Alexander I. ILIADI,

Doctor of philological sciences, Professor of the Department of Translation, Theoretical and Applied Linguistics, Odessa South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University named after K. D. Ushynsky; 34 Staroportofrankivska Str., Odessa, 65020, Ukraine; phone: +38 095 0812118; e-mail: alexandr.iliadi@gmail.com; https://orcid.org/0000–0001–5078–8316

EXPONENT *BOGO-/*-BOGЪ IN THE PROTO-SLAVONIC COMPOSITES

Summary. The paper **aims** to the historical-linguistic study of Proto-Slavonic anthroponyms-composites paradigm with the stem *bog-*. The **topicality** of this paper is determined by a declining interest in research of Old Slavonic lexical heritage in Slavonic historical and modern onomastics. The **purpose** of investigation is the description of the structural and semantic peculiarities of anthroponymic composites with Proto-Slavonic component *bog-*. The **object** of the research is a sum of nomina personalia, taken from accessible Slavonic written sources (mainly collections of Slavonic personal names, to a lesser extent — monuments of different times), which are formed by the way of compounding. Etymological, morphological and lexical-semantic features of Slavonic proper names as well as reconstructed Proto-Slavonic prototypes constitute the **subject** of the study. As the **result** of proposed research, the fragments of the paradigm of Proto-Slavonic composites with exponent *bogo-/*-bogъ are reconstructed; etymological ambiguity of some dithematic proper names is commented; morphological and semantical (ideological) peculiarities of archaic Slavonic anthroponyms-composites are highlighted. **Conclusions**. Proto-Slavonic binominal *nomina propria* with the component *bogo-/*-bogъ are attested as prepositive determinatives as well as a postpositive defined word. Preliminary results of the group reconstruction of

the units, containing the viewed linguistical object, indicate the high degree of the stem *bog- productivity. Particularly Proto-Slavonic vocabulary included at a minimum 69 prototypes with viewed etymon. The significant number of the paradigm with the exponent *bog- impels us to make the conclusion about significant role of *bog-names as words-ideas in the Ancient Slavonic poetic text as whole. Their religious-ideological, ritual, legal load allows to assume their original belonging to the lexicon of a language of ritualized actions closely related to the traditions of name-giving. Exactly within the compound-words the tracks of the long-standing use of *bog- with the legal terminological meaning «a share (in common good)» are traced. Examples of Slavonic poetic speech manifest syntactic counterparts for two-stem personal names; on the basis of these syntactic constructions corresponding anthroponyms perhaps arose. The ***perspectives*** for further research are to attract to the analysis the system of structurally identical, and etymologically related, and typologically close anthroponyms from the onomastic vocabulary of Iranian languages and the comparative analysis of their cultural semantics.

Key words: Proto-Slavonic, reconstruction, anthroponym, composite, diachrony, synchrony, philology, paradigm, prototype, semantics.

1. Introduction

Formulation of the problem. The word *bogъ 'god' in Slavonic religious culture share the fate of similar sacral terms in another Indo-European languages. All of them took a part in the formation of formulaic expressions complex with the certain religious-ethical burden, needed to build the oral texts of the ideological content, cf. *modliti boga, *xvaliti boga, *bogъ věstъ, *bogъ (vьse) viditъ, *da sǫditъ bogъ, *sǫdi bogъ, *bogъ (ne) dajь, *boga radi, *bogъmь zaklinati, *bogъ estъ sъvědokъ (cf. Croat. «Bog je svidok svojem čudu» [19, p. 67], Rus. *бог свидетель*), *bezъ boga, *božьjь darъ, *milostъ božьja, *mirъ božьjь, *voľa božьja, *žъrtva bogu, *terbọ klasti bogu, *terba bogu and so on. However, there are three circumstances that distinguish origin and semantic volume of words for designation of the God in the Slavonic (and Indo-Iranian) languages on the one hand and in the rest languages on the other hand.

Firstly, it is about, that the word denoting 'god' in Hittite, Latin, Greek, Celtic, Baltic and other languages belongs to co-called «inherited lexicon» (its cluster of religious terminology) that is one goes back to the Proto-Indo-European language condition (cf.: [16, p. 692–693; 39, p. 167–168; 35, p. 309]), whereas Slavonic *bogъ as a sacral term was derived at the Slavonic from the reflex of PIE verb *bhag- 'to allocate a share', 'determine a share', thus having developed the sememe 'God' as 'who allocates/determines a share' → 'deity (of wealth, well-being)' or as personification of the sememe 'a share'.

Secondly, the Arian cognates of viewed Slavonic word manifest the same semantic shift, cf. (*bhag- > *bhág-o- 'a share' >) OIr. *baga- 'a share', 'fate', 'destiny' and personified '**God**'; OInd. bhága- 'well-being', 'property', 'happiness' and '**name one of deities**', '**Lord God**' (V. S. Rastorgueva and J. I. Edelman in [ĖSIÂ]; cf. also [12, p. 19–20]). It is presumed, that Slavonic *bogъ as a religious term was formed under the Iranian influence in the Scythian epoch (O. N. Trubachev; two hypotheses as regards belonging *bogъ to inherited vocabulary or loan words see (1) ESSÂ: with a short review of the literature; (2) A. Ė. Anikin «Russian etymological dictionary» (Issue 3, p. 293): detailed review of existing etymological versions). This semantic shift did not affect words with the same etymon in other languages, where we find the only meaning 'a part', 'a share' as in Tocharian (Toch.A pāk, Toch.B pāke) or 'eat' as in Greek (φαγεῖν).

Thirdly, Slavonic *bogъ in the Proto-Slavonic period was used not only with the meaning 'God' but also as 'a share' (cf. subst. *bog-ačъ, adj. *bog-atъ 'who has a large share in the common good'), which is traced in the anthroponymes-composites. The exponent *bog- as a part of compound-words (*nomina personalia*) can not always be explained as '**God**', instead manifesting more archaic semantics 'a share' (as a part of composites it denotes '**holder of a share**'). In this regard Slavonic dithematic personal names differ from Greek, Latine, Hittite, Baltic, Germanic etc. theophoric anthroponyms, where a part 'God' is applied in the direct meaning only.

A special investigation of the Slavonic lexical family with the stem *bog- in point of view of its semantic, derivational potential and its comparison with the paradigm of etymologically identical Indo-Iranian words is the task that requires a separate monographic study on comparative-historical linguistics. It can hardly be overemphasized the importance of that kind research for Indo-European diachronic linguistics by virtue great cultural significance of Slavonic *bogъ and its genetic counterparts in the vocabulary of other languages. And, of course, first of all the comparative-historical study of mentioned lexical cluster is very necessary for the reconstruction of initial stages of the Slavonic sacral texts history. A first step towards the system description of ancient Slavonic words with PIE etymon *bhag- in diachrony is the *reconstruction of paradigm fragments with *bogo-/*-bogъ on Proto-Slavonic chronological slice*. This **problem** is only partly solved up to now, which determines the **topicality** of proposed investigation.

