, since, apart from their content, the ceaseless repetition and proliferation of eponyms with the same ideologically marked components iconically signalled, by virtue of the latter's very reiteration, the uniformity of the world image projected by them, in particular the absence of any variability and the lack of possibility of choice therein. This all-pervasive litany of communist icons the form of eponym names as a means of propaganda and indoctrination, besides forming the sense of belonging in its recipients, played a role in inculcating in the latter the appreciation of such uniformity and conformity as well as the dislike of any plurality, the cumulative effect of this inculcation lingering in the collective mind set of a society long after the ideological and political postulates are officially annulled or otherwise discarded [Matsiuk; Kudryavtseva, Homaniuk].

There are reasons to believe the discourse parameter can prove feasible when applied to other aspects and instances of eponymy as well. The investigation of an eponym's origin in the light of its relation to the discursive-functional context may be heuristically fruitful when identifying an underlying proper names poses no difficulty, so that one can be certain about them, but coincidentally, there is no explanation whatever as to the extralinguistic motivation connecting the underlying and derivative items. Of course, there is the usual caveat applicable to such cases, namely, that this opaque motivation can in fact be a result of a secondary paronymic attraction to a proper or common name, such as in Ukrainian *номанці* 'small dried pieces of bread added to hot soup or, fried in grease, eaten separately', in spite of their similarity to the Christian name *Иоман*, explained as deriving from dialect *номанаму* 'to drown' [Melnychuk 4 : 540] or Russian *затрапез* 'cheap and gaudy fabric', formed from the manufacturer's name *Затрапезнов* rather than the phrase *за трапезой* [Belovinskiĭ : 217– 218]. Another caveat here is that although such an explanation does exist, it can prove to be wrong: for instance, Ukrainian *панам* and its cognates in other languages denoting a kind of light summer hat are generally associated with the Central American state of Panama on the taciturn, but wrong, assumption that it was there that these hats were initially produced (actually they were made in Ecuador and then shipped to Panama to be sold elsewhere) [Simpson]. This assumption, however, is understandable, typologically based as it is on a regular motivational model of eponym formation, namely 'a place (a region, a town, or a country) where something is

made, grown or produced' > 'the name of such a product' [Stern : 325; Yermolenko 2019 : 222–223].

(Seemingly) unmotivated eponyms seem to be numerous enough, and finding out relevant discursive data can turn out to be equally difficult, yet, to the extent that the reconstruction of the discursive situation of their emergence and original usage is possible at all, even a hypothetical solution delineating the range of possibilities should be considered better than none at all.

For instance, as I already mentioned in one of my previous papers, the Russian eponym *Отелло* denoting not only a jealous husband (as its cognates do in other languages) but also, in the vernacular of old Moscow publicans and pub patrons, an attendant whose task was to close the door and put out the lights after seeing the clientele out [Yelistratov : 408]. How did the name of Shakespeare's character *Othello* come to convey the latter meaning, is anyone's guess, educated or otherwise. It seems fairly obvious, with the both aforementioned caveats in mind, that there must have been an association between the origin of this designation and the *milieu* of educated people, actors and/or theatregoers who at the same time were pub regulars. Accordingly, the discourse in which they participated and where the eponym came to being, is to be localized in one of Moscow's pubs or taverns of the period. As to the motivation of this coinage, whatever it may be, it presumably must have been subjective and superficial enough to appear quite arbitrary and fortuitous, and had to do with such a feature of the referent that, while somehow or other related to him, at the same time could only be significant and/or known to a rather restricted and intimate circle.

