

TO THE PROBLEM OF ETHNOTHEROTYPES AND LOCAL NICKNAMES OF THE SLAVS IN LANGUAGE AND CULTURE

Tyshchenko O. V.

INTRODUCTION

The essence of the ethnos is manifested primarily in its culture¹. This ethnographers' statement has its undoubtedly distinctive basis in ethnology, ethnopsychology. It finds its direct reflection in the language of modern and traditional culture of Slavs in the form of ethnic stereotypes, expressed in a certain system of ethnic nominations.

Ethnic names system consideration froms a pragmatic and anthropological point of view and is necessary to understanding the specific world vision and world deviation which is typical to collective ethnic consciousness. The stability of the people names is connected with the very existence of the ethnic group². That is why the analysis of Slavic vocabulary and phraseology for the designation of ethnic communities can be useful both in the ethnohistory study as well as the individual ethnic groups description, in establishing cultural relations and contacts between peoples in their historical past.

Ukrainian ethnographer M. Tivodar admits that each ethnic community has universal signs. Ethnic consciousness is "the totality of knowledge, socio-psychological attitudes, ideas about one's ethnicity, its properties and stereotypes, and its place in the modern world. It is an integrated feature that includes knowledge or understanding of one's homeland, common origin and shared historical fate. All this testifies that the ethnic communities consciousness exists in mass forms of social consciousness, that is, in language, folk art, festive rituals and everyday culture, norms of morality and law, etc."³. Ethnic consciousness is also linked to the love to the native ethnic group, its history, language, culture, religion, tradition and way of life. The characteristic feature is its attitude to the own ethnic community as the highest, that is, the best. Since the formation of primitive tribes, one can speak of the first ethnic stereotypes that were created under the influence of natural and geographical factors. Interethnic

¹ Пономарьов А. Українська етнографія. Курс лекцій. Київ, 1994. С. 117.

² Голикова Т.А. Стереотип как этнически и культурологически обусловленный компонент менталитета / Мир языка и межкультурная коммуникация; отв. ред. Э.Е.Курлянд. Ч.1. Барнаул: БГПУ 2001. С. 82.

³ Тиводар М. Етнологія. Львів 2004. С. 69–70.

conflicts of the primordial era arose mainly from ethnic bias and rejection of alien ethnic groups.

How does an ethnic group identify itself and how are other peoples and social groups perceived, including neighboring ones? Why do ethnic world models fix expressive, abusive nicknames, invectives, including ethnic nicknames? How does the principle of ethnocentrism work in the language, folklore, customs and traditional rites of the Slavs, and how is it reflected in the original ethnoculture and mythological consciousness? After all, as reflected in Slavic ethnoculture, the national linguistic world picture, the main semantic juxtaposition of own/alien, are we at the level of the ethnic group's religious and confessional consciousness? In our opinion, the reflection of the semiotic principle under consideration in the language – in its system, categories and mechanisms – should be found in the most ancient ethnic vocabulary and in figurative and evaluative language units, including nicknames.

It is the range of questions that we are going to address in the proposed exploration, based on linguistic, ethnographic and folklore facts in the Slavic linguistic and cultural continuum.

1. Ethnic nominative units specificity within the naive world picture in anthropology, folklore, traditional folk culture

Note that the study of ethnic names within ethnology, sociology, cultural anthropology and ethno-linguistics is closely combined with the theory of modern onomastics and ethnonymics, which has developed a number of terms for the ethnic communities designation (official, informal, abusive). Researchers claim that when "an ethnic nomination, the attribution of names to a certain type occurs by the subject of the nomination, that is, the speaker's national identity"⁴.

To denote self-ethnicity in linguistic writings, several terms are used in parallel: "auto-ethnonym" (N. V. Vasilyev, G. M. Lyagoshniak, O. O. Rogach), "autoethnonym" (G. F. Kovalev), "endo-ethnonym" (A. S. Gerd, O. I. Kuznetsov). On the other hand, there exist the terms used to refer to ethnic names given by other peoples, ie from outside the country. Researchers call them differently: "exogenous ethnonym" (N. V. Podolskaya), "ethnicon" (V. A. Nikonov), "exo-ethnonym" (G. M. Lyagoshniak), and such terminological designation as "exonym" (A. S. Gerd, O. I. Kuznetsov) or an external ethnonym (V. I. Suprun)⁵.

⁴ Левицький А.Е., Святоку Ю.В. Етнономінації у дзеркалі міжкультурної комунікації. Монографія. Київ, 2011. С. 27.

⁵ Ibid.

Let us emphasize that the vocabulary associated with these concepts and terms conceptualizes a universal for ethnological semantic juxtaposition of "alien" through verbalized collective world and human experience knowledge, and therefore is the subject of study not only in onomastics but also in cognitive semantics, political phraseology, intercultural communication theories, cultural anthropology and ethnography.

O. Belova admits that in folk culture the attitude towards other ethnic groups representatives is largely determined by the ethnocentrism notion, when "their" traditions, "their" religion, "their" customs and "their" language are understood as the only "correct", "the righteous, the "normative," the "true," in contrast to the alien, who is perceived as "unacceptable," "sinful," and the representative of the idio-ethnic group – as being dangerous and even demonic, endowed with supernatural properties⁶. In other words, the division of the universe into two worlds – "one's own" and "alien" – has numerous linguistic-ethnological interpretations and is implemented in oppositions of the type "we/they", "this/that", "here/there", "near/far" etc. Typical in this case is the implementation of the basic oppositions in the axiological, evaluative plan in the form of "good/bad", with a clearly negative assessment of everything that belongs to alien world.

