

УДК 811.161.2'373.21

## CONTRASTIVE INVESTIGATION OF ENGLISH AND UKRAINIAN ANTHROPONYMIC PHRASEOLOGY

**Nataliia Yanitska**

*Ivano-Frankivsk National Technical University of Oil and Gas,  
Kalush College of Economics, Law and Information Technology,  
7 Molodizhna str., 77300, Kalush, Ivano-Frankivsk region, Ukraine,  
phone: (03472) 6-18-08*

The article deals with a contrastive analysis of English and Ukrainian anthroponymic phraseological units, aiming to identify differences and similarities between them through the linguoculturological prism. Some issues pertaining to the process of phraseologization of the personal names as well as the structural and grammatical organization of phraseological units with the anthroponymic component in English and Ukrainian are under consideration. It has been revealed that tendency to pure appellativization of personal names and a huge amount of anthrophrasemes in English in comparison with Ukrainian indicate differences in the cultural paradigms of the both languages native speakers.

*Keywords:* anthroponym, anthroponymic phraseology, phraseologization, semantic change, appellativization, cultural paradigm.

Phraseological units (further PhUs) containing anthroponymic constituents compose one of the most picturesque and colourful subsystems in every language and culture. It is to be interpreted as the reflection of the anthropocentric character of phraseology and language in general. Most of the anthroponymic PhUs have a rich cultural background, conceptualized in national memory as rigid associations-personalities. This fact convinces that modeling of such component of language system as anthroponymic phraseology is a promising area of learning language picture of the world of different nations in the framework of anthropocentric (nominative-pragmatic) paradigm at the junction of various sciences (in particular, onomastics, dialectology, cognitive linguistics, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, ethnolinguistics, etc.). From this point of view, anthroponymic PhUs as a universal phenomenon is one of the most interesting objects for the contrastive investigations at both synchronic and diachronic levels in two or more separate languages. Contrastive exploration of PhUs with anthroponymic component explicates one of the deepest layers of the picture of the world introducing universal (constant) and specific features of a native speaker and his culture, the reproducibility of which contributes to the translation of ethnospecific information between generations and the preservation of the collective cultural identity.

It is worth considering that anthroponymic set expressions become the object of different linguistic studies of native and foreign scholars. Azhnyuk B., Kravchuk A., Lalayan N., Mokienko V., Moroz O., Pasik N., Safronov O., Stepanova L. and others, first of all, give a general description of the material or cover some aspects based on a particular language. At the same time, many problems are not finally solved yet. Interlingual comparison of the anthroponymic PhUs, which forms the foundation for a clarification of a lot of theoretical and applied trends of actual linguistic explorations, e. g. the problems of

phraseography and PhUs translation, the question of the parameters of a contrastive study of the anthroponymic PhUs are still at issue. A comprehensive contrastive study of linguistic features of idioms with an anthroponymic component in English versus Ukrainian has so far not been dealt; a functional aspect of these universal language units and their national-cultural specificity has not been fully studied out. Therefore, the topicality of our article is determined by this fact. The objectives of the presented research are to trace the peculiarities of anthroponymic PhUs formation in English versus Ukrainian, to identify the main semantic modifications that occur to the anthroponymic component before the process of its complete phraseologization, to describe the structural-grammatical types and models of English and Ukrainian anthroponymic phraseology, to emphasize the differences conveying important cultural implications.

Phraseologization is a process of stabilization and consolidation ('freezing') of certain syntagmatic language complexes in speech practice. It consists of all the changes affecting a free word-combination until it becomes a frozen PhU (pure idiom), which is not every time created again but only reproduced, taken from the memory of speakers. In a complex process of certain syntagmatic segments phraseologization, we can distinguish at least three stages:

- 1) restricted word-combination;
- 2) PhU with figurative meaning, occasionally used in specific discourses and with a relatively established lexical valence;
- 3) frozen PhU with a constant figurative meaning, formed as a result of the traditional use of the phrase with precisely this meaning in the general literary language.

