

CONCEPTUALIZATION OF POLITONYMS *VOLIA, SVOBODA* IN UKRAINIAN LANGUAGE PICTURE OF THE WORLD

Yaremko Ya. P.

INTRODUCTION

Every language cultural community has its own idea about the notions liberty, freedom. It is connected with mentality of a nation, its historical development, cognitive and cultural experience. The question is which type of conceptualization appears to be right for the basic notions of human existence in Ukrainian thinking and speech area.

Definition of the concepts liberty, freedom is appropriate to consider through the semantic evolution of these words-politonyms taking into account background knowledge formed by culturology, history, philosophy, psychology, etc. and other humanities. We consider syncretic (cognitive discourse) approach to be highly methodologically efficient to research the nature of the so called “culture concepts”. According to Y. Stepanov the concepts of people’s historical-cultural consciousness as speech units with ethic cultural content are exclusively distinct. They are “the essence of culture in consciousness of a human”, “the bunch” of ideas, notions, knowledge, associations following a word, the main center of culture in mental reality of a human¹. This invisible internal world partially reveals in communication and obtains particular verbal interpretation due to linguistic, pragmatic and culturological aspects.

1. Semantic Realization of the Concept *Volia* (Freedom)

The notion freedom appeared in human consciousness long ago, probably, when a human began to realize their personality. Etymological roots of the notion are considerably deep. It originates from the Old East Slavic (Old Kyivan) language and there it came from the common Slavic source. Proto-Slavic *volja* was formed during the period of Balto-Slavic union (compare Ukr. *volia*, Rus., Brus., Bolg. *volia*, Pol. *wola*, Ch. *vũle*,

¹ Степанов Ю.С. Константы. Словарь русской культуры. М., 1997.

Slv. vól'a, OldSlv. *volia*, Lith. *valia*, Lat. “the same”, USrb., LSrb. *Wola*; comp. the verbs *val* “choice”, OGerm. *Wala* “the same”, LUGerm. *Wahl* “the same; elections”, *wille* “freedom”, *wollen* “to wish”, OInd. *varah* “desire, choice”, Av. *vāra* “freedom, selection”².

In the Old Russian period *volia* can be traced in different contexts – church-religious and life-style denoting respectively “desire, voluntas”, “agreement”, “possibility, liberty, licentia, libertas”³. In this period semantically close to *volia* but more terminated lexeme *svoboda* (liberty) functioned with its original meaning “possibility to act according to your own will”⁴. Political meanings have derived on the basis of the original meaning: “independence”, “liberation from slavery”, “the state of being a free man, freedom”, “liberation”, “permission, a free man”. In Old Ukrainian the semantic structure of these synonyms underwent certain changes: while *volia* considerably broadened its semantics and activated its functioning, *liberty* on the contrary was transferred to the passive fund. Comparative analysis of the following lexicographic sources “Materialy” (“Materials”) by I.I. Sreznevsky, “Old Ukrainian Dictionary of XIV – XV Centuries”, “Ukrainian Dictionary of XVI – first half of XVII – confirms this lexical-semantic transformation. Except the inherited from Old Russian meanings “desire”, “freedom, possibility” the word *volia* acquired in XV century distinctly political meanings “the state of being free”, “temporary liberation of new settlers from feudal obligations and taxes”, as well as psychological “intension, inclination”, “opinion, point of view”⁵. The Old Ukrainian sources do not define the lexeme *svoboda*, but provide its derivative *svobodny* “free” and abstract noun *svobodnost* “freedom”⁶ formed with the help of the suffix *-ost* and from the stem of the adjective *svobodny*.

The concept *volia* gained its fully complete definition in the XVI – XVII centuries, during the Cossack epoch. It is known that the historical events inevitably influence the evolution of the language system, cause the chain reaction of quantitative and qualitative changes in lexical structure. The Cossack epoch established genuine, significantly

² Словник української мови: В 11-ти томах. / АН УРСР. Інститут мовознавства; за ред. І. К. Білодіда. К.: Наукова думка, 1970–1980.

³ Срезневський І.І. Матеріали для словаря древнерусского языка: В 3-х т. М.: Книга, 1958.

⁴ Срезневський І.І. Матеріали для словаря древнерусского языка: В 3-х т. М.: Книга, 1958.

⁵ Словник староукраїнської мови XIV–XV ст./ Ред. Кол.: Д. Г. Гринчишин, Л. Л. Гумецька (голова), І. М. Керницький. Т. 1. К.: Видавництво “Наукова думка”, 632 с.

⁶ Болдырев Н.Н. Значение и смысл с когнитивной точки зрения и проблема многоязычности / Материалы Второй международной школы-семинара по когнитивной лингвистике: В 2-ч. Ч. 1. Тамбов, 2000. С. 11–17.