Polish ethnolinguistic and ethnographic studies have covered in detail such features of linguistic ethno-stereotypes as selectivity, evaluativeness, associativity, generalization, and hyperbolization⁷. In addition, the ethnomarked semiotic model of "one's own and alien" is reflected in ethnophobisms, ethnically connotated categories of onomastic variety, case motivated texts, their semantic and communicative-pragmatic features.

Opposition "We/They" in the process of the semiotic space self-organization which reflects the sociogenesis basic rights is explored by D. I. Voronin. The researcher notes that "the genetic relationship between the consciousness formation processes and the sphere of alien domination understanding is united in a single process the crystallization of "We" as well as the structuring of the "They" vast space"... "We" and "They" contacting is provided through a suggestive influence on the dominant

⁶ Белова О.В. Этнокультурные стереотипы в славянской народной традиции. Москва, 2005. С. 7.

⁷ Bartmiński J., Lappo I. U. Majer-Baranowska Stereotyp Rosjanina i jego profilowanie we współczesnej polszczyźnie / Etnolingwistyka. 2002. №14; Bartmiński J., Panasiuk J. Stereotypy językowe / Współczesny język polski; red. J. Bartmiński. Lublin: UMCS, 2002. S. 374–378; Benedyktowicz Z. Portrety obcego. Od stereotypu do symbolu. Kraków, 2000.

guidelines and socially predetermined priorities collective national-language views and representations”⁸.

A similar opinion was followed by a Polish ethnographer J. St. Bystron and was expressed by Z. Benediktovich, who, in connection with the reconstruction of the "foreigner" image in the primitive and traditional folk culture, distinguishes such dichotomies as "human/inhuman", "human/animal", "endowed with speech-mute, deaf", physical signs, smell, outward features/curvature, black complexion, communication of others as beings unclean with the other side, with the world of silence, darkness, death, etc.⁹. Significant in this regard is the Belarusian folklore, according to which strangers were imagined as wild, naked, fur-covered people with tails who do not talk but squick while drinking the blood of their victims¹⁰.

The researcher in particular discusses the "humans/animals" opposition, which is in turn a manifestation of the "humans/nonhumans" opposition. The stranger was already represented in antiquity and the Middle Ages as half human and animal (donkey with horns, human with dog's head, human without head, with eyes on chest, one-eyed, with goat's hooves, or as a sleeping person for six months in winter). The juxtaposition of "those who have a language/dumb", which Z. Benediktovich also explores in the framework of the "humans/nonhumans" opposition which is determined on the basis of popular culture and etymology in the word "*German*" (etymologically dumb, incomprehensible).

The aforementioned juxtapositions are closely related to the motive of strangers' belonging to lower mythology creatures. Polish ethnographer Jan St. Bystron in his work "Czarność obcych" emphasizes the attribution to aliens of supernatural features related to their appearance and physiology. The fact that a Lutheran, for example, has six toes is indicative. The researcher also admits the so-called internal "blackness". In Poland, there was a belief about the black palate of the Ruthenians, which testified their anger and emotion. The definition of "black" also applied to the Polish gentry¹¹.

The characteristic feature of strangers as unclean creatures was the *blindness* of born children, which brought them closer to animals. The Poles called the blind the little Mazury children, who were credited with blindness at the baptism time. The mentioned researcher Z. Benediktovich notes the existence of internal contradiction in the representation of the

⁸ Воронін Д. І. «Ми» та «вони»: від моделі простору до моделювання соціокультурної взаємодії (на матеріалі російської мови) / Мовознавство, 2003. № 5. С. 54.

⁹ Benedyktowicz Z. Portrety obcego. Od stereotypu do symbolu. Kraków, 2000. S. 121.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Bystron J. S. Czarność obcych / Lud. T. 21. 1922. S. 180.

image of another. On the one hand, strangers are considered to be soulless beings, restricted physically, distorted, wild, and on the other, associated with death, empty life, silence and darkness. A similar criteria is applied to language. The negative sign of silence and the inability to speak (deaf/mute) are contrasted with the positive – conversation, noise, voice – as the natural language expression, which, in fact, analyzes the Nestor chronicle, said K. Moshinsky. These and similar ideas are embodied in Polish and Ukrainian proverbs and sayings. So, the expression *лях-девятьденник* reflects the idea that the Poles are born blind, like kittens, and only on the ninth day do they have their eyes open. Compare the Polish proverbs *Ślepy Mazur od ciemnej gwiazdy, Mazur się ślepo rodzi, Ślepy Mazur do dziewiętego dnia, ale jak przejrzy, to wszystkich szuka, Mazur ślepo się rodzi, ale jak przejrzy, to przeżę, to przeżę*¹², Ukr. *слинуї як мазур по полудні, Слинуй мазур за горами лунить козу назурами*¹³, Polish ethnographer O. Kohlberg in Kujawy recorded such humiliating mummies by Mazur *Ty śleporod, ślepowron*¹⁴; «When a Mazur is born, then for nine days he sees nothing and his mother holds him under a bowel¹⁵, *W mazurze taka dusza, choć umrze, to się rusa* – similar contexts are attested in dialect dictionaries of Polish paremia¹⁶, *U Mazura czarna rura* (a teaser, which was addressed to the castors from Mazury and in response received: "*Poty czarna ovi go Litwin w dupę nie pocatuje*")¹⁷. Even French engineer Guillaume de Boplan, in describing ancient Ukrainian customs and everyday life, drew attention to the belief in the puppy blindness of the Tatars for a long time after birth.

