

UDC 81'42:811.161.2

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32342/3041-217X-2024-2-28-16>

Oksana NIKA

Doctor of Science in Philology, Full Professor,
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Ukraine)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6387-3835>

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF PROPER NAMES OF UKRAINIAN EARLY MODERN PERIOD

Мета статті – визначити специфіку дискурсивної реалізації власних назв українського ранньомодерного часу XVII ст. *Завдання дослідження*: схарактеризувати власні назви як ресурс персвазійності в проповідницькій дискурсивній практиці XVII ст.; **визначити дискурсивну** поліплощинність власних назв у ранньомодерній українській проповіді; проаналізувати власні назви в аспекті особливостей текстопородження і когнітивних процесів мовця (знання, відтворення по пам'яті, аналогія); розкрити принципи поєднання власних назв і творення образів (метафори, порівняння) в українській ранньомодерній практиці; встановити вплив ідеології на дискурс і творення образності агонімів на позначення руських святих. *Методи* дослідження: дискурс-аналіз, ономастичний дискурс-аналіз з урахуванням аксіологічних та ідеологічних репрезентацій дискурсів, контекстуально-інтерпретаційний аналіз, лінгвокультурологічна інтерпретація.

Схарактеризовано, що власні назви є активним ресурсом текстотворення в ранньомодерній проповіді, розвиток якої зумовлений традиційною епістемою та соціокультурними умовами українського ранньомодерну другої половини XVII ст., вимогами інституційного дискурсу, типу дискурсивної практики, настановами автора. Проповідницька практика цього періоду набуває окремих ознак епістемічних дискурсивних трансформацій – переконання і частково знання, що набувають символічного сенсу в проповідницькій діяльності. Власна назва стає активним ресурсом персвазійності, реалізується з урахуванням когнітивної настанови мовця і когнітивної бази реципієнта. Інтерпретація різних культурних, географічних, історичних пластів створює онімну поліплощинність цієї дискурсивної практики.

Доведено, що ономастичний дискурс-аналіз не лише вивчає образність історичних дискурсів, а також екстраполює вивчення власних назв на особливості давнього текстопородження і когнітивні процеси мовця. Опрацювання інформації автором розглянуто в аспектах роботи з іншомовними джерелами (аналіз способів адаптації запозичених власних назв), відтворення інформації по пам'яті (неточні написання власних назв), творення аналогій, образів (метафор, порівнянь). Це уможливує поєднання теонімів і міфонімів, біблієантропонімів і міфонімів, християнських і язичницьких теонімів. Нові сфери знання і вторинні смисли астронімів стають одним із ресурсів барокової образності проповіді, її аксіологічної репрезентації. Схарактеризовано зіставлення агонімів на позначення руських святих із біблієантропонімами, іменами античних філософів, поетів, іменами світової історії. В українському проповідницькому дискурсі XVII ст. **вшанування** руських святих актуалізоване відповідно до тогочасних соціокультурних та ідеологічних передумов.

Ключові слова: дискурс-аналіз, власні назви, дискурсивна проповідницька практика, когнітивні процеси, ідеологія, вторинні смисли, українська ранньомодерна доба.

For citation: Nika, O. (2024). Discourse Analysis of Proper Names of Ukrainian Early Modern Period. *Alfred Nobel University Journal of Philology*, vol. 2, issue 28, pp. 264-278, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32342/3041-217X-2024-2-28-16>

Problem Statement

The analysis of proper names as a resource in early modern preaching practices is conducted within the frameworks of onomastic discourse analysis and historical discourse studies. This research perspective on proper names is projected onto the study of the features of ancient text generation and the cognitive processes of the speaker, examining new sequences of proper name implementation within this discourse (including new forms of proper name coexistence, their establishment, reproduction, or alteration during transcription, recall, and construction into new analogies, comparisons, metaphors). Each sermon contained unique analogies that demonstrated the author's originality and the conceptualism of the sermon.

Analysis of Recent Research and Publications Addressing the Problem

The theoretical tools for studying the history of discursive practices and epistemes have already gained prominence within historical research. Specific issues related to communicative-cognitive features (of the speaker, interlocutor, content of the utterance, reality) and their roles in the processes of generation and perception have been developed within historical pragmatics and discourse studies [Brinton, 1996; Brinton, 2001; Köhnen, 2008; Foucault, 1972; Шевченко, 2000 et al.]. These works have significantly influenced the development of historical discourse studies in pragmatics, cognitive science, discourse analysis, critical discourse analysis, and other scholarly approaches [Dijk, 1981; Dijk, 2006; Dijk, 2012; Geeraerts, Cuyckens, 2010; Flowerdew, Richardson, 2018; Шевченко, Морозова, 2005; Шевченко, 2000]. These studies, in particular, have expanded the edition of the history of discourses, discursive practices, and the examination of cognitive-communicative activities, verbalization of cognitive processes of the speaker, features of text generation and perception, and modal categories despite some limitations caused by the type of written sources and the comprehensiveness of the researcher's understanding of the sociocultural contexts of a particular era.

The main approaches to historical discourse analysis were outlined by L. Brinton [Brinton, 2001, pp. 138–160], who identified its developmental prospects in subsequent historical studies. The historical direction in discursive studies is expanding, as evidenced by works on artistic discourse in the history of the French language and culture [Бурбело, 1999], philosophical discourse of Ancient Greek [Шадчина, 2005], and polemical and preaching discursive practices in early modern Ukrainian language [Олешко, 2017], among others.

The current justification for historical discourse analysis is found in contemporary scholarly studies. In a 2023 article, A. Rejter argues that «the heightened interest in the transformation of discourses over time can significantly enrich reflection and eventually recognize **historical discourse studies** (*emphasis added by the author – O.N.*) as a section of discursive linguistics. Moreover, observing the dynamics of historical discourse may prove to be a central issue in defining and delimiting the concept» [Rejter, 2023, p. 18].

Such research will contribute to developing discourse theory, expand its application in the historical research dimension, and enrich the study of discourses from different periods influenced by communicative, social, and cultural preconditions.

The phenomenon of early modern Ukrainian preaching has been characterized in interdisciplinary studies by M.G. Bartolini [Bartolini, 2016], J. Broggi [Броджі, 2022], T. Getz (Levchenko-Komisarenko) [Гец, 2023; Левченко-Комісаренко, 2006], and O. Maksymchuk [Максимчук, 2019], who argue for the historical discourse of preaching practices. These works describe the polymorphism of Baroque culture and its influence on the author's consciousness, Baroque homiletics as a multi-layered phenomenon [Броджі, 2022], and analyze A. Radyvlovskiy's sermons in terms of moral issues and the discourse of suffering [Bartolini, 2016]. The onomastic issues of Ukrainian Baroque sermons are examined in the aspects of the topics of sacred names [Левченко-Комісаренко, 2006], the argumentation of the images of Olga [Гец, 2023] and Volodymyr. It has been determined that A. Radyvlovskiy uses “bold analogies, examples from Western Latin texts, emblematic writing” [Максимчук, 2019, p. 7] to glorify Prince and Saint Volodymyr, who in the sermons “appears as God's chosen one, simultaneously a formidable prince and spiritual father, and therefore a heavenly patron, that is, the protector of his people” [Максимчук, 2019, p. 7].

O.Yu. Zelinska has described the artistic and stylistic features of proper names in Baroque sermons [Зелінська, 2013, pp. 201–235]. The researcher identified the innovation of these texts, which marked “the emergence of the proper names of ancient artists, secular persons whose activities are

not necessarily related to the affirmation of Christianity. Onomastic vocabulary contributed to raising the artistic level of the homiletic work, served the main idea of affirming eternal Christian values, while also ensuring the high intellectual level of the sermon" [Зелінська, 2013, p. 235].

In reviewing these studies, it should be noted that most of them are dedicated to Ukrainian preaching in the second half of the 17th century, with attention to different groups of proper names or individual ones (Saints Olga, Volodymyr, Borys, and Hlib), employing linguistic (mainly stylistic) and literary approaches.

The preaching discourse practice of the early modern period has been characterized by parameters of intertextuality and the frequency of proper names. In particular, the intertext of ancient Greek philosophers in discursive practices has been analyzed, along with different types of intertext and their deployment in Ukrainian preaching. A frequency dictionary of proper names in early modern Ukrainian sermons has been compiled based on frequency decline, and the obtained results have been interpreted [Nika, Hrytsyna, 2022]. These studies indirectly characterize a portion of anthroponyms (names of ancient philosophers) in intertextual insertions and establish the proportion of different groups of proper names in sermons using linguistic-statistical methods.