The crucial mechanism of phraseologization is conversational implicature that is the action of implying a meaning beyond the literal sense of what is explicitly stated, wherein meaning change occurs in discourse, i.e. in the process of creating and interpreting meanings in specific contexts. In this process, new implicatures may arise and, if they become conventionalized, a new meaning emerges. Accustomed new interpretation of a linguistic expression (free word-combination) is the phenomenon of a new PhU creation.

Free phrases, which include an anthroponym, undergo phraseologization very often in different language systems. However, in this process, not only implicature is the most important mechanism of a 'ready-made' set-expression formation.

Appellativization of personal name accompanies implicature in the process of anthroponymic word-combination phraseologization. Under the term 'appellativization' we mean the transference of a proper name into other lexical subsystems, like nomenclature/terminology, or common lexis, without affixation [5, p. 54]. Pure appellativization with a stylistic purpose is called antonomasia.

Indeed, onyms perform a function of individualization and identification, which, of course, distinguishes them from units of the appellative level [4, p. 291]. These units do not specify but denote a specific object or subject. Anthroponyms, on the contrary, lose their identification function in the process of phraseologization, denoting, instead of naming object or subject. Consider this problem in some detail.

The semantics of proper names is a linguistic issue much discussed by scholars. The most common view is that onyms do not have a lexical meaning: "...it is widely, though not universally, accepted that proper names do not have sense" [2, p. 198]. Anthroponyms are asemantic signs. The information they convey or involve, should not be confused with lexical meaning [6, p. 394-396]. Personal names are motivated only diachronically, deriving from elements of common vocabulary (for example, *Turner* < appellative 'turner', *Мельник* < appellative 'мельник'). However, anthroponyms in the

process of phraseologization acquire their constant semantic content. On the top of that, being an asemantic sign, in the structure of PhU anthroponym becomes a semantic core of this unit, its cognitive center, which organizes specific mythological, axiological knowledge and plays a decisive role in motivation plan of phraseological meaning.

After undergoing phraseologization, the anthroponyms realize pragmatic semes of their semantic structure and as a result become expressive synonyms of appellatives. Therefore, in English, personal name *Sherlock Holmes* is a substitution of the common noun 'detective' (it is worth to say that this anthroponymic PhU of literature origin became interlanguage), *Mrs. Grundy* have acquired a constant meaning 'the tyranny of conventional propriety', *Jack Ketch* is 'a hanger', *Johnny Canuck* is an informal name for a Canadian, or is used as a personification of Canada, *Tommy Atkins* is 'an English soldier', *Tom Thumb* is 'a small man, a Lilliputian', *Tom Tiller* is 'a hen-pecked husband'. Similarly in Ukrainian: *Макар Касян* is 'a glutton', *Акакій Акакійович* is 'a humiliated person' (Akakii is the main character of the story by Gogol M. 'The Overcoat'; he is a poor despised by everybody official Bashmachkin, whose life is focused on tailoring a new coat), *Солоха* is used now in the structure of PhU as a common noun with acquired meaning 'cuckoo', *Хома* is used in different discourses with the meaning 'an one-track mind person', *Іван* is an expressive synonym of a common noun 'a worker', *Хвеська* is a propriat substitutor of a phrase 'a gossip woman', *Чалий* – 'an insidious, treacherous man', *Мацько* is 'a hesitant man'. Some of these partially appellativized names are characterized by the ability to be equally used both as onyms and appellatives. According to Azhnyuk B. [3, p. 134], co-existence of propriat and appellative functions is a prerequisite for the existence of semantic and structural phraseological model, which is a basis for similar units creation.

The appellativization of anthroponyms in the process of phraseologization can be more or less completed. Completed appellativization is manifested orthographically: if propriat lexeme is being written with a lower-case initial letter, it belongs to the category of the common nouns. When appellativization is not yet completed, or it is only partial, then there is a confusion in the writing of anthroponyms and derivatives from it. This phenomenon can be observed in Ukrainian, e.g., від *Адама*, but *їудине плем'я*; *муки Тантала*, but *танталові муки*. The use of a lower-case or upper-case initial letter may vary even in the same dictionary.

