

**MINIAILO Roman V.,**

Doctor of Philology, Professor, Professor at the Department of Ukrainian Linguistics, Literature and Teaching Methods;

Municipal Establishment “Kharkiv Humanitarian-Pedagogical Academy” of the Kharkiv Regional Council, Ukraine; 7 Rustaveli Lane, Kharkiv, 61001

e-mail: [roman298@gmail.com](mailto:roman298@gmail.com)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9392-594X>

**MINIAILO Nataliya V.,**

PhD in Philology, Lecturer at the Department of Foreign Languages and Crosscultural Communication; Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics, Ukraine;

9-A Nauky Avenue, Kharkiv, 61165

e-mail: [nataliya.minyaylo@hneu.net](mailto:nataliya.minyaylo@hneu.net)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4643-3309>

## UKRAINIAN DIALECT VOCABULARY IN THE RECONSTRUCTION OF ANCIENT CRAFTS

**Summary.** The names of several fishing tools and their semantic connections with the terminology of other ancient crafts – such as wickerwork and pottery – are analyzed in the article. These interconnections arise from evolutionary changes in the everyday life of early communities. Archaeological findings allow scholars to conclude that the need for fishing significantly contributed to the transition of ancient ethnic groups from a nomadic lifestyle to permanent settlement, as well as to the development of skills involved in producing various industrial and household tools made of plant materials. The **object** of the research is the lexical system of traditional folk crafts in the East Slavic area, while the **subject** is the semantic and etymological features of fishing-tool names in their relation to wickerwork and pottery terminology. The **purpose** of the study is to clarify the linguistic evidence that reflects the interaction of archaic crafts. The **aim** is to reconstruct the Proto-Slavic lexical base and to determine the semantic mechanisms through which technological actions became integrated into the nomination of fishing tools. An important source for studying primitive syncretism in the archaic cultures of wickerwork, fishing, and pottery is the vocabulary of these traditional crafts – namely Proto-Slavic lexical and semantic reconstructions and Ukrainian dialect material. The analyzed data demonstrate that many Ukrainian nouns denoting wicker fishing gear originated in the Proto-Slavic period: *верша* (versha), *вертень* (verten'), *корзина* (korzyna), *скrypka* (skrypka), *лиска* (liska), etc. The use of wicker baskets as fishing tools in several Ukrainian regions indicates a shared etymological base for the names *киш* (kish), *санетка* (sapetka), *корзина* (korzyna) referring to both fishing and wildcrafting instruments. Similar evidence arises from the use of pottery (*корчага* (korchaha), *гличик* (hlechyk)) in the fishing process instead of wicker devices. The analyzed material also shows that the technological (verbal) sema becomes re-actualized in the internal form of these names after the development of more advanced fishing techniques. This confirms **conclusions** drawn by linguists, ethnographers, and archaeologists regarding the syncretism of archaic industrial cultures and the emergence of vocabulary grounded in shared technological practices.

**Keywords:** primitive syncretism of archaic crafts, fishing lexical-semantic reconstructions, dialect fishing vocabulary, extralingual factors.

**Introduction.** Fishery has played an important role in the formation of human civilization. Works by historians [17; 4; 18] argue that the need to fish significantly contributed to the transition of ancient ethnic groups from a nomadic lifestyle to settlement, and the latter, respectively, added up to agricultural, construction and other skills. The settled way of life also resulted in the emergence of such an ancient craft as weaving from plant materials special tools for household and hunting needs. As I. Saienko points out rightly, weaving from cattails and vines is most characteristic of the areas adjacent to lakes and rivers, so that among the traditional household items there were mostly fishing tools and baskets. According to some researchers, wickerwork with natural materials has also become the primary source of weaving and ceramics [20, p. 215 – 216].

The important material for the study of primitive syncretism in the archaic cultures of wickerwork, fishing and pottery is the vocabulary of these folk crafts, because a word as a structural and semantic unit of language is not determined only by the objective characteristics of the denoted thing, but also by ideas about objects and phenomena connected to the experience of the preceding generations, “not only the generalization of the phenomena of the objective world, but also the selection and concentration in the concept of individual features of various phenomena of the inner, spiritual world” [11, p. 23].