The onomastic issues of the Ukrainian language are diversely represented in the works of L. Belej [Белей, 1995], O. Karpenko [Карпенко, 2000; Карпенко, 2004; Карпенко, 2006], M. Torchynskyi [Торчинський, 2013], and others mainly focus on the functional load of literary onomastics, on the functional classification of literary eponymy, with the identification of four groups of literary anthroponyms – neutral, characteristic, deictic, and ideological [Белей, 1995, pp. 8–10].

Particular attention should be paid to research in cognitive onomastics [Карпенко, 2004; Карпенко, 2006], according to O.Yu. Karpenko, onomastic systems are frames that encompass a particular construction of knowledge: "1) a clear understanding that each proper name has only one referent; identical proper names with different denotations in a language are homonyms, while in the mental lexicon, they are different concepts; 2) knowledge of which things and beings can or must receive proper names in a given language; deviations from such norms are possible, but these are deviations, mostly of an expressive nature <...>; 3) understanding that different categories of things and beings acquire their proper names through very different nomination methods, under different conditions, sometimes ritually or traditionally very complex and that these proper names, depending on the category of denotations, have many specific regularities alongside common features, differing also in their structure, prevalence, and functions" [Карпенко, 2004].

New approaches to studying onomastics influence the rethinking of linguistic knowledge and expand the perspectives of the historical analysis of proper names. The features of discourses and the related types of proper names are outlined in onomastic discourse analysis. In the works of [Rutkowski, Skowronek, 2019; Rutkowski, Skowronek, 2020], the theoretical foundation of the method is substantiated, and the research procedure for onomastic discourse analysis is developed, characterizing the relevance of proper names in different types of discourses. In this context, proper names define the characteristics of axiological and ideological representations of discourses [Matusiak-Kempa, 2019; Rutkowski, Skowronek, 2020].

At the same time, researchers argue that the discursive analysis of proper names "is not understood as a branch of linguistics or a completely separate method", but rather "encompasses nomenclature not only concerning historical and social worlds (i.e., in the sense that names appear against their background to some extent), but as those that convey these cultural and social worlds at the speech/textual level and allow them to be reproduced, focusing on differences and the plurality of concepts, cultures, ethics, and languages" [Rutkowski, Skowronek, 2019, p. 57].

Onomastic studies in the dimensions of text, genre, and discourse are diversely represented in the works of [Cieślukowa, 2001; Rejter, 2016; Rejter, 2020; Rejter, 2021; Rutkowski, Skowronek, 2020; Sarnowska-Giefing, 2003]. Choosing and implementing proper names are analyzed based on contemporary sermons [Skowronek, 2014]. Proper names as an active imagery resource in the Old Polish language are newly examined in the works of [Rejter, 2020; Rejter, 2021]. These are examples of the practical application of onomastic research tools to the edition of medieval multi-genre texts and types of discourses.

Identification of Previously Unresolved Aspects of the General Problem

The Ukrainian early modern period has not been studied in terms of the implementation of proper names in discursive practices, the resourcefulness of onomastics in the process of text gen-

eration, the characteristics of the speaker's cognitive processes in choosing proper names, and their combination in discourse regulated by the requirements of institutional discourse, traditional episteme, and the author's guidelines. The scientific novelty of this research lies in the refinement of the stages of onomastic discourse analysis and their application to the historical specificity of the discursive preaching practice of early modern Ukraine. This perspective on proper names reveals how the author processes information – sourcing and interpretation, memory recall, creation of analogies and images (metaphors, comparisons) – and expands the application of onomastic discourse analysis.

This article investigates the specific character of proper names discursive realization in Ukraine in the early modern period of the 17th century.

Research Objectives:

- To characterize proper names as a resource of persuasiveness in the preaching discursive practice of the 17th century;
- To determine the discursive multidimensionality of proper names in early modern Ukrainian sermons;
- To analyze proper names in terms of text generation features and the cognitive processes of the speaker (knowledge, memory recall, analogy);
- To uncover the principles and situations of combining proper names and creating images (metaphors, comparisons) in early modern Ukrainian practice;
- To establish the influence of ideology on discourse and the creation of imagery of hagionyms, the names of Rus saints.

The discursive practice is analyzed based on Ukrainian sermons from the 17th century (J. Galiatovskiy [Галятівський, 1659; Галятівський, 1665], A. Radyvylovskiy [Ніка, Олешко, 2019]). The general principles of their composition were defined by J. Galiatovskiy in the homiletic treatise “Наука, альбо способ зложення казанья” (lit. “Science, or the Method of Composing a Sermon” [Галятівський, 1665]).

To address the set objectives and achieve the research purpose, a combination of the following analysis *methods* was used: discourse analysis (to characterize the text generation process in the preaching discursive practice of the 17th century, influenced by historical sociocultural conditions), onomastic discourse analysis (based on the analysis of proper names in discourse), considering discourses' axiological and ideological representations; contextual-interpretative analysis (which involves two stages – contextualization and interpretation); linguocultural interpretation (to characterize Baroque conceptualism and identify new, secondary meanings in the preaching discursive practice).

Results and Discussions

Proper names are analyzed in terms of the text creation features of the early modern period, the characteristics of the speaker and recipients, the sociocultural situation, ideology, Baroque patterns, and traditional episteme. Similar to critical discourse analysis, the discursive analysis of proper names reveals a specificity that is “**primarily (but not exclusively) noticeable within their communicative and social functions and behavior in texts and discourses**” [Rutkowski, Skowronek, 2019, p. 49]. Therefore, “**proper names are not only linguistic signs but also social constructions, often highly ideologized, that engage in numerous textual and discursive connections, forming both formal and semantic-connotative or metaphorical-metonymic series, and in many cases play a key role in the (re) construction of social reality**” [Rutkowski, Skowronek, 2019, p. 49].

The authors of these studies define the theoretical principles of onomastic discourse analysis as follows: “1. Proper names should not be viewed as isolated figures but should be analyzed in their use within specific texts, considering their sociocultural, ideological, historical, local, situational, and global contexts. 2. Proper names should be treated in terms of discourse – their selection (why they are chosen and used in the text), their morphological and syntactic forms, orthographic forms (e.g., orthography mismatches), etymologies and motivations, combinations with other syntactic elements, and sentences serve (or may serve) as a form of action at the pragmatic level of the text, thus indicating certain ideologies or sociocultural practices in action. 3. Proper names in texts/discourses are ‘records’ of the social conditions (conflicts and social issues) in which they arose. 4. Proper names in texts are used in discursive strategies, understood here as the plan of speech-discursive actions employed by the addressee to achieve a specific (social, political, psychological) goal” [Rutkowski, Skowronek, 2019, p. 50].

Discursive analysis of proper names involves a sequence of research stages, which the authors of the approach formulate as follows: studying the linguistic and grammatical functions and mechanisms in which proper names participate; analyzing the role of proper names in creating the topic of the discourse; analyzing names in the construction of argumentation strategies; participation and function of proper names in genre structures and stylistic forms; reconstructing the context (situational, historical, geopolitical) of the presence of proper names in a specific text; reconstructing the hidden ideological premises that determine the proper names of the discourse [Rutkowski, Skowronek, 2019, pp. 51-53].

We adopt this definition of the stages of onomastic discourse analysis, occasionally modifying their sequence and supplementing them concerning the historical specificity of proper names in the preaching discursive practice:

- based on their implementation features in the Ukrainian early modern period, with the reconstruction of the sociocultural, ideological, and historical conditions of the second half of the 17th century;
- as a resource of persuasiveness in the sermons during interconfessional discussions of the 17th century;
- based on the multidimensionality that characterizes the interaction of cultures and conceptualism;
- based on discursive combinations and adaptation of borrowings as signs of “sociocultural practices in action,” proper names in ancient texts facilitate the reconstruction of the text’s creation features and the speaker’s cognitive processes (knowledge, memory recall, analogy);
- in terms of creating imagery in early modern Ukrainian practice;
- constructing information about Rus saints as “records” of the social conditions in which they arose.

Proper Names as a Resource of Persuasiveness in Preaching Discursive Practice

The sermon was intended to influence the consciousness of believers, a goal that gained particular relevance during the interconfessional discussions of the 17th century. At this time, “the primary function was to resist Protestantism and the Latin and Greek Catholic Churches. However, the function of consolidating society and strengthening the prestige of the Kyiv Metropolis and Pechersk Lavra was no less important” [Броджі, 2022, p. 332]. Ukrainian preaching implements guidelines for persuasiveness, reinforcing the faith of laypeople and allowing for the interpretation of religious concepts with analogies to non-religious contexts.