Perceptions of aliens for example Muscovites as cannibals, such creatures that eat carrion, raw meat of dogs, cats, frogs and other animals, are also common. All this again confirms the opinion that the alien was associated with animality, blackness, demonism, connected with trait and magic. For example, in Polish folklore, the devil was represented mostly in German attire. Polish ethnographer Ya. Bistron writes that Ukrainian peasants represented the devil in the form of a Polish nobleman¹⁸.

¹² Nowa księga przysłów i wyrażeń przysłowiowych polskich. T.1-4.Red. J.Krzyżanowski, S.Swirko. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1969–1978. T. II. S. 420.

¹³ Бессараба И.В. Матеріали для етнографії Седлецької губернії. Санкт-Петербург, 1903. С. 84.

¹⁴ Kohlberg O. Lud, jego zwyczaje, sposób życia, mowa, podania, przysłowia, obrzędy, gusła, zabawy, pieśni, muzyka i tańce. Serya III. Kujawy. Cz.1. Warszawa, 1867. S. 120.

¹⁵ Bajki,legandy i opowiadania ludowe, zebrane w pow.sokalskim / Lud. Kwartalnik etnograficzny. Rocznik IX. 1903. S. 67.

¹⁶ Słownik gwar polskich. Ułożył Jan Karłowicz. Kraków 1903. T. 1-6. T. III. S. 131.

¹⁷ Nowa księga przysłów i wyrażeń przysłowiowych polskich. T.1-4.Red. J.Krzyżanowski, S. Swirko. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1969–1978. T. II. S. 418–419.

¹⁸ Bystron J.St. Megalomania narodowa. Warszawa: Lud, 1935. S. 264.

In Eastern Slavic myths and legends, the peoples of distant, unknown lands were depicted as unattractive. So the Amazons seemed fantastic creatures with a dark angry face, armed with a spear and a bow with arrows, and the devian people (most likely, the inhabitants of India) appeared in the imagination of the Eastern Slavs as winged, multi-headed monsters with beastly or bird heads and feet. 1993, 9)¹⁹. Representatives of other nations acquired negative characteristics not only at the level of mythological but also naive embodiment of ethnic stereotypes: Ros. *Немеччина, хитрая, безверная, басурманская, У француза ножки тоненьки, душа коротенька*; the same is said of the German²⁰, *Грек скажет правду однажды в год, Татарин – свиное ухо* (В. Даль), укр. *Обідраний як швед тощо, Злодій на костилях, як лях в кайданах, Не дай, Боже, бугаями орати, а ляхами збіроти, Польській міст, Лютерський піст, Турецьке набоженство – то все блазенство*²¹; similar contexts are attested in the Belarusian linguoculture: *Знаць ляха по холявах*²², *Грек за злато себе очи вылупит, Грек одну маслинку съест – и то пальчики обсосет*²³, *Калмык – Иван иванович, маханник. Под собою кобылу съел, Калмык татарина маханиной (кониным мясом корит), Литвины – земляники, землекопы, лопатники, Разве лихо возьмет литвина, чтоб он не дзекнул*²⁴, Belor. *литвин як лін – "is said about the Lithuanians who, under any business, slip up with cunning, like slippery flax"*²⁵, *Литовский мост что немецкий пост* is about something unimportant or incomprehensible²⁶, *Литва пошла* (in Polissia dialects it is recorded as negligible) quarrels²⁷. In the "Great Dictionary of Russian Proverbs" the paremic contexts of other ethnic names, including ancient, ethnonym-related to Russians are repeatedly mentioned: *Русь, руснак: Немец хитер: обезьяну выдумал, На всю Польшу один комар мозгу (глудзу) принес, да и тот бабы расхватили,*

¹⁹ Голубовська І.О. Етнічні особливості мовних картин світу: Монографія, 2-е вид., випр. і доп. Київ, 2004. С. 37.

²⁰ В. М. Мокиєнко, Т. Г. Никитина, Е. К. Николаєва Большой словарь русских пословиц. Москва: Астрель, 2010. С. 592.

²¹ Українські приказки, прислів'я і таке інше. Уклав М.Номис; упоряд., прим. М.М. Пазяка. Київ, 2004. С. 364.

²² Сборник белорусских пословиц / Записки Императорского русского географического общества по отделению этнографии. Т.1. Санкт-Петербург 1867. С. 312.

²³ В. М. Мокиєнко, Т. Г. Никитина, Е. К. Николаєва Большой словарь русских пословиц. Москва: Астрель, 2010. С. 219.

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Op. cit. С. 397, 486.

²⁶ Сборник белорусских пословиц / Записки Императорского русского географического общества по отделению этнографии. Т.1. Санкт-Петербург 1867. С. 337.

²⁷ Українські приказки, прислів'я і таке інше. Уклав М. Номис; упоряд., прим. М.М. Пазяка. Київ, 2004. С. 838.

*Русак до читання, казак до співання, поляк до сказання, Русак задним умом крепок, Русак на трех сваях крепок: авось, небось да как-нибудь, Русский глазам не верит – все надо пощупать, Русский и с горя, и с радости пьет/поет, Что русскому здорово, то немцу смерть, У руським брюхи и тапор сгниет*²⁸. Let's compare some of the Polish proverbial formations that express character traits, psyches, preferences, attitudes to alcohol, work characteristic of different ethnicities, recorded in the compilation *Nowa księga przysłów i wyrażen przysłowiowych polskich* (NKPPie) «*Nowa księga przysłów i wyrażen przysłowiowych polskich*» (NKPP): *Kto węgierskie pije po śmierci nie gnije* [NKPP III: 646], *Gdzie Węgier, tam gniew, gdzie Słowak tam śpiew* [NKPP III: 646], *Polak, Węgier dwa bratanki i do szabli i do szklanki* [NKPP III: 646], *Thucz Węgrzyna w mózdzierzu, przecie on będzie czosnkiem śmierział po staremu* [NKPP III: 646], *Namaż ty Ruska masłem, przecież on dziegiem śmierzdi* [NKPP III: 101], *Rusek do czytania, Chochlak do śpiewania, Polak do opowiadania* [NKPP III: 101]. The connection of aliens with mythological creatures and their similarity to them is evidenced by the following Ukrainian proverb contexts, recorded in M. Nomys's Collection: *Вражі (або: чортові) Ляхи, Що чорт, що Жид, то рідні брати, Коли чорт та москаль що вкрали, то поминай, як звали, Москаль як ворона, та хитріший чорта*²⁹.