The **purpose** of our research is to prove the important role of fishing in the development of wickerwork and pottery, as well as to show the syncretic essence of the vocabulary of these ancient crafts on the basis of fishing lexical-semantic reconstructions and fishing vocabulary in Ukrainian dialects.

**Researches.** The theoretical basis of the work is the concepts of O. Potebnia, B. Larin, O. Melnychuk, O. Trubachov, J. Lakoff.

Because the number of features in each sphere of comprehension is indefinite, the definition can't ever become a whole one, – mentioned by a prominent Ukrainian linguist Oleksander Potebnya. The Academic Oleg Trubachyov posited: in the aspect of age-old realities and local (dialect) names of those we can draw a conclusion that is useful for understanding of the evolution of these realities. Practice of tracking general patterns in forming of differing terminology was auspicated by the researcher of Indo-European and Slavic languages in his writing “Craft terminology in Slavic languages (Derivation and experience of group reconstruction)”, 1966.

Considering O. Melnychuk's directions about etymological nesting of words, T. Chernysh pays attention to etymons, which are equal or related in meaning. Studying of such words will shed a light on possible sematic parallelism and semantic development patterns [23, p. 7].

M. Pimenova summarized the observations of prominent linguists (O. Potebnia, B. Larina, O. Trubachova, etc.) concerning the lexical-semantic syncretism of the ancient word. Despite B. Larin's statement that such units are rare, the scientist suggests the existence of a significant number of etymons with primary semantic indivisibility, which is indirectly confirmed by the existence of the theory and practice of the so-called “multiple etymologies” (M. Makovsky's term).

T. Kazantseva, based on the eloquent example of the famous American cognitivist J. Lakoff, who generalized into one category words of different semantics (‘woman’, ‘sun’, ‘dangerous objects’, ‘nettles’, ‘crickets’) with a common seme ‘fire, burning’, presupposed that ancient Indo-Europeans had similar processes of the world perception. Therefore, the task of a modern researcher, according to T. Kazantseva's opinion, is to understand how our ancestors perceived the world. This will help to reveal trends in language development and study the residual phenomena in it. In turn, it will reconstruct the picture of the world of ancient man.

Thus, the study and arrangement of the linguistic world of fishing in its connection with the culture of other ancient crafts is a relevant problem of linguistics. The study of fishing vocabulary in terms of change or improvement of realities is associated with ethnolinguistic, sociolinguistic, psycholinguistic and other linguistic problems, in particular with the study of the linguistic world image. This will make the deepest etymological and structural-semantic analysis of fishing vocabulary in the context of material and spiritual culture of the ethnos possible.

**Materials and methods.** Methods of research of evolutionary from the origin of mankind fishing terminology will differ from methods of research of those branch terminologies which have arisen as a result of scientific and technical revolutions and whose starting point is a certain historical stage of development of a society. Of course, scientific and technological progress has focused on fishing, but the nuclear part of the vocabulary to denote the realities of this primitive way of life dates back at least the Indo-European community – therefore, the object of linguistic analysis is fishing vocabulary in its historical development. Involvement of as much dialectal fishing vocabulary and phraseology as possible in the scientific analysis, the fund of which is constantly replenished, will enable a more perfect onomasiological description of the models of formation of fishing names.

Linguistic (mainly ethnolinguistic) works devoted to reconstruction of etymons of names of wicker industrial tools are synthesized in the research to achieve the purpose of the given study.

Also, after applying content analysis to the studied names from the dictionary articles “Etymological Dictionary of Slavic Languages (Proto-Slavic Lexical Fund)”, “Etymological Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language” and dialect dictionaries of the Ukrainian language, the method of explanatory description of these language units based on areal and genetic names facts of extralinguistic reality, which testify to the connection of fishing vocabulary with wickerwork and pottery glossary, was used.