different social-political terminology. Subsequently, the lexico-semantic evolution found its reveal in extension of semantic structure of inherited politonyms, development of synonymic rows and semantic differentiation of lexemes. This change occurred to the semantic structure of the word *volia*, which had the following meanings: “one of the functions of human psychic”: “desire, wish, longing”; “will, law, power, right (considering God); “discretion, independence”; “temporary liberation from feudal obligations and taxes”⁷. Polysemantic lexeme *volnost* functioned simultaneously with the word *volia*. Their semantic content crossed in synonymic zone formed by common semes: “independence”; “liberation from obligations”; “desire”⁸. However, *volnost* reflects the tendency to semantic differentiation of synonymic lexemes. It is proved by hierarchy of political meanings having formed the semantic structure of the word *volnost*. The semantic center (basic meaning) is “liberty, freedom”. New lexico-semantic variants developed on the basis of sememe “right, privilege”: “right, permission”; “discretion”⁹. Noticeably that the abstract noun *volnost* is formed with the help of the suffix *-ost* from the stem of the adjective *volny*, where the following meanings can be traced: “free, independent”; “free, permitted”; “having discretion”¹⁰. These meanings were transposed on the noun *volnost*. Due to active usage of stable compounds *svoya volia* (own will), *volnaya volia* (free freedom) with the component *volia* the sememe “svavillia” (tyranny, willfulness) appeared. In fact, it becomes the last one in the meaning hierarchy of the politonym *volnost* determined in “Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language XVI – I half of XVII”¹¹. As far as we are concerned, the conditional character of the consecutive order of lexico-semantic variants and certain ambiguity between their semantic borders do not allow us to include the meaning “svavolia” (tyranny, willfulness) to the semantic structure of the word *volnost*. According to the “Lexicon” (1627) by P. Berynda *volnaya volia* together with the synonymic compounds *samovolnaya volnost* (self-will), *dobrovolnaya volnost* (free will) define the content of the registered word “*samovlastiye*” (self-rule). Historical tendency to this definition is proven in “Materials” by I. Sreznevsky, where *samovlastiye* – “svobodnaya volia” (free will)¹².

⁷ Словник староукраїнської мови XVI – 1 пол. XVII ст. Словник. Вип. 1. Львів, 1994–2010.

⁸ Словник староукраїнської мови XVI – 1 пол. XVII ст. Словник. Вип. 1. Львів, 1994–2010.

⁹ Словник староукраїнської мови XVI – 1 пол. XVII ст. Словник. Вип. 1. Львів, 1994–2010.

¹⁰ Словник староукраїнської мови XVI – 1 пол. XVII ст. Словник. Вип. 1. Львів, 1994–2010.

¹¹ Словник староукраїнської мови XVI – 1 пол. XVII ст. Словник. Вип. 1. Львів, 1994–2010.

¹² Срезневський И.И. Материалы для словаря древнерусского языка: В 3-х т. М.: Книга, 1958.

Comparative analysis of the idiom *svoya volia* (one's own will) in the Old-Russian period and in XVI as well shows that the stable compound underwent double semantic shift: in "Materials" by Sreznevsky *svoya volia* (one's own will) means "liberty", *po svoey volie* "freely, voluntarily", *svoyeyu voleyu* (according to one's own will) "freely, voluntarily", *byty svoeyu voleyu* "to act freely". Obviously their connotation is positive. On the contrary, in XVI the compounds acquired another meaning a) lawlessness; b) "whoredom". The impetus for the semantic transformation was, apparently, extra lingual factors. All Cossack rights and privileges were called *volnosti* of Zaporizhzhian force. This is evidenced by the Lviv Chronicle of the mid-seventeenth century where we read: "prosyl...ω oryvie(r)nienie vo(l)nosty(y) davny(kh) vo(i)sku zaporozkomu" (...they asked for returning the former rights of Zaporizhzhian Army)¹³. "Cossachchyna had been struggling for "za tsi volnosti nalezhni rytsarskym liudiam" (for the rights proper for knights), "nadani kniazem ruskym i koroliamy" (given by Russian Prince and kings) for the period being ruled by Polish power"¹⁴. Polish authorities called the claims *svoyevolia kozatskaya*, *svavolia kozatskaya* (Cossack willfulness) and Ukrainian liberation war – *kozachschyzna*. The other components of synonymic row for the notion "protest, rebel" appeared probably for the same reason: *buntovaniye*, *zburennye*, *bunt*.

The above mentioned shift of connotation from obviously positive to completely negative of the compounds *svoya volia*, *volnaya volia* reflects the violation of the semiotic principle of systematic congruity (conformity, compatibility) when signs (historical figures, historical events) which belong to one estimation system and cultural code are interpreted by another system and other national interests. Regardless of the national interests it is quite difficult to define Cossacks as "politically correct" using exclusively terminology of modern multiculturalism since they *svoyeyu voleyu* (voluntarily) manifested their protest against social oppression. However, *volia do svobody* (wish for freedom) being cultivated by Cossacks interfered every level of the national consciousness and became the significant feature of the national mentality. It couldn't escape the attention of the foreigners, for instance, French engineer H. Boplan staying in Ukraine in XVIII century

¹³ Словник староукраїнської мови XVI – 1 пол. XVII ст. Словник. Вип. 1. Львів, 1994–2010.

¹⁴ Крип'якевич І. Історія українського війська. Львів: Видання Івана Тиктора, 1936. Ч. 1. 288 с.

admitted: “The Ukrainians appreciate freedom the best and they cannot live without it”. Genetic connection of the idea of *svoboda* with the Cossacks’ worldview and lifestyle is proven by the lines from the national anthem: Dushu j tilo my polozhym (We will sacrifice our body and soul) Za nashu svobodu (To our freedom) / I pokazhem shcho my brattia (And we will show that we, brothers,) / Kosatskogo rodu (of Cossack origin).