Among the features of the sermon, O. Zelinska notes the interaction between communicants and the achievement of persuasive influence, specifically: “the sermon as an act of communication presupposes interaction between the speaker and the addressees”, “a feature of the sermon is persuasiveness – the persuasive influence aimed simultaneously at the mind, emotions, and will of the listeners and readers”, “the necessity of influencing not only the intellect but also the emotions, will, and feelings, which determines the artistry and publicistic style of the sermon language, thereby making it a work of fine literature” [Зелінська, 2013, p. 28].

Expressing persuasiveness includes argumentation, which in the early modern sermon was ensured by quotations, inserted narrative elements, illustrations, examples, counterexamples, analogies, and appeals to historical and socio-political facts. O. Matushek, in the article “Українська проповідь XVII століття як ‘дія за допомогою слів’” (lit. “Ukrainian Sermon of the 17th Century as ‘Action through Words’”), agrees with Polish researchers that the argument is one of the most important means of influencing believers [Матушек, 2010, p. 73].

Speech influence on recipients and the interaction of communicants were achieved through various methods and means, including epistemic, evidentiality, neologization, deixis, and others, which we have already examined in previous publications. Precisely, the emphasis is placed on persuasiveness for the historical analysis of discourse and modus as a discursive category, the epistemic modus of the author/reader in early modern discursive practices, and the identification of explicators of epistemic modality (knowing, understanding) aimed at achieving contact-establishing and persuasive functions in preaching discursive practice.

We note that the discursive combination of proper names reveals new aspects of the study of discursive epistemic transformations and conceptualism, which, along with other methods and means, ensure persuasiveness.

In the 17th century, preaching discursive practice was widespread, novel, syncretic, and multicultural, significantly characterized by creation (rather than reproduction) due to the sociocultural and religious challenges of the time. To persuade recipients, authors used proper names to create temporal, cultural, and geographical heterogeneity, presenting religious issues with examples from human earthly life aimed at persuasion and forming attitudes consistent with Christian morality. This discursive practice demonstrates reinforcement in faith (cognition – faith) and appeals to other cognitions (beliefs, partially – knowledge) inherent in other discursive practices, which provides grounds for interpreting discursive epistemic transformations.

A. Radyvylovskiy employs the form of the constellation *ХамеліСпардалісь* (*Khamelopardalis*) to draw parallels with the deception of earthly life. He details the characteristics and name of the constellation, relating it to various vices that may befall a believer: *Власне якъ Сѡнаа химера, ХамеліСпардалісь названаа, шією показуєть коня, ногами и голєнями вола, головою вє(л) блюда, шє(р)стю тигриса, албо дикого вєпра; такъ свѣтъ сей Сѡблудный человѣка то в(ъ) роспусты ко(н)скіє, то в(ъ) Сѡбжирс(тв)а воловые, то в(ъ) лєни(в)ство вє(л)блужєє, то в(ъ) срго(ст) и запа(л)чиво(ст) тигрисовую в(ъ)правуєть* (lit. **Just as a chimera, called Camelopardalis, shows a horse's neck, the legs and calves of an ox, the head of a camel, the coat of a tiger or a wild boar, so does this world lead a deceived person into horse-like debauchery, ox-like gluttony, camel-like laziness, and tiger-like severity and fierceness**) [Ніка, Олешко, 2019, p. 187].

As known, the constellation *Camelopardalis* gained scientific recognition in 1624 through the publication by Jakob Bartsch. However, it had been known since 1598 when Petrus Plancius proposed defining the constellation as “Giraffe” (*Gyraffa Camelopardalis*) [Nockolds, 2007]. In Plancius' comments, the astronomer and theologian referred to the camel on which, according to the Book of Genesis, Rebekah arrived in Canaan to become Isaac's wife.

The discovery of the new constellation was known to the Ukrainian preacher, who incorporated the figurative interpretation of contemporary astronomical innovation into the religious institutional discourse.

Conceptism was common in Latin and Polish preaching, texts with which Ukrainian authors were familiar. The theory of rhetoric and homiletics was known from the courses at the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, including the treatise by J. Galiatovskiy, “Наука, альбо способ зложення казання” (lit. “Science, or the Method of Composing a Sermon”) [Гялятовський, 1665].

In preaching interpretation, establishing the similarity of opposites, “combining the uncombining”, reveals the deep essence of characteristics and influences recipients. Imagery aims to surprise, be memorable, persuade, and create interaction. For example, ‘The soul of Mary/Mary through her virtues is a precious stone in heaven that adorns God's majesty’: <...> *дивный каме(н), дшу мовлю Преблз(с)венноу Дѡвы Мїрїи видѣли; але жебы оный до скарбници нб(с)ной занєсли. Дорогий камень Мїрїа, гды тепєрь ю(ж) аж(ъ) на Сздобу самого маєстату Бжего взаты(м) бываєть(ъ), и на(д) всѣ нбса, не без(ъ) великогѡ всѣхъ стїихъ задивєн(ъ)а по(д)носит(ъ)са* (lit. <...> **a wondrous stone, I mean the soul of the Most Blessed Virgin Mary, so that it may be brought to the treasury of heaven. The precious stone Mary, now taken to adorn God's majesty, and above all the heavens, is not lifted without great amazement of all the saints**) [Ніка, Олешко, 2019, p. 90]. The author emphasizes the choice/creation of imagery using the parenthetical *мовлю* (lit. “I mean”), which explicates the subjective choice and actualizes deixis.

The Multidimensionality of Proper Names in Early Modern Preaching Practice

The spectrum of proper names in the early modern period was actively enriched through reading, translation, and knowledge of European texts, which became sources of familiar images and parallels and the creation of new images. Given the multidimensionality of Baroque, proper names created a semantic and figurative polyphony through the use of various cultural layers.

In early modern preaching practice, different groups and subgroups of proper names are utilized – theonyms, biblical anthroponyms, hagionyms, mythonyms, names of ancient philosophers, historians, poets, notable figures of world history, and astronoms. Their positioning as religious or secular proper names is indifferent, as they are implemented into the textual environment and create the semantic space of the sermon.

A discursive analysis of proper names valorizes the presence of specific groups (mythonyms, astronoms, etc.) in early modern preaching practice and predominantly discursive combinations:

– biblical anthroponyms and mythonyms;
– theonyms, names of Christian and pagan deities;
– figurative reinterpretation of astronomical knowledge (names of stars and constellations);
– hagonyms (names of Rus saints) with biblical anthroponyms, names of ancient philosophers, historians, poets, and notable figures of world history.

In the interpretive part, the author combines ancient proper names with biblical ones to thoroughly and convincingly prove the sermon's theme. Heterogeneity promotes a new combination of biblical anthroponyms (specifically from the Old Testament – *Голіаф* (lit. Goliath), *Самсон* (lit. Samson)) and the mythonym *Геркулес* (lit. Hercules), which the author uses in the plural form to explain Christian concepts and create an impact on readers: *Тут(ъ) же оуважмо, кто збуриль Іер(с) лимъ? кто муры и дѡмы в(ъ) нем(ъ) сплюндрова(л)? чи кто з(ъ) силны(х) Самсонѡ(в), чи кто з(ъ) страшныхъ Голіадовъ? чи кто з(ъ) ѡ(т)важныхъ(ъ) Геркулесѡвъ? Нѣтъ* (lit. Let us consider, who disturbed Jerusalem? Who plundered its walls and houses? Was it one of the strong Samsons, or one of the dreadful Goliaths, or one of the brave Hercules? No) [Ніка, Олешко, 2019, p. 202]. Various proper names are strung together in rhetorical questions, selecting a precedent proper name (biblical anthroponym, mythonym) with attributes of *сильный* (lit. strong), *відважний* (lit. brave), *страшный* (lit. dreadful) (contextually). The persuasive effect is enhanced by the use of dialogization, where the assertion about physical strength, represented by precedent names, can be negated (the answer being *ні* (*Нѣтъ*)), thereby deepening the secular-religious opposition and concluding with a religious resolution.

In the discursive practice of the sermon, the preacher compares a theonym with mythonyms: *такъ Хс поступиль з(ъ) смертю, якъ Геркулесъ з(ъ) Какусомъ* (lit. *thus Christ dealt with death, as Hercules with Cacus*) [Галятовський, 1659, p. 68v]. **Based on specific characteristics, the author establishes the choice of similar situations, in his opinion, by comparing them.** The comparison of theonyms and mythonyms introduces a new sequence of names in the early modern preaching practice.