It is worth to admit that there is a reversed process in phraseology, which is called onymization of common nouns. In terms of stylistic, it is another type of antonomasia: appellatives lose their semantics and turn into the individualizing proper names. Consequently, the proper name establishes a homonymic relation with the original common name: *May and December* (in this case, metaphorical antonomasia is realized in antithetical binomial), *Lady Luck*, *Miss Thing* etc.

There are some additional transformational mechanisms of phraseologization, which lead to semantic changes of proper name and result in conceptual changes. These mechanisms can be divided into several types:

- 1) periphrasis: *cousin Betty*, *Адамові реберце*, *Адамові діти*, *Адамові слізки*, *їудине плем'я*;
- 2) euphemism: *old Harry*, *Гнат безп'ятий* (used as a mild substitutions for a taboo word 'devil'), *іти до Омелька*, *Іванова хата*;
- 3) hyperbole: *before you could say Jack Robinson*, *not to know somebody from Adam*, *від Адама*, *за царя Гороха* (*Панька*, *Тимка*, *Хмеля*);
- 4) epithet (associated): *a plane Jane*, *a simple Simon*, *язиката Хвеська*;
- 5) irony: *Buckley's chance*, *a Jack-of-all-trades*, *Дем'янова юшка*;

6) simile: *(as) pleased as Punch, (as) poor as Lazarus, як Тарас Бульба з Андрієм, як Адам і Єва в раю, як баба Палажка і баба Параска, вискочити як Кузьма з конопель, товктися як Марко (рідше Сивко) по пеклу, як Гриць до суніць, як пишної Явдохи ковток, заманулось як Веклі кисличок;*

7) metaphor: *Naboth's vineyard, Jacob's ladder, Davy Jones's locker;*

8) personification: *the jolly Roger, the real McCoy, Jack Frost, old Tom, Mary-janes, швидка Настя;*

9) reification: *Nessus' shirt;*

10) allegory: *Balaam's ass, Валаамова ослиця;*

11) metonymy: *in Abraham's bosom;*

12) repetition:

- phonemic repetition (assonance): *a plain Jane, a Long Tom;*

- phonemic repetition (alliteration): *a Billy Bunter, a Richard Roe, a simple Simon, nice Nelly;*

- rhyme: *even Steven, Христя в намисті, тьотя Мотя, як Гриць до суніць;*

- morphemic repetition: *out-Herod Herod;*

- lexical repetition: *ні сюди Микита ні туди Микита;*

- syntactic repetition:

binomials: *David and Goliath, Darby and Joan, Лада і Ладю, Максим і Клим;*

trinomials: *Brown, Jones and Robinson; any Tom, Dick or Harry.*

It should be mentioned that the crucial and additional transformational processes that accompany the proper name phraseologization are the same in both languages. However, pure appellativization (antonomasia) without additional lingual means is more typical of the English language. In Ukrainian, this phenomenon is rather rare. Instead, appellativization of the anthroponym in the structure of idiomatic simile is very productive in Ukrainian.

Structural-grammatical organization of anthroponymic phraseology is also important for revealing the differences and similarities of the languages under consideration. That is why we took into account morphological expression of the phraseological main component, syntagmatic construction of PhUs, the main component position in relation to the dependent one. Here we identified the following paradigmatic structural-grammatical groups, which are the same in English and in Ukrainian with minor differences in syntactic relations between the components of PhUs:

#### 1. Substantival phraseologisms

Substantival PhUs denote first a person, sometimes other living beings or objects. The main component of the substantival PUs is a noun. Dominating role of nouns in the structure of PUs is ontology-based, i.e. they serve for objects of subjective reality nomination, for instance, *Jack Ketch, man Friday, Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, Daniel in the lion's den, nice Nelly, old Harry, old Tom, Томту Atkins, Христя в намисті, Іванова хата, Гнат безп'ятій, Робінзон на безлюдному острові.*

Substantival set expressions are built according to different structures.