Aims and objectives. The main purpose of our study is to reconstruct Proto-Slavonic stratum of compound words with the exponent *bogo-/*-bogъ (the core of *bog-names paradigm). All other tasks are: 1) to determine the diapason of semantical valency of the stem *bog- by establishing the sum of words, which were able to be combined with the *bog- within the composites; 2) to determine syntactic correlates for dithematic personal names (it is about the phrases on the basis of which this names arose); 3) to derive etymological and semasiological definitions for unclear cases. The **object** of the research is *nomina*

personalia, taken from Slavonic written sources (namely, collections of Slavonic personal names, to a lesser extent — monuments of different times), which are formed by the way of compounding.

Reference to previous studies. Proto-Slavonic anthroponyms (as well as proper names of separate Slavonic languages) with the analized exponent have been already under consideration by many scientists. It is worth mentioning classical onomastic works by Witold Tashicky (cf. first of all his great work as the editor of the «Słownik staropolskich nazw osobowych», 1965–1985), Tadeush Milewski («Ewolucja morfologiczna indoeuropejskich złożonych imion osobowych», «Ze studiów nad antroponimią indoeuropejską» [25; 26]), Stanislav Rospond («Słowiańskie nazwy miejscowe z sufiksem -jъ» [30]), Kazimierz Rymut («Zasób leksemów w prasłowiańskich imionach złożonych» [32]), V. L. Vasiliev («Slavonic Toponymical Antiquities of the Novgorod land», 2012) and in-depth studies on Slavonic, Indo-European etymology and comparative-historical linguistics by academics O. N. Trubachev, V. N. Toporov, V'ach. Vs. Ivanov, dedicated, among other things, to analysis of Slavonic *nomina personalia* with *bog- on the broad Indo-European background. Here we should mention numerous great achievements of many more linguists, which collected appropriate onomastic data and gave a preliminary assessment of this material. Their studies in the present paper (see below) are used.

Analysis of the latest research and publications. By virtue the practical specificity of the selected type of research, we provide a critical review of our predecessor's scientific versions directly in the process of work with every analyzed example, if necessary.

2. The main part. Here we present the core of reconstructed ancient paradigm of Proto-Slavonic theophoric or «bearing a share» names.

2.1. The word structure (list of prototypes).

*Bez-bogъ: Bulg. *Безбог* — mycrotoponym [7, p. 726] < *Безбогъ «Who is deprived of his share» (in the common good).

*Bělo-bogъ: Serb. *Белобог — theonym, cf. a phraseological expression «не видети *белог бога*» [7, p. 428], OCzech *Bělboh* [32, p. 8], cf. ORus. theonym *Бѣлобогъ, which is attested as a part of some Ukranian mycrotoponyms (*Білобожниця, Білобогів* etc.).

*Bogo-budъ: OCzech *Bohobud* [32, p. 8, 9].

*Bogo-dalъ/*Bogъ-dalъ: Bulg. *Богодал* [1, p. 190], OCzech *Bohdal*: *Bogdal*, 1088, *Bohdal* plebanus, 1268 [17: I, p. 77], Czech *Bohdal* ([24, p. 16]: *богъ*), OPol. *Bogdał*: *Bogdal* de Xans, 1376 [38: I, p. 190], Pol. *Bogdał* [24, p. 16].

*Bogo-danъ/*Bogъ-danъ: Bulg. *Бòгдан, Богдàн* ([5, p. 79]: «given by God», corresponds to Greek Θεοδόσιος), OSerb. *Богъданъ*, XII [4, p. 84], Czech *Bohdan*, Upper Sorbian *Bóhdan* (ÈSSÂ), OPol. *Bogodan*: Uilla *Bogodani*, 1175; *Bogdan*: Villa piscatorum cum his ... Crisan, *Bogdan*, Carz, 1136 [38: I, p. 187, 190], ORus. *Богоданъ, Богданъ*, 1470, Ukr. *Богдáн*, Belarus. *Багдáн* (for more details see: [25, p. 52] and the second volume of ÈSSÂ).

*Bogo-darъ: Serb. *Богодар* [9, p. 147], OPol. *Bogodar*, 1265 [38: I, p. 190], Ukr. *Богодар* [6, p. 92].

*Bogo-gostъ: Slav. *Boggost* [29, p. 7]. That is «God's guest»?

*Bogo-xvalъ: OPol. *Bogofał*: *Bogophalus*, 1265, Magister *Bogofalus*, 1250 ([38: I, p. 190]: to *Bogchwał, Boguchwał*), Kashubian *Bogochulaus*, XII [4, p. 85].

*Bogo-ľubъ: Serb. *Богољуб* ([23, p. 113]: 'deo carus'; [2, p. 39]: as translation of Greek name Θεόφιλος), *Bogoljub* [11, p. 971, 992], OCzech *Bohoľub, cf. deanthroponymic geographical name *Bohoľubi*, -ľub: De *Boholib* [17: I, p. 77], Ukr. *Боголюб* [6, p. 92].

*Bogo-měrъ: Slav. *Bagamér* (Pannonia), *Bagamer, Bogomer* — toponyms = *Bogoměr-jъ* [30, p. 45].

*Bogo-milъ: OBulg. *Богомилъ*, Bulg. *Богомùл* ([5, p. 79]: 'dear to God' = Rus. 'кто мил богу'), Serb., Croat. *Богомил, Bogomil* ([23, p. 113]: 'deo carus'; [2, p. 39]), Sloven. *Bogomil* [36], OCzech *Bohomil*: *Bohomilus*, 1321 [17: I, p. 77], OPol. *Bogomił*: *Bogomil*, 1146 [38: I, p. 190], Ukr. *Богомил* [6, p. 92] and so on. See also: [30, p. 45].

*Bogo-mirъ: Bulg. (rarely) *Богомùр*, 1905 ([5, p. 79]: 'peace from God' = Rus. 'мир от бога'), Serb. *Богомир* [2, p. 39], OSloven. *Bogomir*: *Bochmir* [20, p. 111], OSlovak *Bogomir*, cf. «*Bogomirovým* týnem na Rohačke» (Rohatej Skale), (in Hungarian rendering) *Bogomeri, Bogomeria* — hydronym [37, p. 44, 45, 50] < *Bogomir or (if Hungarian forms reflect primordial *ě) *Bogoměr. See above *Bogoměrъ.