In her aforementioned dissertation, O. Kovalchuk notes that among eponyms denoting birds, items are many that are derived from anthroponyms, which, probably, implies a tradition of designating birds with people's names [Kovalchuk : 100], with the further reference to J. Rudnyckyj's «An Etymological dictionary of the Ukrainian language». Unfortunately, she didn't mention L. Bulakhovskyi «Common Slavonic bird names» (first published in 1948), addressing this subject at some length, albeit without recouring to the terms *эпоним* or *эпонимия* [Bulakhovskyi : 213–215]. Among items he discussed, there are Czech *jiříček* 'a house-martin' and some other Czech and Slovak bird names that derive from first names *Jiří* (diminutive *Jiříček*) and *Đuro*, *Juro*, and may have been motivated by the date of these birds' vernal arrival (the feast of St. George is on 23 April). Correspondingly, the coinages may have resulted from the contact of the church and folk calendar taking place within the context of the traditional folk discourse; the occasional by-product of this contact could have been items of folklore discourse such as the Russian seasonal prognostic proverb *На егорьевской неделе прилет ласточкам* [Dal 1 : 514]. But this is the only instance of this kind among those cited in Bulakhovskyi's paper. As to the rest, the author states that only those of them can be considered motivated whose association with an underlying anthroponym was based, by means of folk etymology, either on similarity with a sound produced by a bird, or with a bird's previous name [Bulakhovskyi : 214], while with others, the choice of a particular first name remains unexplained. Volk etymology, alternatively called for paronymic attraction, is a natural feature of the everyday discourse of uneducated speakers [Yermolenko 2006 : 76]. Taking into consideration materials such as contained in Bulakhovskyi's study, are we to infer that they indeed testify, among other things, to a tradition (or, putting it somewhat differently, a motivation model, a meaning shift type etc.) to name birds with human first

names in such a way that the selection of the latter is essentially random and in no way influenced by some feature of a denoted bird? And, further, are we to correlate this naming pattern with the discourse of the traditional (or archaic) agricultural society, all the more so since the evidence of this pattern is not limited to the Slavonic languages, occurring as they are outside their area as well? (Cf. in this respect the similar treatment of Ukrainian *мартин* 'a water bird, *Larus L.*' (< the anthroponym *Мартин*) as a possible lexical or semantic borrowing from West European languages in «Etymological dictionary of the Ukrainian language» [Melnychuk 3 : 401–402], where, too, such a borrowing is qualified as a manifestation of a traditional eponymic pattern of bird naming).

The foregoing applies, *mutatis mutandis*, to folk plant names as well. For instance, the entry *васильок* in «Etymological dictionary of the Ukrainian language» [Melnychuk 1 : 337–338], which contains a long list of plant species denoted by this word and its variants, and explains it, on the one hand, as a borrowing from Greek (< βασιλικόν 'a king') and on the other, as an autochthonous Ukrainian coinage from the first name *Василь*. In the opinion of the compilers, the latter version of origin is substantiated by the wide range of reference of this lexeme and its derivatives, and also, «...probably, by a long-standing tradition in folk botanical nomenclature to employ commonly-used Christian names, such as *Василь*, *Іван*, *Марія* (the consequent semantic shift from one kind of plant to another being based on resemblance in its flowers colour, inflorescence shape, smell, or the way of its use in folk medicine)» [Melnychuk 1 : 338].

Be it as it may, one should exercise cautiousness in handling such cases lest one find oneself in a situation similar to that of Koz'ma Prutkov's poem character, a young landowner, who, upon learning that there is some timothy grass in the meadow he owned, demanded that it be immediately returned to a person of this name: «Вот Тимофеева трава... Мою траву отдать, конечно, пожалею; но эту возвратить немедленно Тимофею!» (Koz'ma Prutkov. *Pomieshchik i trava*). Fortunately, in the case of this particular eponym, we know that the plant, native to Europe, was named after «<...> American farmer Timothy Hanson, who promoted its use outside New England and among British farmers in the early 1700s». [Timothy plant] (cf. [Mel'nychuk 5 : 568]). According to Oxford English dictionary, the designation was first registered in 1736; the 1765 quotation says that it was «<...> artificial grass called Timothy-grass, because it was brought to Carolina from New York by one Timothy Hanson» [Simpson]). And while the route of this phytonym from where it originated to the Ukrainian language still remains to be traced down, including inter- and intralinguistic contacts of specific discourses this route included, its entrance into the Ukrainian language, where it took the indigenous form of *тимофіївка* (< *Тимофіїв*, a possessive adjective from the corresponding Ukrainian first name *Тимофій* + the suffix *-ка*), was doubtless facilitated by the already existing precedent of such word formation found in the traditional folk nomenclature of Ukrainian and other European languages. At the same time, it will be noted that the scheme underlying the inner form of *Timothy grass* and *тимофіївка* corresponds to one of modern technical term models (i.e. the naming of something after a person involved in its creation, design or discovery) [Дзюба 2010 : 36–63].

