



OLENA KRYZHKO

Berdiansko valstybinis pedagoginis universitetas, Ukraina  
Berdyansk State Pedagogical University, Ukraine

# UKRAINOS FOLKLORO NACIONALINIŲ IR KULTŪRINIŲ ZOOMORFINIŲ VAIZDINIŲ REALIZAVIMO SPECIFIKA

National and Cultural Specifics of Realization  
of Zoomorphic Images in Ukrainian Folklore Genres

## SUMMARY

The article is devoted to the specifics of national and cultural symbolism of zoomorphic images in Ukrainian folk genres. The author establishes the national-specific features of the Ukrainian zoomorphic linguistic picture of the world. A fragment of the knowledge of Ukrainians about the animal world, which was formed on the basis of rethought associative and estimated meanings of these nomens, is characterized. The author emphasizes that some properties of objects of reality reflected in the linguistic picture of the world have not been lost. They remain undeniably significant, while Zoosemism, the name of the main category, takes over the basic, prototypical characteristics of the animal species belonging to this group (both objectively existing and belonging to the cultural tradition), which are recorded in the memory of the Ukrainian mother tongue. The study notes that the use of zoomorphic images in Ukrainian folk genres reflects a person's attitude to the world through his life experience, assessment of social phenomena, compliance with norms and principles of morality.

## SANTRAUKA

Straipsnyje analizuojama nacionalinių ir kultūrinių Ukrainos folkloro zoomorfinių vaizdinių simbolių realizavimo specifika. Atskleisti nacionaliniai Ukrainos zoomorfino lingvistinio pasaulio paveikslo bruožai. Straipsnyje pateikiamas ukrainiečių žinių apie gyvūnų pasaulį fragmentas, kurį formavo permąstytos ir įvertintos šių nomenų reikšmės. Pabrėžiama, kad tam tikri kalbiniame pasaulio paveiksle atsispindintys tikrovės objektų požymiai nėra prarandami ir išlieka reikšmingi. Zoosemizmas, pagrindinės kategorijos pavadinimas, perima šiai grupei priklausančių gyvūnų rūšių pagrindines, prototipines savybes (tiek objek-

RAKTAŽODŽIAI: hiperonimai, hiponimai, zoomorfiniai vaizdai, zoosemizmai, metafora, simboliai, Ukrainos folkloras.  
KEY WORDS: hyperonyms, hyponyms, zoomorphic images, zoosemisms, metaphor, symbols, Ukrainian folklore genre.

tyviai egzistuojančias, tiek priskiriamas kultūrinei tradicijai), kurios įrašytos ukrainiečių gimtosios kalbos atmintyje. Zoomorfinių vaizdinių naudojimas ukrainiečių folkloro žanruose atspindi žmogaus požiūrį į jį supantį pasaulį per įgytą gyvenimo patirtį, socialinių reiškinių vertinimą pagal moralės normas ir principus.

## INTRODUCTION

In various folk genres the role of animals, as well as animal (zoomorphic or theriomorphic) components in general is extremely important, especially in the aspect of animals in the early stages of human development, when they were not separated from the human realm (Makovskii 1996). This separation was neither in its synchronic state (animals were included in the social hierarchy, the location of sacred animals at the top of the hierarchical gradation), nor in the diachronic (the idea of the origin of a particular group of animals or animal ancestors), nor in the ontological dimension (animal awareness as a special human incarnation) (ibid).

The topicality of the proposed investigation deals with the need to establish the specifics of the implementation of national and cultural symbols of zoomorphic images in Ukrainian folklore genres. The article aims to analyse the functional rethinking of zoomorphic images and to establish the features of hypero-hyponymic relations between them in Ukrainian folklore genres. The analysis focuses on the description of the national concepts of zoonyms, their implementation in Ukrainian folklore genres, also, the analysis of the concept of zoosemism with its subsequent semantization according to the the following scheme: hyperonyms – hyponyms – cohyponyms.

## FUNCTIONAL RETHINKING OF ZOOMORPHIC IMAGES IN UKRAINIAN FOLKLORE GENRES

In any art system, in particular in such a universal one as folklore, images-symbols occupy a prominent place (Pokhlebkina 1995). However, V. Kononenko says that in the poetics of folklore „they are especially important also because they often play the role of figurative codes of the mentality of the people, indicators of its values, landmarks, etc.“ (Kononenko 1991: 33).