The first structural-grammatical type is represented by the model Det + Anthroponym: *a Jack Adams, a Jimmy Woodser, a Jimmy Woodser, a Peter Funk, a Richard Roe.* This structural type is not typical of Ukrainian phraseology, as we mentioned earlier. Instead, we found a specific PhU structural model consisting of a name and a middle name (*Акакій Акакійович*) in Ukrainian literature discourse.

The second type is the sequence (Det) + title + Anthroponym: *a Colonel Blimp, Mr. Right (Miss Right), sister Ann, Uncle Sam*. This structural type is less productive in Ukrainian phraseology: *тьоття Моття*.

The third structural-grammatical type is the sequence including (Det), Adj and Anthroponym in various combinations: *a proper Charlie, clever Dick, little Jack Horner, nice Nelly, square John*. This model is not productive in Ukrainian: *швидка Настя, язиката Хвеська*. The words order in Ukrainian PhUs of this type can be different: *Хома невірний*. Specific forms of implementation of this model are different in the contrasting languages. In English, there is no coordination of an adjective with a noun. Unlike English, in Ukrainian, there is a coordination in number, case, and gender: *язиката Хвеська* (coordination of the noun and the adjective in the nominative case, the feminine gender, and the singular). This model has an attributive type of syntactic relations with the coordination in an adjectival-nominal group in Ukrainian, the English language is characterized by adjectival-nominal attributive type with contiguity connection.

The fourth type represents the more complex phraseological model: (Det) + Anthroponym's + N. It is a specific subgroup in English. There is a combination of a noun (personal name) in a possessive case and another noun (appellative): *Achilles' heel, Adam's ale, Adam's apple, an Aladdin's cave, an Aladdin's lamp, a Benjamin's portion, Cassandra's warnings, a Frankenstein's monster, Hobson's choice, Jacob's ladder, a Job's comforter, Job's news, Naboth's vineyard, Murphy's law, Morton's fork, Tom Tiddler's ground, Tom Drum's entertainment*. Proper name in a possessive case is a dependent component in the given examples.

The fifth type is similar to the previous one: (Det) + Anthroponym (in a possessive case) + N (*a Judas kiss, Promethean fire, a Potemkin village*). This type is one of the most productive in Ukrainian anthroponymic phraseology. However, in Ukrainian this type is formed by sequences involving derivative of a proper noun (possessive Adj) + N: *Адамові реберце, Адамові діти, Адамові слізки, Валаамова ослиця, Іванова хата, Каїнова душа, Каїнове діло, сізіфова праця, юдині (їудині) срібняки*.

There is a semantically synonymous variety of this type of idiomatic substantival structure in Ukrainian: N + Anthroponym in genitive case: *поцілунок Юди, діти Адама*. This Ukrainian phraseological model is similar to English N1 + preposition + N2 (N1 + of + Anthroponym).

It is necessary to highlight a participial-nominal group of the attributive type with contiguity in English: Det + P (I, II) + Anthroponym: *a peeping Tom*. This model is not productive in Ukrainian since active participles in the Ukrainian language are beyond the norm of literary usage. Compare *a doubting Thomas* (Det + P + Anthroponym) in English and its equivalent *Хома невірний* (Anthroponym + Adj) in Ukrainian.

N1 + preposition + N2 (the name can occur in position 1 or position 2). This model is typical of two languages. In this subclass, the combination of a noun with a noun (or a noun phrase) is fulfilled by prepositional subordination: *Alice in Wonderland, Hamlet without the Prince, a labour of Sisyphus, the mark of Cain, the thread of Ariadne*. Compare in Ukrainian: *Робінзон на безлюдному острові, Христия в намисті*.