**Discussion.** Historians of the language have repeatedly drawn attention to the verbs common to Proto-Slavic and other Indo-European languages denoting human economic activity, in particular to Proto-Slavic lexical and semantic reconstructions *\*viti* ‘spin’ and *\*plesti* ‘weave’ [5, p. 24], which are associated with the emergence of the names of wicker fishing gear made of willow and horse hair. Thus, the Proto-Slavic vocabulary of fishing is an important source for studying the evolutionary development of material and spiritual culture of the Ukrainians. And regarding to understanding the reasons for the lexical and semantic richness of any Slavic language, we stand in solidarity with O. Tsaruk, that even a millennium ago the lexical system of language as a full-blooded organism capable of modification, mainly by displacing older forms with newer ones [25, p.17].

In the Mesolithic era or the Middle Stone Age, fishing of proto-Ukrainian hunters was prompted by difficulties in hunting animals that fled to forests and swamps. According to scientists in the Mesolithic era, people were able to fish with wicker baskets [17, p. 16 – 17]. Having studied the system of motivational signs of the ancient Slavic genetic nucleus, headed by the root *\*(s)vbr-/\*(s)vʒr-* with *\*g*-determinative and basic (initial) semantics ‘bend’, ‘twist’,

O. Iliadi comes to the conclusion that spreading of Slavic names of a wicker fishing trap with this stem, as well as the diversity of its phonetic structure, which reflects the original [*\*e*], [*\*ъ*], [*\*ь*], testifies in favor of the originality of all words that reach Proto-Slavic *\*vbržb(a)*, formed from the imperfective *\*vbržati* < *\*vbrzjati* ‘weave’ (Iliadi 2000, 61).

In the Eastern Slobozhansky dialects of the Ukrainian language, there is a name for a wicker fishing trap *вѣрмень* (*verten*), which the author of the article detected in Belovodsk, Luhansk region (the Derkul). We are convinced that this dialecticism arose as a result of the permutation of sounds – metathesis. Compare the name *вермень* with the names of the same fishing gear in the dialects of Lower Transnistria – *вѣнтер* (*vientier*), *вѣнтер* (*vintier*), which etymologists derive from the Proto-Baltic *\*ventē* ‘twig’ [12, p. 349]. And it is extremely important that in the dialecticism *вермень* we can observe intuitive reflection of the basic form for the etymon associated with twisting (in Ukrainian *за/верт/анням*) of twigs.

Given the above examples of lexical-semantic reconstructions and dialectisms, we note: the semantics of action, or rather the physical impact on materials of plant and animal origin (such as twisting willow twigs, sharpening a tree branch or animal bone), is the key which helps to understand the inseparable unity between the name of the action and the name of the manufacturing ancient reality. Hence, historians of the language draw attention to the fact that Proto-Slavic *\*kostь* ‘bone’ has a Latin equivalent *costa*, which means ‘ribs’ [5, p. 20], and according to archeological findings the tips of the first fishing traps were made of ribs, as it is evidenced in particular by the bone harpoon-trident of the Early Iron Age discovered by D. Kozak in a multi-layered settlement near the village of Khrinniki in Volyna [8, p. 95 – 96].

The compilers of the Etymological Dictionary of Slavic Languages (Proto-Slavic Lexical Fund) saw that the meaning of the Proto-Slavic reconstruction *\*kosterь* ‘fish with hard scales that are difficult to remove’ reflects the commonality of semantic features of words *\*kostь* ‘bone’ (in Ukrainian *кіст/ка*) and *\*česati* ‘scratch, remove’ (in Ukrainian *чеч/аму*), and hence the value of the verb semantics of the etymon-ichthyonym.

Derivatologists, analyzing the confixal formations of the Proto-Slavic stage of development of the Ukrainian language with the formant *\*o-...-ž(-ь, -a)*, give the reconstruction *\*ovbržь* ‘a net of twigs to prevent fish from flowing away’, which together with typologically similar *\*okolь* ‘round fence, circle’, *\*omotь* ‘waterhole, whirl’, *\*otora* ‘appellation name of the reservoir’, *\*oskěpь* ‘spear’ etc. illustrates the prevalence in the Proto-Slavic era of nouns of verb origin to denote the realities of the environment [3, p. 40 – 41].