It is known that the mechanism of emergence of artistic symbols is a long and multi-stage process (Kostomarov 1994). Its motivation may be described by the R. Zorivchak's words:

„many objects have a certain property, which is perceived as their constant and special feature. Due to this, the relationships between the object and the sign sometimes changes so much that the object becomes a symbol of the property expressed by its sign“ (Zorivchak 1989: 79).

Subsequently, under the influence of various anthropological, geopolitical, culturological processes (Vasko et al. 2020), additional, secondary, new semantic aspects and nuances are layered on this motivational value of the formed image-symbol, which expands its mythopoetic spectrum. The basis of the my-

thologized plots, which we find in the zoosemisms of the Ukrainian language, is primarily national folklore. The folk semantics can be interpreted only based on its mythological sources (Kryzhko 2019; Tyshchenko et al. 2021). Socio-domestic plots, compressed in zoosemisms, arose because of interpretation of practical experience of human-animal contacts, which took place in objective reality and were recorded in various folklore genres, as well as human ideas about different actions of animals, their physical strength, and magical properties.

In particular, Ukrainian proverbs *Вовка за вухо не втримаєш* (lit. *You can't hold a wolf by the ear*) (Ukrainian proverbs, sayings and so on 1993: № 5261), *вниїмати вовка за вухо* (lit. *to catch a wolf by the ear*) (means 'to show courage, dexterity' (Phraseological dictionary of the Ukrainian language 1993: Vol. 1, 139) testify that the original image of the *вовка* (lit. *wolf*) here looks fantastic rather than real (the wolf runs away, but the person aspires to catch it). These proverbs express the same common idea: it is as impossible to carry out a plan as it is impossible to catch (by the ear, leg or tail) a running wolf (no doubt), these proverbs do not reflect the real practice of human contact with wolves, but their ideas that are connected with the folklore-poetic image of the wolf, especially with the archaic cult of the wolf, the origins of which date back to the pre-Indo-European period (Zhuikova 2000: 195).

In Christianity, the wolf is evil, devil, cruel, cunning. Witches and sorcerers ride on a wolf (Cooper 1995: 43). An important component of *the wolf* cult was

the idea that sacred knowledge was revealed to him (Cooper 1995: 196). V. Ivanov notes that one of the oldest Indo-European names of the wolf *\*weid-n(o)* is formed from the root *\*weid* with the meaning 'to know', which is reflected in some Slavic nominations in the Western Ukrainian name *віщун* (lit. soothsayers) for the werewolf (Ivanov 1975: 400–401). There is indirect evidence that the Slavs believed that the wolf did not die by itself: *Як вовку здихать, так сему бувать. Як вовку не здихать, так мені не бувать* (lit. *As a wolf sighs, so it happens. As a wolf does not breathe, so I do not happen*) („it will never happen“) (Ukrainian proverbs, sayings and so on 1993: № 5485). But if such a rare event as the death of a wolf ever happens, it will have an extraordinary impact on human life. The following proverb testifies it: *Певне, вовк у лісі здох!* (lit. *Maybe, a wolf has died in the woods!*) (see I. Franko's commentary on it: „They speak when they hear some unexpected news“) (Franko 1901–1909 (1): 241).

It is interesting that the relics of the wolf cult largely contradict the stereotype of the wolf, which is formed in Ukrainian native speakers by an array of folklore data material, in particular in Ukrainian fairy tales about animals (Ukrainian fairy tales about animals 2005). The wolf is mostly not wise, but stupid: he is poorly oriented in the situation, it is easy to deceive and defeat, despite his physical strength, such as in the fairy tale *„Про вовчика-братика і лисичку-сестричку“* (lit. *„About a wolf-brother and a fox-sister“*). At the same time, the norms of domestic behaviour until recently were focused on a fundamentally

different image of the wolf, i. e. a strong, powerful forest owner, an object of worship and reverence (sometimes when meeting a wolf was attributed to kneel before him) (Nechui-Levytskii 1992).

Thus, the language image of the wolf reflected in the above-mentioned Ukrainian proverbs and the stereotype of the wolf formed by folklore and other culturally significant sources are to some extent contradictory. This is because M. Zhuikova believes that

„the image of the wolf over the centuries has undergone changes in popular consciousness under the influence of various factors, one of the most important of which is that in the spiritual world of Ukrainians in the past the image of the wolf was determined by the belief in the exceptional power and sacred knowledge of this animal, which is able to have a magical effect on humans. It is this belief that contributed to the emergence of signs that interpret the meeting with the wolf as an event favourable to human, but they, in turn, are entrenched in stable statements“ (Zhuikova 2000: 196).