The elements in the English and Ukrainian substantival PhUs can be combined by complex connection (by means of conjunction *and*): Anthroponym + *and* + Anthroponym. Characteristic morphological features of double expressions or irreversible binomials are specified by denotation to the same, close or even opposite notions: *David and Goliath, David and Jonathan, Damon and Pythias, Darby and Joan, Jekyll and Hyde, May and December*. In Ukrainian, *баба Палажка і баба Палажка, Максим і Клим, Лада і Ладо*.

## 2. Verbal phraseologisms

Verbal PhUs are the units with a verb as the main component denoting an action/a state, e.g. *astonish the Browns, break Priscian's head, dine with Duke Humphrey, rob Peter to pay Paul, Химині кури розводити, висіти дамокловим мечем.*

These subordinate verbal stable phrases express objective or objective-adverbial relations. Verbal PhUs may express objective relations in different structures. Since in Ukrainian, the main method of expressing objective connection is government, in English – contiguity, the objective-postpositive type of syntactic relations with government in Ukrainian corresponds to the objective-postpositive type with contiguity in English.

Anthroponym in the structure of verbal PhU is an object (or one of the components of an object) which can be direct and indirect according to the verb category of transitivity vs. intransitivity. The model under consideration can be expanded by prepositional extension, by an adjective or an adverb. The most frequently used prepositions in English anthroponymic verbal PhUs are *from, to, for*, in Ukrainian – *до*:

V + Direct Object (Anthroponym): *do a Thatcher, out-Herod Herod, take the Mickey (out of), remember poor Jack, співають (заводити/завести) Лазаря, скорчить Лазаря;*

V + Direct Object (Anthroponym's + N): *break Priscian's head, open (a) Pandora's box;*

V + Indirect Object (Anthroponym): *dine with Duke Humphrey, appeal to Caesar, keep up with the Joneses, іти до Омелька;*

V + Direct Object (Anthroponym or Anthroponymic phrase (Possessive Adj in Ukrainian) + N): *bend the bow of Ulysses, have the Midas touch, розводити Химині кури, розрубувати гордіїв вузол;*

V + Direct Object (Anthroponym) + V + Indirect Object (Anthroponym): *rob Peter to pay Paul.*

## 3. Adverbial phraseologisms

Adverbial PhUs function as adverbial modifiers and express characteristics of an action and the degree of qualitative characteristic of an object. The expressions with the meaning of time, manner, place begin with prepositions: *since Adam was a boy, according to Hoyle, in Abraham's bosom, on one's Jack, before one/you can say Jack Robinson; за царя Панька, як була земля тонка; за царя Гороха (Панька, Тимка, Хмеля), по Марусин поясок, від Адама.*

The most productive adverbial phraseologisms in both languages are stereotyped similes, denoting the degree of a certain quality regarding the object, subject, action, or state. These PhUs are realized in speech practice when objects, subjects, actions, or states are being contrasted on the basis of their similarity or difference. The linking words connecting the two contrasting objects, subjects, actions, or states play an important role in adverbial PhUs creation. These linking words are usually represented by the functional lexemes *like* and *as* in English and *як, ніби, наче, неначе, немовби* in Ukrainian.

Adverbial phrasemes-similes in English and Ukrainian anthroponymic phraseology are formed as shown in following patterns:

(as) Adj + as + Anthroponym (initial linking word *as* is optional in most cases):  
(as) *old as Methuselah, old as Adam;*

V + *like* (*як, ніби, наче, немов, немовби* in Ukrainian) + Anthroponym (or noun phrase): *feel like Daniel in the lion's den, товктися як (мов, ніби) Марко (Сивко) у пеклі, вискочити як Пилип з конопель, вискочити як Кузьма з маку, вистрибнути як Марко з пасльону, як сидорову козу (бити, лупцювати), як Марко (Хома) на вовні*

(заробити, підробити), як Мартин мила (набратися, наїстися, налігатися), як Мартин до мила (допастися, припасти), як Адам і Єва в раю, як Тарас Бульба з Андрієм (стояти, протистояти).