Theonyms, the names of pagan deities, are rarely used in early modern sermons. A. Radyvlovskiy mentions the name of *Перуна* (lit. *Perun*), the God of thunder and lightning, without specifying the source from which he cites the example in his narration. In the sermon, he conveys the properties of Perun and the signs associated with the location where treasures are hidden: *Пишетъ єдинъ з(ъ) историкѡвъ, ижъ на границѣ Галиціей провѣнціи Гишпанскои, гды Перунъ оударит(ъ), скарбъ з(ъ) собою великій приноситъ, тымъ способом(ъ): гды впадет(ъ) в(ъ) землю, рыючися землю ѡ(т)верзаєт(ъ) злато, которое сѧ на ономъ найдуетъ мѣсци. Люде теды которые ѡ томъ вѣдають, з(ъ) великою ѡхотою чекаю(т) Перунѡвъ, и за оударен(ъ)ем(ъ) Перуна прибѣгають(ъ), и злато ѡбфитое з(ъ) земли збирають(ъ). которые за(с) ѡ то(м) не вѣдають(ъ), болатся барзо Перуна, и прѣ(д) ни(м) далеко оутѣкаю(т). И то жъ єсть всакоє оутрапєн(ъ)є на томъ свѣтѣ если не Перунъ? бо якѡ Перунъ страшный єсть люде(м), так(ъ) и оутрапєн(ъ)є* (lit. One of the historians writes that on the border of Galicia in the province of Spain, when Perun strikes, he brings a great treasure with him: when he falls to the ground, digging into the earth, he reveals the gold found in that place. The people who know about this eagerly await Perun's strike, and after the strike, they gather the abundant gold from the ground – those who do not know about this fear Perun considerably and flee far from him. Moreover, is not all earthly trouble like Perun? Just as Perun is terrible to people, so is trouble) [Ніка, Олешко, 2019, pp. 191–192].

To create Baroque conceptualism, the preacher contextually compares some attributes of Perun the Thunderer with those of the Lord God: *якѡ Перунъ з(ъ) нѡа спадаєт(ъ), такъ и оутрапєн(ъ)є самъ Г(с)дъ Бжъ пуцаєт(ъ)* (lit. *Just as Perun descends from the sky, so does the Lord God send trouble*) [Ніка, Олешко, 2019, p. 192]. **Perun might be perceived as the proper name of «the other/foreigner», whereas A. Radyvlovskiy, who was long a deputy and preacher at the Kyiv-Pechersk Monastery, proposes comparing some situations by their similarities and verbalizes an unusual comparison with the theonym Lord God.**

Astronyms related to scientific knowledge are de-terminologized and acquire figurative interpretation in the early modern author's preaching activity. Symbolically, J. Galiatovskiy describes the 12 stars on the crown of the Virgin Mary using astronomical commentary. The names of these stars (astronyms) are: *Феофорусъ* Theophorus, *Гесперусъ* Hesperus, *Арктось* (lit. Arctos), *Орыѡнь* (lit. Orion), *Офсухусъ* (lit. Opsuchus), *Нодусъ* (lit. Nodus), *Целестісь* (lit. Celestis), *Комета* (lit. Comet), *Спѣка* (lit. Spica), *Лѣра* (lit. Lyra), *Алматеа* (lit. Almathea), *Кассіѡпеа* (lit. Cassiopeia), *Андромеде*

(lit. Andromeda) [Г'алятовський, 1659]. For each of these names, the author explains the etymology, which he figuratively interprets, comparing it to the virtues of the Virgin Mary. The author's choice was driven by the desire to present specific scientific knowledge from astronomy as a source for creating new images, engaging readers with associations of astrononyms with mythonyms.

Secondary meanings characterize the encyclopedic knowledge of the author and rhetorical skill in establishing new analogies that unusually combine different temporal, geographical, and cultural planes, mythological and real, religious and secular.

Regarding the borrowing of proper names, questions of their adaptation become relevant (foreign quotes, adoption through intermediary languages, reflective borrowings). These techniques characterize how the author processed borrowings through their attestation in ancient texts and discourses.

Methods of Rendering Borrowed Proper Names in Discursive Practice

The methods of rendering borrowed proper names in discursive practice reveal the citation of sources in various languages or reproduction from memory. Proper names are used both within quotations and outside of them as evidence of the author's erudition and familiarity with a wide range of sources, which he incorporates into his text. We pay attention to partially adapted proper names, which can indicate whether the author worked with originals or translations.

Borrowed proper names were rendered in Cyrillic but with the retention of characteristics typical of Latin or Polish languages. Among the borrowed names, we note the anthroponyms, the names of famous ancient philosophers: *Аристотеле(с)* (Ancient Greek Ἀριστοτέλης), *Діогенесь* (Ancient Greek Διογένης), *Софоклесь* (Ancient Greek Σοφοκλῆς). It is known that in the translation of Greek names into Latin, -es was preserved (Ancient Greek Ἀριστοτέλης, Latin Aristotélēs). However, from the spelling *Плато* (Latin Plato), it can be concluded that the author used a Latin text as an intermediary. The names of ancient Greek and Roman gods were partially rendered according to Latin and Polish sources: *Аполліо* (Latin Apollo); *Меркуріушъ* (Latin Mercurius, Polish Mercuriusz). In J. Galiatovskyi, the proper name of the Roman orator Marcus Tullius Cicero is rendered as *Туллѣу(ш)*, corresponding to Polish Marek Tulliusz Cynceron. Ukrainian preachers of the 17th century conveyed the softness [л'], characteristic of Polish (and German) languages: *Плютархъ*.

Different traditions of rendering proper names in preaching discursive practice led to orthographic-phonetic variations such as *т – ѿ, з – с: Атенскою, до Аѳень ишли на филозофію* (lit. *To Athens, they went to study philosophy*) [Ніка, Олешко, 2019, pp. 39, 115], for comparison: Greek Αθήνα.

Inaccurate Rendering of Proper Names

Among these are biblical anthroponyms from the Old Testament, which are inaccurately written: *Валтисар* (instead of *Валтасар*), *Навходоносор* (instead of *Навуходоносор*), *Наузардан* (instead of *Навузардан*), *Голіадов* (plural form of *Голіаф*). This can be explained in several ways: the biblical anthroponym *Валтисар* is used in the manuscript of a military sermon that was not printed. The spellings *Навходоносор* and *Наузардан* are due to the phonological reduction of -ву- to *в* and its positional pronunciation as [ў] in the Ukrainian language.

In this discursive practice, the name of the constellation (chimera) *ХамеліОпардались* is symbolically interpreted, with its Latin equivalent being *Camelopardalis*. In rendering the final part of the proper name, the author modifies the initial letter and retains the softness [л'], likely influenced by Polish language mediation.

The inaccurate rendering of proper names could have been caused by various factors influencing the speaker's choice: reproducing the proper name from memory, adapting the spelling according to Ukrainian orthoepy, and preserving the phonetic-orthographic features of the source language text.

Discourse and Ideology: The Imagery of Hagionyms Denoting Rus Saints

The imagery of proper names aligns with the requirements of early modern Ukrainian practice and serves to construct information about Rus saints. A special place in this discursive practice is held by sermons in honor of Rus saints (Volodymyr, Theodosius, and Anthony of Pechersk, Borys, and Hlib). The analyzed sermons also mention Monk Ioan the Much-Suffering, Princes Oleh, Yaropolk, Sviatopolk, and others. Notably, 5 out of the 23 analyzed sermons are dedicated to Saints Volodymyr, Theodosius, Anthony of Pechersk, and Borys and Hlib.

In the frequency dictionary of proper names, based on Ukrainian sermons from the 17th century and compiled using linguistic-statistical calculations, the frequency of the subgroup “Hagionyms. Names of Rus Saints” amounts to 134 usages, determined from a total of 51,821 words [Nika, Hrytsyna, 2022]. We provide several comparisons to understand the proportion of this subgroup of proper names compared to others. For example, the most representative group among the 24 identified groups and subgroups is “Theonyms. Christian Theonyms” – 1265 occurrences, while “Hagionyms. Names of Saints and Martyrs. Names of Christian Theologians and Church Fathers” – 219 occurrences [Nika, Hrytsyna, 2022]. Nevertheless, “Hagionyms. Names of Rus Saints” constitute more than half of the usages within the subgroup “Hagionyms. Names of Saints and Martyrs. Names of Christian Theologians and Church Fathers”.