The earthenware found in the Dniester basin, similar in shape to a wicker fishing tool, which in the modern Ukrainian literary language is called *вепуа* (*versha*) dates back to the Neolithic epoch. According to scientists, the invention of this tool was caused primarily by the need to preserve fish, because, salted in a vessel, it could be stored longer [17, p. 17]. In Proto-Slavic lexical-semantic reconstructions there is a lot of evidence regarding to the similarity of the shape of pottery (originally – a wicker container, which was then coated with clay for strength) and fishing traps. Hence, the word *кору́аза* (*korchaha*) < *\*k̑rčaga* ‘a device with a neck’ < *\*k̑rk̑* ‘neck’ in Ukrainian means a container with a narrow neck for vodka, and in Russian dialects – a wicker trap made of willow. Along with the reconstructed Proto-Slavic name *\*k̑rčaga* / *\*k̑rčag̑* as a possible suffixal formation from *\*k̑rk̑* ‘neck’ some linguists suggest its connection with the Turkish word *korčak* ‘bag, leather sack’ [14, p. 46]. We think that given the “millennial relations of the Ukrainian language with representatives of not one but several Turkic peoples, the lexical composition and structural features of languages which we either do not know, or know very little (Avars, Pechenegs, Bulgarians, Khazars, Polovtsians, black klobucks, kipchaks of the Golden Horde, Crimean Tatars, Nogai of the Ukrainian steppe, Turks)” [24, p. 13], Turkic influence on the formation of the name is quite possible.

Wicker products (walls, fences, vessels, etc.) were coated with clay to enhance strength and the ancient Germans used reeds, straw, young shoots of trees for weaving [9, p. 54]. S. Širenko, considering the ethnological classifications of fishing tools, gives an example of the possibility of replacing wicker fishing tools with pottery: “In the mountain rivers of the Carpathians, a jug with porridge stuck to the walls was placed in the water until the 40s of the twentieth century. In the morning, it was taken out with tench” [21, p. 110].

The connection between fishing culture and wickerwork technology is extremely strong. On the material of dialects of the Ukrainian and Russian languages O. Yusikova distinguishes a semema ‘wicker basket’ in the semantic structure of the name *кѣу* / *кѣу* (*kish* / *kosh*) within the lexical-semantic group “wicker container” and “tools for fishing” in contrast to the lexical-semantic group “wooden container”, where the name *кѣу* functions as a representative of the semema ‘board basket’, ‘box in the grain mill’, ‘caravan, board cart of the vehicle’. Regarding the meaning of the word *кѣу* the researcher concludes that the differentiation of sememas in its

dynamics is due to the influence of extralingual factors: the peculiarities of life and management of the population, natural factors, contacts with neighboring non-Slavic peoples [26, p. 333].

The name of the wicker container *киу* (*kou*) is regarded by etymologists to Proto-Slavic *\*košb* (< *\*kosjo-*), which reaches the Indo-European *\*kʷas-* ‘wicker basket’ [13, p. 451 – 452].

In Eastern Slobozhansky dialects, the lexical-semantic group “wicker vessel” includes one of the lexico-semantic variants of the *canémka* (*sapetka*) ‘a basket in the form of a cut cone without a bottom, which is used to cover the fish in the muddy water on the shoal, and then catch it through a smaller hole that is above the water’. The author of the article discovered this name in Luhansk region: in the village of Karmazynivka of Svativskyi district (on the river Zhrebets – the left tributary of the Seversky Donets) and in the village of Tretyakivka of the Belovodsky district (on the river Derkul – the left tributary of the Seversky Donets). It should be noted that in the all-Ukrainian continuum fishing semema is only a separate component of the semantic structure of this word, as the peculiarities of the economic purpose of reality have led to the emergence of other lexical and semantic variants. This is demonstrated by the dialecticisms of the northern dialect of the Ukrainian language: *canéma* (*sapeta*), *canéma* (*sapieta*) (diminutively *canémka* (*sapetka*), *canémka* (*sapietka*)) ‘a vine basket with two ears for carrying vegetables, peat, etc.’ [10, p. 190], *canémka* ‘a basket with two handles is woven from vine rods of the big size’ [1, p. 135], as well as Central Slobozhansk dialecticisms: *canémka* ‘wicker extension on the cart, wicker box’ [19, p. 196].