The concepts *volia*, *svoboda* are strongly connected with the concepts *nation*, *state*. Y. Malaniuk is completely right tracing the sources of establishing of modern Ukrainian nation in the Cossack age, its intellectual-military features: “The same as Sich managed to create a military state on the territory of another state, the society managed to create “state inside the state” by means of schools, societies and endless struggle.

The Old Ukrainian terminology reached its evolutionary peak during the Hetmanate of Bohdan Khmelnytsky and Ivan Mazepa. After the fatal Poltava battle (1709), the construction of a state by Western European model with the preservation of the traditional Cossack system, as Ivan Mazepa, the “architect of the European Ukraine” planned¹⁵”, declined. According to Y. Malaniuk “the night of statelessness” had come. He called it “night” because since that time Ukraine ceased being the political affair (Y. Malaniuk’s underlining)¹⁶. Under such historical circumstances it is definitely impossible to develop the Ukrainian conceptosphere as a sphere of national knowledge and political or cultural experience.

The more extensive experience is the deeper content of the concept becomes on the level of cognitive perception. The interaction of these aspects influences the conceptualization depth interpreted as “the process of emergence and formation of concepts in consciousness”, as well as “comprehension of new information leading to concept formation”¹⁷. Consequently, the conceptosphere in the process of historical development is constantly changing, reflecting what concepts at a certain stage of history were more significant to society, and which – less important, which semantically enriched or emerged, and which –

¹⁵ Пахльовська О. Імператив інтелектуального опору / День. 2–3 квітня 2010 р. С. 21.

¹⁶ Маланюк С. Нариси з історії нашої культури. К., 1992.

¹⁷ Болдырев Н.Н. Значение и смысл с когнитивной точки зрения и проблема многоязычности / Материалы Второй международной школы-семинара по когнитивной лингвистике: В 2 ч. Ч. 1. Тамбов, 2000. С. 11–17.

fell down or disappeared. Historically the content structuring of a concept is uneven and mosaic by nature.

Since conceptosphere is considered to be as storage of human reality so the reveal of person's consciousness is materialized to some extent in the language picture of the world. In this case it is important to figure out the changes undergone by concepts *volia*, *volnost*, *svoboda* by means of reconstruction of both language facts and culture. Conceptually similar lexicographic sources, "Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language" by P. Biletsky-Nosenko and "Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language" edited by B. Grinchenko can serve a basis for the observation, as both dictionaries are closely connected to social-historical and cultural life of people in XIX century.

The characteristic feature of the folk language is the tendency to name objects, household phenomena, which typically have the specific objective meaning. Purely sensual knowledge of the environment of that kind was enough for the perception of reality and practical activity of an illiterate peasant of XIX century with his traditional lifestyle. However, it is impossible to cognize spiritual, inner world using just empirical knowledge due to the demand for words of abstract, mental character. The lack of words of this kind makes the conceptualization of political categories on the logic-rational level quite complicated. Whereas the meaning of the concept depends on specific social-historical conditions, under which speaking and thinking activities are carried out, we can assume: when Ukraine lost (at the end of XVIII century) even "latent" (half-sovereign) statehood its territory belonged to other states of imperial type, consequently the development of cognitive picture of the world as well as political idea were blocked.

In terms of above mentioned discriminatory prohibitions – the Valuyev Circular and Ems Ukaz – there was no point mentioning any Cossacks' *volnosti*. Thus, the words *volnost*, *svoboda* were getting suppressed, deactivated and the Dictionary by P. Biletsky-Nosenko did not fix them. The lexeme *volia* reduced its semantic structure abruptly due to the loss of social-political meanings but two inherited: "Desire" and "Freedom. Right". Instead it acquired the new one connected with inner word of a human "Wickedness; hatred"¹⁸.

¹⁸ Білецький-Носенко П. Словник Української мови / АН УРСР. Ін-т мовознавства ім. О. О. Потебні; підготував до видання / В. В. Німчук; Відп. ред. К. К. Цілуйко. Наук. думка, 1966. 419 с.

It is interesting to observe cognitively the reasons why this socially important denotatum obtained negative content. The primary reasons are the specific social-political conditions of statelessness, national and social discrimination of foreign authorities reflected in the Dictionary by Grinchenko. Besides two common meanings denoted in the Dictionary by P. Biletsky-Nosenko – “freedom, liberty”, “desire” the Dictionary by Grinchenko fixed a new social-political meaning “power”¹⁹. It is obvious that due to the discriminative character of this power it caused categorical rejection in national consciousness and consequently acquired negative meaning “wickedness; hatred”. For the social-political meaning “power” the following idioms can serve good examples: “whose the will is the one comes to power; the Polish enemies won’t rise to power in Ukraine and the famous Shevchenko’s saying: there is the truth and power and freedom in your home”²⁰.

When “everybody keeps silence because of being exalted” (T. Shevchenko) the national consciousness expressed its desire of freedom in idioms. These were probably inherited from the times of Cossacks archetypes hidden in the collective unconscious (K. G. Yung’s term) and transmitted from generation to generation. It is no coincidence that the Cossacks were the symbol of Ukraine, its eternal struggle for *freedom and independence*²¹. While the master’s or imperial *will*, if to be more precise – *arbitrariness of power* caused rejection. This was the source of meaning differentiation we can observe in idioms. Therefore, phraseological units with the component *volia* in M. Nomys’s compilation correlate with the following meaning (the pages marked in brackets):

– “freedom, liberty” the Lord is free so as you are (241); freedom belongs to a freeman (241); struggling but free (287); though poor but free (100); at least in three days liberated (100); where is the freedom? Has it quitted or vanished? (100); though were served modestly but were free and happy (100);

– “power, force”: you go either voluntarily or forced (88); master’s will (241); to the master’s will (241); this is nothing but helplessness (100);

¹⁹ Словарь української мови / За ред. Б. Грінченка. Київ, 1907–1909. Т. 1–4.