*Bogo-slavъ: Bulg. *Богослав* ([5, p. 79]: 'one who glorifies God'), Serb. *Богослав* [7, p. 31, 84, 86], Sloven. *Bogoslav* [21], OPol. *Bogosław*: *Bogozlauus*, 1168 [38: I, p. 191], Pol. *Bogosław* [33, p. 802], Kashubian *Bogoslav*, XII [4, p. 85], Ukr. *Богослав* [6, p. 93].

*Bogo-sǫdъ: OCzech *Bogosud* (15 — M. Â. Moroshkin).

*Bogo-vidъ: Serb. *Боговид* [2, p. 39], derivative with -ov-itjь *Боговидовиќ*, XVIII (Split) [7, p. 81], OCzech *Bohovid*, 965 (15 — M. Â. Moroshkin). The meaning was «[Who has] face of deity»? The typological parallels in the Middle Iranian anthroponymy are traced.

*Bogo-vitъ: OPol. *Bogawetz* — toponym = *Bogowic < *Bogovit-jъ with *vitъ 'dominus, who has power' ([30, p. 45]: less probably is to single out here an etymon *vidъ 'visus'), Rus. *Боговит* [29, p. 7]. It is possible to propose an alternative version of explanation of the second part as *vitъ (< *u̯ik-tu- ∼

Lat. *victima* in according to V. N. Toporov) 'sacrifice, victim'. Thus semantics of composite as whole can be reconstructed as «Sacrifice for a deity» = «Who is intended for God».

It seems to be controversial the interpretation Slav. *Vit* as the result of a rethink by Slavonians-pagans of the name of a Christian saint, that is saint *Vit*. It is assumed that name of saint *Vit* got to Slavonians even after the first baptism (I century A. D.) and firmly came into their use. See: ([4, p. 86–86]: with reference to a work by A. Kirpichnikov).

*Bogo-vojь: Serb. *Боговој* [2, p. 39].

*Bogo-voldъ: OCzech *Bohovlad* [32, p. 18].

*Bogo-volstь: OPol. *Bogowłość*: *Bogovloscz*, 1353 [38: I, p. 191].

*Bogu-darъ: OCzech *Bohudar*: Obiit *Bogudar* Kosm. pokrač., 1134 [17: I, p. 78], OPol. *Bogudar*, 1265 [38: I, p. 195].

*Bogu-xvalъ: OCzech *Bohuchval*: *Bohuhualus*, 1280, filiae *Bohuchwalonis*, 1391 [17: I, p. 78], OPol. *Boguchwał*: *Boguchual*, 1204, *Boguchwal*, 1388 [38: I, p. 195], PPom. *Boguchval* [32, p. 8, 11], ORus. *Богухвалъ*, 1510 (ÈSSÂ), OUkr. Павша *Богуфалъ*, 1547, OBelarus. *Богухвал*, 1555 [3, p. 44]. For more on this, see: [25, p. 50] and the second volume of ÈSSÂ.

*Bogu-ľubъ: Bulg. *Боголюб* ([5, p. 79]: 'любимый богом'), Serb. *Богољуб* [9, p. 64], OCzech *Bohu-ľub* [32, p. 12].

*Bogu-měrъ: Sorab. *Bohumĕr* [30, p. 45].

*Bogu-milъ: Sloven. *Bogumil*, OCzech *Bohumil*: *Bogumilus* canonicus, *Bohumilus*, 1289 [17: I, p. 77], Czech *Bohumily* ([24, p. 16]: *богъ*), OPol. *Bogumilo* Liber Fundat, XIV (16 — M. Â. Moroshkin), Pol. *Bogumił* [33, p. 805], Ukr. *Богумил* [6, p. 93]. Cf. also Pol. toponym *Bogumiłowice* [24, p. 16], derived from relevant anthroponym. Also see: [30, p. 45].

*Bogu-mirъ: Slovak *Bohumír* [28, p. 144], derivative Pol. *Bogumir-ski* [33, p. 805].

*Bogu-mьstь: OCzech *Bohumest*: *Bogumeſt* [17: I, p. 78]. As regards word composition cf. OCzech *Bolemest* [17: I, p. 78].

*Bogu-ordъ/*Bogu-radъ: OPol. *Bogurad*, 1388 [38: I, p. 198], Pol. *Bogurad* [33, p. 806].

*Bogu-slava, *Bogu-slavъ: OCzech *Bohuslaua* abatissa, 1333 [13, p. 357], Czech *Bohuslav* [24, p. 16], Slovak *Bohuslav* [18], *Bohuslava* [28, p. 144], OPol. *Bogusław*: *Boguzlau*, 1206 [38: I, p. 199], Pol. *Bogusław* [33, p. 807], Kashubian fem. *Boguslava*, XIII [4, p. 85], Rus. toponym *Богуславль* [24, p. 16], Ukr. *Богуслав* [6, p. 93]. Also see: [30, p. 45–46].

*Bogu-sǫdъ: OCzech *Bohusúd*: *Boguzud*, *Bohusud* de Beczwarz, 1295, *Bochusud* [17: I, p. 79], OPol. *Bogusąd* ~ **sǫdi-* : **sǫditi* 'to judge' [32, p. 15].

*Bogu-těxъ: OCzech *Bohutěch* (*Bogucea*) [24, p. 34] ~ Rus. *тéшить*, *у-тéха*, Czech *těšiti*.

*Bogu-tolъ: OPol. *Bogutol*, 1150 (16 — M. Â. Moroshkin).

*Bogu-vědъ: OPol. *Boguwiad* ~ **vědo-* : **věděti* 'to know' [32, p. 17].

*Bogu-volstь: OCzech *Bohuvlast* ~ **volsti-* : **volstiti* 'to rule' [32, p. 18], OPol. *Boguwłość*: *Bogulost*, 1265, *Boguvloscz*, 1350 [38: I, p. 205].

*Bogu-živъ: Serb., Croat. *Boguživ* [23, p. 106].

*Bože-borъ: OCzech *Božebor* [32, p. 8], OPol. *Bożebor*, XIII [4, p. 85]. That is «God's load» (Rus. «Кого несёт Бог», «Божья ноша»).

*Bože-darъ: Bulg. *Божидàр* ([5, p. 80]: 'gift from God'; as translation of Greek Θεόδωρος), Maced. *Божидар* (cf. name of a famous Macedonian linguist *Божидар* Видоески), OSerb. *Bosidarius*, 1354 (18 — M. Â. Moroshkin), Serb., Croat. *Bòžidâr*, *Boždar* ([23, p. 114]: 'divinum donum' or 'divinum donum habens'), *Божидар* ([2, p. 39]: as translation of Greek name Θεόδωρος), *Božidar* [11, p. 970, 980], Czech *Božídar* [24, p. 16], OPol. *Bożydar* [32, p. 8], Pol. *Bożedarz* [24, p. 16] < **Božedar-jь*, Ukr. *Божидар* [6, p. 95].

