

The state and prospects of Ukrainian literary onomastics development in the Slavic context

NATALIIA KOLESNYK, OKSANA PETRENKO

*Chernivtsi Yuriy Fedkovych National University, ul. Kocjubinskega 2,
UA – 58002 Černivci, n.kolesnyk@chnu.edu.ua, o.petrenko@chnu.edu.ua*

1.02 Pregledni znanstveni članek – 1.02 Review Article

Literarna onomastika je ena najbolj priljubljenih smeri v slovanski onomastiki. Kljub njeni priljubljenosti v ukrajinski onomastiki pa še vedno obstajajo nekatera terminološka nasprotja, celo glede samega termina. V članku trdimo, da so terminološke nedoslednosti povezane ne le s kompleksnostjo predmeta preučevanja, ampak tudi z različnimi nameni in nalogami, ki si jih zastavljajo raziskovalci, ter z veliko različnimi stališči, ki veljajo za predmet literarne onomastike. Glede na raznolikost literarnih besedil ter funkcij, ki jih imajo v literarnih besedilih lastna imena, menimo, da je perspektiva razvoja literarne onomastike razumevanje te onomastične smeri kot večplastne in kompleksne discipline.

Literary onomastics is one of the most popular fields of Slavic onomastics. However, despite the popularity, certain terminology disagreements in literary onomastics still exist. The article brings up the opinion that the complexity of the object of study is not the only reason for the terminological inconsistencies. According to the tasks that the researchers set themselves in terms of literary onomastics analysis, there is a completely different purpose behind it. Given the diversity of literary texts and the functions of proper names, it considers the understanding of it as a complex multidimensional discipline to be a perspective of literary onomastics development.

Ključne besede: onomastika, slovanska onomastika, literarna onomastika, Ukrajina

Key words: onomastics, Slavic onomastics, literary onomastics, Ukraine

Literary onomastics within Slavic onomastics has been a popular research trend in the past decade. Nowadays, there is a range of interesting monographic studies by various scholars representing their national linguistic fields (notable examples include: Ukrainians – Yuriy Karpenko and Myroslava Melnyk, Liubomyr Belei, Valeryi Kalinkin; Poles – Aleksander Wilkoń, Irena Sarnowska-Giefing, Martyna Gibka; Russians – Olga Foniakova, Nataliia Vasilieva; the Czech Republic – Žaneta Dvořáková, and many others). The panel discussion dedicated to the issues of literary onomastics is usually held not only within national conferences in onomastics,

but international ones as well. For instance, the panel discussion dedicated to literary onomastics became a mandatory one in Ukraine at the VI Ukrainian Onomastic Conference in 1990, where 60 presentations in literary onomastics were given. It has been held ever since, including in 2019 at the XVIII Onomastic Forum of Ukrainian Onomasts in Lviv. Another significant argument to this trend's popularity is that in 1984 at the XV International Onomastic Congress in Leipzig the issues of literary onomastics were the main topic of discussion. The XXVII International Council of Onomastic Sciences will be held in August 2021 in Krakow (Poland). There will be a separate panel discussion dedicated entirely to proper names in literature and other cultural texts.

Many proceedings in general onomastics include works regarding proper names in literary contexts. Nowadays, there are even proceedings that are fully dedicated to the issue of onyms functioning in literary texts: Ukrainian "Literary Onomastics of the Ukrainian and Russian Languages: Interaction and Correlation" (1992), Czech and Slovak "Onomastika a škola" (1992), Polish "Onomastyka literacka" (1993) and so on. Among others, the last proceedings of all mentioned above included works of not only Polish onomasts, but also Czech, Bulgarian and Macedonian scholars. They presented their results at the VIII Polish Onomastic Conference fully dedicated to the aforementioned issue.

In 1998, the encyclopaedia "Polskie nazwy własne" was published. It contained a separate chapter by Czesław Kosyl dedicated to the issues of literary onomastics. A relevant chapter can also be found in the work of Petar Šimunović, Croatian onomast, which is called "Uvod u hrvatsko imenoslovlje" and published in 2009.

In 2002–2003 the encyclopaedia "Słowiańska onomastyka" was published, which was a result of international cooperation between Slavic onomasts. Among its 24 chapters, there is one, Chapter 22, which is fully dedicated to literary onomastics. It includes the most solid thoughts of the respected Slavic onomasts regarding the function of literary onyms, their typology and connection with literary schools and genres, the issue of onyms translation, as well as proper names in folklore literature.