2. Stereotypical ideas about collective groups, local and religious names of Slavs

In his work «*Megalomania narodowa*», Polish ethnographer J. Bistron explains the means of naming tribal and local groups from the point of view of ethnic and cultural contacts. They are micro-ethnonyms (ethnic names), where the object of the name is the residents of the neighboring border areas, which reflect the traditional ideas of strangers and aliens. The mechanism of the emergence and comprehension of experiences about these collective groups objectifies the "re-evaluation of oneself", reflects the evaluative idealization of their group, leads to collective and social megalomania, which was peculiar to the primitive peoples and by which this, external, world, can be influenced by a certain system of ritual actions. The claim of others reflects collective social and cultural values, and the alien image set of traits identification is essential for the study of the rejection or hatred psychology of certain tribes and groups in

²⁸ Смоленский этнографический сборник. Сост. В.Н. Добровольский. Ч. III. Пословицы. Санкт-Петербург, 1894. С. 81.

²⁹ Українські приказки, прислів'я і таке інше. Уклав М.Номис; упоряд., прим. М.М. Пазяка. Київ, 2004. С.838.

traditional folk culture, which, in modern studies, finds its continuation in the theory of ethno-stereotypes. "The nickname is often encountered in the different ethnocultural groups," says J. Bystron, "for example, it concerns the environment of Polish immigrants in America, in which immigrants are referred to as indigenous people, in particular, *pyrky* (residents of Poznan), *pyry*. "Potatoes")³⁰.

As the Russian researcher A. Zhuravlev rightly points out, local-group names contain different features in their appearance, in particular the designation of the location in which the carriers of the nickname reside, its natural-geographical landscape, the characteristic natural conditions; such micro-ethnonyms can objectify real historical events (migration processes, local history, residents' contacts with a particular ethnic group); anecdotal nature events, facts and stories that make fun of something different, other traits of occupations, crafts, material culture, cuisine, clothing and shoes type, the manner of their wearing and use, etc³¹.

In general, the stereotype (from the Greek. Stereos – solid and topos – imprint, sample) – «word, linguistic recurrence, unchanged, as the established formula, language pattern".

Ethnologists refer to ethnic stereotypes as "cultural standards, stamps, and behavioral skills that, through transgenerational communication, have shaped the unique face of ethnic groups in the course of ethnogenesis and adaptation to the environment"³². W. Lippman, who introduced this concept into cognitive linguistics, views the stereotype as a one-sided, partial and simplified image in the human head, a common mental correlate of objects and phenomena of the world. This sociological approach emphasizes the social aspect of stereotypes, that is, their formation and function in social behavior.

Polish researcher K. Pisarkova points to differences in the evaluation of the auto-stereotype (imaginative ideas about one's ethnicity) and the stereotype of someone else. This is especially the case in the self-identification of the ethnic stereotypes bearer, which emphasizes the positive evaluation of one's social group and the negative evaluation of another ethnic group representatives³³. The Polish ethnographer A. Kempinski sees the reason for the others interest and the stereotypes formation "by the hidden thirst of this people to increase their own internal ethnos value sense"³⁴.

³⁰ Bystron J. St. Megalomania narodowa. Warszawa: Lud, 1935. S. 75.

³¹ Васильев М.А. Анты, словене, немцы, греки: славянский культурно-лингвистический мир и его соседи в раннесредневековое время / Славяноведение. 2005. № 2. С. 14.

³² Тиводар М. Етнологія. Львів, 2004. С. 154.

³³ Pisarkowa K. Tożsamość nosiciela stereotypów etnicznych / Etnolingwistyka, 2002. № 14. S. 27.

³⁴ Kępiński A. Lach i Moskal. Z dziejów stereotypu. Warszawa – Kraków, 1990. S. 7.

The stereotype is also the object of studies of ethno-linguists (E. Bartminsky, I. Lappo, U. Mayer-Baranovska, J. Panasyuk), who primarily interpret it not as words (as in common dictionaries) or as corresponding to real objects (as in encyclopedias) but as a kind of semantic correlates that stand between words and objects, otherwise – public perceptions of the subject. Under the stereotype, which inherits a narrower understanding of the formula, Polish linguists understand the idea of an object that is framed in a certain social frame and determine, "what that object is, how it looks, how it is interpreted by a person, etc., such an idea is embedded in the language and is accessible through language and pertaining to collective world knowledge". E. Bartminsky mentions of stereotypes as "stabilized in culture and language characteristics that correlate with the name of objects". Another definition, which is practically embodied in the concept of stereotypes and cultural symbols of the Lublin ethno-linguistic school, is "a subjectively conditioned view of a something which descriptive and evaluative features exist and which results from the reality interpretation within socially produced models ..."; its aim is to reproduce "a cultural-linguistic portrait of the object being described and to show how it is viewed by a typical cultural representative"³⁵.