The Rus saints and the center of faith in Kyiv became an essential element of the spiritual history of Rus, reflecting the continuity of faith and its significance for early modern society. The cult of Rus saints, characteristic of the Kyiv school of oratory and preaching, held an essential sociocultural status for Rus and reflected the “**‘canon’ that can be called the canon of the Kyiv Metropolis and the Pechersk Monastery**” [Броджі, 2022, p. 331]. “**During a period when it seemed that the dreadful two decades of the ‘Ruins’ were coming to an end, the search for a tough balance between the political dependence of the Hetmanate on Russia and the ecclesiastical autonomy of the Lavra and the metropolis (including the protection of its very stavropegia) was timely**” [Броджі, 2022, p. 333].

The glorification of Rus saints in sermons involved a broader context of imagery, including the juxtaposition and comparison of hagionyms with precedent names, the sources of which were the Holy Scriptures or the famous “Alexander Romance”. Conceptism legitimizes the author’s creation/use of secondary meanings through the juxtaposition and comparison of precedent names: St. Volodymyr with the biblical King David, the secular ruler Alexander the Great, and St. Theodosius of Pechersk with the Old Testament Noah.

Emphasizing the significance of St. Volodymyr for Rus, A. Radyvylovskiy highlights his unwavering faith by comparing him to the biblical King David. For this comparison, the author selects well-known names that extend beyond Rus’ history. These precedent names combine meanings of ‘godly’ and ‘steadfast in faith’, thus glorifying the named virtues: *єдинаго Владиміра яко втораго Дв(д)а избралъ* (lit. single Volodymyr as the second David) [Ніка, Олешко, 2019, p. 41].

Astionyms *Херсон* (lit. Cherson) and *Київ* (lit. Kyiv) and the hydronym *Почайна* (lit. Pochaina), associated with baptism, serve as deictic actualizers in the sermon and represent the continuity of faith and Kyiv Christianity. The image of the Kyiv-Pechersk Monastery as the *ornament and Head of all our Ruthenian land* serves as a reminder of one of the first monasteries in Kyivan Rus and the Rus saints, which preachers extend to the sociocultural situation of the second half of the 17th century.

The spiritual dimensions of St. Volodymyr are also valorized in comparison with the most influential emperor of the Roman Empire, Alexander the Great, whose life and campaigns are described in the translations of the «Alexander Romance»: *якоє щаст(ь)є былѡ поткалѡ Алеѡандра Великогѡ в(ь) Вхсходных(ь) краѡ(х), такоє по(т)кало щаст(ь)є Владиміра ст҃го в(ь) тыхъ же Вхсѡдны(х) краѡ(ь) в(ь) Константїнополю* (lit. the fortune that met Alexander the Great in the Eastern lands, the same fortune met St. Volodymyr in those same Eastern lands in Constantinople) [Ніка, Олешко, 2019, p. 46]. **In comparing Volodymyr with Alexander the Great, the spiritual aspect predominates, making the Rus saint significant as an exemplar of Christian values.**

A. Radyvylovskiy compared St. Theodosius of Pechersk to the Old Testament Noah in terms of righteousness and spiritual salvation: *Прп(д)бный ойць наш(ь) Феѡдосій Печерскій(й), якѡ вторы(й) Нѡе обрѣтєся съверше(н) и праведє(н)* (lit. Our venerable father Theodosius of Pechersk, like a second Noah, was found perfect and righteous) [Ніка, Олешко, 2019, p. 20]. **In the preaching discourse, *Ноїв ковчег порятунку* (lit. Noah’s Ark of salvation) is developed into an analogy in which the author symbolically interprets the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra as an ark: *Нѡе нашъ російскій Феѡдосіє ст҃ый, якѡ звѣрата и птици з(ь) великою ѡхотою горнулися до Кѡвчєгу ѡнагѡ стародавнаго Нѡѡ, бы мѡгли заховаными быти ѡ(т) потопу, такъ до твоего Ковчєгу, ѡбитєли мовлю ст҃о(й) Печє(р)ско(й)* (lit. Our Ruthenian Noah, St. Theodosius, just as animals and birds eagerly flocked to the ancient Noah’s Ark to be saved from the flood, so do they flock to your Ark, the abode of Pechersk) [Ніка, Олешко, 2019, p. 20].**

Precedent names that determine the structure and symbolism of the entire sermon are conveyed through comparison or metaphor. In this context, *Феѡдосій Печерскій(й)* (lit. Theodosius of Pe-

chersk) is attributed with the qualities of *вторы(й) НСЄ, Нашъ новыи НСЄ ФеодСїи стый, НСЄ нашъ ФеСДосїе стый* (lit. **the second** Noah, **our new** Noah St. Theodosius, **our** Noah St. Theodosius).

Secondary meanings arise in comparisons of proper names belonging to different cultural types, united by Baroque. To glorify St. Anthony of Pechersk, A. Radyvylovskiy creates an analogy, comparing him to an ancient poet: just as Sophocles can be called the Athenian bee for his poetic works, so Anthony of Pechersk can be called the Pechersk bee, the spiritual bee, for his deeds for heavenly glory: *Аже якС Софоклесь поета для солодкои своеи вымовы, названный є(ст) пчелою Атенскою; так(ъ) АнтСнїи стый Печерскїи для сладСсти Снои нбснои славы, которую завше мѣль въ азыку своем(ъ), завше С ней мовляль и (оу)чникСвъ своихъ научаль, якъ мѣли пре(з) розмышле(н)є уставичное и бѣжмыслност(ъ) Снои нбснои сладости заживати, назватиса може(т) пчелою Пече(р)скою* (lit. Just as Sophocles, the poet, for his sweet speech, was called the Athenian bee, so St. Anthony of Pechersk, for the sweetness of the heavenly glory he always had on his tongue, always spoke of it and taught his disciples to enjoy the constant contemplation and piety of the heavenly sweetness, can be called the Pechersk bee) [Ника, Олешко, 2019, p. 39].

The created imagery (comparison, metaphor) may pertain to a fragment of the sermon or the sermon. Once the analogy is established, the preacher builds the entire text on it, using various means of creating imagery through comparison (as in the previous example) and metaphor: *О той Пчель Дѣховной Преп(д)бномъ Оцѣ нашемъ АнтСнїю Печерскомъ, и до которой з(ъ) пчель єсть подобєнь, словС мое до ласкъ ваши(х) мѣти желаю* (lit. About this Spiritual Bee, our Venerable Father Anthony of Pechersk, and which bee he resembles, I wish to speak with your kindness) [Ника, Олешко, 2019, p. 31].

Various figurative means of glorifying the saint (*мыслен(н)аа нїа пчела, пчела любима* [lit. mental bee, beloved bee]) reveal his wisdom, diligence, and mentorship, represented by metaphors such as the *медъ покоры стїои, воск любви, в(ъ) ул(ъ)ю для (оу)ченикСвъ свСихъ мешкан(ъ) а: АнтСнїи стый, ровнымъ способомъ кто са з(ъ) насъ не задивит(ъ), присмотрючиса з(ъ) якою прем(д)ростїю, з(ъ) якою бѣгло(ст)ю, з(ъ) якою працею, мыслен(н)аа нїа пчела, АнтСнїи стый, якС в(ъ) ул(ъ)ю нѣаком(ъ) в(ъ) нїи поробилъ для (оу)ченикСвъ свСихъ мешкан(ъ)а! якС в(ъ) ню медъ покоры стїои напуцаль, якС воско(м) любви Скружалъ!* (lit. honey of humility, the wax of love, in the hive for his disciples: St. Anthony, who can not marvel, seeing with what simplicity, with what agility, with what labor, our mental bee, St. Anthony, made a hive for his disciples! How he filled it with the honey of humility, surrounded it with the wax of love!) [Ника, Олешко, 2019, p. 33]; *якС пчела любима є(ст) всѣмъ и славима С(т) всѣхъ, такъ прп(д)бный оцѣ нш АнтСнїи Пече(р)скїи былъ любимый всѣ(м) и слави(м) С(т) всѣ(х), вє(д)лу(з) сихъ сло(в): МнСзи возлюбивша єзС* (lit. just as the beloved bee is loved and praised by all, so our venerable father Anthony of Pechersk **was loved by all and praised by all, according to these words: Many loved him**) [Ника, Олешко, 2019, p. 37].