In 2005, the 40th Issue of the Journal "Onoma" was published containing the articles of almost 20 authors from different countries entirely devoted to the relevant issues. There the scholars not only analysed the achievements of French, German, Italian, Polish and Russian onomastic fields and the issues of terminology, but they also considered the nature of proper-name-and-text relation, theoretical and methodological aspects of studying literary onyms, the classification of their functions and the development of complex methods of analysis based on recent achievements in this field. Even such a practical aspect as the translation of literary onyms, as well as the meaning of theoretical principles for practical issues of translation studies, were brought under scrutiny. In the introductory article to the proceedings Grant Smith qualifies an appearance of the analysed volume, entirely dedicated to literary onomastics, as a fact of scientific recognition of this trend in onomastic research. However, the author states that there are quite a few difficult issues in this field, in particular he mentions that the theoretical and methodological bases of such schools are hardly elaborated (Smith 2005: 7).

The 47 chapters of “The Oxford Handbook of Names and Naming” 2016 edition written by 43 authors from 13 countries are devoted to various fields of onomastics. This book is a massive opportunity to summarise the achievements of the science about proper names and fixing its current status on a global scale. It is significant that the third part of this collective monograph consisting of five chapters is devoted to the theoretical and methodological problems of literary onomastics.

As to Ukrainian linguistics, interest in the issues of literary onomastics has its own long-standing history. The first work on Ukrainian material called “Names in Poetry” (1966; first and foremost on Taras Shevchenko’s works) was written by Ukrainian diasporic scholar Iraida Gerus-Tarnavetska. Tetiana Nemyrovska, a scientist from Odesa, is the author of one of the first dissertations on literary onomastics in the former USSR. She conducted her research on Ukrainian material, in particular on Mykhailo Kotsiubynskyi’s prose works (1988). Concerning the first typological scheme of proper names functions in a literary text in English, a modern Polish researcher Martyna Gibka in her work in 2019 reasonably mentions the article called “Functions of Proper Names in a Literary Work” written in 1959 by Jaroslav Rudnyckyj, an Ukrainian scholar from Canada. There is yet another fact that cannot be omitted: in 1951, it was Ukrainian immigrants in Canada who established the first onomastic series on the North American continent entitled “Onomastica”. The article of Ukrainian onomast Yuriy Karpenko, published in 1986 in the Polish journal “*Onomastica*”, alongside the works of Russian scholars Vladimir Nikonov and Emmanuil Magazanik, became one of the first profound studies in the former USSR dedicated to the peculiarities of proper names in literature. For the first time the peculiarities of a proper name in a vulgar language and fiction were brought to focus in Yuriy Karpenko’s report in 1984 at the XV International Onomastic Congress in Leipzig (Karpenko 1984: 88).

Nowadays, the theses in literary onomastics represent almost one third of the number of onomastic studies in Ukraine (it equals over 80 theses, three out of which are habitational ones). By comparison, Polish onomasts have calculated that in the past 50 years over 800 different works in literary onomastics have been written by national scientists, while Russian scholars claim that, after literary onomastics has established itself, the number of new schools doubles with every time for the past decades.

However, despite this trend being quite popular, Ukrainian onomastics still experiences some terminology issues, especially regarding the trend’s name: for instance, in Ukrainian linguistics it is common to interchangeably use the following terms: *literary onomastics*, *poetry onomastics*, *literary and fiction onomastics*, *poetry of onyms*, *poetonymology*, etc. Such a situation, to our mind, is connected not only to the intricacy of the object of study, but also to the different objectives and respective tasks which researchers set, the cumulative aspects which are considered to be the subject of study in literary onomastics, as well as to the understanding of scope and content of this field.