Etymologists interpret the word *caném* (*sapet*) as a borrowing from the Turkic languages, compare a Turkish word *sepet* and a Crimean Tatar word *sápät* ‘basket’, which are considered to be borrowed from the Persian language [15, p. 179].

The name *корзіна* (*korzyna*) ‘basket’ etymologists associate with Proto-Slavic *\*kʷr̥z-* ‘weave’, assuming kinship with Latvian *kurža* ‘wooden bark box; basket of twigs’ or with Lithuanian *keržti* ‘to tie’, *kárglioti* ‘to weave a fence; to spin’ [14, p. 17]. In his profound ethnographic research, V. Chabanenko described how people were fishing with baskets in estuaries, lakes and basins of the Great Meadow: “*Корзіна* was a truncated cone woven from thin rods. Hornwort and algae were covered with it (pressing the wider edge to the bottom), and then rummaged in the water by hand, looking for fish. In this way they caught mostly clumsy tench and crucian carp, which like to dwell in the mud” (Chabanenko 2010, 80).

The similarity of technologies for the manufacture of various tools and, accordingly, the etymological commonality of names in the field of weaving, pottery, fishing are associated with the syncretism of settled (reproductive) household management, which gradually replaced the appropriation of nature as the only source of livelihood. Hence, the above mentioned reconstruction *\*vr̥žati* ‘weave’, which the name for the woven fishing gear *вепуа* derives from, echoes the Lithuanian verb *veržti* ‘bind, squeeze’ [12, p. 362]. The meaning ‘squeeze’ is connected to the etymon of another name for a woven fishing tool in Middle Polissya dialects – *скрыпка* (*skrypka*): ‘stationary trap made of vine “rods” for ice fishing, which looked like a trough, most of which was cone-shaped and solid, and the second (smaller) was woven only half’ [6, p. 27]. “The Etymological Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language” refers the word *скрупу́ця* (*skrupytsia*) to derivatives *скру́нку* (*skrypky*) ‘grommets in the loom which threads hang on and which rise and fall along’, *прискру́нати* (*pryskrypaty*) ‘press, squeeze’, which have parallels in particular in the Czech language: *skřípnouti* ‘press, squeeze’, *skřípec* ‘clamping device; clothespin; trap, block in a loom’. Etymologists consider that meanings developed from ‘to split, something split up’, in connection with which the verbal nucleus is also derived from the Indo-European *\*sker-* ‘cut, pin’ [15, p. 287 – 288].

It is remarkable to mention the lexical and semantic evolution of the Proto-Slavic name *\*lěsa* (*\*lěska*) from the ancient meaning, connected *\*lěsz* (only deciduous forests grew on the site of the former felling during the slash agriculture), to the meaning ‘tied to the fishing rod a long strong thread (of horse hair, silk, kapron, etc.)’, at the end of which a fishing hook is attached’ – a synonym *волосінь* (*volosin*) [2, p. 731]. In the dialects of the Ukrainian language, we can observe the preservation of the primary meaning of the word *ліса* (*lisa*) ‘a hedge’ and its suffixal derivative *ліска* (*liska*) ‘device made of rods to fish’ [16, p. 415]. Etymologists connect the Proto-Slavic lexical-semantic reconstruction *\*lěsz* to the Indo-European stem *\*uel-* ‘tear, shred, beat’, it serves as an umbrella term for three nuclei with the meanings ‘tear, shred’ – ‘weave’ – ‘something that is torn off, picked up (hair, fur, an ear of wheat)’.

Thus, the Proto-Ukrainians developed the meaning of the word *\*lěsa* (*\*lěska*) based on an array of extralinguistic factors: development and decline of slash agriculture, invention of weaving, taming horses and, accordingly, the ability to use horse hair as a material for weaving, and so on. In general, in naming tools of labor the material criterion of nomination is always

inferior to another – *due to the common technology of manufacturing industrial tools* (weaving, bending, etc.).

