ANTHROPONYMIC FORMULA AS A BASIC TERM OF ONOMASTICS

Oksana Chornous

Ph.D., Assistant Professor, Kropyvnytskyi Institute of State and Municipal Governance, Ukraine
e-mail: trollly@ukr.net, orcid.org/0000-0001-8770-8869

Summary

This paper is a preliminary attempt to summarize and supplement key information about anthroponymic formula as a basic term of Ukrainian onomastics. Methods of research are predetermined by the aim and tasks put in the article. The main ones are comparative analyses, observation method, analysis of the scientific literature, method of classification, descriptive, comparative, and historical methods as well as methods of generalization and abstraction. They made it possible to clarify the content of the term *anthroponymic formula*, to describe differences between the existing definitions, and to examine the available equivalents in other languages. This study is the first step towards enhancing our understanding of anthroponymic formula's definition that we defined initially as an order of anthroponyms in the official name of a person. This paper also describes some aspects of the analysed term's formation, in particular a wide range of this term's variants introduced into scientific parlancein in Slavistics.

Keywords: name scheme, definition, content of term, variants, official name.

1. Introduction

It is well known that every modern society has socially, historically, legally established system for identifying its members. Spanish researcher M. S. Sastre argues that the concept of onomastic identification has a functional role within a society *(Sastre, 2014: 136)*. This involves, on the one hand, definition of individuality, and affirmation of one's self and, on the other hand, belonging to a community as well as definition of an origin. In turn, as a means of constructing a person's identity, manifested in self-representation and addressing, person's name as a unit of language enables variation of form, combinations of different components within the full name, titles, which creates space for manipulation *(Novikova, 2011: 17)*.

There are various algorithms worldwide for constructing official names of people that differ in the maximum number of components, their semantic nature and the order. Moreover, some of these components are mandatory, and the others are optional. In the literature this is often explained by the influence of both purely linguistic and extralingual factors (religious traditions, historical events, cultural values of a nation or ethnic group, etc.). Terminological harmony and clarity of these parameters is provided by S. Pakhomova's researches *(Pakhomova, 2012: 72–74)*. She uses the term *multilexemic name* to denominate the number of person's official names with an emphasis on the anthroponymic category (as opposed to the formal number of words). The term *anthroponymic phrase* has been applied to denote parsing. At the same time, *anthroponymic formula* is identified as the name scheme. Since the latter is among the most widely used concepts in onomastic studies, it seems logical and necessary to analyze it in more detail. We also noticed that most studies in onomastics have only focused on the use of this term and only few researchers analysed its definition. So, this paper is a preliminary attempt to   summarize and supplement key information about anthroponymic formula as a

basic term of Ukrainian onomastics. Methods of research are predetermined by the aim and tasks put in the article. The main ones are comparative analyses, observation method, analysis of the scientific literature, method of classification, descriptive, comparative, and historical methods as well as methods of generalization and abstraction. They make it possible to clarify the content of the term *anthroponymic formula*, to describe differences between the existing definitions, and to examine the available equivalents in other languages.

2. Some aspects of the term's formation

The term *anthroponymic formula* was introduced into scientific parlance of the Ukrainian onomastic as a result of intensive long-standing scientific search for the most appropriate designation of standardized national naming of Ukrainians in diachrony and synchrony. The term is a two-component construction built on the principle of specification of the main component: *anthroponymic* is the adjective derivative of the lexeme *anthroponym*, *formula* was borrowed from Latin formula that is diminutive of *forma* ("a form, rule") and now in Ukrainian means a short form of recording information symbolically or a general relationship between given quantities *(Byrne, 2014: 57)*. During its formation there had been much discussion on the main component, which confirms a wide range of this term's variants introduced into scientific parlance: kind of naming (А. Зубарєва, О. Зябірова, М. Ковальчукова), type of naming (Р. Керста, М. Худаш), anthroponym model (О. Багірова, О. Скляренко, О. Шеверинова, Г. Шаповал, І. Петрова), naming structure (С. Зинін, Г. Сергеєва). Based on S. Pakhomova's arguments, we consider the variant *formula* most appropriate than others: the *model* is well-established in the term system of word formation (word-formation model); the *structure* can refer not only to multilexemic, but also to the single lexemic onyms *(Pakhomova, 2012: 73)*; an *aspect* in linguistics operates to denote a grammatical category (perfective and imperfective aspect); *type* is the basic concept of linguistic typology. Also we particularly favoured the researcher's positioning of the anthroponymic formula as a representative of the multidimensional, multilevel nature of a person's nomination, which also expresses a certain structural pattern.