The most common were also the ideas of most ethnic groups about the human soul in the form of various animals and birds, which are fixed and preserved in numerous folklore data materials. Compare the origins of the Christian image of the dove as a symbol of love, peace, happy couple, etc. and the image of the dove as a harbinger of death in other Eastern traditions.

In the Ukrainian traditional mythopoetic worldview, the dove is „a symbol of love, creation, purity, purification, as well as marriage and ritual ceremonies“ (Voitovych 2002: 402). Obviously, the

primary symbolism of this ornithological image in Ukrainian folklore poetics was developed due to the metaphorical transfer of the signs of tenderness, attractiveness, fidelity, inherent in the bird, to human. „Little Russians say about lovers that they love like a pair of pigeons“ (Kostomarov 1994: 88): *Понід садом, понід вуличкою, / Сидів голуб із голубочкою; / А в голуба золота голова, / А в голубки позолочувана, / Шовком пристроювана* (lit. *Under the garden, under the street, / He and she doves were sitting; / The he dove has the golden head, / The she dove has the gilded head, / Stitched with silk*) (Folk songs in Ivan Manzhura's records 1974: 43).

*Ворон* (lit. a crow), i.e. an unclean, sinister bird, is considered to be the harbinger of death in Ukrainian mythopoetics. Obviously, in determining its motivational basis one should take into account the metonymic connection *black colour – death, misfortune, grief*, as well as the established associations with the unpleasant ominous voice of a bird whose croaking portends disaster. These generalized and metaphorized artistic factors became a good basis for deriving the core meaning of the symbol of *ворон* (lit. a crow), i.e. a wicked harbinger of trouble, death, „inseparable, formidable guardian of the slain“ (Kostomarov 1994: 100). In orders, songs, ballads, *чорний ворон* (lit. *the black crow*) plays the role of a priest who performs rituals: *Обізвався в полі ворон: / ... Я вас буду доглядати – / Живцем очі видирати* (lit. *He called in the field of crows: / ... I will take care of you – / To tear out your eyes alive*) (Ballads: Folk art 1987: 295).

In Ukrainian folklore the image of saying goodbye to life is sometimes associated with the symbolism of *лебедя* (lit. *a swan*). The mythopoetic connection of this zoosemism-ornithological image with the burial ritual is also proved by J. E. Cirlot, because „the essential symbols of the mystical path to the afterlife (except the death ship) are *the swan* and the harp“ (Cirlot 1994: 285–286) (hence the derivative symbolism of the secondary image of *the swan song*, i.e. farewell on the verge of death).

It should be noted that the scope of semantic action of this zoosemism is quite wide: it is used to denote the sun, metaphorically depicting a beautiful woman who in fairy tales acts as a „swan-bird, red maiden“ In Ukrainian songs, the meaning of „гарна молода дівчина“ (lit. „beautiful young girl“) is mostly actualized, the positive emotional colour of which at the formal-textual level is often expressed by the traditional formula of semantic-syntactic parallelism: *Що сі в полі забіліло – / Ой чи гуси, чи лебеді? / Тепер гуси не літають, / А лебеді не плавають, – і / Татарове полон женуть; / Один полон з жіночками / Другий полон з дівочками* (lit. *What has turned white in the field – / Oh, geese or swans? / Now geese do not fly, / And swans do not swim, – and / Tatar captivity is driven away; / One captivity with women / The second captivity with girls*) (Ballads: Folk art 1987: 236).

Obviously, there is reason to believe that the images of flying animals – birds can be associated with the idea of *upper* and *lower* – one of the main semantic oppositions of popular ideas about the world. The upper part is endowed with

symbolic the following signs: „good“, „prosperous“, „fruitful“, „rich“, „vital“, etc., and the lower part – with the following signs: „bad“, „not good“, „deadly“, „poor“, etc. In wedding songs, there is a motif of the division of animals in the upper, middle, and lower parts of the magic tree: birds relate to the crown (quite often there is an eagle at the upper part). Hoofs (horses, bulls, cows, deer, moose, antelopes, sheep, goats, etc.) are correlated with the middle part. Snakes, frogs, mice, fish, beavers, sometimes bears or chthonic-type monsters are associated with the lower part of the tree (its roots). Similar descriptions have existed in the minds of many ethnic groups, including Ukrainians (Tyshchenko 2000).