*Bože-liša (?): OSloven. *Boželiša*: *Boselisa* [20, p. 111].

*Bože-lъga or **Bože-lъza*: OCzech *Boželze*, which is explained in relation with **lъži-* : **lъžiti* (*sę*) 'to scold', 'to berate' [32, p. 12]. In my opinion, this interpretation is not satisfactory in semantic terms, because motivation «That who is berated by the God», «The one who is scolded by the God» is questionable, as such. The proper names at Indo-Europeans were given to protect their carriers, wish them to be holders of different ideas or to wish them happiness. On reaching the age of initiation a person could get another name corresponding to qualities of his/her character. It is scarcely necessary to prove that semantics «That who is berated/scolded by the God» does not correspond to mentioned functions of proper names. The idea «That who berates/scolds the God» is impossible in principle. Here we most likely are dealing with the name containing Proto-Slavonic **lъga*, **lъza*, cf. their reflexes: Rus. dial. *льга* 'possibility', 'lightness', 'relief', 'power, strength', 'what is allowed', 'what is freely', OCS *льза* 'possibility', OPol. *lza* 'as possible', adv. OCzech *lzě*, Czech *lze* 'as possible' (ÈSSÂ). Thus intended meaning of **Bože-lъza* was something like «God's permission».

*Bože-mirъ: Bulg. *Божимùр* [5, p. 80], Serb. *Божимир* [2, p. 39], OCzech *Božemír*: *Bozemirum*, 1359 [17: I, p. 89], derivative Pol. *Bożymir-ski* [33, p. 929].

*Bože-myslъ: Czech (old) *Bohomysl*, XIX, Sorab. *Bademäusel* = *Božemysle* — deanthroponymic place name (for more details see: [18, p. 34]).

Bože-slavъ: Sloven. *Božislav* [36], OPol. *Bożysław*, 1220, ORus. fem. *Божислава* (19 — M. Â. Moroshkin).

Bože-těxъ: OSerb. *Bosethech*, Serb., Croat. *Božetjeh* [23, p. 105], OCzech *Božetěch*, *Božtěch*: *Bozetech* abbas Kosm. pokrač., 1095, *Boztiech* de Chunraticz, 1287 [17: I, p. 89], Pol. *Bożeciech* [34, p. 14].

Bože-vojь: OSloven. *Boživoj* [36], Serb. *Боживо̄ј* (18 — M. Â. Moroshkin), Slovak (old) *Božvoj* [22, p. 208], PPom. *Božvoj* [32, p. 8].

Čъrno-bogъ: Rus. *Чернобожье* — place name in the former Pskov province [31, p. 106]. But a similar name (oikonym) in ancient Novgorod land is explained as the derivative of anthroponym **Чьрнобудъ* with taking into account of such historical forms of this toponym as *Чернобыш*, *Чернобуж* (98 — V. L. Vasiliev).

Čъsti-bogъ: OSloven. *Častibog* [36], OCzech *Častiboh*, *Ctiboh* [29, p. 26].

Dadjь-bogъ: OPol. *Dadzbog*, 1254, *Dadibog*, 1254 [38: I, p. 448] with imper. **dadjь* (inf. **dati* 'to give', praes. **dadmь*) as the first component; Ukr. *Дажбог* [6, p. 226], (derivative) ORus. панъ Данило Задеревецкии *Дажбоговичь* [8, p. 79].

Daľe-bogъ: Ukr. *Далебіг*, dem. *Далебожик*, cf. also *Далібоґа* [6, p. 226] < ORus. **Далебогъ*.

Xvali-bogъ: Czech *Chvaliboh* [26, p. 377], OPol. *Chwalibog* [32, p. 8, 11], Pol. *Chwalibóg* [33, p. 1471].

Jako-bogъ (?): *Jacobog* (= 'mighty God') — the name of a God of Antes, mentioned by Mauro Orbini (with reference to Geremia Russo) in his «Regno de gli slavi hoggi corrottamente detti schiavoni», cf.: «Della religione di quelli Anti scriue Geremia Russo negli Annali di Moscouia, che, frà gli altri Dei, adorauano vn' Idolo, cui fotto i piedi ftaua yn capo d'huomo, vn' altro di leone, nella deftra mano teneua vn dardo, e nella finiftra vna palla d'argento, e lo chiamauano JACOBOG, cioè Dio Forte» [27, p. 19]. Anyhow, the structure of the theonym is not clear.

Jьno-bogъ: ORus. **Инобогъ*, reconstructed with taking account of the toponym *Инобож* (in the former Yaroslavl province) (173 — V. L. Vasiliev), which is a derivative with possessive suff. *-j-*.

Milo-bogъ: Pol. *Miłobog* [33, p. 7253].

Modli-bogъ: OCzech *Modliboh* (182 — V. L. Vasiliev), OPol. *Modlibog*, ORus. *Молибог* [32, p. 8, 12], Ukr. *Молибог* [6, p. 489]. T. Milewski characterized Pol. *Modlibog* as an innovation, because this personal name is attested in the Polish only [26, p. 377]. However, this name is also known in Czech and East-Slavonic languages and this fact indicates the antiquity of the anthroponym.

Myslo-bogъ: ORus. **Мыслобогъ*, whose reconstruction is on the base of the deanthroponymic toponyms, cf. Ukr. *Мислобіж*, Belarus. *Мыслабож* [10, p. 275].

Mьsti-bogъ: OSerb. *Mstibog* [29, p. 66], Czech *Mstiboh*, ORus. *Мьстьбогъ*, 1202 as the combination of **mьstiti* (in the imperative mood) & **bogъ* (ÈSSÂ).

Na-bogъ: cf. secondary grammatical form in Sorab. *Nabož* [29, p. 67].

Ne-bogъjь, *Ne-božь*: Pol. *Nebohy* [33, p. 7657], which, judging by the orthography, belongs to Czech anthroponymy, Ukr. *Небож* [6, p. 507].

Per-da-bogъ: OPol. *Przedabog*, 1402 [38: IV, p. 359] ~ **perda-* : **perdati* 'to give away', 'to hand' [32, p. 13]. Good wish «Give [your] share»?

Po-bogъ: OPol. *Pobog*, 1420 ([38: IV, p. 295]: *Pobog* 1).

Pъlko-bogъ: OPol. *Pełczybog*: Nicolaus *Pelczibog*, 1396 [38: IV, p. 210], which is, probably, a form with the results of partial rethinking. The semantics of **Pъlko-bogъ* (~ **pъlkъ* 'army', 'host') was «[Who is with] God's army»?