It should be noted that the proposed term in Slavistics is recorded in the N. Podolskaya's dictionary of onomastic terminology since the last century and in the interpretation of the 1980s indicates a certain order of different types of anthroponyms and appellatives in the official name of a person of a certain nationality, social status, religion in a given era *(Podolskaya, 1988: 36)*. Since then, it has been actively used by Russian (Л. Ахметзянова, О. Врублевська, О. Горелова, О. Гусиніна, О. Єрмакова, І. Корольова, В. Нерознак, У. Природина, Н. Рогозинникова, М. Самарова, О. Суперанська, Л. Щетинін), Ukrainian (Н. Булава, І. Єфименко, С. Пахомова, Н. Петріца, А. Смольська, М. Торчинський, І. Фаріон, П. Чучка, Н. Шульська, Л. Ящук) and Belarusian (Ю. Гурська, С. Королевич) onomasts, sporadically operated by Polish researches (P. Złotkowski), but the term *anthroponymic formula* is not fixed in English-language publications. Preference is given to the descriptive construction *typical components of a name*, the translation of which correlates with the Ukrainian equivalent to denote the components of the anthroponymic formula, or a single variants such as *anthroponymic pattern* (La Dunifa, W. Van Langendonck).

3. Content of the term

During this time, onomastics have repeatedly tried to improve the content of the term *anthroponymic formula*. For example, in his paper on onomastic terminology of 2011 the Russian

researcher V. Suprun modeled a dictionary article on anthroponymic formula, complementing the well-established definition and systematizing its specific features: "Formula anthroponymic (Latin formula "formula, rule", anthroponymic). An order of anthropolexems in a complete anthroponym, which changes historically and socially, is characteristic of a certain nation or nationality…" *(Suprun, 2011: 136)*. In contrast to other researches V. Suprun introduced in the definition the concept of complete anthroponym, which, according to the author's wording, is represented by personal name, surname and patronymic and, transforming, in each of its components retains a denotative relation, contains an encyclopedic (for real persons) information *(Suprun, 2009: 256)*. Also the researcher concretized in the definition the established opinion that the order of a lexemes can change historically and socially. For example, initially an anthroponymic formula could have appellatives (terms of kinship, titles), but with the development of the national anthroponymic system, it is transformed and fixed in documents (passports) in only two or three-component form. In turn, the components of the anthroponymic formula can be used with full (first name, surname) and relative autonomy (patronymic), in rigid (Hungarian, Chinese, Korean: first name, surname) or relative free order (Russian: official lists – surname, first name, patronymic, other texts – first name, patronymic, surname).

At the same time, the term *anthropolexeme* used by the author in the analyzed definition raises many doubts: "... An order of anthropolexems in a complete anthroponym ... " *(Suprun, 2011: 136)*. Our analysis has found that its content varies in the literature. Two interpretations are represented in the second edition of N. Podolska's dictionary of onomastic terminology. According to the first of them, "anthropolexeme is a word as a structural element of a language that performs the role of anthroponym" *(Podolskaya, 1988: 35)*. In other words, the anthroponymic lexeme is a product of the onymization process *(Nietbajtegi, 2016: 79)*. The second variant corresponds more to the definition of anthroponymic formula: «Anthropolexeme is the notation of each of the words that are part of the two or multi-component name formula» *(Podolskaya, 1988: 35)*. At the same time in the twenty-first century linguistics offered another definition of anthropolexeme. They are units of one of the numerous thematic groups of the modern lexicon. It is the group name people *(Dulichenko, 2000: 3; Krasnikova, 2004: 3; Osmak, 2014: 17)*. In this context, the arguments of researchers on the need to differentiate between the terms *anthroponym* and *anthropolexeme* deserve special attention: an anthroponym is a proper name that only names a person, but does not "attribute" any qualities to him; anthropolexeme is positioned as an anthropocentric nomination that characterizes or evaluates a person (on external / internal characteristics, behaviour, abilities, social status, etc.) *(Kundrotas, 2019: 38)*. Examples are lexemes indicating nationality (khachik, cheburek, negativ), age (girl, grandmother), gender (man, woman), etc. Undoubtedly, such a variety of interpretations requires their further unification, but now we believe that in order to avoid terminological misunderstandings in the definition of the anthroponymic formula, it is necessary to operate with the concepts of "anthroponym", "appellative" established in onomastics.

4. New terms

In Russian onomastic there are also new terms such as *formula FIO (Denisova, 2007: 3)* or *passport formula for naming a person*, which defines the full name in the passport of a citizen *(Aznabaeva, 2017: 50)*. It is specified that the passport formula is used in official communication situations or in everyday communication, if it is a completely unknown person *(Astafeva, 2017: 18)*. We believe, that it is necessary to add to this list also *documentary name* (documentary name is a name in passport *(Petrovskij, 2000)* and *official name* (name that is generally accepted in

official use, particularly first name, surname, patronymic in passport *(Podolskaya, 1988: 120)*. Their specificity is an obvious connection to business discourse and a direct or indirect indication that a name is is needed not only for nomination but also for the regulation of social and legal relations (conclusion of agreements, banking operations, issuing orders), the implementation of which requires a documentary identity document, in particular a passport. Considering the appropriateness of the use of these terms in Ukrainian reality, we draw attention to the fact that at present our country in accordance with the Law "On the Unified State Demographic Register and Documents that Prove Citizenship of Ukraine, Identity Persons or Their Special Status" has several passports, for which different anthroponymic formulae are used. For example, a three-lexeme anthroponymic formula (surname + first name + patronymic) is entered in the passport of a citizen of Ukraine, and a two-lexeme (surname + first name) is entered in the passport of a citizen of Ukraine for travel abroad. In this regard, the use of the terms *formula FIO*, *passport formula for naming a person*, *documentary name* will need to be clarified each time, which anthroponymic formula or which passport (document) is in question. Accordingly, we deal with them with certain reservations. We consider the variant *official name* to be more appropriate because "official" is interpreted by dictionaries as one that is inherent in government documents and business papers in general. This means that the term can be used for all laws and regulations, as well as for official business. In summary, we believe that official name is generally accepted in official use name, in particular in legal documents and business papers.