This is a typical situation not only for Ukrainian onomastics, but for other national linguistics as well. In Polish onomastics, for example, the word combination ‘stylistic name’ was used at first to denote the aforementioned trend (Rymut 1993: 16), now the most commonly used term is *onomastyka literacka*. That is the name

of the aforementioned proceedings of the VIII Polish Onomastic Conference in 1993 (that is a term that was used also in the titles of the several articles included in the proceedings; *Onomastyka literacka* 1993). Moreover, it is worth mentioning the works of Polish authors, especially theoretical ones, that contain this word combination (Sarnowska-Gieffing 2003: 436–446). However, both the chapter in the encyclopaedia “Polskie nazwy własne” (1998) and Chapter 2.2 in the Polish part of the encyclopaedia “Słowiańska onomastyka” (in 2 volumes; 2002–2003) are devoted to the issue of onyms functioning in a literary text and have the title “Proper Names in Literature” (“Nazwy własne w literaturze pięknej”). In the aforementioned encyclopaedia “Polskie nazwy własne” (1998), in the respective chapter the attributes *stylistic* and *literary* are used interchangeably (*Polskie nazwy własne* 1998: 363–387).

In Russian linguistics, *stylistic onomastics* was one of the most wide-spread terms denoting literary onomastics during the period of its establishment. That is highly likely due to the influence of such reputable scientist as Alexandra Superanskaya, who examined proper names functioning in literary texts in terms of the issue “Stylistics of proper names” (ref. her work “General Theory of a Proper Name” (1973) and the respective chapter of the joint monograph “Theory and Methods of Onomastic Research” (1986)). However, alongside the mentioned term there were *literary onomastics* and *poetic onomastics* that are used at present as well. The former one was established in Slavic onomastics due to the article by Yuriy Karpenko called “Specific Feature of a Proper Name in Fiction” (1986), which was ground-breaking for the development of the literary onomastics theoretical base in the former USSR. Emmanuil Mahazanyk, who is considered to be one of the founders of Russian literary onomastics, was arguably the first one who suggested the term *poetic onomastics*, which he divided into *onomapoetics* and *onomastylistics* (Magazanyk 1967). Some ambiguity and a somewhat different interpretation of the terms, which was typical for that period of onomastics development, found their representation in the Dictionary of Russian Onomastic Terminology by Nataliya Podolskaya that records the following terms and phrases: *poetic onomastics*, *onomatopoetic*, *poetic name (poetonym)*, *poetic anthroponym*, *anthroponym of a literary work*, *proper names in a specific work*, *literary anthroponym* (Podolskaya 1988: 96, 108). Furthermore, the article from 2004 by Anatolij Fomin, Russian onomast, was published under the title “Literary Onomastics in Russia: Outcomes and Prospects” (Fomin 2004: 108–120). Yet another fact is, to our mind, quite symptomatic. The proceedings to one of the oldest and most reputable onomastic forums in Russia, which was established by Vladimir Nikonov in the 1960s, included the reports dedicated to the study of onyms in a literary text, which were traditionally compiled under the common rubric “Literary and Folklore Onomastics”.

Up to now, there was no generally accepted universal term for denoting the branch under analysis in Ukrainian onomastics. The “Encyclopaedia of the Ukrainian Language” records *poetic onomastics* as a lead term, however, provides the following synonyms alongside: *onomapoetica*, *poetry of onyms*, *literary onomastics* (The Ukrainian Language: encyclopaedia 2004: 438). The most longstanding history of usage belongs to the term *literary onomastics*. It was firstly used in the

forementioned dissertation of Iraida Gerus-Tarnavetska in literary onomastics conducted on Ukrainian literature (1966): “/.../ a separate branch of onomastics is appearing that deals with the study of proper names in literary works, and it’s called *literary onomastics*” (Gerus-Tarnavetska 1966: 7). Mykhailo Khudash in his monograph “On the History of Ukrainian Anthroponymy” considers the term *fiction and literary anthroponymy* as more accurate compared to *epic* and *literary onomastics* (Khudash 1977: 19). According to the observations of Olena Karpenko, by the end of the 1980s the term *literary onomastics* had become generally acknowledged, however, it still had the alternative word combinations, e.g. *poetic onomastics*, *stylistic onomastics* (Karpenko 1998: 9).

The absence of a general term to denote literary onomastics can be explained by both the issues with the development of the scientific branch itself and the simultaneous existence of at least three generally accepted schools in Ukraine, which put the functioning of proper names in literary texts under scrutiny. Every one of them (in Odesa, Donetsk and Uzhhorod) – represented by their leading scientists – set its preferences on its own suggested or already existed terms for denotation of the branch, taking into consideration the revealed contradictions and discrepancies between the terms chosen by colleagues. The scholars from Odesa consistently use the term *literary onomastics*, however, they do not deny the “appropriateness” of the terms *poetic onomastics*, *poetry of onym*, using the phrase *onomastics of literature* as well (Karpenko 2008: 3–4).