Thus, in finding out the specific character of relationship between an eponym and a discursive-functional context(s) of their formation and/or usage, one can recur to already established typological patterns and regularities, as well as occasionally adding ad hoc explanations. For instance, some anthroponyms in

the Ukrainian and other languages are known to obtain an emotional colouring or other associative meaning, and so becoming what Y. S. Otin and H. P. Lukash called connotative names and connotonyms respectively [Otin; Lukash]. Lukash cites V. Zhaivoronok's monograph [Zhaivoronok 2007], in which the following instances of these are given: «the Ukrainian male name *Хома* and female name *Химка* denote a loser or unlucky one, *Ганка*, *Феська*, *Хівря* an uncultured or uncouth person etc.» [Zhaivoronok 2007 : 226–227; Lukash : 245]. Zhaivoronok also regarded such names as acquiring general meaning and so becoming similar to words with evaluative and emotive sense [Zhaivoronok 2007 : *ibid.*]. Some of such names, according to O. A. Moroz, those that were most commonly used in the society's lower strata, also occur in phraseologisms. Moroz also identified, as other factors influencing a name's phraseologization, its association with a certain recurrent everyday state of affairs, its phonetic colouring (e.g., the sound **f** as well as its variants **ch**, **chw**, and **p** inducing pejorative connotations, as in *велика Педоря, та дурна; дурна Хвеська*), the rhyme connecting it with another word in a phraseologism, and, finally, its frequent occurrence in folklore texts [Moroz : 6] (neither Moroz, nor Zhaivoronok use the term and concept of eponymy).

Establishing whether it was its phraseologization that preceded the autonomous use of an anthroponym in the generalized emotive sense, or, on the contrary, a name which became a part of phraseologism had already developed such a meaning, or these processes were two mutually independent, — the very possibility of solving this task may seem fairly problematic. Anyway, it is noteworthy that in such cases an anthroponym, in the final analysis, seems to be able to turn into an eponym with such a general (in fact, appellative) meaning for no apparent reason at all. Arguably, this semantic shift has to do not (so much) with specific properties of individual anthroponyms, but principally with their shared basic feature, as proper words, of expressing unique reference to an individual person. That this is indeed so, is proven by the interchangeability of such items in the variants of the same proverb (cf. the collocation denoting an amorous couple *Семен та Одарочка*, and its variants *Максим і Одарочка*, *Панас і Одарочка*, *Мартин та Одарочка*, cited by Lukash [Lukash : 283–284], to which one can add the expression *парочка — Максим та Варочка* and in all probability some other too) as well as by their rhyming capabilities as a single criterion of their being employed as a part of a phraseologism (*про мене, Семене; шлюс (о юю), Параню, по коханю* etc). And in this aspect, the way these names are employed can be compared with the usage of pronouns, especially of the second and third person, in poetic discourse, which turn them from deictic items, localizing entities in time and space within the frame of reference of the communication situation structure, into poetic appellative lexemes with a generalized meaning [Yermolenko 2015 : 28–30], since in both cases there is a change from unique to generalized, abstract reference. In the artistic discourse, the possibility of such a change can be considered as preconditioned by the purely intensional character of artistic literary semantics], in that the content of artistic discourse is a purely aesthetic construct with cannot be assessed as true or false [Ingarden : 179–273; Langer : 219–236]. Presumably, this feature is shared by the folklore discourse as well; and since phraseological units with anthroponyms, such as discussed or mentioned by Lukash, Moroz and Zhaivoronok, are of paroemiological character, they are should be treated as entities that belong to the folklore discourse and manifest its properties while being used in the discourse of everyday colloquial speech. This should apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to emotionally coloured appellative variants

of first names when they are used autonomously as well, in other words, they, too, should putatively be treated as (modern or older) folklore items.