²⁰ Словарь української мови / За ред. Б. Грінченка. Київ, 1907–1909. Т. 1–4.

²¹ Словник символів культури України / За заг. ред. В.П. Коцура, О.І. Потапенка, М.К. Дмитренка. Київ: Міленіум, 2002. 260 с.

– “wickedness, hatred”: he is as free as a chained dog (100); “freely free but still upset”(100); I am free and pay the full price for it (100); you have plenty of freedom; as the master wishes (241);

– “desire”: a good intention may be appreciated (587); whether good or bad fortune is to the Lord’s will (587); there are two wills in the field (450);

The syncretism of meanings can be observed in some phraseological units especially of social-political meanings “freedom, liberty” and “power, force”: *a man without freedom as a horse without walk* (587); *you can find comfort in a cage but never meet freedom there* (241).

Volia can acquire symbolical meaning which according to the researcher of national symbols of Ukrainian V. Kononenko “can be felt more than realized”²². In general he noticed the *transcendental character of a symbol* and then observes the mechanism of emerging of a national symbol: “the transition from the archetypal word-symbol to the national one which is located in accordance with the given ethnos is carried out by means of complicated semantic transformations caused by figuratively-semantic shift on the basis of particular ethnoculture, pragmatic aspects and nationally oriented set of presuppositions”²³.

The people who had once experienced freedom but lost it associated *volia* with Cossacks. M. Kostomarov pointed out the great respect of Ukrainians for their knights: “I noticed that the image of a Cossack is always positive in the Ukrainian songs”²⁴. The folk ideas fixed in phraseological units were represented in M. Nomys’s “Compilation”: *Cossack and freedom – great fortune* (74). *Steppe and freedom are Cossack’s destiny* (74). *Field is freedom for a Cossack* (74). The idea of freedom acquired existential character for the mentality, worldview and lifestyle of those desperate people. They could not imagine their life without it. *Cossack’s freedom* could evolve moving from the military dimension to the religious one. *Because freedom is the gift of God*. The example of such transformation is the lexeme *proshchalnyk* fixed in the Dictionary by Grinchenko with its distinct pragmatic (connotative-emotional) coloring: “a Cossack who bid farewell to revelry and secular

²² Скаб М. Закономірності концептуалізації та мовної категоризації сакральної сфери. Чернівці: „Рута”, 2008. 559 с.

²³ Скаб М. Закономірності концептуалізації та мовної категоризації сакральної сфери. Чернівці: „Рута”, 2008. 559 с.

²⁴ Костомаров Н.И. Об историческом значении русской народной поэзии / Костомаров М.И. Слов’янська міфологія. К., 1994.

life before joining monks”²⁵. The worshiping of *volia* followed by them, evoked piety in Shevchenko, who, according to D. Dontsov, "clearly distinguished between the two castes – “the knights” (Cossacks) and “the swineherds”. For the latter, there were many synonyms: “the sneaky slaves”, “the footrests”, “the little ones”, “the cold ones”, “peasant souls” (“Kniazhna” (“the Princess”)), “the plebeians, buckwheat-sowers” (“Neophytes”), “the lambs” (“Kholodny Yar”), “the big head cabbage” (“Khiba Samomu Napysaty”)²⁶. D. Dontsov called the poet “the last bard of the Cossacks”, who did not imagine the existence without freedom: “Our soul does not die, / does not die the will”.

The pages of history testify resilience, non-indulgence of the idea of *volia* in the folk consciousness. The idea of *national will* had always been rooted in the history of the Ukrainian liberation movement. It played the leading role in the 20's of the twentieth century for the Kholodny Yar rebels, on the black banner there was a motto: “Will of Ukraine or death.” The historical tendency of the national-existential idea of will was affirmed at the Third Extraordinary Meeting of the OUN (1943), which at the same time formed a political credo: “The will of the people is the will of a man”.

2. Semantic Content of the Concept Svoboda (Liberty)

The concept *svoboda* (*liberty*) turned out to be less productive than *volia* (freedom). There is only one phraseological unit with this word in M. Nomys’s “Compilation”: “Adventure calls liberty”, though there is the signal of its actualization in the Dictionary by B. Grinchenko: the derivatives *svobodyty* (to liberate), *svobodny* (liberated), *svobodno* (freely) were formed on the basis of the stem *–svobod*²⁷. Earlier *svoboda* was renewed in the “Little Ukrainian-German Dictionary” by Y. Zhelekhivsky, S. Nedilsky. Together with the derivatives *svobodny* (free), *svobodnist* (freedom, liberty), *svobodoliubyvy* (freedom-loving) it acquired the political meaning²⁸. The Austrian Constitution 1867 supported this process. There was noted: every nationality of the state regardless of their race is equal: each has the immutable right to keep and respect their nationality and language”²⁹. The above mentioned translated

²⁵ Словарь української мови / За ред. Б. Грінченка. Київ, 1907–1909. Т. 1–4.