Founder of the Uzhhorod school of literary onomastics Liubomyr Belei claims that, in the case of *literary onomastics*, we are dealing with a wider notion, i.e. *stylistic onomastics*, and the terms *poetic anthroponym*, *poetonym*, *expressive name*, *stylistic anthroponym*, *literary anthroponym* are prone to over generality and a lack of specificity; therefore, the most accurate term is *literary and fiction anthroponym* (Belei 2002: 9).

The representative of Donetsk school Valeriy Kalinkin at first gave his preference to the terms *poetic onomastics* or *poetry of onyms*, however, later he was in favour of *poetonymics*, and, later still, he settled on the term *poetonymology* (Kalinkin 2008: 97). The author of the terminological word combination *poetry of onyms* thinks: an attribute *stylistic* is unsatisfactory mainly due to the fact that it takes the notion behind the term beyond fiction and brings it into a wider context of language phenomena (Kalinkin 1999: 72). The drawback to the attribute *literary* is, to his mind, the fact that it concerns more the object of study, rather than the science itself. “A broad meaning of the notion *poetry of onyms* presupposes that it covers all the spheres of creative use of proprial units: from the language of science to slang and everyday speech. A narrow meaning of the term allows to limit the boundaries of *poetry of onyms* by literary texts, where the phenomenon under study is concentrated the most and represented in the most versatile way”, states the scholar (Kalinkin 1999: 72–73). Regarding the terms suggested by Valeriy Kalinkin, Anatoliy Fomin’s view in this respect appears to be interesting. The scientist finds the terms *poetry of onyms* and *poetonymology* irrelevant as they do not comprise the word *onomastics*, and, therefore, the connection with this science impairs and becomes indirect while the connection with poetry builds up (Fomin 2009: 62).

It is obvious that Ukrainian scientists put different emphasis on scientific interests of their own scientific cores, moreover, they support different approaches to literary onym study and, therefore, different terms for its denotation.

Liubomyr Belei, a representative of the traditional onomastic paradigm in literary onomastics, examines literary and fictiononyms as one of the continuants of national literary language and its onymic system. Therefore, the main task of literary and art onomastics, according to the scholar, is to determine the role of literary and art anthroponymy in the process of establishing national naming system and national literary language, as well as multi-faceted study of functional and stylistic possibilities of literary and fictiononyms (Belei 2002: 4). Valeriy Kalinkin views the poetry ofonyms as the subject of literary onomastics, as well as the study of linguistic and stylistic mechanisms of appearance and influence of aesthetic effects of proprial units, which contribute to artistic integrity of the text (Kalinkin 1999: 65). Concerning Yuriy Karpenko's position, the scientist once claimed: "... the subject of this science (literary onomastics – N. K., O. P.) comprises not only poetry, but everything regarding proper names usage in fiction" (Karpenko 2006: 316). The Odesa school of literary onomastics has always focused on the integral analysis ofonyms in a certain work or even works of a particular author inseparably with the context, taking into account their theme and genre peculiarities. In the 1990s, Yuriy Karpenko, after decades of contrastive study of proper names functioning in Ukrainian and Russian fiction, in poetry, prose and drama of different literary movements, drew such a conclusion regarding literary onomastics typology. The general type of literary onomastics is defined by three principles ofonyms use: "/.../ lyric (proper names figurativeness, their phonetic instrumentation), epic (proper names cogency, their direct meaning, as opposed to figurative), humorous principle (combination of incompatible, instructions to laugh) ...Every of three distinguished... principles (types) of proper names use has its own types, sub-types that correspond to literary movements ..."(Karpenko 1993: 102–103).

Reverting to the issue of literary onomastics terminology, i.e. terminological discrepancies in the field, we suppose that such situation is stipulated by diverse factors. The first one is the complexity of the subject under study: *literary text* is a broad notion, therefore, every time the condition of its appearance, peculiarities of the structure and functioning, the aim of creation are different. Every authentic text is one of the versions of the author's personal world map, therefore, it includesonyms as its fundamental part as they become an inseparable piece of this personal and authentic virtual reality. The second factor is different objective and tasks which the researcher sets and the totality of the aspects which the researcher considers as the subject of literary onomastics. It means that every linguist has his or her own vision of its scope and content.