The horizontal scheme of a magic tree agrees, as a rule, with motives of an estimation of animals. However, the sources of the cultural connotation of the motives for assessing the location of animals may vary. Therefore, the traditional perception of animals, associated with a positive or negative attitude towards them in accordance with their position on the World Tree, is not always true. For example, among the birds belonging to the upper part of the tree, there are positive (eagle, falcon) and negative (magpie, crow). We agree with V. Voityvych's statement that „first of all the animal world of ancient Ukrainians is divided into „pure“ and „unclean“, which respectively embody positive or negative features in view of the culture of that time“ (Voityvych 2002: 515). It should be noted that these worldviews are basic, but the language retains them up to this day.

For example, *the falcon* (pure bird) is a „young handsome man“, i. e. it is about mastering the image of this bird as a symbol of male beauty: *Їхав Павлечко через густий лісок, / Соколю ясний, паничу красний...* (lit. *Pavlechko rode through the thick forest, / The falcon is clear, the lady is red...*) (Folk songs in Ivan Manzhura's records 1974: 59). The mythopoetic symbolism of this bird as a messenger of love is reflected in Ukrainian songs and ballads. A typical plot situation is represented when the falcons are entrusted with the artistic functions of transmitting letters, news to loved ones, informing lovers about each other and so on. Let's compare, for example, the following adequate illustrations in terms of ornithological symbolism: *Ой прилетів сокіл та й сів на вікні / Добри вечір, дівко, приніс тобі вість: / Уже твій миленький на подвір'ї єсть* (lit. *Oh, the falcon flew in and sat on the window / Good evening, girl, I brought you news: / Your little one is already in the yard*) (Ballads: Folk art 1987: 222).

Meanwhile, as a *magpie* is an unclean bird, it is symbolized with the image of a „talkative woman“ and as one that bites a corpse: ... *Зоставайся, мила, / Зоставайсь здорова. / Сороки-ворони / Тіло потерзали, / Вовчики сіренькі / Кості розтаскали* (lit. ...*Stay, darling, / Stay healthy. / Magpie-crows / The body was shaken, / Gray wolves / The bones were torn apart*) (Folk songs in Ivan Manzhura's records 1974: 143).

Metaphorical rethinking reflects any feature of the character of the animal, and it is the result of centuries of human observation of them. But these features are seen by a certain person in a certain

situation, in a certain era, i. e. they are very subjective. Characterizing someone by the name of an animal, a person concentrates only one quality in the name, making the animal a symbol of this quality, while scholars understand the symbol as „the discovery of some social attitude to something / someone whose essence can be represented as an idea, a concentrated socio-cultural content“ (Rubtsov 1991: 41). The emotional-associative specificity of language, according to scholars (Shakhovskii, Sorokin, Tomasheva 1998), is especially evident in evaluative zoosemisms. Metaphors based on animal-human and human-animal models have clear and constant evaluative connotations (Wolf 2002: 59).

In Slavic culture, according to O. Lysytska, „the meaning of the words reptile, viper, snake has a negative colour ... Used to conceptualize the idea of evil, theft, these names have become metaphorical symbols“ (Lysytska 2001: 12). The idea of the serpent as the creation of evil was influenced by the biblical story of the temptation of the devil, who took the form of a serpent, Adam and Eve, so now the evil man, a man capable of thieves, is called a viper and so on. The token reptile on a semantic level is identified with the noun snake, because both units are used to denote an evil man but differ in stylistic sense.

Therefore, the given examples from folklore data materials give grounds for reconstruction of the corresponding myths with participation of animals or, at least, partial motives in which metaphorically reinterpreted zoosemisms are fixed. These motives are the basis for

many metaphorical names in the modern Ukrainian language, which are reinterpreted by native speakers, denoting cer-

tain human qualities, a certain type of character, behaviour and arouse considerable interest among scholars.

## HYPER-HYPONYMIC RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN ZOOMORPHIC IMAGES IN UKRAINIAN FAIRY TALES ABOUT ANIMALS

The origin of the fairy tale from the myth is recognized by almost all scholars (Propp 1986). As it was noted by O. Potebnia, an important prerequisite for the transformation of myths into fairy tales, which have a ritual basis and are part of rituals or commentary on them, was the rupture of the direct connection of these myths with the ritual life of people (Potebnia 1989).