²⁶ Донцов Д. „Козак із мільона свинопасів” / Донцов Д. Літературна есеїстика. Дрогобич: Відродження, 2010. С. 154–172.

²⁷ Словарь української мови / За ред. Б. Грінченка. Київ, 1907–1909. Т. 1–4.

²⁸ Малоруско-німецький словар. Т.2: П-Я / Желехівський Є. та С. Недільський.

²⁹ Караванський С. Секрети української мови. К.: „Кобза”, 1994. 152 с.

lexicographic work „Die juridisch – politische Terminologie für die slawischen Sprachen Österreichs” (“Legal-Political Terminology for the Slavonic Languages of Austria, 1851) promoted the establishment of the Ukrainian political lexicon in linguistic area. It was the profound work which united efforts of the prominent Slavonic researchers: P.–Y. Shafaryk, V. Karadzhych, F. Mikloshych, Y. Holovatsky. German-Ukrainian Dictionary gives the Ukrainian equivalents *volnost*, *svoboda* to the registered *Freiheit*³⁰. The politonyms *svobodny*, *osvobodyty*, as well as terms-combinations *svobodny zhytel*, *svobodny ot obiazanosti* refer to the concept *svoboda* alike³¹. The register of the dictionary could not escape the influence of the revolutionary event known as “Spring of Nations” which induced Ukrainians according to I. Krypyakevych “to assemble politically”³² [16, 288]. The first Ukrainian political organization “Supreme Ruthenian Council” emerged in Galicia. It manifested (1848) the unity of 15 million Ukrainians and the security of their rights³³. The protection undoubtedly demanded military support. Thus, the Council initiated the creation of the National Guard. In Pre-Carpathian region for to fight the Hungarian troops there were national self-defense units and battalion of mountain shooters formed³⁴.

The provided historical context enables to explain the further development of the Ukrainian concepts *volia*, *svoboda*. The thing is that the language reaction on revolutionary events in 1848 was the emergence of the important word *volnomysliye* (free thinking). It caused the new turn not only in semantic evolution of the word *volia* but probably in the development of the Ukrainian political idea. However, we should be grateful to “Spring of Nations” 1848 for the enrichment of the Ukrainian lexicon with the synonym of *volnomysliye vilnodumstvo* “critical observation of the existing prevailing religious or political opinions on social order” and derivatives *vilnodumnyi* “the one who critically observes the existing prevailing religious or political opinions on social order”, *vilnodumnist* “the quality referring to vilnodumny”, *vilnodumets* “the person whom vilnodumstvo inherent to”, *vilnodumna* “fem. of vilnodumets”, *vilnodumstvuvaty* “to show vilnodumstvo”³⁵,

³⁰ Die juridisch-politische Terminologie für die slawischen... Sprachen Österreichs. Wien. 1851.

³¹ Die juridisch-politische Terminologie für die slawischen... Sprachen Österreichs. Wien. 1851.

³² Крип'якевич І. Історія українського війська. Львів: Видання Івана Тиктора, 1936. Ч. 1. 288 с

³³ Кульчицький С. Головна Руська Рада / Довідник з історії України. К.: Генеза, 2001. С. 166–167.

³⁴ Die juridisch-politische Terminologie für die slawischen... Sprachen Österreichs. Wien. 1851.

³⁵ Словник української мови: В 11-ти томах. / АН УРСР. Інститут мовознавства; за ред. І. К. Білодіда. К.: Наукова думка, 1970–1980.

which have powerful though invisible pragmatic (connotative-emotional) potency. The spring in 1848 supported the formation of the European values – civil rights and liberties therefore the tendency of the Ukrainian concept *volia* and *svoboda* to political Eurocentric direction.

S. Karavansky points out “the Galician political life in XIX century was to some extent a laboratory, where the new linguistic forms were tested and subsequently established or found by the literary language”³⁶. One of the most productive was the form *svobodoliubyvy* on the basis of which the phonetic derivative *svobodoliubny* “the one who loves freedom, independence, who endeavors to get freedom, independence; voleliubny” was formed³⁷ and the range of other derivatives formed from it: *svobodoliubnist*, *svobodoliubstvo* “love, desire for freedom, independence”, *svobodoliub* “the person who is voleliubny”, *svobodoliubets*³⁸. The semes with positive connotation are dominant in the structure of political meaning of the politonyms with the distinct pragmatic meaning. According to psycholinguistic meaning of the word these politonyms-pragmatisms cause in the speaker’s consciousness the corresponding semantic halo, corresponding associations.

Semantic potency laid in the politonym *svoboda* realized itself in the main meaning of this word “absence of political or economic oppression, persecution and limitations in social-political life of any stratum or the whole society; freedom”. The semantic shade “state sovereignty” was added to the basic meaning³⁹, though this shade contains the whole semantic weight of the main meaning.

It is doubtful that the directors planning Ukrainization in 20-s of XX century wished to actualize precisely this meaning. Modern historiographers believe this process to be artificial and ambiguous. Eventually the contemporaries realized it alike. Their memories will help both to form the idea of social-political situation, where it was necessary to struggle for the existence of *svoboda* as existential value of a human and as a social ideal and to help to realize the artificial verbal lacunarity of the Ukrainian concepts *volia* and *svoboda*. Y. Temchenko in his letter to the secretary of Shevchenko Scientific Society V. Hnatiuk does not

³⁶ Караванський С. Секрети української мови. К.: „Кобза”, 1994. 152 с.