The goal is to conceptually glorify the Rus saint and ensure his inclusion in the “system of praise” for the righteous: *Межи цѣлебниками цѣлебник(ъ), межи исповѣдниками исповѣдникъ, межи дѣвстве(н)никами дѣвствен(н)ик(ъ), межи мѣчниками доброво(л)ный мѣчникъ, межи (оу)чтлами прикла(д)ный (оу)чтль, межи пастырами добрый пастырь, межи іереями іереи, незлобивъ, безскверненъ, С(т)лученъ С(т) грѣшникъ. межи прп(д)бными прп(д)бнъ въ всѣхъ дѣлехъ своихъ* (lit. **Among healers, a healer; among confessors, a confessor; among virgins, a virgin; among martyrs, a voluntary martyr; among teachers, an exemplary teacher; among shepherds, a good shepherd; among priests, a priest, blameless, pure, separated from sinners; among the venerable, venerable in all his deeds**) [Ника, Олешко, 2019, p. 16].

In these sermons, Rus saints were compared and contrasted with well-known biblical (Old Testament) or secular names to find similar attributes with biblical names (King David, Noah) or to demonstrate some similarity and, at the same time, internal difference (Alexander the Great). Symbols of salvation associated with precedent names (Noah’s Ark) were also reinterpreted in the figurative interpretation of the Lavra. The precedent comparisons of hagionyms denoting Rus saints and the figurative glorification of their spiritual virtues were ways of constructing information about Rus saints and Kyiv Christianity in the sociocultural conditions of the second half of the 17th century. They expressed not only the views of Ukrainian preachers as a social group but also consolidated society and influenced the consciousness of the Rus people.

Conclusions

Onomastic discourse analysis considers the interaction of discourse analysis and onomastics, integrating knowledge from history, cultural studies, literary criticism, poetics, and rhetoric, as well as linguistic data from etymology, historical stylistics, and the history of language to study early modern discursive practices. This discourse analysis reveals the selection and usage of proper names in various discourse and discursive practices.

Onomastic analysis of discourse in early modern Ukraine identifies the features of text generation and the cognitive processes of the author, which determine the knowledge, reproduction of proper names from book sources or memory, and creation of imagery. This type of discourse analysis is not limited to studying the imagery of a specific historical period. However, it can expand understanding of the author's cognitive base and its reception by the audience, the adaptation of borrowed proper names and their inaccurate spellings, collectively reconstructing text generation features. Creation by analogy is realized in metaphor, metonymy, and comparison, which could define the imagery of the entire sermon or its part. The imagery of proper names conveyed axiological potential.

Baroque principles of conceptism and the high level of communicative interaction and influence in early modern preaching discursive practice concentrate various groups of proper names and create new combinations for interpreting sacred meanings by analogy with non-sacred ones and persuading believers. The preaching practice of this period acquires features of epistemic discursive transformations, which, in the discourse of faith, explicate beliefs and partial knowledge, gaining symbolic meaning in preaching activities. The author's encyclopedic knowledge, the creation of new images, and persuasiveness accumulate in the sermon with multidimensional proper names that synthesize different cultural layers in the preacher's actualized interpretation.

Based on the characteristic features of proper name spellings, it is determined that the authors of the sermons knew and used Latin and Polish sources for creating their **"words"**. **The group representing** ancient proper names – mythonyms and names of ancient philosophers, poets, and historians – proves to be representative, serving as a kind of "ancient discovery" in Baroque.

Some proper names known from the Old Testament are written inaccurately, which may characterize their reproduction from memory and adaptation to the Ukrainian pronunciation of the sermon authors.

Creating images by analogy defines Baroque syncretism, which combines theonyms and mythonyms, biblical anthroponyms, and mythonyms. The Baroque author creates new imagery by juxtaposing theonyms denoting Christian deities with pagan ones. These linguistic-cultural opposites are combined in the discursive space of the sermon, situationally comparing similar elements and interpreted according to the sermon's theme.

New areas of knowledge and secondary meanings of astrononyms become one of the resources of sermon imagery, enabling the combination of theonyms with astrononyms: star names are reinterpreted in comparison with the characteristics of theonyms, and constellation names and their forms are explicated concerning the sinfulness of the earthly world.

Sociocultural and ideological conditions actualize **"words" in honor of Rus saints in Ukrainian** preaching discourse. The special status of these hagionyms for 17th century Ukrainian preachers is characterized by comparisons of hagionyms with biblical anthroponyms, names of ancient philosophers, poets, and world history figures. Institutional discourse and the guidelines of Ukrainian sermons valorize well-known and authoritative parallels from the Old Testament or **"Alexander Romance"**, and the works of Sophocles in sermons honoring Rus saints. Given the metatextuality of the Baroque text, they created semantic and figurative polyphony by using different cultural layers in the perception of the sermon, influencing the consciousness of contemporary Rus people.

Further research prospects lie in the study of proper names in various discursive practices of early modern Ukraine, in comparing their history and changes during the early modern period, in studying Baroque imagery, and in reconstructing the author's discursive activity.

Bibliography

Белей, Л.О. (1995). *Функціонально-стилістичні можливості української літературно-художньої антропонімії XIX–XX ст.* Ужгород: Патент.

Броджі, Дж. (2022). *Культурний поліморфізм українського світу.* Київ: Дух і літера.

Бурбело, В.Б. (1999). *Художній дискурс в історії французької мови та культури IX–XVIII ст.* (Автореф. дис. докт. філол. наук). Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка, Київ.

- Галятовський, І. (1659). *Ключ разумьня*. Київ: Друкарня Києво-Печерської Лаври.
- Галятовський, І. (1665). *Ключ разумьня*. Львів: Друкарня Михайла Сльозки.
- Гетц, Т. (2023). Образ Київської княгині Ольги як аргумент у міжконфесійних змаганнях XVII століття. І. Braha (Ред.), *Dialog der Sprachen –Dialog der Kulturen. Die Ukraine aus Globaler Sicht* (S. 108-119). München: Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität.
- Зелінська, О.Ю. (2013). *Українська барокова проповідь: мовний світ і культурні витоки*. Київ: Видавничий Дім Дмитра Бураго.
- Карпенко, О.Ю. (2000). Про літературну ономастику та її функціональне навантаження. *Записки з ономастики*, 4, 68-74.
- Карпенко, О.Ю. (2004). *Ментальна організація власних назв. Мовознавство*, 4, 25-34.
- Карпенко, О.Ю. (2006). *Проблематика когнітивної ономастики*. Одеса: Астропринт.
- Левченко-Комісаренко, Т. (2006). Топіка сакральних імен у проповідях Антонія Радивиловського. *Літературознавчі обрії. Праці молодих учених*, 11, 125-128.
- Максимчук, О.В. (2019). Князь і отець: постать святого Володимира в рукописній проповіді Антонія Радивиловського. *Наукові записки НАУКМА. Літературознавство*, 2, 3-9. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18523/2618-0537.2019.2.3-9>
- Матушек, О.Ю. (2010). Українська проповідь XVII століття як “дія за допомогою слів”. *Наукові записки Тернопільського національного педагогічного університету. Літературознавство*, 30, 67-76.
- Морозова, О.І., Шевченко, І.С. (2005). Дискурс як мисленнєво-комунікативна діяльність. І.С. Шевченко (Ред.), *Дискурс як когнітивно-комунікативний феномен* (с. 15–19). Харків: Константа.
- Ніка, О., Олешко, Ю. (Ред.). (2019). *Радивиловський Антоній. Барокові проповіді XVII століття*. Київ: Освіта України.
- Олешко, Ю.Л. (2017). *Староукраїнська проповідь XVII ст. у комунікативно-когнітивному вимірі*. (Автореф. дис. докт. філол. наук). Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка, Київ.
- Торчинський, М.М. (2013). Українська ономастика: історія, сьогодення, перспективи. *Актуальні проблеми філології та перекладознавства*, 6 (1), 217-238.
- Шевченко, І.С. (2000). Об историческом развитии когнитивного и прагматического аспектов дискурса. *Вісник Харківського національного університету ім. В.Н. Каразіна*, 471, 300-307.
- Шадчина, А.С. (2005). *Текстотвірні функції епістемічної модальності в давньогрецькому філософському дискурсі (на матеріалі текстів Геракліта і Платона)*. (Автореф. дис. канд. філол. наук). Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка, Київ.
- Bartolini, M.G. (2016). The Discourse of Martyrdom in Late 17th century Ukraine. The “passion sufferers” Boris and Gleb in the Homilies of Antonii Radyvylovskiy and Lazar Baranovych. *Zeitschrift für Slawistik*, 61 (3), 499-527. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/slwa-2016-0030>
- Brinton, L.J. (1996). *Pragmatic Markers in English Grammaticalization and Discourse Functions*. Berlin, New York: Moutjn de Gruyter.
- Brinton, L.J. (2001). Historical discourse analysis. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, H.E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 138-160). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Cieślakowa, A. (2001). Nazwa w tekście a tekst w nazwie. W: A. Pajdzińska, R. Tokarski (Red.), *Semantyka Tekstu Artystycznego* (s. 99-108). Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMC.
- Dijk, van T.A. (1981). *Studies in the Pragmatics of Discourse*. Mouton: Hague.
- Dijk, van T.A. (2006). Discourse and Manipulation. *Discourse & Society*, 17 (3), 359-383. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926506060250>
- Dijk, van T.A. (2012). *Ideology and Discourse A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. Barcelona: Pompeu Fabra University.
- Flowerdew, J., Richardson, J.E. (Eds.). (2018). *The Routledge Handbook of Critical Discourse Studies*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (Transl. by A.M. Sheridan Smith). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Geeraerts, D., Cuycens, H. (Eds.) (2010). *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Köhnen, T. (2008). Historical text linguistics: Investigating language change in texts and genres. In H. Sauer, G. Waxenberger (Eds.). *English Historical Linguistics*. (Vol. 2, pp. 166-187). Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Matusiak-Kempa, I. (2019). *Nomen Omen. Studium Antroponimiczno-Aksjologiczne*. Olsztyn: Wydawnictwo UWM.