5. Conclusions

Adapting the identified definitions of the anthroponymic formula to the proposed study, we prefer the following formulation: anthroponymic formula is an order of anthroponyms in the official name of a person. This study is the first step towards enhancing our understanding of the anthroponymic formula's definition. Proposed definition is initial and will be further supplemented by other specific features of the anthroponymic formula.

References

1. *Astafeva, E. A. (2017). Idiolektnyj antroponimikon kak istochnik izucheniya yazykovoj lichnosti dialektonositelya [Idiolect anthroponymycon as a source of learning the linguistic personality of the dialect speaker](PhD thesis). National Research Tomsk State University, Tomsk. [in Russian]*
2. *Aznabaeva, A. F. (2017). Patronimy v pasportnoj formule imenovaniya lichnosti v rossijskoj federacii: ekzistencialnye paradoksy i norma [Passport formula for naming a person in the Russian Federation: existential paradoxes and norm]. Filologicheskie nauki. Voprosy teorii i praktiki, 5(71). Tambov: Gramota. [in Russian]*
3. *Byrne, J. (2014). Scientific and technical translation explained: a nuts and bolts guide for beginners. Hoboken: Taylor and Francis.*
4. *Denisova, T. T. (2007). Prozvisha kak vid antroponimov i ih funkcionirovanie v sovremennoj rechevoj kommunikacii : (na materiale prozvish Shumyachskogo i Ershichskogo rajonov Smolenskoj oblasti) [Nicknames as a species of anthroponyms and their functioning in modern speech communication : (on nicknames of Shumyachi and Ershichi districts of Smolensk region)] (PhD thesis). Smolensk State University, Smolensk. [in Russian]*
5. *Dulichenko, L. V. (2000). Antropoleksemy s negativnym znacheniem i ih leksikograficheskoe opisanie [Anthropolexemes with negative meaning and their lexicographic description] (PhD thesis). Universitas Tartuensis. [in Russian]*

6. Krasnikova, I. R. (2004). Pragmatika okkazionalnyh antropoleksem v sovremennom russkom yazyke [Pragmatism of occasional anthropolexems in modern Russian] (PhD thesis). Rostov State University, Rostov-on-Don. [in Russian]

7. Kundrotas, G., & Vizgirdė, L. (2019). Komparativnyj analiz russkih i anglijskih slengovyh antropoleksem [Comparative analysis of Russian and English slang anthropolexems]. Językoznawstwo, 1(13). [in Russian]

8. Nietbajtegi, K. A., Darkulova, K. N., & Ibraeva, L. B. (2016). Aktualizaciya periferijnoj semantiki slova v sfere kazahskoj antroponimii [Updating peripheral semantics in the field of Kazakh anthroponymy]. Almanah sovremennoj nauki i obrazovaniya, 3. Tambov: Gramota. [in Russian]

9. Novikova, O. N. (2011). Tendencii razvitiya britanskogo antroponimikona [Trends in British anthroponymics] (Doctoral thesis). Bashkir State University, Ufa. [in Russian]

10. Osmak, N. A. (2014). Leksicheskie edinicy povsednevnoj razgovornoj rechi: puti leksikograficheskogo opisaniya ih funkcionirovaniya [Lexical units of everyday spoken language: ways of lexicographic description of their functioning](PhD thesis). St Petersburg University, Sankt-Peterburg. [in Russian]

11. Pakhomova, S. M. (2012). Evoliutsiia antroponimnykh formul u slovianskykh movakh [Evolution of anthroponymic formulas in Slavic languages]. Uzhhorod : Vydavnytstvo Oleksandri Harkushi. [in Ukrainian]

12. Petrovskij, N. A. (2000). Slovar russkih lichnyh imen: Bolee 3000 edinic [Dictionary of Russian personal names: more than 3000]. Moskva: Russkie slovari.

13. Podolskaya, N. V. (1988). Slovar russkoj onomasticheskoj terminologii [Dictionary of Russian onomastic terminology]. Moskva: Nauka. [in Russian]

14. Sastre, M. (2014). About the concept of onomastic identity: the privileges' parchments of the city of Balaguer(1211-1352). Imago Temporis. Medium Aevum, 8.

15. Suprun, V. I. (2009). Russkij antroponim: struktura, vzaimosvyaz komponentov, denotativnye i konnotativnye aspekty onomasticheskoj semantiki [Russian anthroponym: structure, interconnection of components, denotative and connotative aspects of onomastic semantics], Etnolingvistika. Onomastika. Etimologiya. Ekaterinburg: Izdatelstvo Uralskogo universiteta. [in Russian]