It also should be added that while being distinguishable in some cultural details of the *Weltbild* behind it, the original discourse in which these eponyms and phrases originated is not essentially different, as regards its epistemic and linguistic characteristics, from its present-day counterpart. But the situation can get far more complicated when we put some eponyms found in folklore in a deeper historical perspective. For instance, Ukrainian *Дунай* 'the Danube' represents an arguable case meriting such an approach. This name of the second longest European river occurs in the Ukrainian folklore, in particular, in songs, but, in contrast to the largest Ukrainian river Dnieper (*Дніпро*), *Дунай* is mentioned in them not only in contexts that unambiguously relate this name to its actual referent, but in some other as well, in which the meaning of *Дунай* is essentially different. Zhaivoronok in his «Anthology of signs of Ukrainian ethnoculture» notes that occurring in folk songs, *Дунай* can denote a river, specifically one that separates one from the native land, and metaphorically, it can indicate a border between the native and the alien [Zhaivoronok 2018 : 217–218]. This picture gets further complicated if one takes into consideration that outside folklore, Ukrainian dialect *дунай* has the meanings 'a spring flood; a large torrent', cf. also Russian *дунай* 'a spring', Old Polish (also present-day dialect) *dunaj* 'a faraway unknown river; a sea' and some other its Slavonic and Indo-European cognates denoting a river [Melnichuk 2 : 145; Trubachev 5 : 157], cf. also the poetic use of Ukrainian *Дунай* denoting a torrent, as in: « <...> Проколи серця, товсті й ліниві, і гноївки випусти *Дунай*» (D. Pavlychko. Molytva). Thus, beneath the modern Ukrainian lexeme *Дунай* / *дунай* and its etymological parallels, i.e. words coming from Common Slavonic **Dunajь*, there is a very long prehistory and then history of their development from the Indo-European root denoting water or river. Also, folklore imagery and motifs related with the Danube indicate to ancient myths underlying them, localizing this river in the Garden of Eden as well as making it both the world's center and frontier, and also identifying it, and its crossing, with the flow of human life, in particular with such its stages as marriage and death [Tolstoj 2 : 146–147]. All this puts a concept of eponymy as applied to the study of ancient proper names in an essentially different perspective, necessitating the elaboration of a corresponding theoretical and methodological approach, whose essential feature would be taking into account the specific functional character of the context of discourse in which a proper name is used.

Thus, there are reasonable grounds to believe that introducing the discursive-functional aspect in the model of description and analysis of eponymy, and studying eponyms and formation thereof within the corresponding theoretical and methodological framework will help elucidate not only entities of this kind but also will turn out insightful for discourse investigations, too.

REFERENCES

- Baturina O. V. (2004). Idiomaticnost' slovoobrazovatel'noi formy. *Unpublished Cand. of Sc. dissertation*. Kemerovo State University. [In Russian].
- Belovinskij L. V. (2007). *Illustrirovannyj enciklopedicheskij istoriko-bytovoj slovar' russkogo naroda XVIII – nachala XX v.* Moscow: Eksmo. [In Russian].
- Bulahovskij L. A. (2006). Obshchieslavjanskije nazvaniya ptic. *Bulakhovskij L. A. Vybrani pratsi v p'jaty tomakh*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 272–289. [In Russian].
- Dal V. (1999). *Tolkovyj slovar' zhivogo velikorusskogo yazyka v chetyrioh tomah*. Mos-