#### 4. Interjectional (exclamatory) phraseologisms

Interjectional PhUs are formula phrases, e.g., *Lord Harry!*; *let George do it*; *I'm all right, Jack*; *hey, Rube!*; *for Pete's sake*; *by George!*; *крути, Гаврило!*; *з Богом, Парасю!* These expressions are pragmatically specialised units often structured as imperative sentences, curses or optations.

The research on structural-grammatical features of anthroponymic PhUs in English and Ukrainian allowed to find out common features present in the analyzed languages and the specific features distinguishing them from each other. Thus, the analysis of anthroponymic PhUs in English and Ukrainian in structural-grammatical aspect shows a significant similarity of the structural-grammatical organization of English and Ukrainian PhUs. The main structural-grammatical types of PhUs are substantival (78% in English, 49% in Ukrainian), adverbial (12% in English, 25% in Ukrainian), verbal (10% in English, 23% in Ukrainian), interjectional (6% in English, 3% in Ukrainian). The research demonstrated that the most productive in both languages are substantival PhUs.

Summing up the brief semantic and structural-grammatical survey of anthroponymic PhUs in English and Ukrainian, it is worth to admit that the contrastive research on these aspects did not reveal any significant differences. However, there is one feature that indicates the difference between the above-mentioned phraseosystems in both languages. And this difference is not of linguistic origin, it is cognitive. It is about the number of units.

English is rich in anthroponymic PhUs. There are much fewer Ukrainian idioms with anthroponymic components, and these units have a much narrower spectrum of semes and connotations of its elements. The main factor here is cross-cultural, worldview difference. For West-European and American axiological system, a person traditionally is an individuality with his/her own name. The westerners are more open-minded and forthright. They are people with their own opinions, not dependent on the public, religious imposition or fate. They create their own destiny. Furthermore, the individual is given preference over family. Consequently, a person has more freedom and power to take decisions on his/her own, unlike those in the east [1]. That is why the British anthroponyms as the element of western linguacultural system demonstrate productive transition into the category of common nouns: a person is important; his/her own name is significant (sometimes crucial) as the expression of his/her individuality, feelings, the way of life, etc.

Ukraine is situated between Asian and European regions. Therefore, its culture is a spatiotemporal combination of Eastern and Western cultural systems. The relationships always used to be family centric in Ukrainian culture. The self was not given preference over family and hence decisions on priority and relevance of relationships were not of the individual [1].

As follows, the cultural paradigms of Ukrainian and English speaking worlds determine the specific content of the language lexical system and phraseological fund. And even such a factor as a number of language units reflects the peculiarities of national mentality and world vision, despite the fact that the semantic processes of phrasemes creation and the structural-grammatical organization of the units under consideration are almost identical.

The presented investigation confirms that one of the best methods to analyze linguistic and cultural peculiarities of a certain selected language area is to compare it to the

same area in different languages. This is especially true for those units that most clearly reflect the national cultural characteristics and the way of formation and existence of man's knowledge about the world.

1. *Dhar N.* Top 10 Differences between Eastern and Western Cultures / Nabanita Dhar [Electronic resource]. Access mode : <http://topyaps.com/top-10-differences-between-eastern-and-western-cultures> (last accessed 10 April 2017).
2. *Lyons J.* Semantics / Lyons John. Cambridge, 1977.
3. *Ажнюк Б. М.* Англійська фразеологія в культурно-етичному висвітленні / Б. М. Ажнюк. – Київ, 1989.
4. *Ковалик І. І.* Про ономатизацію, трансономатизацію і деонматизацію / Іван Ковалик // Питання українського і слов'янського мовознавства. Вибрані праці / упоряд. З. Терлак. – Львів; Івано-Франківськ, 2008. – Ч. 2. – С. 280-282.
5. *Подольская Н. В.* Словарь русской ономастической терминологии / Н. В. Подольская. – Москва, 1988.
6. *Толстой Н. И.* Ещё раз о семантике имени собственного / Н. И. Толстой // Толстой Н. И. Избр. тр. : в 2 т. – Москва, 1997. – Т. 1. – С. 394-396.