Nika, O., Hrytsyna, S. (2022). *A Frequency Dictionary of Proper Names in a Seventeenth-Century Original Text*. In V. Lytvyn (Ed.), *CEUR Workshop Proceedings COLINS 2022. Computational Linguistics and Intelligent Systems. Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Computational Linguistics and Intelligent Systems* (pp. 653-663). Gliwice: CEUR Workshop Proceedings.

Nockolds, P. (2007). Plancius, Petrus. In T. Hockey (Ed.), *The Biographical Encyclopedia of Astronomers* (p. 911). New York: Springer. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-30400-7_1096

Rejter, A. (2016). *Nazwa własna wobec gatunku i dyskursu*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo UŚ.

Rejter, A. (2020). Obrazowość polszczyzny średniowiecznej i jej współczesne korelaty. Rozważania wprowadzające. *Prace Językoznawcze*, 22 (4), 139-149. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31648/pj.5820>

Rejter, A. (2021). Proper names in medieval literature and the imagery of the Old-Polish language. *Onomastica*, 65 (2), 87-102. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17651/ONOMAST.65.2.6>

Rejter A. (2023). Discourse in the context of language history – research potential and perspectives. *Stylistyka*, 32, 11-22. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25167/Stylistyka32.2023.1>

Rutkowski, M., Skowronek, K. (2019). Onomastyczna analiza dyskursu. *Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Skłodowska, sectio FF – Philologiae*, 37 (1), 47-60. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17951/ff.2019.37.1.47-59>

Rutkowski, M., Skowronek, K. (2020). *Onomastyczna analiza dyskursu*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo AGH.

Sarnowska-Giefing, I. (2003). *Od onimu do gatunku tekstu. Nazewnictwo w satyrze polskiej do 1820 roku*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.

Skowronek, K. (2014). Nazwy własne jako elementy strategii kaznodziejskiej (na przykładzie wybranych homilii arcybiskupa Sławoja Leszka Głódzia). *Onomastica*, 58, 331-347.

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF PROPER NAMES OF UKRAINIAN EARLY MODERN PERIOD

Oksana I. Nika, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Ukraine)

e-mail: nikaoksanaiv@gmail.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32342/3041-217X-2024-2-28-16>

Key words: *discourse analysis, proper names, discursive preaching practice, cognitive processes, ideology, secondary meanings, Ukrainian early modern era.*

The purpose of the article is to define the specific character of proper names discursive implementation of Ukrainian proper names in the early modern period of the 17th century. The research task is to characterize proper names as a resource of persuasiveness in the preaching discursive practice of the 17th century; to determine the discursive polyplanarity of proper names in early modern Ukrainian sermons; to analyze proper names in terms of text generation and cognitive processes of the speaker (knowledge, memory reproduction, analogy); to reveal the principles of combining proper names and creating images (metaphors, similes) in Ukrainian early modern practice; to establish the influence of ideology on the discourse and creation of the imagery of agionyms for the designation of the names of the Rus saints.

Research methods: discourse analysis (to characterize the process of text generation in the preaching discursive practice of the 17th century, which is conditioned by historical sociocultural processes), onomastic discourse analysis (based on the analysis of proper names in discourse) taking into account axiological and ideological representations of discourses, contextual and interpretive analysis (two stages, contextualization and interpretation, are covered), linguistic and cultural interpretation (to characterize baroque conceptism and determine secondary meanings in the preaching discursive practice).

Proper names are an active resource of text creation in the early modern sermon, which is analyzed in accordance with the traditional episteme and sociocultural conditions of the Ukrainian early modern of the second half of the 17th century, the requirements of institutional discourse, the type of discursive practice, and the author's instructions. Baroque conceptism with the creation of new meanings contributed to the memorization and perception of the presentation, activation of attention, emotions of recipients, influence on the consciousness of Ruthenians. The preaching practice of this period acquires certain signs of epistemic discursive transformations, which explain beliefs and partly knowledge that acquire symbolic meaning in the preaching activity to the discourse of faith. The encyclopedic nature of the author, the creation of new images, and persuasiveness accumulate in the preaching of multi-layered proper names that synthesize different cultural layers in the preacher's updated interpretation.

The onomastic discourse analysis not only studies the imagery of historical discourses, but also extrapolates the study of proper names to the peculiarities of ancient text generation and the cognitive processes of the speaker. Processing of information by the author is considered in the aspects of processing foreign language sources (analysis of methods of adaptation of borrowed proper names), reproduction of information from memory (inaccurate spelling of proper names), creation of analogies, images (metaphors, similes).

The creation of images by analogy determines baroque syncretism, which combines theonyms and mythonyms, biblical anthroponyms and mythonyms, Christian theonyms and pagan theonyms. New fields of knowledge and secondary meanings of astronomical names (names of constellations, stars) become one of the resources of the baroque imagery of the sermon, its axiological representation. Sociocultural and ideological conditions actualize sermons in honor of the Rus saints in the Ukrainian preaching discourse. The comparison of these agionyms with biblical anthroponyms (parallels from the Old Testament), names of ancient philosophers, poets (Sophocles), names of world history (Alexander the Great) is characterized.