³⁷ Словник української мови: В 11-ти томах. / АН УРСР. Інститут мовознавства; за ред. І. К. Білодіда. К.: Наукова думка, 1970–1980.

³⁸ Словник української мови: В 11-ти томах. / АН УРСР. Інститут мовознавства; за ред. І. К. Білодіда. К.: Наукова думка, 1970–1980.

³⁹ Словник української мови: В 11-ти томах. / АН УРСР. Інститут мовознавства; за ред. І. К. Білодіда. К.: Наукова думка, 1970–1980.

have any illusions about Ukrainization: “do not idealize our state. It’s a kind of pro-forma for now. The Moscovians hold the whole power and we pray for not to find ourselves being a part of “yedina, niedielima” one day. Who is going to protect Ukrainian interests when the country is ruled by “alien people”? “The army will get organized but what if against us?”⁴⁰. Although being in status of fake freedom (Grabovsky would say in this case, unfree freedom) the ones, who strongly believed in *svoboda* created scientific-cultural phenomenon of 20-s. With this period, we associate a "terminological explosion", where we draw attention to the dictionaries of Ukrainian military terminology being a component of the political lexicon, which have been codified on a scientific basis for the first time.

In “Practical Russian-Ukrainian Dictionary for the Military” published in 1924, the Ukrainian corresponding words *volia*, *vilnist* (freedom) were provided referring to the Russian registered *svoboda* and to the derivatives *svobodny*, *vilnoliubny* corresponded Ukrainian *vilny*, *vilnoliubny*⁴¹. We can assume that the synonymic range in the Ukrainian part of the dictionary is preserved with the only difference – instead of the word *svoboda* it actualized the word *vilnist*. In the “Russian-Ukrainian Dictionary of the Military Terminology” by S and O. Yakubski published in 1928 the Russian *volia* correlates with the Ukrainian *volia*, *svoboda*⁴² and on the basis of the stem of the word *volia* derived semantically specialized *vilny* “vilno” (“at ease” military command), *vilnonaimany* (a recruit) and term-combinations *vilny biy* (free fight), *vilni rukhy* (free movements)⁴³. This socially and linguistically meaningful lexicographic work does not capture *svoboda* in the register of politonyms because of the reasons that do not depend on the will of the authors. The reason consists in potentially laid political content of the word *svoboda* which influenced the combinability and connotations of this word in both Russian and Ukrainian, compare: *vypuskat na svobodu* – *vypuskatu na voliu* (to liberate); *demokraticheskiye svobody* – *demokratychni svobody* (democratic liberties); *lishat svobody* – *pozavliaty voli* (to deprive of freedom, imprison); *politicheskkiye svobody* – *politychni svobody* (political liberties); *prishla svoboda* – *pryishla volia* (*svoboda*) (freedom has come),

⁴⁰ Листи Євгена Тимченка до Володимира Гнатюка *Записки НТШ. Праці філологічної секції*. Львів, 1992, Т. 224.

⁴¹ Бурячок А., Демський М., Якимович Б. Російсько-український словник для військовиків. Київ-Львів: Варта, 1995.

⁴² С. та О. Якубські Російсько-Український словник військової термінології. Київ: 1928.

⁴³ С. та О. Якубські Російсько-Український словник військової термінології. Київ: 1928.

svoboda voli – *svoboda voli* (freedom of will), *svoboda lichnosti* – *svoboda osoby* (personal freedom), *chriezmiernaya svoboda* – *nadmirna vilnist* (excessive freedom)⁴⁴.

Despite the obvious synonymic relations of *volia* and *svoboda* the difference in their connotation is obvious: while the word *volia* is used in word combinations with both positive content (*vypuskaty na voliu* (to liberate)) and negative (*pozbavliaty voli* (to deprive of freedom, imprison; *nadmirna vilnist* (excessive freedom)), the word combinations with the component *svoboda* bear exclusively “positive” connotations. The difference is in the pragmatic (emotional-connotative) coloring of the words *volia* and *svoboda*, their combinability may help to differentiate these terms as it occurred to the Russian language, where the concept *svoboda* was politicized much earlier than in Ukrainian. Plural form of the noun with supporting adjectival attributes-qualifiers indicates political significance as well. However, lexicographically these terminological combinations were provided only in 80-s of XX century in “Russian-Ukrainian Dictionary” (the edition of 1984), though the notion *civil liberties* was known for the political discourse much earlier. The actualization of this notion can be observed in the content represented by the author of the first legal dictionary K. Levytsky: “When our people came to freedom and first civil liberties near Austria (1848) they did not have national advocates and due to this defenselessness they were prone to great loss in every part of their life”. “German-Ukrainian Legal Dictionary (494 pages) was published in 1920 in Vienna, where such civil freedoms as freedom of speech and freedom of the press functioned in terms of civil society. The “Russian-Ukrainian Dictionary of the Military Terminology” by S. and O. Yakubski was published in 1928 in terms of “permissive” freedom, when Bolsheviks proclaimed Ukrainization, but Soviet censorship might have considered the subtle mentioning of civil liberties to be subversive movement. When the echo of the Liberation Movement of 1917-1921 for the Ukrainian state has not yet calmed down, such a politically ambitious concept was clearly not included in the scenario of Bolshevik Ukrainization, as it caused "wrong thoughts" – too freedom-loving and too Ukrainian. In this case "struggle with class enemies" was simplified: no word – no notion, no idea, and no cognition. After all, human

⁴⁴ Бурячок А., Демський М., Якимович Б. Російсько-український словник для військовиків. Київ-Львів: Варта, 1995.

knowledge begins with the word. It means: without an adequate denunciation of political reality it could not have become its adequate reflection.