Sve-bogъ: OCzech *Svěbož* [32, p. 8], toponym OSlovak *Svebožь gozdъ* (< **Svebog-jь gozdъ*) > Hungarian *Szébozgaz* ([30, p. 134]: to *sve-* : PSlav. **svojь* 'suus').

Svęto-bogъ: OCzech *Svatiboh* [29, p. 100].

Svojь-bogъ: OCzech *Svojboh*: *Zuoybog* [14, p. 199] ~ **svojь* 'one's' [32, p. 16].

Uně-bogъ: OPol. **Uniebog*, cf. secondary grammatical form in OPol. *Uniebož*: *Unebosus*, 1281 [38: I, p. 185; V, p. 523]. The first part is the stem of PSlav. **unějь*, **unijь* 'better' (compar. to **dobrъ*), **uněti* 'to be full of energy', 'to be full of life', 'to be in the prime of life', 'to thrive' (for more on this exponent in the anthroponyms see: [30, p. 142; 32, p. 17; 25, p. 54]).

Vedi-bogъ: Bulg. *Веди-бог* — mycrotoponym [7, p. 726] < **Ведибогъ* as name-wish «[Let] God lead [you]» = Rus. «Веди [тебя] Бог».

Vъse-bogъ: OCzech **Všeboh*, which is the word-forming base for toponym *Všebohy* ([24, p. 46, 140]: *вьсь*).

Želi-bogъ: OSloven. *Žalibog* [21, p. 166].

Žilo-bogъ: Sorb. *Žilobog* ~ **žilo-* : **žilъ* 'living' [32, p. 18].

2.2. The compatibility of the stem **bog-/*bož-*. All these personal names were formed due to a high degree of the semantic valency of overviewed lexeme. One was able to attach a quite wide spectrum of another stems. Let us view them.

The objects: **borъ*, **-budъ*, **darъ*, **gostь*, **-xvalъ*, **liša* (?), **lьga* or **lьza*, **měrъ*, **mirъ*, **myslo-/*myslъ*, **mьstъ*, **pъlkъ* (**pъlko-*), **-slavъ*, **sǫdъ*, **těxъ*, **-tolъ*, **-vědъ*, **vidъ*, **vitъ*, **vojь*, **voldъ*, **volstъ*.

The attributes: (adjectives) *bělъ (*bělo-), *čьrnъ (*čьrno-), *daľe, *ľubъ, *milo-/*-milъ, *ordъ/*radъ, *svętъ (*svęto-), *unějь (*uně-), *živъ; (pronouns) *jьno- (*jьnъ), *sve-, *svojь, *vьse; (participles) *dalъ, *danъ, *žilъ (*žilo-).

The predicates: *čьsti, *dadjь, *xvali, *modli, *mьsti, *per-da-, *vedi, *želi.

The prepositional-prefixal components and negation: *bez-, *na-, *ne-, *po-.

2.3. Semantic peculiarities of *bog-anthroponymes. All known personal names of mentioned category arose in two ways. **Firstly**, on the base corresponding word combinations with *bog- as the stem of root noun and *bož- as the stem of possessive adjective 'god's' (Rus. божий). These formulaic expressions had a religious-ideological, ethical and ritual (*xvaliti boga, *modliti boga) meaning, obviously, moved to the relevant anthroponyms, which became the carriers of different cultural meanings. Grammatical relationships between the parts of composites correspond to syntactic relationships between the parts of relevant word combinations. For example:

*Bogo-darъ ∼ Croat. «ka ne mre nikadar, / vridna čas, nam ka je od boga ljepši dar», «svakom milosti višnji bog darova» [15, p. 18, 69].

*Bogo-ľubъ ∼ Croat. «Obuću naoputi, tako te bog ljubi, / tere se uputi, a brieme ne gubi» [15, p. 442];

*Bogo-slavъ ∼ Croat. «duh moj tebe Boga slavi» [19, p. 32], slavni Bog [19, p. 34];

*Bogo-sǫdъ ∼ Croat. «Da se uvistiš koje tribe / svakom priti di Bog sudi, / di će izvrć van zale ribe / a razabrat dobre u sudi» [19, p. 12], Rus. dial. saying бог суди твои костыли (that is лукавство = slyness) (I: 8 — V. I. Dal');

*Bogo-vidъ ∼ Croat. Bog sve vidi [15, p. 410], Rus. бог всё видит;

*Bogu-slavъ ∼ Rus. dial. saying коли не людям в честь, ин (так) Богу в славу (I: 6 — V. I. Dal');

*Bože-darъ ∼ Croat. boži dar [15, p. 18], Rus. божий дар and дар божий;

*Bože-mirъ ∼ Croat. «Odždente zli nemir od vaše mladosti, / a primte boži mir pun svake radosti» [15, p. 119] and good wish Mir božji s tobom! [15, p. 263];

*Bože-slavъ ∼ Croat. božja slava «pivaju se božje slave» [19, p. 294, 336], Na slavu božju! [15, p. 201];

*Xvali-bogъ ∼ Sloven. hvala Bogu, Croat. «hvala vraća, velom Bogu, ki se obraća» [19, p. 145], Rus. dial. Богу хвала, а вам (добрым людям) честь и слава (I: 8 — V. I. Dal');

*Modli-bogъ ∼ Croat. «a gdje se, moj brate, ne moli bog, tu nie milosti božje» [15, p. 143];

*Svęto-bogъ ∼ Croat. svet Bog [19, p. 486].

The semantical difference between compound words with *bogo- VS *bogu- is caused by the grammatical specificity of both forms of the stem. However, the details of their semantic distribution are not always clear, cf. *Bogo-darъ «Gift of God» (?), where *bog-o- is the root with connecting vowel -o-, and *Bogu-darъ «Gift to God», where *bogu is form of the dative case.

Secondly, it is about constructing of dithematic proper names by combining different exponents. The syntactic correlates for these anthroponyms are absent therefore the very possibility of adding parts depended on the semantic valency of *bog-/*bož-. Among the names of this category, we would like to highlight those in which *bog- probably had semantics 'a share' (in the common good). Cf.: *Bez-bogъ **«[Who] does not have [its] share»**, *Bělo-bogъ (only as personal name of a human!) **«[Who has] a good (white) share»**, *Čьrno-bogъ **«[Who has] a bad (black) share»** (it should be noted, that black colour at Slavonians not always symbolizes the misfortune or unhappiness), *Jьno-bogъ **«[Who has] other share»**, *Na-bogъ **«[?] share»**, *Ne-bogъ **«[?] share»**, *Per-da-bogъ **«[Let the] share be transferred [to you]»** (good wish), *Po-bogъ **«[?] share»**, *Sve-bogъ, *Svojь-bogъ **«[Who has his] own share»**, *Uně-bogъ **«[Who has] better share»**, *Vьse-bogъ **«[Who has] all the shares»**.