**Conclusion.** The tradition of tracing general patterns in the multidisciplinary terminology formation was established by the eminent linguist O. Trubachov in his work “Craft Terminology in Slavic Languages (Etymology and Experience of Group Reconstruction)” (1966). Our analysis of fishing vocabulary in its connection with the vocabulary of other ancient crafts was performed based on linguistic (linguistic reconstructions and dialectisms) and extra lingual (archaeological and ethnological) material. It once again testified to the need for an interdisciplinary approach to the search for motivational features of Proto-Slavic etymons. This need is evidenced by the insightful research of fishing culture by scientists of various profiles, which were the theoretical basis for our article and presented in References. The analyzed material points to the fact that the origin of nouns derived from verbs denoting wicker fishing gear in the Ukrainian language dates back to the Proto-Slavic era: *верша* (*versha*), *вертень* (*verten*), *корзина* (*korzyna*), *скрыпка* (*skrypka*), *лиска* (*liska*) and so on. The use in some regions of Ukraine of a wicker basket as a tool for fishing indicates a common etymological base of names *киш* (*kish*), *санетка* (*sapetka*), *корзина* (*korzyna*) to denote the realities of fishing and wildcrafting. Using pottery in the fishing process (*корчага* (*korchaha*), *гличук* (*hlechyk*)) instead of wicker fishing gear also proves it. The analyzed material also shows that the technological (verb) sema re-actualizes in the internal form of names after the development of technologies for the manufacture of fishing gear. And this also confirms the conclusions of language historians, ethnographers, archaeologists about the syncretism of archaic industrial cultures, the emergence of vocabulary which united the commonality of technological actions.