There are at least one and a half million species of animals on the planet Earth, but only about one hundred and sixty names of animals are used figuratively in the projection on the conceptosphere of *MAN* in the Ukrainian language. It should be noted that to illustrate the hyper-hyponymic relationships between zoomorphic images, we rely on the following six main zoological categories: type, class, series, family, genus, species. The important for the description of the language data material extracted by a continuous sample from Ukrainian fairy tales about animals (Ukrainian fairy tales about animals 2005) is the analysis of the scope of the concept of zoosemism with its subsequent semanticization. It covers heterogeneous names of animals, related by the following scheme: hyperonym – hyponyms – cohyponyms.

The hyperonym *ЗВІПІ* (lit. *ANIMALS*) in Ukrainian fairy tales about animals has the following hyponyms: *domestic*

*animals, wild animals, predators, small animals that live next to humans.*

The hyponym *домашні звірі* (lit. *domestic animals*) in Ukrainian fairy tales about animals has the following co-hyponyms: *кошеня, кицька* (lit. *kitten, cat*) – ‘trustworthiness’, ‘inexperience’ (Ukrainian fairy tales about animals 2005: 61); *кім* (lit. *cat*) – ‘pity’, ‘theft’, ‘laziness’, ‘wisdom’, ‘devotion’, ‘cunning’ (ibid: 85; 194; 232); *котофей* (transl. *kotofey*) – ‘protection’, ‘pretending to force’ (ibid: 223); *кінь* (lit. *horse*) – ‘mind’, ‘strength’, ‘fidelity’ (ibid: 57; 96; 206); *осел* (lit. *donkey*) – ‘insignificance’, ‘stupidity’, ‘redundancy’, ‘uselessness’, ‘cunning’, ‘stubbornness’ (ibid: 57; 100; 145; 208); *віл* (lit. *ox*) – ‘strength’, ‘determination’, ‘anger’ (ibid: 51); *собака* (lit. *dog*) – ‘anger’, ‘loyalty’, ‘service to the master’ (ibid: 126; 198–199); *нєс* (lit. *dog*) – ‘old age’, ‘uselessness’ (ibid: 54; 281); *коза* (lit. *goat*) – ‘cunning’, ‘lying’, ‘ingratitude’ (ibid: 10); ‘bull’ – (ibid: 9); *ягнятко* (lit. *lamb*) – ‘cowardice’ (ibid: 59); *козел* (lit. *goat*) – ‘trustworthiness’ (ibid: 20); *кролики* (lit. *rabbits*) – ‘retribution’, ‘revenge’, ‘justice’ (ibid: 70); *вівця* (lit. *sheep*) – ‘stupidity’ (ibid: 211).

The hyponym *дикі звірі* (lit. *wild animals*) in Ukrainian fairy tales about animals has the following co-hyponyms: *лисиця* (lit. *fox*) – ‘deception’, ‘cunning’, ‘ritual’, ‘baptism’; ‘insincerity of rela-

tions', 'not hospitality', 'mockery of slowness and carelessness of actions' (Ukrainian fairy tales about animals 2005: 20; 26; 49; 230; 290); *білка* (lit. *squirrel*) – 'gratitude', 'diligence', 'care' (ibid: 69; 88); *ведмідь* (lit. *bear*) – 'strength', 'domination and mockery of the weak', 'arrogance', 'selfishness', 'mockery of the lesser' (ibid: 67; 69); *олень* (lit. *deer*) – 'carelessness' (ibid: 72); *заець* (lit. *hare*) – 'mocking', 'giving courage to the lesser' (ibid: 74); *зайчик* (lit. *bunny*) – 'cowardice', 'trust', 'kindness' (ibid: 169); *їжак* (lit. *hedgehog*) – 'prudence', 'cunning', 'wisdom' (ibid: 72; 74), *дика коза, козенята* (lit. *wild goat, little goats*) – 'disobedience' (ibid: 164).

The hyponym *хижаки* (lit. *predators*) in Ukrainian fairy tales about animals has the following co-hyponyms: *вовк* (lit. *wolf*) – 'weakness', 'robbery' (Ukrainian fairy tales about animals 2005: 49); *вовчик-братик* (lit. *wolf-brother*) (ibid: 9); *вовк-панібрат* (calque *wolf-panibrat*) – 'flattery' (ibid: 98); *вовк-колядник* (lit. *wolf-caroller*) – 'impudence' (ibid: 179); *лев* (lit. *lion*) – 'power', 'mockery of the lesser' (ibid: 66; 68).