According to Jerzy Bartminski, "in sociology, stereotypes are "notorious", they are biased by the tendency of evaluation, mass consciousness manipulation, which for the most part becomes a barrier in human and intercultural communication. However, in linguistics, stereotypes is a cognitive, culturally reconstructive category, aimed at the categorization of the object, because the language not only gives a negative assessment to someone (mother-in-law, stepmother) or for some reason, also simplifies, generalizes and symbolizes"³⁶.

The stereotyping of representations in individual, everyday consciousness identifies "one's own" either with an emotionally neutral norm or with a positive evaluation. For the most part, "alien" is rated neutral or negative. When referring to external ethnonyms (naming by someone) it should be noted that the means of nomination are based on the external name characteristic or subjective assessment of ethnicity, its way of life, social or political system, historical and spiritual development. Such "external ethnonyms are used by hostile communities and have disapproving characteristics, often offensive. This type of ethnic

³⁵ Толстая С.М. Этнолингвистика Ежи Бартмиńskiego / Языковой образ мира: очерки по этнолингвистике. Москва: Индрик, 2005. С. 16.

³⁶ Bartmiński J. Stereotypy mieszkają w języku. Studia etnolingwistyczne Lublin: UMCS, 2007. S. 8.

nomination is highlighting and sharply contrasting to certain, not always clear or unusual, signs and brings such names closer to abusive nicknames or even invectives"³⁷.

Let us consider these linguistic facts on the basis of ancient Slavic ethnographic sources.

As the ethnographer I. Bessaraba states in the Siedlec province, they say "*Поляк зъйїв... гною за трояк*"; the historical confrontation between the Masurians and the Rusyns is attested in the following contexts: "*Mazur: Rusin kobylę zadusił – Mazur: Rusyn strangled the mare, Rusyn: A polacy się zbiegli i kobylę zjedli – А поляки позбігались і її з'їли*"³⁸.

In Polish ethnographic works of XIX – XX century. O. Kolberg, A. Fisher, E. Rulikovskiy and others such ethnic surnames of Ukrainians (Ruthenians) were recorded as *барани, чуби, чубарики, хештаки, секали, постольники*³⁹. For example, the Russian guralts wore the nickname *цотакі* (they say *цо таке, sotaki*), *лішаки, lishaks* (use *lish* in the meaning of "only"; Bukovynian Hutsuls are called *баранами (rams)*, because there peasants wear beards once *гештаками* Polishchuk (from exclamation when referring to "Heshta" horses; in the Kholm region, *синії латки* the Russian people call the Mazur *постольниками*⁴⁰.

Russian ethnographers D. K. Zelenin, I. Snegirev call these collective nicknames and ethnic nicknames "folk sayings." They do not refer to a single person, but to a group of persons that is a geographical or ethnographic entity; in these units, "the people submit an ethnographic division of themselves"⁴¹. D. Zelenin considers nicknames of this type an important element for the study of folk poetry, folklore, book writing, cultural history of the ethnic group and its relations with neighbors and in general for the comparative characterization of different ethnographic groups. This unit from a linguistic point of view can be expressed by a single-word name, phrase or whole sentence, dialogue, anecdote⁴².

An example of such regional collective-regional designations is ridicule, mockery of certain people communities, for example, in the Russian areal space: *Андозера-хайдуки – нет ни хлеба, ни муки*

³⁷ Левицький А.Е., Святюк Ю.В. Етнономінації у дзеркалі міжкультурної комунікації. Монографія. Київ, 2011. С. 29.

³⁸ Бессараба И.В. Материалы для этнографии Седлецкой губернии. Санкт-Петербург, 1903, С. 84.

³⁹ Rulikowski E. Zapiski etnograficzne z Ukrainy / Zbiór wiadomości do antropologii krajowej. T. III. Kraków, 1879. S. 129.

⁴⁰ Fisher A. Rusini. Zarys etnografii Rusi. Lwów-Warszawa-Kraków, 1928. S. 8.

⁴¹ Зеленин Д.К. Великорусские народные присловья как материал для этнографии / Избранные труды. Статьи по духовной культуре 1901–1913. Москва: Индрик, 1994. С. 51.

⁴² Ibid. С. 39.

(Andozera – residents of Andozerskoye village) – mock at the fact that they have little activity and eat only fish from their lake⁴³, *горчичник* – so once were called the inhabitants of Samara (sown a lot of mustard), *гужатники* (boiled crows instead of mushrooms), *гужееды* – immigrants from different provinces of Russia; they were very poor, and from hunger were forced to eat the harnesses from the harness⁴⁴, the *кереметники* – the nickname of the Marians (from the *кереметка* – a nervous disease, similar to epilepsy)⁴⁵, *гуца новгородская*⁴⁶, *Даниловцы и романовцы барана в зыбке закачали*⁴⁷, *Егорьевцы – коновалы, головотяпы, рудометы*,⁴⁸ *Калязинцы – свинью за бобра купили; собаку за вола купили, Тверитяне вприглядку с сахаром чай пьют*⁴⁹. In the Ukrainian ethnoculture, there are different toponymic nicknames, characterized by M. Nomis: *В Суражі все люди вражі, В Олику – полика, в Клевань – по діда, в Дражню –по горішки* (the first two towns, and then – the village in Volyn,) *Ромен город на горі, по дві дурниці на дворі* – thanked Romnov visiting fair visitors, *З Вересочі повилазили очі, Понірці – дурні віці, Диве – silly sheep, Красныане (Krasnokolyadinka), народ хитруватий и роцотний*., ridicule so from Poniortsy (village Ponyra)⁵⁰.