3. Conclusions. So, the main purpose of suggested paper has been achieved, therefore it is possible make some comments on the viewed linguistic units. The paradigm of lexemes, achievable for reconstruction, contains 69 compound-words with PSlav. exponent *bogo-/*bože- VS *-bogъ as the first (attribute) and the second (object) part. This fact indicates the high degree of the stem *bog- productivity. The high specific weight of the composites with the exponent *bog- impels us to make the conclusion about significant role of *bog-names as words-ideas (mythopoetic complexes) in the Ancient Slavonic poetic text as whole. Their religious-ideological, ritual, legal load enables us to assume their original belonging to the vocabulary of a language of ritualized actions (so-called «high language») closely related to the traditions of name-giving. Exactly within the compound-words the tracks of the long-standing use of *bog- with the legal terminological meaning «a share (in common good)» are traced. Examples of Slavonic poetic speech manifest syntactic counterparts for two-stem personal names; on the basis of these syntactic constructions corresponding anthroponyms perhaps arose.

The **perspectives** for further research are to attract to the analysis the system of structurally identical, and etymologically related, and typologically close anthroponyms from the onomastic vocabulary of Iranian languages and the comparative analyzis of their cultural semantics.

References I

1. Влахова-Ангелова М. Лични имена, образувани от основата *бог-*, в историческата и съвременната българска антропонимия. *Слѣдовати достоитъ: Доклади от международната ономастична конференция «Антропоними и антропонимни изследвания в началото на XXI век»*, посветена на 100-годишнината от рождението на проф. д.ф.н. Йордан Заимов (1921–1987), 20–22 април 2021 г., гр. София. София : БАН, 2021. С. 186–202.

2. Грковић М. Речник личних имена код срба. Београд : Вук Караџић, 1977. 324 с.

3. Єфименко І. В. Українські прізвищеві назви XVI ст. Київ : Інститут укр. мови НАН України, 2003. 168 с.

4. Желєзняк І. М. До семантичної характеристики сербохорватської антропонімії XII–XV ст. *Дослідження з мовознавства*. Київ : Вид-во АН УРСР, 1962. С. 77–93.

5. Илчев Ст. Речник на личните и фамилни имена у българите. София : БАН, 1969. 626 с.

6. Ірклієвський В. Етимологічний словник українських прізвищ. Мюнхен : [Б. в.] 1987. 903 с.

7. Михайловић В. Српски презименик. Нови Сад : Аурора, 2002. 736 с.

8. Розов В. Українські грамоти. Том перший: XIV в. і перша половина XV в. Київ : УАН, 1928. 176 с.

9. Чучка П. П. Прізвища закарпатських українців: Історико-етимологічний словник. Львів : Світ, 2005. 704+XLVIII с.

10. Шульгач В. П. Праслов'янська спадщина в топоніміконі Волинсько-Ровенського Полісся. *Науковий вісник Чернівецького університету*. 2007. Вип. 354–355 : Слов'янська філологія. С. 274–277.

11. Bosanski Petrovac: Žrtve Rata 1941–1945. Available at: https://dokumen.tips/documents/bosanski-petro-vac-zrtve-rata-1941–1945.html?page=76.

12. Cheung J. Etymological Dictionary of the Iranian Verb (= Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series; ed. A. Lubotsky). Leiden ; Boston : Brill, 2007. 600 p.

13. Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Moraviae / [Herausgegeben von P. Ritter v. Chlumecky]. Brünn : Commission bei Nitsch & Grosse, 1854. Band VI. 398 + LXVIII.

14. Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Moraviae. Index. Brunae : Typogr. Caroli Winikerii, 1850. 200 p.

15. Držić M. Djela. *Stari pisci hrvatski*. Zagreb : Dionička tiskara, 1875. Knj. VII. 480 s.

16. Gamkrelidze Th. V., Ivanov Vjač. Vs. Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans: A Reconstruction and Historical Analysis of a Proto-Language and a Proto-Culture. Berlin ; New York : Mouton de Gruyter, 1995. Part I. 864 + 264 p. (= Trends in linguistics. Studies and monographs : 80).

17. Gebauer J. Slovník staročeský. Praha : Unie, 1903–1904. D. I–II.

18. Iliadi A. I. Slavo-Iranica : Compound Words with Slav. *mysl-* : Iran. *mana-*, *mazda-* (against Baltic Background). *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica*. 2022. T. LXXXVII. P. 30–63.

19. Kavanjin J. Povjest vanđelska bogatoga a nesrećna Epuluna i ubogoga a čestita Lazara (Bogastvo i uboštvo). *Stari pisci hrvatski*. Zagreb : Dionička tiskara, 1913. Knj. XXII. 554 s.

20. Kos Fr. Ob osebnih imenih pri starih Slovencih. *Letopis matice slovenske*. Ljubljana : Narodna tiskarna, 1886. S. 107–151.

21. Lampe Fr. Spomin. *Letopis matice slovenske*. Ljubljana : Narodna tiskarna, 1886. S. 152–210.

22. Majtán M. Chronologické a geografické rozvrstvenie zložených slovanských osobných mien. *Slovenská reč*. 1986. Roč. 51. Č. 4. S. 208.

23. Maretić T. O narodnim imenima i prezimenima u Hrvata i Srba. *Rad Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti*. 1886. Knjiga XIV (LXXXI). S. 81–146.

24. Miklosich F. Die Bildung der Ortsnamen aus Personennamen im Slavischen. Wien : Aus der Kaiserlich-Königlichen Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, 1864. 74 S.

25. Milewski T. Ewolucja morfologiczna indoeuropejskich złożonych imion osobowych. *Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego*. 1957. T. 16. S. 37–69.

26. Milewski T. Ze studiów nad antroponimią indoeuropejską. Część I. *Onomastica*. 1957. T. III. S. 349–379.

27. Orbini M. Il Regno de gli Slavi hoggi corrottamente detti Schiavoni. Pesaro : Girolamo Concordia, 1601. 473 p.

28. Ovsená B. Pátranie po tajných slovenských dejinách a slovenskom duchu. Trnava : Eko-konzult, 2014. 216 s.

29. Pačić J., Kollár J. Gmenoslow čili Slownik osobných Gmen rozličných kmenů a nářečí národu Slawenského. Budin : Tiskem kr. wšeučilišťě Peštianského, 1828. 113 s.

30. Rospond St. Słowiańskie nazwy miejscowe z sufiksem *-jь*. Wrocław : Wyd-wo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 1983. 183 s.