The hyponym *маленькі звірі* (lit. *small animals*) that live next to humans in Ukrainian fairy tales about animals has the following co-hyponyms: *мишка, мишеня* (lit. *mouse, little mouse*) – 'cunning', 'deception' (Ukrainian fairy tales about animals 2005: 61); *миша* (lit. *mouse*) – 'greed', 'greed' (ibid: 88).

The hyperonym *птахи* (lit. *birds*) in Ukrainian fairy tales about animals has the following hyponyms: *птахи лісові, домашні птахи, водоплавні птахи, птахи хижі* (lit. *forest birds, domestic birds, waterfowl, wild birds*).

The hyponym *птахи лісові* (lit. *forest birds*) in Ukrainian fairy tales about animals has the following co-hyponyms: *соловейко* (lit. *nightingale*) – 'mind', 'wisdom' (Ukrainian fairy tales about animals 2005: 186); *сова* (lit. *owl*) – 'own / foreign' (ibid: 182); *дятел* (lit. *woodpecker*) – 'diligence' (ibid: 26); *ворона* (lit. *crow*) – 'carelessness', 'gullibility', 'carelessness', 'carelessness' (ibid: 273); *бузьвок* (лелека) (translit. *buzok* (lit. *stork*)) – 'cunning', 'revenge' (Ibid: 277); *горобець* (lit. *sparrow*) – 'revenge'; 'theft', 'cunning' (ibid: 277, 281-282; 284).

The hyponym *домашні птахи* (lit. *poultry*) in Ukrainian fairy tales about animals has the following co-hyponyms: *півник* (lit. *rooster*) – 'wisdom', 'cunning', 'wealth' (Ukrainian fairy tales about animals 2005: 268); *голуб* (lit. *pigeon*) – 'helping the needy' (ibid: 292).

The hyponym *водоплавні птахи* (lit. *waterfowl*) in Ukrainian fairy tales about animals has the following co-hyponyms: *журавель* (lit. *crane*) – 'guest', 'godfather relations' (Ukrainian fairy tales about animals 2005: 109); *журавель* (lit. *crane*) – 'courtship not with equals' (ibid: 277); *чапля* (lit. *heron*) – 'reassessment of their qualities'; 'cunning', 'deception' (ibid: 277; 284); *качка* (lit. *duck*) – 'pride', 'arrogant'; 'petty care' (ibid: 273; 275).

The hyponym of *птахи хижі* (lit. *wild birds*) in Ukrainian fairy tales about animals has the following co-hyponyms: *орел* (lit. *eagle*) – 'thief', 'murderer', 'food' (Ukrainian fairy tales about animals 2005: 70; 182).

The hyperonym *риби* (lit. *fish*) in Ukrainian fairy tales about animals has the hyponym of *river fish*.



The hyponym *риби річкові* (lit. *river fish*) in Ukrainian fairy tales about animals has the following co-hyponyms: *рак* (lit. *cancer*) – ‘helping the needy’; ‘Flattery’, ‘flattery’, ‘cunning’; ‘wisdom’, ‘establishment of justice’, ‘punishment for what has been done’, ‘slowness’, ‘waste of time’, ‘futile expectation’ (Ukrainian fairy tales about animals 2005: 10; 273; 284; 286); *сом* (lit. *catfish*) – ‘cunning’, ‘care’ (ibid: 273); *в’юн* (translat. *vyun*) – ‘agility’, ‘powerlessness’ (ibid: 288).

The hyperonym *плазуни* (lit. *reptile*) in Ukrainian fairy tales about animals has the following hyponyms: *черепаха* (lit. *turtle*) – ‘slowness’ (Ukrainian fairy tales about animals 2005: 285); *вуж* (*уж*) (lit. *snake*) – ‘revenge’ (ibid: 297).

The hyperonym *комахи* (lit. *insect*) in Ukrainian fairy tales about animals has the following hyponyms: *мурашка* (*муравель*) (lit. *ant*) – ‘diligence’; ‘gratitude’ (Ukrainian fairy tales about animals 2005: 292); *муха* (lit. *fly*) – ‘boredom’, ‘annoyance’ (ibid: 177); bees – ‘boredom’, ‘annoyance’ (ibid: 14).