The Belarussian folk-dialect language presents some collective-group names for designation of preferences, occupations' nature of, historical-cultural, natural-geographical features of Byelorussian inhabitants, crafts characteristics and so on: *Могилевцы-кулажники кулагу на локоць продаюць, а на палец прибавки даюць – насмешка над уроженцами города Могилева и даже могилевской губернии*⁵¹, *Мсциславцы не умирають на своей лавце – характеризует природных Мстиславских жителей, мещан, не любящих сидеть дома*⁵², *Оришанцы-вапенники-насмешливое название жителей города Ориши, где в большом количестве находят известковый камень*⁵³.

⁴³ В. М. Мокиенко, Т. Г. Никитина, Е. К. Николаева Большой словарь русских пословиц. Москва: Астрель, 2010. С. 43.

⁴⁴ Словарь русских народных говоров. Вып.1-36. Москва-Ленинград (СПб.): Наука, 1965–2002. Вып.8. С. 204–205.

⁴⁵ Ibid. Вып.13. С. 186.

⁴⁶ Ibid. Вып.8. С. 251.

⁴⁷ В. М. Мокиенко, Т. Г. Никитина, Е. К. Николаева Большой словарь русских пословиц. Москва: Астрель, 2010. С. 233.

⁴⁸ Ibid. С. 325.

⁴⁹ Ibid. С. 397, 900.

⁵⁰ Українські приказки, прислів'я і таке інше. Уклав М.Номис; упоряд., прим. М.М.Пазяка. Київ, 2004. С. 585

⁵¹ Сборник белорусских пословиц / Записки Императорского русского географического общества по отделению этнографии. Т. 1. Санкт-Петербург, 1867. С. 344.

⁵² Ibid. С. 346.

⁵³ Ibid. С. 392.

In another ethnographic source, "Smolensk Ethnographic Collection" recorded many Belarusian and Russian ottonymic names, often with emotionally-expressive, disparagingly-offensive and mockingly-ironic connotation designating the intellectual abilities of man, his exterior. For example, *арлоўцы – прабитая голова, Смаленьціна – шабаішнікі, – ражком сабор падперлі; рязанцы телку огурцом резалі; калужцы на арышн квас прадают; самарцы на меру кішкі прадаюць, аржаўцы (Ельнінцы) аглоблю абпаляюць і ездюць в пабіраішкі*⁵⁴.

CONCLUSIONS

Thus, the article examines some mechanisms of nominative identification (lexical, figurative, folklore) of ethnic nominations, individual religious stereotypes and ethnic names of Ukrainians, Russians, Byelorussians and Poles. Some of them clearly reflect the ancient ethno – and cultural stereotypes (ritual, custom, mythological) associated with the idea of foreigners against the ethnic groups image background. The semantics and pragmatics of these names, as we have seen, are caused by stereotypical attitudes towards a certain ethnicity, the principle of ethnocentrism, uniqueness, isolation, exclusiveness of "one's own" and negative attitude to "alien", different names of neighboring local groups, especially at the linguistic and cultural border. Evidence of this is considered by some ethnic and local-group (collective-regional), including toponymic surnames, nicknames and unofficial surnames of the character-evaluative type.

It interesting to discuss collective-regional and ethnic nicknames nomination models of reflected in the precedent texts (anecdotes, artistic, folklore, including ritual texts of different genres). One can speak separately about the ethnonyms functioning in various ritual practices, orders, omens, folk beliefs, ritual games, calendar ceremonies, riddles, and not only Slavic ones. For example, in the well-known collection of English puzzles about the world's background and especially we can find ethnonyms in the European, Eastern and some exotic peoples riddles about the pot and other household items and plants. In these enigmatic texts, the ethno-racial plan is combined with the symbolism of the parts of the human body names, which is first and foremost related to the anthropomorphic character of many ancient everyday artifacts of material culture and instruments symbolism, such as spindles, coffers, sieves, etc. For example, a black man and a tan are identified through clothing

⁵⁴ Смоленский этнографический сборник. Сост. В.Н.Добровольский. Ч. III. Пословицы. Санкт-Петербург, 1894. С. 96.

(wearing brown trousers) or a horse's color: *A Negro in brown breeches on a brown horse, carrying a black pot on his head*⁵⁵. Even more striking are the riddles texts with a another nation representative, a Russian whose hair is sticking out of a pot, designates the radish that protrudes from the ground (this puzzle has several variants): *A Russian in a pot, his hair sticks out.—Radish; White Russian in the bathhouse, his beard outside. – Radish), Next to the bathhouse lies a White Russian, and his beard shines outside. – Radish), My grandfather's body is in Hades, his beard is in the world. Now, explain. – Radish)*⁵⁶, *Stiff standing in the bed, / Sometimes white and sometimes red, / Every lady in the land / Takes it in her hand, / And puts it in the hole before. – Radish.*

Polish erotic sexual riddles imitate sexual intercourse when the pot boils, which is codified by the ethnic names of gypsies: *Siedzi Cygan na Cygance, poty nie zlezie, az się osmarce. – Pot with boiling water; other things in household use include the image of the Tartar: Szukój w polu Tatarzyna, and Tatarzyn za łeb trzyma. Leno czasem dobry klaps, ni ma z niego ani chaps; The German functions in the riddle about the beet: Siedzi Niemiec w ziemi, łeb mu sie zieleni, and the German woman is onion, cf. Przyjechała Niemka w czerwonych sukienkach. – Jak ją rozbierali, to nad nią płakali; this is not something to complain about; instead, the Hungarians codify the image of a cat: Chodził Węgier po węgryźnie, nosił dzieci w koszalczyńie. Które wrzaśnie, to przykłaśnie, które piśnie, to przyciśnie*⁵⁷.