31. Russisches geographisches Namenbuch [Begründet von Max Vasmer]. Wiesbaden : Otto Harrassowitz, 1980. Bd X. 543 S.

32. Rymut K. Zasób leksemów w prasłowiańskich imionach złożonych. *Onomastica*. 1993. T. XXXVIII. S. 5–19.

33. Rymut K. (red.) Słownik nazwisk używanych w Polsce na początku XXI wieku. Kraków : Instytut Języka Polskiego PAN, 2003 (CD).

34. Słownik etymologiczno-motywacyjny staropolskich nazw osobowych. Cz. 1: Odapelatywne nazwy osobowe / [Oprac. A. Cieślikowa]. Kraków : DWN, 2000. 378 s.

35. Smoczyński W. Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego [współpraca redakcyjna M. Osłon; wydanie drugie, poprawione i znacznie rozszerzone, na prawach rękopisu]. 2019. Available at : www.rromanes.org/pub/alii/Smoczyński W. Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego.pdf.

36. Stara slovanska imena [http://www.dlib.si/preview/URN:NBN:SI:DOC-DEOPQVQS/34e4051a-7621–48c6-bd23–11d6f7e1ca2e/save].

37. Šmilauer V. Vodopis starého Slovenska. Praha ; Bratislava : Učené společnosti Šafaříkovy, 1932. 564 s.

38. Taszycki W. (red.) Słownik staropolskich nazw osobowych. Wrocław etc. : PAN, 1965–1985. T. I–VII.

39. Vaan de M. Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages. Leiden ; Boston : Brill, 2008. 825 p.

References II

1. Vlakhova-Angelova, M. (2021), "Personal Names, Derived from the stem *bog-*, in Historical and Modern Bulgarian Anthroponymy", *Sledovati dostoit : Proceedings of the International Onomastic Conference «Anthroponyms and Anthroponymic Researches in the Beginning of 21ˢᵗ Century», dedicated to the 100ᵗʰ anniversary of the birth of prof. Yordan Zaimov, Dr. Sc. (1921 — 1987) 20 — 22 April 2021, Sofia* ["Lični imena, obrazuvani ot osnovata *bog-*, v istoričeskata i savremennata balgarska antroponimija", *Sledovati dostoit : Dokladi ot mezhdunarodnata onomastichna konferentsiya «Antroponimi i antroponimni izsledovaniya v nachaloto na XXI vek»,* posvetna na 100-godishninata ot rozhdeniyeto na prof. d.f.n. Yordan Zaimov (1921–1987), 20–22 april 2021 g., gr. Sofia], Prof. Marin Drinov Publishing House of Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia, pp. 186–202.

2. Grković, M. (1977), *A Dictionary of the Serbian Personal Names* [*Rečnik ličnih imena kod srba*], Vuk Karadžić, Beograd, 324 p.

3. Êfimenko, I. V. (2003), *Ukrainian Surnames of* XVI *century* [*Ukrayins'ki prizviščevi nazvi XVI st.*], Institute of the Ukrainian language NAS of Ukraine, Kyiv, 168 p.

4. Zhel'eznyak, I. M. (1962), "On Semantic Characteristic of Serbian and Croatian Anthroponymy of XII–XV cent.", *Studies on Linguistics* ["Do semantichnoyi kharakterystyky serbokhorvats'koyi antroponimiyi XII–XV st.", *Doslidžennia z movoznavstva*], Academy of Sciences of USSR Publishing House, Kyiv, pp. 77–93.

5. Ilchev, St. (1969), *A Dictionary of the Bulgarian Personal Names and Surnames* [*Rechnik na lichnite i familni imena u balgarite*], BAN Publishing House, Sofia, 626 p.

6. Irkliêvs'kiy, V. (1987), *The Etymological Dictionary of Ukrainian Surnames* [*Etymologičny slovnyk ukraîns'kykh prizvyšč*], München, 903 p.

7. Mihajlović, V. (2002), *A Dictionary of the Serbian Personal Names* [*Srpski prezimenik*], Aurora Publishing House, Novi Sad, 736 p.

8. Rozov, V. (1928), *Ukrainian Manuscripts* [*Ukraîns'ki hramoty*], UAS Publishers, Kyiv, Vol. I, 176 p.

9. Chuchka, P. P. (2005), *The Surnames of the Ukrainian of Transcarpathia : Historical-Etymological Dictionary* [*Prizvyshcha zakarpats'kykh ukrayintsiv : Istoryko-etymologichnyi slovnyk*], Svit Publishing House, Lviv, 704+XLVIII p.

10. Shul'hach, V. P. (2007), "Proto-Slavonic Heritage in Toponymy of the Volyn-Rovno Polesye", *Scientific Bulletain of Chernivtsi National Yu. Fedkovych University. Slavonic Philology* ["Praslovyans'ka spadshchyna v toponimikoni Volyns'ko-Rovens'koho Polissya", *Naukovyi visnyk Chernivetskoho natsionalnoho universytetu imeni Yu. Fedkovycha, Slovyanska filolohiya*], Ruta Publishing House, Chernivtsi, Vol. 354–355, pp. 274–277.

11. Bosanski Petrovac : Žrtve Rata 1941–1945. Available at: https://dokumen.tips/documents/bosanski-petrovac-zrtve-rata-1941–1945.html?page=76.

12. Cheung, J. (2007), *Etymological Dictionary of the Iranian Verb* (= Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series; ed. A. Lubotsky), Brill, Leiden ; Boston, 600 p.

13. *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Moraviae* (1854), Herausgegeben von P. Ritter v. Chlumecky, Commission bei Nitsch & Grosse, Brünn, Band VI, 398 + LXVIII p.

14. *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Moraviae* (1850), Index, Typogr. Caroli Winikerii, Brunae, 200 p.

15. Držić, M. (1875), "Djela", *Stari pisci hrvatski*, Dionička tiskara, Zagreb, Knj. VII, 480 s.

16. Gamkrelidze, Th. V., Ivanov, Vjač. Vs. (1995), *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans : A Reconstruction and Historical Analysis of a Proto-Language and a Proto-Culture*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin ; New York, Part I, 864+264 p. (= Trends in linguistics. Studies and monographs : 80).

17. Gebauer, J. (1903–1904), *Slovník staročeský*, Unie, Praha, D. I–II.

18. Iliadi, A. I. (2022), "Slavo-Iranica : Compound Words with Slav. **mysl-* : Iran. **mana-*, **mazda-* (against Baltic Background)", *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica*, Vol. LXXXVII, pp. 30–63.

19. Kavanjin, J. (1913), "Povjest vanđelska bogatoga a nesrećna Epuluna i ubogoga a čestita Lazara (Bogastvo i uboštvo)", *Stari pisci hrvatski*, Dionička tiskara, Zagreb, Knj. XXII, 554 s.