References

- Bartolini, M.G. (2016). The Discourse of Martyrdom in Late 17th century Ukraine. The “passion sufferers” Boris and Gleb in the Homilies of Antonii Radyvylovs’kyi and Lazar Baranovych. *Zeitschrift für Slawistik*, vol. 61, issue 3, pp. 499-527. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/slwa-2016-0030>
- Belej, L.O. (1995). *Funktsionalno-stylistychni mozhylyvosti ukrainskoi literaturno-khudozhnoi antroponii XIX–XX st.* [Functional and Stylistic Possibilities of Ukrainian Literary and Artistic Anthroponymy of the XIX–XX Centuries]. Uzhhorod, Patent Publ., 120 p.
- Brinton, L.J. (1996). Pragmatic markers in English grammaticalization and discourse functions. Berlin, New York, Moutjn de Gruyter, 405 p.
- Brinton, L.J. (2001). Historical discourse analysis. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, H.E. Hamilton (eds.). *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Oxford, Blackwell, pp. 138-160.
- Brodzhi, Dzh. (2022). *Kulturnyj polimorfizm ukrainskoho svitu* [Cultural Polymorphism of the Ukrainian World]. Kyiv, Dukh i Litera Publ., 520 p.
- Burbelo, V.B. (1999). *Khudozhnij dyskurs v istorii frantsuz’koi movy ta kul’tury 9–18 st.* Avtoref. dys. dokt. filol. nauk [Artistic discourse in the history of the French language and culture of the 9th–18th centuries. Doctor Thesis Abstract]. Kyiv, 36 p.
- Cieślikowa, A. (2001). *Nazwa w tekście a tekst w nazwie* [Name in text or text in name]. In A. Pajdzińska, R. Tokarski (eds.). *Semantyka tekstu artystycznego* [The Semantics of an Artistic Text]. Lublin, Wydawnictwo UMC Publ., pp. 99-108.
- Dijk, van T.A. (2006). Discourse and Manipulation. *Discourse & Society*, vol. 17, issue 3, pp. 359-383. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926506060250>
- Dijk, van T.A. (2012). *Ideology and Discourse A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. Barcelona, Pompeu Fabra University, 95 p.
- Dijk, van T.A. (1981). *Studies in the Pragmatics of Discourse*. Mouton, Hague, 331 p.
- Flowerdew, J., Richardson, J.E. (eds.). (2018). *The Routledge Handbook of Critical Discourse Studies*. London, New York, Routledge, 656 p.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (Transl. by A.M. Sheridan Smith). New York, Pantheon Books, 254 p.
- Galiatovskiy, I. (1659). *Kliuch razuminiia* [The Key to Understanding]. Kyiv, Drukarnia Kyievo-Pecherskoi Lavry Publ., 508 p.
- Galiatovskiy, I. (1665). *Kliuch razuminiia* [The Key to Understanding]. Lviv, Drukarnia Mykhajla Slozky Publ., 532 p.
- Geeraerts, D., Cuyckens, H. (eds.) (2010). *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1334 p.
- Getts, T. (2023). *Obraz Kyivskoi kniahyni Olhy iak arhument u mizhkonfesijnykh zmahanniakh 17 stolittia* [The image of Princess Olga of Kyiv as an argument in inter-confessional competitions of the 17th century]. I. Braha (ed.). *Dialog der Sprachen – Dialog der Kulturen. Die Ukraine aus Globaler Sicht*. München, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, pp. 108-119.
- Karpenko, O.Yu. (2000). *Pro literaturnu onomastyku ta ii funktsionalne navantazhennia* [About literary onomastics and its functional load]. *Onomastics Notes*, vol. 4, pp. 68-74.
- Karpenko, O.Yu. (2004). *Mentalna orhanizatsiia vlasnykh nazv* [Mental organization of proper names]. *Movoznavstvo: Scientific and theoretical journal*, vol. 4, pp. 25-34.
- Karpenko, O.Yu. (2006). *Problematyka kohnityvnoi onomastyky* [Problems of Cognitive Onomastics]. Odesa, Astroprynt Publ., 326 p.
- Köhnen, T. (2008). Historical text linguistics: Investigating language change in texts and genres. In H. Sauer, G. Waxenberger (eds.). *English Historical Linguistics*. Amsterdam, John Benjamin Publishing Company, vol. 2, pp. 166-187.

Levchenko-Komisarenko, T. (2006). *Topika sakralnykh imen u propovidiakh Antonia Radyvylovskoho* [The topic of sacred names in the sermons of Antony Radyvylovsky]. *Literary Horizons. Works of Young Scientists*, vol. 11, pp. 125-128.

Maksymchuk, O.V. (2019). *Kniaz i otets: postat sviatoho Volodymyra v rukopysnij propovidi Antonia Radyvylovskoho* [The prince and the father: the figure of St. Volodymyr in the manuscript sermon of Antony Radyvylovsky]. *Scientific Notes of NaUKMA. Literary Studies*, vol. 2, pp. 3-9. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18523/2618-0537.2019.2.3-9>

Matusiak-Kempa, I. (2019). *Nomen omen. Studium antropomiczno-aksjologiczne* [Nomen Omen. Anthropological and Axiological Study]. Olsztyn. Wydawnictwo UWM Publ., 382 p.

Matushek, O.Yu. (2010). *Ukrainska propovid 17 stolittia iak "diia za dopomohoiu sliv"* [Ukrainian preaching of the 17th century as "action with the help of words"]. *Scientific Notes of Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University. Literature*, vol. 30, pp. 67-76.

Morozova, O.I., Shevchenko, I.S. (2005). *Dyskurs iak myslennievo-komunikatyvna diialnist* [Discourse as a Thought-Communicative Activity]. In I.S. Shevchenko (ed.). *Dyskurs iak kohnityvno-komunikatyvny fenomen* [Discourse as a Cognitive-Communicative Phenomenon]. Kharkiv, Konstanta Publ., pp. 15-19.

Nika, O., Oleshko, Yu. (eds.). (2019). *Radyvylovskij Antonij. Barokovi propovidi 17 stolittia* [Radyvylovskij Antonij. Baroque Sermons of the 17th Century]. Kyiv, Osvita Ukrainy Publ., 381 p.

Nika, O., Hrytsyna, S. (2022). *A Frequency Dictionary of Proper Names in a Seventeenth-Century Original Text*. In V. Lytvyn (ed.). *CEUR Workshop Proceedings COLINS 2022. Computational Linguistics and Intelligent Systems. Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Computational Linguistics and Intelligent Systems*. Gliwice, CEUR Workshop Proceedings Publ., vol. 1, pp. 653-663.

Nockolds, P. (2007). Plancius, Petrus. In T. Hockey (ed.). *The Biographical Encyclopedia of Astronomers*. New York, Springer, p. 911. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-30400-7_1096

Oleshko, Yu.L. (2017). *Staroukrainska propovid XVII st. u komunikatyvno-kohnityvnomu vymiri* [Old Ukrainian Sermon of the 17th Century in the Communicative and Cognitive Dimension. Doctop Thesis Abstract]. Kyiv, 17 p.

Rejter, A. (2016). *Nazwa własna wobec gatunku i dyskursu* [Proper Name Towards Genre and Discourse]. Katowice, Wydawnictwo UŚ Publ., 240 p.

Rejter, A. (2020). *Obrazowość polszczyzny średniowiecznej i jej współczesne korelaty. Rozważania wprowadzające* [Picturesqueness of medieval Polish and its contemporary correlates. Preliminary remarks]. *Prace Językoznawcze* [Papers in Linguistics], vol. 22, issue 4, pp. 139-149. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31648/pj.5820>

Rejter, A. (2021). Proper names in medieval literature and the imagery of the Old-Polish language. *Onomastica*, vol. 65, issue 2, pp. 87-102. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17651/ONOMAST.65.2.6>

Rejter A. (2023). Discourse in the context of language history – research potential and perspectives. *Stylistyka*, vol. 32, pp. 11-22. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25167/Stylistyka32.2023.1>

Rutkowski, M., Skowronek, K. (2019). Onomastyczna analiza dyskursu. *Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Skłodowska, sectio FF – Philologiae*, vol. 37, issue 1, pp. 47-60. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17951/ff.2019.37.1.47-59>

Rutkowski, M., Skowronek, K. (2020). *Onomastyczna analiza dyskursu* [The Onomastic Discourse Analysis]. Kraków, Wydawnictwo AGH Publ., 148 p.

Sarnowska-Gieffing, I. (2003). *Od onimu do gatunku tekstu. Nazewnictwo w satyrze polskiej do 1820 roku* [From an Onym to the Genre of Text. Onomastics in Polish Satire Until 1820]. Poznań, Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM Publ., 335 p.

Shadchyna, A.S. (2005). *Tekstotvorni funktsii epistemichnoi modalnosti v davnohretscomu filosofovkomu dyskursi (na materialii tekstiv Heraklita i Platona)*. Avtoref. dys. kand. filol. nauk [Text-Creative Functions of Epistemic Modality in Ancient Greek Philosophical Discourse (On the Material of the Texts of Heraclitus and Plato). PhD Thesis Abstract]. Kyiv, 20 p.

Shevchenko, I.S. (2000). *Ob istoricheskomy razvitii kognitivnogo i pragmaticheskogo aspektov diskursa* [On the historical development of cognitive and pragmatic aspects of discourse]. *The Journal of V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University*, vol. 471, pp. 300-307.

Skowronek, K. (2014). *Nazwy własne jako elementy strategii kaznodziejskiej (na przykładzie wybranych homilii arcybiskupa Sławoja Leszka Głódzia)* [Proper names as elements of a preaching strategy (based on the example of selected homilies of Archbishop Sławoj Leszek Głódź)]. *Onomastica*, vol. 58, pp. 331-347.

Torchynskyi, M.M. (2013). *Ukrainska onomastika: istoriia, siogodennya, perspektyvy* [Ukrainian Onomastics: History, Present, Prospects]. *Actual Issues of Philology and Translation Studies*, vol. 6, issue 1, pp. 217-238.

Zelinska, O.Yu. (2013). *Ukrainska barokova propovid: movnyj svit i kulturni vytyky* [Ukrainian Baroque Sermon: the Linguistic World and Cultural Origins]. Kyiv, Vydavnychyj Dim Dmytra Buraho Publ., 407 p.