- cow: Russkij yazyk. [In Russian].
- Callaway E. (2021). 'A bloody mess': confusion reigns over naming of new COVID variants. *Nature*. URL: <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-021-00097-w> (last accessed: 19.02.2021).
- Chertok B. (1999). Rakety i lyudi. 2-nd ed. Moscow: Mashinostroenie. [In Russian].
- Dziuba M. M. (2010). Eponimichni naimenuvannia v ukrainskii naukovi terminolohii. *Ukrainska mova*, (3), 55–63. [In Ukrainian].
- Dziuba M. M. (2011). Eponimy v ukrainskii naukovi terminolohii. *Abstract of the Cand. of Sc. dissertation*. Lutsk: Lesia Ukrainka Volhynia National University. [In Ukrainian].
- Dziuba M. M. (2018) Linhvokohnityvni osoblyvosti eponimichnykh ukrainskykh terminiv pryrodnych nauk. *Naukovyi visnyk Mizhnarodnoho humanitarnoho universytetu. Filolohiia*. (33, 1), 30–32. [In Ukrainian].
- Gentner D., Holyoak K. J., Kokinov B. K. (Eds.) (2001). Analogical mind. Perspectives from cognitive science. Cambridge (MA): Bradford Books (The MIT Press).
- Ingarden R. (1988). O dziele literackim. Badania z pogranicza ontologii, teorii języka i filozofii literatury. Warszawa: PWN.
- Karpenko Y. O. (1973). Tvorennia zahalnykh imen vid vlasnykh. *Ukrainska mova i literatura v shkoli*, (10), 23–30. [In Ukrainian].
- Karpenko Y. O. (1990). Onimizatsiia i transezimizatsiia yak slovotvirnyi akt. *Shosta respublikanska onomastyczna konferentsiia. Tezy dopovidei i povidomlen, ch. 1*. Odesa: ODU, 35–37. [In Ukrainian].
- Kornienko N. V. (2013). Imya Moskvy i Peterburga v russkoy literature 1910-1930-h gg. Ch. 2. *Kul'turologicheskij zhurnal*, (3), 1–21. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/imya-moskvy-i-peterburga-v-russkoy-literature-1910-1930-h-gg-chast-2/viewer>. (last accessed: 19.02.2021). [In Russian].
- Kovalchuk O. P. (2019). Strukturno-semantichni osoblyvosti eponimiv angliiskoi ta ukrainskoi mov. *Unpublished Cand. of Sc. dissertation*. Ivan Franko National University of Lviv. [In Ukrainian].
- Kudriavtseva N., Homaniuk M. (2020). Contested names in the toponymic landscapes of post-Soviet space. *Ideology and politics*, (5), 4–10.
- Langer S. (1957). Philosophy in a new key. A study in the symbolism of reason, rite, and art. Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press.
- Losev A. F. (1995). O kommunikativnom znachenii grammaticheskikh kategorij. *Losev A. F. Imya*. Saint Petersburg: Aleteia, 349–342. [In Russian].
- Lukash H. P. (2011). Aktualni pytannia ukrainskoi konotonimiky. Donetsk: Promin. [In Ukrainian].
- Malash O. (2017). Narodni floromeny u bolharskii movni kartyni svitu. *Unpublished Cand. of Sc. thesis*. Kyiv: NASU O. O.Potebnia Institute of Linguistics. [In Ukrainian].
- Matthews P. H. (2003). The concise Oxford dictionary of linguistics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Matsiuk H. P. (2014) Pro pryrodu vzaiemodii movy i identychnosti v Ukraini (na materialy miskoho urbanonimikonu radianskoho ta postradianskoho periodiv. *Ukrainotsentryzm naukovoho sumlinnia. Zbirnyk naukovykh prats na poshanu profesora Zenoviia Terlaka*. Bilous M. P. (Ed.). Lviv: Prostir-M, 539–565. [In Ukrainian].
- Melnichuk O. S. (Ed.) (1983-2012). Etymolohichni slovnyk ukrainskoi movy. Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, iss. 1–6. [In Ukrainian].
- Moroz O. A. (2002). Frazeolohichni odynytsi z komponentom «vlasne imia» v suchasni ukrainskii movi. *Abstract of the Cand. of Sc. dissertation*. Donetsk National University. [In Ukrainian].
- Mykhailishyn B. P. Z istorii terminiv-eponimiv. *Movoznavstvo* (4–5), 45–50. [In Ukrainian].