20. Kos, Fr. (1886), "Ob osebnih imenih pri starih Slovencih", *Letopis matice slovenske*, Narodna tiskarna, Ljubljana, ss. 107–151.

21. Lampe, Fr. (1886), "Spomin", *Letopis matice slovenske*, Narodna tiskarna, Ljubljana, ss. 152–210.

22. Majtán, M. (1986), "Chronologické a geografické rozvrstvenie zložených slovanských osobných mien", *Slovenská reč*, Roč. 51, č. 4, s. 208.

23. Maretić, T. (1886), "O narodnim imenima i prezimenima u Hrvata i Srba", *Rad Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti*, Knjiga XIV (LXXXI), ss. 81–146.

24. Miklosich, F. (1864), *Die Bildung der Ortsnamen aus Personennamen im Slavischen*, Kaiserlich-Königlichen Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, Wien, 74 S.

25. Milewski, T. (1957), "Ewolucja morfologiczna indoeuropejskich złożonych imion osobowych", *Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego*, T. 16, ss. 37–69.

26. Milewski, T. (1957), "Ze studiów nad antroponimią indoeuropejską. Część I", *Onomastica*, T. III, ss. 349–379.

27. Orbini, M. (1601), *Il Regno de gli Slavi hoggi corrottamente detti Schiavoni*, Girolamo Concordia, Pesaro, 473 p.

28. Ovsená, B. (2014), *Pátranie po tajných slovenských dejinách a slovenskom duchu*, Eko-konzult, Trnava, 216 s.

29. Pačić, J., Kollár, J. (1828), *Gmenoslow čili Slovník osobných Gmen rozličných kmenů a nářečí národu Slawenského*, Tisk kr. wšeučilište Peštianského, Budin, 113 s.

30. Rospond, St. (1983), *Słowiańskie nazwy miejscowe z sufiksem -jь*, Wyd-wo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, Wrocław, 183 s.

31. *Russisches geographisches Namenbuch* (1980) [Begründet von Max Vasmer], Bd X, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 543 S.

32. Rymut, K. (1993), "Zasób leksemów w prasłowiańskich imionach złożonych", *Onomastica*, T. XXXVIII, ss. 5–19.

33. Rymut, K. (red.) (2003), *Słownik nazwisk używanych w Polsce na początku XXI wieku*, Instytut Języka Polskiego PAN, Kraków, (CD).

34. *Słownik etymologiczno-motywacyjny staropolskich nazw osobowych*. Cz. 1: Odapelatywne nazwy osobowe (2000) [Oprac. A. Cieślikowa], DWN, Kraków, 378 s.

35. Smoczyński, W. (2019), *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego* [współpraca redakcyjna M. Osłon ; wydanie drugie, poprawione i znacznie rozszerzone, na prawach rękopisu]. Available at : www.rromanes.org/pub/alii/Smoczyński W. Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego.pdf.

36. *Stara slovanska imena.* Available at : http://www.dlib.si/preview/URN:NBN:SI:DOC-DEOPQVQS/34e4051a-7621–48c6-bd23–11d6f7e1ca2e/save/

37. Šmilauer, V. (1932), *Vodopis starého Slovenska*, Učené společnosti Šafaříkovy, Praha ; Bratislava, 564 s.

38. Taszycki, W. (red.) (1965–1985), *Słownik staropolskich nazw osobowych*, PAN, Wrocław etc., T. I–VII.

39. Vaan de M. (2008), *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages*, Brill, Leiden ; Boston, 825 p.

ІЛІАДІ Олександр Іванович,
доктор філологічних наук, професор кафедри перекладу і теоретичної та прикладної лінгвістики факультету іноземних мов ДЗ «Південноукраїнський національний педагогічний університет імені К. Д. Ушинського»; вул. Старопортофранківська, 34, 65020, Одеса, Україна; тел.: +38 095 0812118; e-mail: alexandr.iliadi@gmail.com; https://orcid.org/0000–0001–5078–8316

ЕКСПОНЕНТ *BOGO-/*-BOGЪ У ПРАСЛОВ'ЯНСЬКИХ КОМПОЗИТАХ

Анотація. Стаття має на меті історико-мовне дослідження суми праслов'янських антропонімів-композитів із кореневою основою *bog-. **Мета** студії — опис структури та особливостей семантики антропонімічних композитів із праслов'янським компонентом *bog-. **Об'єкт** дослідження — утворені шляхом складання «основа + слово», «слово + слово» давні слов'янські Nomina Personalia, ексцерповані з доступних писемних джерел (в основному — зібрань слов'янських особових імен і (меншою мірою) пам'яток писемності різного часу). **Предмет** — етимологічні, фонетичні, морфологічні, лексико-семантичні властивості історично засвідчених слов'янських особових назв і реконструйованих під час аналізу праслов'янських архетипів. **Результати** дослідження: здійснено реконструкцію фрагмента системи праслов'янських двочленних лексем (особових назв) із експонентом *bogo-/*-bogъ; прокоментовано етимологічно неоднозначні особові назви; висвітлено морфологічні та семантичні властивості праслов'янських особових імен-композитів. **Висновки**. Компонент *bogo-/*bože-/*-bogъ у праслов'янських дитематичних Nomina Propria засвідчений як препозитивне означення, так і як постпозитивне означуване. Попередні результати групової реконструкції одиниць, які постали в гнізді з основою *bog-, засвідчують високий рівень її продуктивності. Зокрема, праслов'янський ономастичний вокабулярій налічував, як мінімум, 69 *bog*-композитів. Висока продуктивність парадигми з експонентом *bog- спонукає до висновку про значимість ролі *bog*-антропонімів як слів-ідей у давньослов'янському поетичному тексті. Їхнє релігійно-ідеологічне, ритуальне, правове навантаження дозволяє передбачати їх належність до словника мови ритуалізованих дій, безпосередньо пов'язаних із традиціями давання імен. Саме у складі композитів зберігаються сліди давнього використання *bog- із правовим термінологічним значенням '(суспільна) доля'. Приклади слов'янського поетичного мовлення демонструють синтаксичні відповідники слов'янських двоосновних особових назв; на базі цих синтаксичних конструкцій були сформовані відповідні антропоніми. **Перспективи** подальших досліджень убачаються в залученні структурно ідентичних та етимологічно споріднених і типологічно близьких антропонімів із ономастичного вокабулярія іранських мов і компаративному аналізі їхньої культурної семантики.

Ключові слова: праслов'янський, реконструкція, антропонім, композит, діахронія, синхронія, філологія, парадигма, прототип, семантика.