It is generally common Slavic tendency – every scientist, scrutinizing the works of the predecessors, examining the benefits and drawbacks of their vision on theoretical backgrounds to the movement under study, suggests his or her own variant of vision, in particular on the classification of the functions of literary proper names, of the problem that is fundamental for this onomastics trend. As Rudolf Šramek reasonably wrote, literary onomastics is a field which examinesonyms' functions very intensively, and it is, in fact, its matter (Šramek 1999: 24).

Yuriy Karpenko started his article “On Literary Onomastics: The Thoughts Based on Lina Kostenko’s Work Called ‘Shortly as a Diagnosis’” (2002) with the following words: “The study of the functions of proper names in a literary text has already been formed as a separate onomastic science, which in the whole world is mostly called literary onomastics ...” (Karpenko 2002: 61). Nowadays, there are scores of such classification variants, to say the least. Valeriy Kalinkin, for instance, refused to give his own variant of the functions’ classification, as they directly “depend on the literary communication act” (Kalinkin 1999: 280). Moreover he “associates the functions of poetonyms with ‘language level separation’”, which means that he groups literary proper names according to what is expressed by the poetonymic meaning, not to what proper names express. Therefore, there are phonetic, lexical, grammatical and syntactic levels which have corresponding phonetic and morphological means, lexical and semantic, lexical and grammatical, word-building and grammatical means, vocative and comparative functions (Karpenko 2006: 319).

One of the last works of Slavic onomasts devoted to the problem of the onym’s function in the fiction text is the monography “Literary Onomastics: Theory” (2019) by Polish scholar Martyna Gibka. The researcher Martyna Gibka suggests a new theoretical approach to study onyms’ functions in fiction, which presupposes the analysis of two acts: a nominative one and an act of proper name use. Within the former one, permanent and constant functions are typical of proper names, while within the latter one, it is opposite: the functions are variable (Gibka 2019: 48). However, the study of literary onyms’ functions, in terms of functional and communicative and pragmatic linguistics, in her research is limited by the genre of the novel and only characters’ names. Nowadays, the problem of literary onyms’ function classification remains unsolved.

Summing up the results of almost half a century of development of Ukrainian literary onomastics as a separate onomastic branch, we can certify its multidimensionality, multifaceted interest and diverse understanding of its tasks. The reason for this is not only different approaches to the study of literary onyms, but also the fact that literary texts based on specific and relative genre backgrounds operate different proper names with different aim and in different way. The variety of these texts (mythological, folklore, biblical, literary and art, etc.), the mechanisms of their functioning, communicative peculiarities, and therefore, the peculiarities of the proper names fixed in these texts and the functions of these proper names are quite appreciable. Therefore, in Ukrainian onomastics we find predominant not only the multidimensional study of literary proper names, but also the formation of the vision of literary onomastics as a multidimensional onomastic field.

In the process of development of any other science in literary onomastics, which is nowadays experiencing a period of extensive and intensive development, alongside broadening the circle of phenomena under study, accumulation of materials, theoretical generalisations, there is an ongoing process of explication, when revelation of a certain unit content leads to separation of the parts that become independent.

In Ukrainian onomastics in recent years, several movements have been created within literary onomastics itself, in particular folklore and biblical onomastics.

Nowadays, Ukrainian folkloronymy is described as an integral phenomenon, one of the sub-spaces of the national onymic space (in 1998 a thesis titled “Proper Names in Ukrainian Folk Ritual Songs” and in 2018 a habilitational thesis titled “Onym space of Ukrainian Song Folklore: Semantic, Structural, and Functional Aspects” was defended by Natalia Kolesnyk). It has its determined place in both onymic and general lexical system of the Ukrainian language. The principal notions of folklore onomastics are justified and a complex system of description of folklore onyms as structured space is developed. The peculiarities of appurtenance, formation and functioning for every of these components of national system (sacral, real and virtual) are characterised and the principles to their analysis are suggested (Kolesnyk 2017).

In 2010, Lviv scholar Halyna Tymoshyk successfully defended a thesis dedicated to proper names in the Holy Writ. The scientist made an attempt to find out about the peculiarity of biblical anthroponyms and the reasons for distinguishing them in a separate block of onymic material, as well as the division criteria according to the source of fixation, source language and ontological features. The scholar distinguished the aspects and prospects of biblical anthroponym study, i.e. she justified the independent existence of yet another important fragment of Ukrainian linguistic and cultural space in onomastic paradigm (Tymoshyk 2010).