The hyperonym *хробаки* (lit. *worms*) in Ukrainian fairy tales about animals has the following hyponyms: *черв’як* (lit. worm) – ‘stubbornness’, ‘persistence’, ‘confidence’ (Ukrainian fairy tales about animals 2005: 67).

Co-hyponyms and hyponyms are basic categories that function in a reinter-

preted sense in Ukrainian fairy tales about animals. These categories are more widely used by humans in various communicative situations because most of our knowledge is structured at the basic level than at the hyperonymic level.

Thus, in Ukrainian fairy tales about animals, zoonyms-hyperonyms in comparison with zoonyms-co-hyponyms and hyponyms are seldom used in a metaphorical sense, and as a rule in the names of the fairy tales themselves. It happens because of many factors, primarily the imagery of the zoometaphorical name. Zoonym-hyperonym, being a generic concept, does not evoke in the human imagination the specific and sensual image that is attached to zoonyms-co-hyponyms and hyponyms. Ontological zoonyms later emerged because of the development of abstract thinking and related to the needs of the science of biology. In this regard, we can say that the expressive zoometaphorical nomination with the help of zoonyms-co-hyponyms and hyponyms was inherent in the ancient mythological type of human consciousness. But zoometaphorical nomination with the help of zoonyms-hyperonyms arose much later, when such most commonly used hyperonyms as beast, bird acquired, though generalized, but quite clear ideas in the human mind, and thus began to serve as data material for secondary nomination.

## CONCLUSIONS

Consideration of the functioning of zoosemisms in Ukrainian folklore genres allows to more fully reveal the connection between language and culture and

to determine the national-specific features of the zoomorphic language picture of the world of Ukrainians. This fragment of Ukrainians’ knowledge about the ani-

mal world was formed on the rethought associative and evaluative meanings of animal names. It has a distinct discrete character, but there are two trends in the degree of its concentration. Firstly, some properties of the objects of reality reflected in the language picture of the world are not lost but remain undeniably significant. Zoosemism-name of the basic category absorbs the main, prototype qualities and properties of the animal species belonging to this group, recorded in the memory of the native speaker of the Ukrainian language. They are both objectively available and attributed to cultural tradition. Secondly, the density

of representation of the zoomorphic language picture of the world increases significantly due to the figurative meanings of the names of invertebrates in relation to the names of vertebrates. In our opinion, this phenomenon can be explained by the criterion of remoteness / proximity of an animal to a human. Figuratively, the names of those animals with whom the Ukrainian ethnic group had the closest contacts are most often used.

The further scientific research will consider the problem of figurative-nominal and evaluative characteristics of folklore zoosemisms of the Ukrainian language.

## References

- Ballads: Folk art – Балади: Народна творчість. 1987 [Ballads: Folk art]. Київ: Дніпро: 319.
- Cooper Jean C. – Купер Дж. 1995. Энциклопедия символов [Encyclopedia of symbols]. Москва: Ассоциация Духовного Единения «Золотой век»: 399.
- Folk songs in Ivan Manzhura's records – Народні пісні в записах Івана Манжури. 1974. [Folk songs in Ivan Manzhura's records]. Київ: Муз. Україна: 312.
- Franko Ivan – Франко І. 1901–1909. Галицько-руські народні приповідки: В 3-х томах, 6 випусках. [Galician-Russian folk tales: In 3 volumes, 6 issues]. Етнографічний збірник НТШ. Львів: Т.1(1).
- Ivanov Vyacheslav V. – Иванов В. В. 1975. Реконструкция индоевропейских слов и текстов, отражающих культ волка [Reconstruction of Indo-European words and texts reflecting the cult of the wolf]. *Известия Академии наук СССР*: Т. 34(5): 399–408.
- Cirlot Juan Eduardo – Керлот Х. Э. 1994. Словарь символов [Dictionary of symbols]. Москва: REFL-book: 653.
- Kononenko Vitalii I. – Кононенко В. І. 1991. Словесні символи в семантичній структурі фрази [Verbal symbols in the semantic structure of a phrase]. *Мовознавство* 6: 30–36.
- Kostomarov Nikolai I. – Костомаров Н. И. 1994. Об историческом значении русской народной поэзии [On the historical significance of Russian folk poetry]. *Славянская мифология*. Москва: «Чарли»: 201–256.
- Kryzhko Olena. 2019. National and Cultural Symbolism of Zoo-Anthropomorphic Creatures in Ukrainian Mythological Picture of the World. *Logos* 101: 159–167.
- Lysytska Olena. P. – Лисицька О. П. 2001. Концепти «добро» та «зло» в російській мовній картині світу [Concepts of «good» and «evil» in the Russian language picture of the world]: Автореф. дис. ... канд. філол. наук: 10.02.02 / Національний педагогічний ун-т ім. М.П. Драгоманова: 17.
- Maikovskii Mark M. – Маковский М. М. 1996. Сравнительный словарь мифологической символики в индоевропейских языках [Comparative dictionary of mythological symbolism in Indo-European languages]. Москва: Гуманитарный издательский центр: 416.
- Nechui-Levytskii Ivan – Нечуй-Левицький І. 1992. Світогляд українського народу: Ескіз української міфології [Worldview of the Ukrainian people: Sketch of Ukrainian mythology]. Київ: Обереги: 88.
- Phraseological dictionary of the Ukrainian language – Фразеологічний словник української