It should be noted that in other Slavic languages, the Gypsy ethnonym implements another structural-semantic adverb 'do unnecessary vain' proverbs, as evidenced by the contexts in one of V. Fleischans' most ancient Czech phraseology: *cikána*. – literally: «wash the gypsy»⁵⁸. And in English, the phrase with the Gypsy component to indicate the variety of the dish is certified: *Gypsy stews the rabbit Dish with onions and potatoes (so-called because the main ingredients are readily available to gypsies)*⁵⁹.

The proposed article does not claim to be a comprehensive description of such ethnic names, but outlines possible ways of studying archaic ethnonominations and some religious, confessional designations in the

⁵⁵ Taylor A. *English Riddles from Oral Tradition* / A. Taylor. – Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1951. P. 34.

⁵⁶ Op. cit. P. 196, 638.

⁵⁷ *Polskie zagadki ludowe. Wybrał i opracował S.Folfasiński. Warszawa: Ludowa Spółdzielnia Wydawnicza, 1975. S. 146–147.*

⁵⁸ *Česka příslovi. Sbirka příslovi, prupovedi lidu českeho v cechach, na Morave a v Slezsku / vybral a uspořadal V.Flajhans, D. 1-2, Praha: Nakladem F.Simacka 1911–1913. D. 1. S. 68.*

⁵⁹ *Wilkinson P.R. A Thesaurus of Traditional English Metaphors / P. R. Wilkinson. London ; New York : Routledge, 1993. P. 13.*

Slavic linguistic space by lexicographic and ethnographic data, and the possibility of comparing them with other languages.

SUMMARY

The article deals with some mechanisms of ethnic nominations nominative identification (lexical, figurative, folklore), individual religious stereotypes and ethnic names of Ukrainians, Russians, Byelorussians and Poles. Some of them clearly reflect the ancient ethno – and cultural stereotypes (ritual, custom, mythological) associated with the idea of foreigners with the background image of other ethnic groups. The semantics and pragmatics of these names, as we have seen, are conditioned by stereotypical attitudes towards a certain ethnicity, the principle of ethnocentrism, uniqueness, isolation, exclusiveness of "one's own" and negative attitude to "alien", the names of neighboring local groups. This is evidenced by some ethnic and local-group (collective-regional) considerations, including toponymic surnames and nicknames.

Ethnonyms are spoken in comparable languages not only as a part of stable words compounds, but also reflected in folklore pragmatics – verbal magic, healing magical practice, texts of orders, dream books, different in intensity verbal speech acts-wishes and, of course, in rhytal, as a broader semiotic embodiment of the manifestos of one's own and others' space.

It is promising to cover nomination models for collective-regional local nicknames that are related to foreign or neighboring regional groups representatives. The proposed article does not claim to be a comprehensive description of such ethnic names, but outlines possible ways of studying archaic nicknames. The latter constitute a significant part of the archaic ethnonymic and toponymic, which is promising for consideration in areal-typological, onomasiological and cognitive-pragmatic terms.

At present, models of nomination for collective-regional and ethnic nicknames are reflected in the precedent texts (anecdotes, artistic, folk, including ritual texts of different genres).

REFERENCES

1. Белова О.В. Этнокультурные стереотипы в славянской народной традиции / О.В. Белова. М.: Индрик, 2005. 288 с.
2. Бессараба И.В. Материалы для этнографии Седлецкой губернии.-СПб.: Тип. Имп. Акад. наук, 1903. 324 с.
3. Васильев М.А. Анты, словене, немцы, греки: славянский культурно-лингвистический мир и его соседи в раннесредневековое время / М.А.Васильев // Славяноведение. 2005. № 2. С. 3–17.

4. Воронін Д. І. «Ми» та «вони»: від моделі простору до моделювання соціокультурної взаємодії (на матеріалі російської мови) / Д.І.Воронін // Мовознавство. 2003. № 5. С. 50–56.
5. Голикова Т.А. Стереотип как этнически и культурологически обусловленный компонент менталитета / Т.А. Голикова // Мир языка и межкультурная коммуникация / отв. ред.. Э.Е. Курлянд. Ч. 1. Барнаул: БГПУ, 2001. С. 80–87.
6. Голубовська І.О. Етнічні особливості мовних картин світу: Монографія, 2-е вид., випр. і доп. / І.О. Голубовська. К.: Логос, 2004. 284 с.
7. Даль В.И. Толковый словарь живого великорусского языка в 4-х томах. М., 1989–1991. Т. 1–4.
8. Добровольский В.Н. Смоленский этнографический сборник. Ч. 1–4. СПб., М. 1891–1903.
9. Зеленин Д.К. Великорусские народные присловья как материал для этнографии / Д.К. Зеленин // Избранные труды. Статьи по духовной культуре 1901–1913. М.: Индрик, 1994. С. 38–58.
10. Куликовский Г. Словарь областного олонецкого наречия в его бытовом и этнографическом применении. Санкт-Петербург. 1898–1999.
11. Левицький А.Е., Святюк Ю.В. Етнономінації у дзеркалі міжкультурної комунікації. Монографія. / А.Е. Левицький, Ю.В. Святюк. К.: Логос, 2011. 192 с.
12. Мокиенко В., Никитина Т., Николаева Е.К. Большой словарь русских пословиц. Москва: Олма Медиа Групп, 2010. 1024 с.
13. Мокиенко В.М., Николаева Т.Г. Большой словарь русских поговорок. Москва: Олма Медиа Групп, 2007. 784 с.
14. Номис М. Українські приказки, прислів'я і таке інше. Київ: Либідь, 2004. 768 с.
15. Пастернак Я. Звичаї та вірування в с.Зіболках Жовківського повіту / Я. Пастернак // Матеріали до етнології й антропології. Т. XXI–XXII. Ч. 1. Львів, 1929. С. 321–352.
16. Подвысоцкий А.А. Словарь областного архангельского наречия в его бытовом и этнографическом применении. СПб.: 2-е Отд-ние Акад. наук, 1885. 198 с.
17. Пономарьов А. Українська етнографія. Курс лекцій / А.Пономарьов. Київ: Либідь, 1994. 317 с.
18. Русские крестьяне. Жизнь. Быт. Нравы. Материалы «Этнографического бюро» князя В.Н. Тенишева.-Том 1. Калужская губерния. СПб., 2004. 568 с.