Conclusion

The aforementioned Yuriy Karpenko wrote over ten years ago that, although it may be true that in terms of literary proper names studies we remained behind compared to Poland, Germany and England as to the extent of material analysis, i.e. extensively, theoretically “conceptually they remain behind compared to us as theoretical views in literary onomastics in Ukraine ... have generally acknowledged achievements” (Karpenko 2007: 178). Therefore, the fact that Martyna Gibka in her monograph of 2019 referring to the work of 1966 by Ukrainian diasporic scholar Iriada Gerus-Tarnavetska absolutely ignored the fifty-year-old achievements of Ukrainian onomastics appears to be inequitable.

Thus, the objective of our study was to draw attention of fellow onomasts to the works of Ukrainian linguists, who built up theoretically and methodologically justified view of the issues in this field.

REFERENCES

- Liubomyr BELEI, 2002: *Nova ukrayins'ka literaturno-xudozhnya antroponimiya: problemy teorii ta istoriyi (New Ukrainian Literary and Art Anthroponymy: Theoretical Issues and History)*. Uzhhorod.
- Anatoliy FOMIN, 2004: Literaturnaya onomastika v Rossii: itogi i perspektivy (Literary Onomastics in Russia: Outcomes and Prospects). *Voprosy onomastiky* 1, 108–120.
- Anatoliy FOMIN, 2009: Vsegda li literaturnaya onomastika tozhdestvenna poeticheskoy onomastike? (Is Literary Onomastics Always Identical to Poetic Onomastics? Issues of onomastics). *Voprosy onomastiky* 7, 57–67.

- Iraida GERUS-TARNAVETSKA, 1966: *Nazovnytstvo v poetychnomu tvori (Names in Poetry)*. Munich-Winnipeg.
- Martyna GIBKA, 2019: *Functions of Proper Names in a Literary*. Łódź: ArchaeGraph.
- Valeriy KALINKIN, 1999: *Poetika onyma (Poetry of onym)*. Donetsk: Yugo-Vostok.
- , 2008: Poetonymologiya: iz zametok o metayazyke nauki (Poetonymology: From the Notes on Metalanguage of Science). *Logos of onomastics* 2, 96–101.
- Yuriy KARPENKO, 1984: Specifika imeni sobstvennogo v obshenarodnom yazyke i hudozhstvennoj literature. *XV Internationaler Kongreß für Namenforschung Resümees der Vorträge und Mitteilungen*. Leipzig. 88.
- , 1993: Pytannia typolohii literaturnoi onomastyky (Issues of Literary Onomastics Typology). *Problemy kontrastyvnoi linhvistyky*. Kirovohrad. 102–103.
- , 2002: On Literary Onomastics: The Thoughts Based on Lina Kostenko's Work Called "Shortly as a Diagnose". *Linguistica slavica*. Kyiv. 75–83.
- , 2006: Fenomen Valerii Mykhailovycha Kalinkina (Phenomenon of Valeriy Mykhailovych Kalinkin). *East-Ukrainian Linguistic Collected Papers* 10, 333–340.
- , 2007: Pro vahomist kandydatskoho doslidzhennia (Onomastychni studii dramatychnykh tvoriv Lesi Ukrainky). *Zapiski z onomastiki: zb. nauk. pr.* Odesa: Astroprint. 79–86.
- , 2008: Peredmovna do zbirnyka "Literaturna onomastyka" (The Introduction to the Collection "Literary Onomastics"). *Literaturna onomastyka: zb. statei (Literary Onomastics: collection of scientific articles)*. Odesa. 3–4.
- Olena KARPENKO, 1998: *Prahmatychna spriamovanist vlasnykh nazv u khudozhnomu tekstii: Metod. vkazivky do spetskursu. Dlia studentiv f-tu romano-herman. filolohii (Pragmatics of Proper Names in a Literary Text: methodological guidelines to an option course for the students of Roman and German Philology Department)*. Odesa.
- Mykhailo KHUDASH, 1977: *Z istoriyi ukrayins'koyi antroponymiyi (From the History of Ukrainian Anthroponymy)*. Ky'viv: Nauk; Dumka.
- Nataliia KOLESNYK, 2017: *Onymia ukrainskoi narodnoi pisni (Onymy Ukrainian folk song)*. Chernivtsi: Tekhnodruk.
- Emmanuil MAHAZANYK, 1967: *Poetika imyon sobstvennykh v russkoy klassicheskoy literature. Imya i podtekst: avtoref. dys... kand. filol. nauk: 10.02.01 "Russkij yazyk" (Poetics of Proper Names in Russian Classical Literature. Name and Implication: abstract of a PhD thesis: Major code 10.02.01 "The Russian Language")*. Samarkand.
- Onomastyka literacka*. Red. M. Biolik. (Filologia polska: Studia i Materiały, 53). Olszyn, 1993.
- Nataliia PODOLSKAYA, 1988: *Slovar russkoy onomasticheskoy terminologii (The Dictionary of Russian Onomastic Terminology)*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Polskie nazwy własne. Encyklopedia*. Pod red. E. Rzetelskiej-Feleszko. Warszawa–Kraków, 1998.
- Kazimierz RYMUT, 1993: Onomastyka literacka a inne dziedziny badań nazewnicych. *Onomastyka literacka* 53, 15–19.
- Irena SARNOWSKA-GIEFING, 2003: Onomastyka literacka – integracja językoznawstwa i literaturoznawstwa? *Metodologia badań onomastycznych*. Olsztyn. 436–446.
- Grant W. SMITH, 2005: Names as art: An introduction to essays in English. *Onoma* 40, 7–28.
- Rudolf ŠRAMEK, 1999: *Uvod do obecne onomastiky*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.