- Mykulchyk R. B. (2016). Prizvyshchevi ta vidprizvyshchevi terminy v movi ukrainskoi fizychnoi terminnoi systemy: osoblyvosti struktury ta funktsiiuvannia. *Unpublished Cand. of Sc. dissertation*. Ivan Franko National University of Lviv. [In Ukrainian].
- NOAD (2005). New Oxford American Dictionary. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press (Kindle default dictionary).
- Otin Y. S. (1978) Konotatyvna onomastychna leksyka. *Movoznavstvo*, (6), 52–73. [In Ukrainian].
- Pryimak O. O. (2003). Vidonomastychnyi slovotvir u sferi terminolohii ta nomenklatury (na materialy kulinarnoi leksyky). *Abstract of the Cand. of Sc. dissertation*. V. N. Karazin National University of Kharkiv. [In Ukrainian].
- Simpson (2009). Simpson J. and Weiner E. (Eds.) Oxford English dictionary on CD-ROM (v. 4.0). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stern G. (s. a.) Meaning and change of meaning. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- (s. auct.) (2012). The name game. *Nature Magazine*, (7412), 429. URL: <https://www.nature.com/articles/488429b#citeas> (last accessed: 19.02.2021).
- Sarnov B. (2011). Stalin i pisateli. Kniga chetviortaya. Moscow: Eksmo. [In Russian].
- Shmagun O. (2013). Pochiemu Moskva — port pyati moriej. URL: <https://www.the-village.ru/city/asking-question/125739-port-pyati-morey> (last accessed: 19.02.2021). [In Russian].
- Tolstoj N. et al. (Eds.) (1995–2012). Slavyanskije drevnosti: etnolingvističeskij slovar'. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya, iss. 1–5. [In Russian].
- Trubachov O. N., Zhuravliov A. F. & Varbot Zh. Zh. (Eds.) (1974–2018) Etimologičeskij slovar' slavyanskijh yazykov: Praslavyanskij leksičeskij fond. Moscow: Nauka, iss. 1–41. [In Russian].
- Tymothy plant. (2016). Encyclopædia Britannica. URL: [<https://www.britannica.com/plant/timothy#ref1231815>] (last accessed: 20.01.2010).
- Dubisz St. (2001). St. Dubisz (Ed.) Uniwersalny słownik języka polskiego. Wersja 1.0. Warszawa: PWN.
- XIth General Assembly. (1961). Berkeley.
- Yelistratov V. S. (2004). Yazyk staroj Moskvy. Lingvoenciklopedičeskij slovar'. Moscow: Astrel'. [In Russian].
- Yermolenko S. S. (2006). Movne modeliuvannia diisnosti i znakova struktura movnykh odynts. Kyiv: Vydavnychi Dim Dmytra Buraho. [In Ukrainian].
- Yermolenko S. S. (2015). Person in artistic discourse. *Movoznavstvo*, (3), 20–32.
- Yermolenko S. S. (2017). Hramatychni ta mifolohichni aspekty realizatsii heortonomiv v konteksti narodno-kalendarnykh prysliviv. *Movoznavstvo* (2), 3–13. [In Ukrainian].
- Yermolenko S. S. (2018). Linguistic description of eponyms: parameters and problems. *Movoznavstvo* (4), 10–26.
- Yermolenko S. S. (2018a). Categorizing Ukrainian eponyms from a socio-cultural perspective. *Mova i suspilstvo*, (9), 5–13.
- Yermolenko S. S. (2018b). *Ukrainska eponimiia v sotsiokulturnomu aspekti*. Sotsiolinhvistyčne znannia yak zasib formuvannia novoi kultury bezpeky: *Ukraina i svit. II. Mizhnarodna naukova konferentsiia*. Lviv: LNU, ISPC, 45–47. [In Ukrainian].
- Yermolenko S. S., Zymovets H. V. (2018). Some issues in research of eponymous business name motivation (with reference to Ukrainian onomasticon). *Linhvistychni studii*, (36), 110–115.
- Yermolenko S. S. (2019). Movoiu vlasnykh imen: suchasna ukrainska eponimiia v interlinhvistychnomy ta mihzkulturnomu konteksti. *Ukrainska mova i yevropeiskyi linhvokulturnyi kontekst*. B. M. Azhniuk (Ed.). Kyiv: Vydavnychi Dim Dmytra Buraho. [In Ukrainian].
- Yermolenko S. S. (in print). The category of disembodied proper names and linguistic-cultural description of Ukrainian eponyms: with special reference to eponyms in «Лексикон львівський».