19. Русские крестьяне. Жизнь. Быт. Нравы. Материалы «Этнографического бюро» князя В.Н. Тенишева.- Том 1. Костромская и Тверская губернии. Спб., 2004. 570 с.

20. Сборник белорусских пословиц // Записки Императорского русского географического общества по отделению этнографии. Т. 1. Санкт-Петербург 1867. С. 255–482.

21. Словарь русских народных говоров. Вып. 1–36. Москва-Ленинград (СПб.). 1965–2002.

22. Тиводар М. Етнологія / М. Тиводар. Львів: Світ, 2004. 621 с.

23. Толстая С.М. Этнолингвистика Ежи Бартмиńskiego / С.М. Толстая // Языковой образ мира: очерки по этнолингвистике. М.: Индрик, 2005. С. 9–20.

24. Bajki, legendy i opowiadania ludowe, zebrane w pow.sokalskim // Lud. R.IX. 1903. S. 67–68.

25. Bartmiński J. Stereotypy mieszkają w języku. Studia etnolingwistyczne / J. Bartmiński. Lublin: UMCS, 2007. 360 s.

26. Bartmiński J., Lappo I., Majer-Baranowska U. Stereotyp Rosjanina i jego profilowanie we współczesnej polszczyźnie // Etnolingwistyka. 2002. № 14. S. 105–152.

27. Bartmiński J., Panasiuk J. Stereotypy językowe / J. Bartmiński, J. Panasiuk // Współczesny język polski, red. J. Bartmiński, Lublin: UMCS, 2002. S. 374–378.

28. Benedyktowicz Z. Portrety obcego. Od stereotypu do symbolu / Z. Benedyktowicz. Kraków, 2000. 216 s.

29. Bystroń J. S. Czarność obcych / J.S. Bystroń // Lud. T. 21. 1922. S. 179–182.

30. Bystroń J. St. Megalomania narodowa / J.S. Bystroń. Warszawa: Lud, 1935. 244 s.

31. Česka příslovi. Sbirka příslovi, prupovedi lidu českého v cechach, na Morave a v Slezsku / vybral a uspořadal V. Flajhans, D. 1-2, Praha: Nakladem F.Simacka 1911–1913.

32. Federowski M. Lud okolic Żarek, Siewierza i Pilicy, jego zwyczaje, sposób życia, obrzędy, podania, gusła, zabobony i t.p. Warszawa, 1889. 345 s.

33. Fisher A. Rusini. Zarys etnografii Rusi / A. Fisher. Lwów-Warszawa-Kraków, 1928.

34. Kępiński A. Lach i Moskal. Z dziejów stereotypu / A. Kępiński. Warszawa – Kraków, 1990. S. 57.

35. Kolberg O. Lud, jego zwyczaje, sposób życia, mowa, podania, przysłowia, obrzędy, gusła, zabawy, pieśni, muzyka i tańce. Serya III. Kujawy. Cz. 1. Warszawa, 1867.

36. Nowa księga przysłów i wyrażeń przysłowiowych polskich. T. 1-4. Red. J. Krzyżanowski, S. Swirko. Warszawa, 1969–1978.
37. Petrow A. Lud ziemi Dobrzyńskiej, jego charakter, mowa, zwyczaje, obrzędy, pieśni, przysłowia / A. Petrow // Zbiór wiadomości do antropologii krajowej. T. II. Kraków, 1878. S. 15–40.
38. Pisarkowa K. Tożsamość nosiciela stereotypów etnicznych / K. Pisarkowa // Etnolingwistyka, 2002. № 14. S. 27–45.
39. Polskie zagadki ludowe. Wybrał i opracował S. Folfasiński. Warszawa: Ludowa Spółdzielnia Wydawnicza, 1975. 455 s.
40. Rulikowski E. Zapiski etnograficzne z Ukrainy / E. Rulikowski // Zbiór wiadomości do antropologii krajowej. T. III. Kraków, 1879. S. 62–167.
41. Słownik gwar polskich, ułożył Jan Karłowicz. Kraków, 1903. T. 1–6.
42. Taylor A. English Riddles from Oral Tradition / A. Taylor. Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1951. 959 p.
43. Wilkinson P.R. A thesaurus of traditional English metaphors / P. R. Wilkinson. London ; New York : Routledge, 1993. 490 p.

Information about the author:

Tyshchenko O. V.,

Doctor of Philology, Professor at the Department
of Foreign Languages and Translation Studies,
Lviv State University of Life Safety
35, Kleparivska str., Lviv, 79007, Ukraine,
Professor at the Department of Russian Studies,
University of Ss. Cyril and Methodius in Trnava
nam. Herdu 2, Trnava, Slovak Republic