Halyna TYMOSHYK, 2010: *Bibliieantroponymy v novochasnykh perekkladakh Sviatoho Pysma ukrainskoiu movoiu: avtoref. dys. ... kand. filol. nauk: 10.02.01 (Biblical anthroponyms in the Modern Day Ukrainian Translation of the Holy Scripture: avtoref. dys... kand. filol. nauk: 10.02.01)*. L'viv, Lviv. nats. un-t im. Ivana Franka.

Ukrainska mova: entsyklopediia (The Ukrainian Language: encyclopaedia). 2-e vyd., vypr. i dop. Red. V. M. Rusanivskyi, O. O. Taranenko, M. P. Ziabliuk. Kyiv: 2004.

STANJE RAZISKAV IN RAZVOJNE PERSPEKTIVE UKRAJINSKE LITERARNE ONOMASTIKE V SLOVANSKEM OKVIRU

V članku obravnavava stanje preučevanja in razvojne perspektive literarne onomastike, ki je eno najbolj priljubljenih področij onomastičnih raziskav v Ukrajini. Osrednja pozornost je usmerjena v tista vprašanja literarne onomastike, ki povzročajo dileme. Slednje se v ukrajinski onomastiki med drugim odražajo v obstoju treh splošno priznanih šol – odeške, užgorodske in donecke. Kot kaže najina raziskava, ima vsaka od njih svoj pogled na predmet in metodologijo raziskovanja lastnih imen v literarnih besedilih in uporablja celo svoj termin za označevanje te onomastične smeri – *literarna onomastika*, *literarnoumetnostna onomastika* ter *poetična onomastika*. Upoštevajoč izsledke raziskovalcev drugih slovanskih onomastik sva raziskali teoretična izhodišča vseh ukrajinskih šol literarne onomastike. Ugotovili sva, da so ukrajinske raziskave lastnih imen v literaturi tako raznolike in bogate, ker se predstavniki različnih šol literarne onomastike v svojih raziskavah lotevajo različno – glede na namen, cilje in izhodišča ter glede na sam predmet preučevanja. To priča o raznoliki obravnavi teoretičnih in metodoloških temeljev tega znanstvenega področja. Sodobna ukrajinska literarna onomastika tako ponuja večplastno preučevanje lastnih imen v literaturi, kar je povezano tako z raznolikostjo besedil, ki jih analizirajo, kot tudi z bogastvom in raznolikostjo funkcij, ki jih imajo lastna imena v besedilih. Danes je ukrajinska onomastika večplastna in kompleksna disciplina, ki združuje več podsmeri. Govorimo lahko o polnovrednem obstoju literarnoumetnostne, folklorne in biblijske onomastike. Zaključiva lahko, da so dosežki ukrajinskih znanstvenikov zanimivi in koristni tudi za slovansko onomastiko.