It was quite difficult for *svoboda* to get “registration” in the dictionary because the editors S. and O. Yakubski could not help feeling the ideological suffocation and persecution before the shameful trial over the Union for the Liberation of Ukraine (1929). Dozens of prominent scholars, public-political and state figures including S. and O. Yakubsky were soon repressed and physically destroyed. Ukrainianization was replaced by Russification.

The essence is to substitute the process of thinking for its imitation, free-thinking – with a primitive and manipulatively-centered collective thinking, a communist “yedinomyслиye”. Stereotyping and unification of thinking was based on political dictionary full of ideologic words for instance *komunistychnye budivnytstvo* (communistic establishment), *moralny kodeks budivnyka komunizmu* (moral codex of a communist developer), *suspilni blaha* (social benefits), *okryleni uspikhamy trudiashchi* (workers inspired by the success), *entuziasm narodu* (people’s enthusiasm), *virnist partiyi* (loyalty to the party), *peremozhna khoda komunizmu* (the victorious course of communism) etc. the Soviet political dictionary could not rid of the taste of fake ideology during the so called perebudova (Perestroika), when the notion *svoboda* acquired allegedly new content according to the proclaimed “socialism with a new face”.

The *road of the victorious course of communism* was being marked by famines, repressions, millions of murdered peoples, destroyed lives... Of course, in a totalitarian society, it would be naive to expect the development of a national conceptual sphere, particularly the part which is verbalized in the language picture of the world. Even though the national conceptual sphere was functionally reduced and in some segments (military and religious) completely blocked due to deprivation of external stimuli for the military and spiritual world, their ethnic space, national freedom demonstrated viability. It accumulated national spirit which supports *will for freedom*. This interaction comes from the existential sufficiency of *national spirit* that according to W. Humboldt and Hegel integrates ideal and ordinary, present and past, workaday and historic⁴⁵.

⁴⁵ Кримський С. Під сигнатурою Софії. К., 2008. 367 с.

CONCLUSIONS

There are no doubts that national spirit plays the leading role in the development of the spiritual structure of a human or nation. Its influence is deep and universal; it is comprehensive, though we cannot define it directly. Its essence is “the particular level of transcendental reality, which unites nation into spiritual unity, and is the sense of its spiritual development, the reveal of its mentality, its uniqueness as biospiritual phenomenon. National spirit as a transcendental layer is structured in different forms of culture – art, science, folklore, music, concentrated in various forms of national activity: from political to physical, syncretized with the spiritual nature of a human...”⁴⁶. This substance is far from being ephemeral and turns out to be the generator of the development of every self-sufficient (sovereign) nation: if there is national spirit, nation becomes the subject of history; if there is not any or it was lost the nation is doomed to be the object.

National spirit was revealed especially distinctly in the crucial for the nation periods – during the struggles for the statehood. Therefore, the concept *national spirit* is a constant of the concept *svoboda*. Ukrainian philosopher Serhiy Krymsky underlines: “The spirit is coming out through the history of a nation: starting from its genesis as ethic phenomenon – to the establishing of political community of the civil society. Ukrainian people having found strength to overcome all the historical drama were strengthening their fortitude with the specific mentality. The starting point of this mentality was the idea of fatherland holiness, God’s Excellency of their land, respect for their mother-Ukraine”⁴⁷. These accents shift the dimensions of *svoboda* conceptualization not only as a political category but also a moral-ethic one.

SUMMARY

The article is devoted to the evolution of the semantics of the concept liberty, freedom as basic components sphere. On the basis of the cognitive-discursive approach it is enlightened their significative filling, cultural and spiritual consequence in the being of the conceptual personality (man or national community). That’s why it is taken into consideration the triad of these components: political, moral-ethical, spiritual.

⁴⁶ Федик О. Мова як духовний адекват світу. Львів: В-во „Місіонер”, 2000. 299 с.

⁴⁷ Кримський С. Під сигнатурою Софії. К., 2008. 367 с.