- мови / Уклад. В. Білоноженко, В. Винник, І. Гнатюк та ін. 1993 (1); 1999 (2) [Phraseological dictionary of the Ukrainian language]. Київ: Наук. думка. Т. 1: 528; Т. 2: 984.
- Pokhlebkın William V. – Похлебкин В. В. 1995. Словарь международной символики и эмблематики [Dictionary of international symbols and emblems]. Москва: Международные отношения: 560.
- Potebnia Alexander A. 1989 – Потебня А. А. 1989. Слово и миф [Word and myth]. Москва: Правда: 624.
- Прорп Vladimir Ya. – Пропп В. Я. 1986. Исторические корни волшебной сказки [The historical roots of the fairy tale]. Ленинград: Изд-во Ленинградск. ун-та: 365.
- Rubtsov Nikolai N. – Рубцов Н. Н. 1991. Символ в искусстве и жизни: философское размышление [Symbol in art and life: philosophical reflection]. Москва: Наука: 176.
- Shakhovskii V. I., Sorokin Yu. A., Tomasheva I. V. – Шаховский В. И., Сорокин Ю. А., Томашева И. В. 1998. Текст и его когнитивно-эмотивные метаморфозы: Межкультурное понимание и лингвоэкология [Text and its cognitive-emotive metamorphoses: Intercultural understanding and linguoecology]. Волгоград: Перемена: 148.
- Tyshchenko Oleh V. – Тищенко О. В. 2000. Обрядова семантика у слов'янському мовному просторі [Ritual semantics in the Slavic language space]. Київ: Видавничий центр КДЛУ: 236.
- Tyshchenko O., Korolyov I., Palchevska O. 2021. Cultural and Cognitive Structure of the Omen: Epistemology, Axiology and Pragmatics. *Wisdom* 2(18): 137–151.
- Ukrainian fairy tales about animals – Українські казки про тварин. 2005 [Ukrainian fairy tales about animals]. Київ: Техніка: 320.
- Ukrainian proverbs, sayings and so on – Українські приказки, прислів'я і таке інше / Збірники О. В. Марковича та ін. (Уклад М. Номис). 1993. [Ukrainian proverbs, sayings and so on / Collections O. V. Markovich and others. (Concluded by M. Nomis)]. Київ: Либідь: 765.
- Vasko R., Korolyova A., Pakholok Z., Korolyov I. 2020. Logic and Semiotic Passportization Data of Numbers in Different Cultures. *Journal of History Culture and Art Research* 9(3): 277–287.
- Voitovych Valerii M. – Войтович В. М. 2002. Українська міфологія [Ukrainian mythology]. Київ: Либідь: 664.
- Wolf Elena M. – Вольф Е. М. 2002. Функциональная семантика оценки [Functional Semantics of Evaluation]. Москва: Эдиториал УРСС: 280.
- Zhuikova Margaryta V. 2000 – Жуйкова М. В. 2000. Дещо про образ вовка в мовній картині світу білорусів [Something about the image of the wolf in the linguistic picture of the world of Belarusians]. *Семантика мови і тексту: зб. ст. VI Міжнародної наукової конференції*. Івано-Франківськ: Плай: 194–197.
- Zorivchak Roksolana P. – Зорівчак Р. П. 1989. Реалія і переклад: на матеріалі англомовних перекладів української прози [Reality and translation: on the material of English translations of Ukrainian prose]. Львів: Вид-во Львівськ. держ. ун-ту: 216.