Zhaivoronok V. V. (2007). *Ukrainska etnolinhvistyka. Narysy*. Kyiv: Dovira. [In Ukrainian].
Zhaivoronok V. V. (2018). *Antolohiia znakiv ukrainskoi etnokultury*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka. [In Ukrainian].

С. С. ЄРМОЛЕНКО

Інститут ім. О. О. Потебні НАН України
м. Київ, Україна
Електронна пошта: signum70.1@gmail.com
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1340-0444>

ЕПОНІМІЯ І ДИСКУРСИВНО-ФУНКЦІЙНИЙ КОНТЕКСТ

У статті, яка продовжує серію публікацій, присвячених теоретичним і методологічним питанням дослідження епонімії, розглянуто доцільність розширення авторської параметричної моделі опису й аналізу цього класу мовних одиниць шляхом додання до трьох її основних компонентів, пов'язаних відповідно з трьома частинами епонімічного дериваційного зв'язку, четвертого компонента, який стосується дискурсивно-функційного контексту. Автор доводить, що відношення між епонімом і мовним та позамовним когнітивно-комунікативним довкіллям, у якому епонім виникає і/чи функціонує, становить не випадкову і поверхову, а істотну і невід'ємну рису епонімії, яку через це слід урахувувати у поглиблених студіях цього явища. Відповідно вихідним дискурсивним параметром таких студій має бути відслідковування функціонування епонімів у різних дискурсивних різновидах, які відмінні за своїми когнітивними і комунікативно-функційними характеристиками, що у свою чергу дозволяє провести розрізнення дискурсивно маркованих і немаркованих епонімів. Подальшим кроком є з'ясування природи відношення між дискурсивним різновидом і співвідносним з ним епонімом, зокрема встановлення впливу дискурсу на семантичні й функційні, можливо, також і формальні властивості останнього. Важливо, щоб репрезентативна модель опису епонімії враховувала можливу ієрархію дискурсивних контекстів, тобто можливості функціонування епоніма у вторинному для нього дискурсивному середовищі. У цьому аспекті запроваджено концепцію між- і внутрішньомовних контактів дискурсивних різновидів (тобто мовно-культурних кодів) як інструмент для висвітлення дискурсивних транспозицій епонімів, а також випадків, коли твірне власне ім'я використовується для створення епоніма, призначеного для використання в іншому, ніж у нього, дискурсивно-функційному середовищі. Авторські положення проілюстровано матеріалом, узятим з української та інших мов, а в їхніх межах — з дискурсивних різновидів, пов'язаних з мовою науки, ідеології, фольклору, релігії, міфології, а також з традиційним (народним) і повсякденно-побутовим дискурсом.

Ключові слова: епонім, дискурсивно-функційний різновид, комунікативно-епістемічне спрямування, власне ім'я, апелятив.

Дата надходження до редакції — 20.02.2021

Дата затвердження редакцією — 25.02.2021