REFERENCES

1. Баган О. Кожна влада ефективно працює лише тоді, коли боїться контролю з боку громадян. *Вільне слово*. 26 серпня 2009 р.
2. Болдырев Н.Н. Значение и смысл с когнитивной точки зрения и проблема многоязычности. / Материалы Второй международной школы-семинара по когнитивной лингвистике: В 2 ч. Ч. 1. Тамбов, 2000. С. 11–17.
3. Бурячок А., Демський М., Якимович Б. Російсько-український словник для військовиків. Київ-Львів: Варта, 1995.
4. Відкритий лист української інтелігенції до адміністрації США та урядів країн ЄС. *День*. 29 липня 2009 р.
5. Гаврилишин Б. Людство й Україна потребує іншої життєвої філософії. *День*. 13–14 липня 2012 р.
6. Дзюба І. У світі думки Лесі Українки. Луцьк, 2006.
7. Донцов Д. „Козак із мільона свинопасів”. *Донцов Д. Літературна есеїстика*. Дрогобич: Відродження, 2010. С. 154–172.
8. Ильин И.А. Путь духовного обновления. *Путь к очевидности*. М., 1993.
9. Караванський С. Секрети української мови. К.: „Кобза”, 1994. 152 с.
10. Кононенко В. Символи української мови. Івано-Франківськ: Плай, 1996. 269 с.
11. Костенко Ліна. Поет, що ішов сходами гігантів. *Українка Леся. Драматичні твори*. К.: Дніпро, 1989.
12. Костомаров М. Дві руські народності / Серія „Бронебійна публіцистика” / За заг. ред. Лариси Івшиної. Видання друге. Бібліотека газети „День” „Україна Incognita”. К., 2013. 72 с.
13. Костомаров Н.И. Об историческом значении русской народной поэзии. *Костомаров М.І. Слов'янська міфологія*. К., 1994.
14. Кралюк П. Валуєвський циркуляр і група „148”. *День*. 2–3 серпня 2013 р.
15. Кралюк П. Ніч безелітарності. *День*. 23–24 серпня 2013 р.
16. Кримський С. Під сигнатурою Софії. К., 2008. 367 с.
17. Крип'якевич І. Історія українського війська. Львів: Видання Івана Тиктора, 1936. Ч. 1. 288 с.
18. Кубрякова Е.С. Об установках когнитивной науки и актуальных проблемах когнитивной лингвистики. *Вопросы когнитивной лингвистики*. 2004. № 1. С. 6–17.

19. Кук В. Генерал-хорунжий Роман Шухевич. Головний Командир Української Повстанської Армії. Львів, 2005.
20. Кульчицький С. Головна Руська Рада. *Довідник з історії України*. К.: Генеза, 2001. С. 166–167.
21. Листи Євгена Тимченка до Володимира Гнатюка. *Записки НТШ. Праці філологічної секції*. Львів, 1992. Т. 224.
22. Маланюк Є. Нариси з історії нашої культури. К., 1992.
23. Масенко Л. Що мав прославляти Стус. *День*. 1–2 лютого 2013 р.
24. Михаськів М. Історичний нарис сіл Сівки-Войнилівської і Мошковець. Львів: Ліга-Прес, 2007. 157 с.
25. Ницше Ф. По ту сторону добра и зла. М., Харьков, 1999.
26. Пахльовська О. Мазепа – архітектор європейської України? *День*. 29 червня 2009 р. С. 7.
27. Пахльовська О. Імператив інтелектуального опору. *День*. 2–3 квітня 2010 р. С. 21.
28. Пахльовська О. „Прямим проломом пам'яті в безмежність”. *День*. 11–12 листопада 2011 р. С. 6.
29. Радевич-Винницький Я. Мовна складова національного буття: студії з української лінгвонаціології. Київ-Дрогобич: Посвіт, 2013. 266 с.
30. Райхель Ю. „Найрозумніший німецький державний діяч із часів Бісмарка”. *День*. 31 жовтня 2009 р.
31. Свідзинський Л. Синергетична концепція культури. Луцьк: ВАТ „Волинська обласна друкарня”, 2009. 695 с.
32. Скаб М. Закономірності концептуалізації та мовної категоризації сакральної сфери. Чернівці: „Рута”, 2008. 559 с.
33. Словарь української мови / За ред. Б. Грінченка. Київ, 1907–1909. Т. 1–4.
34. Словник староукраїнської мови XVI – 1 пол. XVII ст. / Словник. Вип. 1. Львів, 1994. 2010.
35. Словник фразеологізмів української мови / НАН України, Ін-т укр. мови, Укр. мовно-інформ. фонд ; відп. ред. В. О. Винник; уклад. В. М. Білоноженко. К. : Наук. думка, 2003. 1098 с.
36. Словник української мови: В 11-ти томах. / АН УРСР. Інститут мовознавства; за ред. І. К. Білодіда. К.: Наукова думка, 1970–1980.
37. С. та О. Якубські Російсько-Український словник військової термінології. Київ: 1928.

38. Степанов Ю.С. Константы. Словарь русской культуры. М., 1997.
39. Срезневский И.И. Материалы для словаря древнерусского языка: В 3-х т. М.: Книга, 1958.
40. Сюдюков І. Той, хто не гнув голови. *День*. 4 вересня 2009 р.
41. Українка Леся. Зібрання творів у дванадцяти томах. *Леся Українка. Роберт Брюс, король шотландський*. К., 1975. Т. 2. С. 41–53.
42. Українка Леся. Там само. *Леся Українка. До А.Ю. Кримського*. К., 1979. Т. 12. Листи (1903-1913). С. 370–373.
43. Українка Леся. Осіння казка. *Леся Українка. Драматичні твори*. К., 1989.
44. Федик О. Мова як духовний адекват світу. Львів: В-во „Місіонер”, 2000. 299 с.
45. Франко І. „Земле моя, всеплодющая мати”. Зібрання творів: У 50 т. К., 1976. Т. 1. С. 28.
46. Юхновський І. Про ідеологію і політику Українського інституту національної пам’яті. *Дзеркало тижня*. 27 жовтня 2007 р.
47. Die juridisch-politische Terminologie für die slawischen... Sprachen Österreichs. Wien. 1851.

Information about the author:

Yaremko Ya. P.

Doctor of Philology,

Professor at the Ukrainian Language Department,

Dean of the Faculty of Philology,

Ivan Franko Drohobych State Pedagogical University

24, Shevchenko str., Drohobych, 82100, Ukraine