#### **Illustrative material**

1. *Brewer E.* Cobham Dictionary of Phrase and Fable / E. Brewer [Electronic resource]. Access mode : <http://www.bartleby.com/81/> (last accessed 12 April 2017).
2. Cambridge Dictionary [Electronic resource]. Access mode : <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/> (last accessed 15 April 2017).
3. Cambridge International Dictionary of Idioms / Sinclair John (ed.). Cambridge, 1995.
4. Chambers English Dictionary of Idioms / Keber Janez. Edinburgh, 2003.
5. Collins COBUILD Dictionary of Idioms. London : Harper Collins Publishers [Electronic resource]. Access mode : <http://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english> (last accessed 30 April 2017).
6. Merriam-Webster Dictionary [Electronic resource]. Access mode: <http://www.merriam-webster.com/> (last accessed 27 April 2017).
7. Oxford Idioms Dictionary for Learners of English / Brown Keith et al. (eds.). Oxford, 2001.
8. Словник фразеологізмів української мови / В. М. Білоноженко, І. С. Гнатюк [та ін.]. – Київ, 2003.
9. *Удовиченко Г. М.* Фразеологічний словник української мови : У 2 т. – Київ, 1984.
10. *Ужченко В. Д.* Фразеологічний словник української мови / В. Д. Ужченко, Д. В. Ужченко. – Київ, 1998.

*Стаття надійшла до редколегії 20. 04. 2017*  
*доопрацьована 30. 05. 2017*  
*прийнята до друку 15. 08. 2017*



---

**ПОРІВНЯЛЬНЕ ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ АНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ Й УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ АНТРОПОНІМНОЇ ФРАЗЕОЛОГІЇ****Наталія Яніцька**

*Івано-Франківський національний технічний університет нафти і газу  
Калуський коледж економіки, права та інформаційних технологій  
вул. Молодіжна, 7, 77300, Калуш, Івано-Франківська обл., Україна,  
тел. (03472) 6-18-08*

Здійснено порівняльний аналіз англійської й української антропонімної фразеології, метою якого є виявлення відмінностей між цими лінгвокультурними субсистемами.

Ідіоми з іменами людей є великою групою фразеологічного фонду й англійської, і української мов. Саме вони чи не найяскравіше відображають антропоцентричний характер мови й засвідчують потребу вивчення різних мовних одиниць не лише в структурно-системному, але й в антропологічному вимірі. Внутрішній образ, прихований у значенні чи використанні фраземи, можна експлікувати лише на фоні національної культури, у контексті якої стійка одиниця виникла. Це пояснюється тим, що номінатором й інтерпретатором мовних знаків завжди є носії конкретних етнодиференційних модальних систем.

У запропонованому дослідженні висвітлено проблеми фразеологізації імен, а також особливості структурно-граматичної організації фразеологічних одиниць із антропонімним компонентом в англійській і українській мовах. З'ясовано, що основні й додаткові механізми трансформаційних процесів, що супроводжують фразеологізацію власних імен, однакові в обох мовах. Проте апелятивізація без додаткових лінгвальних засобів не продуктивна в українській фразеології. Тенденція до чистої апелятивізації власних назв і значна кількість антропонімних фразем в англійській мові порівняно з українською вказують на відмінності в культурних парадигмах носіїв досліджуваних мов. Фразеологія англійської мови відображає цінності західної культури: схильність до персоналізації, превалювання особистості, індивідуальності над спільнотою (сім'єю, народом, етносом, нацією). Українська ж антропofразеологія, що є надбанням народу, у культурі якого перетинаються цінності західного й східного світів, відображає превалювання спільноти над особистістю.

*Ключові слова:* антропонім, антропонімна фразеологія, фразеологізація, семантична зміна, культурна парадигма.