#### Л і т е р а т у р а

1. Аркушин Г. Л. Словник західнополіських говірок. Т. 2. Луцьк : Вежа, 2000. 689 с. URL: <http://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/ulib/item/UKR0000987>
2. Білодід І. К. Словник української мови. Т. 1. Київ : Наукова думка, 1970. 799 с. URL: <http://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/ulib/item/UKR0001576>
3. Білоусенко П. І. Нариси з історії українського словотворення (іменникова суфіксація). Запоріжжя–Кривий Ріг : ТОВ «LIPS» LTD, 2010. 421 с. URL: <http://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/ulib/item/UKR0010200>
4. Бунятян К. П. Давнє населення України. Київ : Либідь, 1999. 228 с. URL: <http://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/ulib/item/UKR0001412>
5. Винник В. О. Історія української мови. Лексика і фразеологія. Київ : Наукова думка, 1983. 742 с. URL: <http://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/ulib/item/UKR0002775>
6. Глушко М. Риболовецькі знаряддя лову та способи їх застосування. *Полісся України : матеріали історико-етнографічного дослідження*. Львів : ІН НАН України, 1999. Вип. 2. С. 19–32. URL: <http://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/ulib/item/ukr0000012775>
7. Ліаді О. І. Гніздо кореня \*vъrg / \*vъrg у праслов'янській мові. *Мовознавство*, 2000. № 4–5, С. 60–65.
8. Козак Д. Н. Житлово-господарський комплекс рибалок раннього залізного віку на Волині. *Археологія*, 2009. № 2. С. 94–98. URL: <http://dspace.nbuv.gov.ua/handle/123456789/65276>
9. Левицький В. В. Основи германістики. Вінниця : Нова книга, 2008. 528 с.
10. Лисенко П. С. Словник поліських говорів. Київ : Наукова думка, 1974. 260 с. URL: <http://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/ulib/item/UKR0001830>
11. Лисиченко Л. А. Лексико-семантичний вимір мовної картини світу. Харків : Основа, 2009. 191 с.
12. Мельничук О. С. Етимологічний словник української мови. Т. 1. Київ : Наукова думка, 1982. 632 с. URL: <http://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/ulib/item/UKR0001331>
13. Мельничук О. С. Етимологічний словник української мови. Т. 2. Київ : Наукова думка, 1985. 572 с. URL: <http://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/ulib/item/UKR0001334>
14. Мельничук О. С. Етимологічний словник української мови. Т. 3. Київ : Наукова думка, 1989. 553 с. URL: <http://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/ulib/item/UKR0001335>
15. Мельничук О. С. Етимологічний словник української мови. Т. 5. Київ : Наукова думка, 2006. 507 с. URL: <http://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/ulib/item/UKR0001340>
16. Онишкевич М. І. Словник бойківських говірок. Т. 1. Київ : Наукова думка, 1984. 494 с. URL: <http://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/ulib/item/UKR0002754>
17. Пайк В. Корінь безсмертної України та українського народу. Львів : Червона Калина, 1995. 56 с.
18. Палій О. Історія України. Київ : К.І.С., 2015. 596 с.
19. Сахаровський А. А. Матеріали до діалектного словника Центральної Слобожанщини (Харківщина). Т. 2. Харків : ХНУ, 2013.
20. Саснко І. Ф. Традиції плетінництва в Україні : історія і сучасність. *Гуманітарний вісник*. Черкаси : ЧДТУ, 2014. № 21. Вип. 5. Ч. 2, С. 214–219. URL: [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Gvi\\_2014\\_21\\_5\(2\)\\_19](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Gvi_2014_21_5(2)_19)
21. Сиренко С. До питання класифікації риболовних знарядь лову. *Народна творчість та етнографія*, 2011. № 1. С. 106–107. URL: [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/NTE\\_2011\\_1\\_16](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/NTE_2011_1_16)
22. Царук О. Українська мова серед інших слов'янських мов : етнолінгвістичні та граматичні параметри. Дніпропетровськ : Наука і освіта, 1998. 324 с. URL: <http://elibrary.kdpu.edu.ua/xmlui/handle/0564/897>
23. Чабаненко В. Етнографічні праці. Запоріжжя : Запорізький національний університет, 2010. 96 с.
24. Черниш Т. О. Oleksandr Melnychuk jako etymolog i komparatysta. *Studia z Filologii Polskiej i Słowiańskiej*, 2019. № 54. С. 1–9. URL: <https://doi.org/10.11649/sfps.1797>
25. Халимоненко Г. І. Тюркізми в професійно-виробничій лексиці української мови (лексика тваринництва): автореф. дис. ... д-ра філол. наук. Київ : Інститут сходознавства ім. А. Кримського НАН України, 1996. 417 с.

26. Юсікова О. Семантичні паралелі слова *кіш* в українських і російських діалектах. *Наукові записки Вінницького державного педагогічного університету ім. М. Коцюбинського. Серія: Філологія (мовознавство)*. 2012. № 16. С. 330–334.  
URL: [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Nzvdpu\\_filol\\_2012\\_16\\_75](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Nzvdpu_filol_2012_16_75)

## References

1. Arkushyn, H. L. (2000), *Dictionary of West Polissya dialects* [Slovník zakhidnopoliskykh hovirok], Vol. 2, Lutsk: Vezha, 689 p. Available at: <http://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/ulib/item/UKR0000987>
2. Bilodid, I. K. (Editor in Chief). (1970), *Dictionary of the Ukrainian language* [Slovník ukraïnskoi movy], Vol. 1, Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 799 p. Available at: <http://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/ulib/item/UKR0001576>
3. Bilousenko, P. I. et al. (2010), *Essays on the history of Ukrainian word formation (noun suffixes)* [Narysy z istorii ukraïnskoho slovotvorennia (imennikova sufiksatsiia)], Zaporizhzhia–Kryvyi Rih: TOV “LIPS” LTD, 421 p. Available at: <http://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/ulib/item/UKR0010200>
4. Buniatian, K. P. (1999). *The ancient population of Ukraine* [Davnie naselennia Ukrainy]. Kyiv: Lybid. 228 p. Available at: <http://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/ulib/item/UKR0001412>
5. Vynnyk, V. O. et al. (1983), *History of the Ukrainian language. Vocabulary and phraseology* [Istoriia ukraïnskoi movy. Leksyka i frazeolohiia], Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 742 p. Available at: <http://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/ulib/item/UKR0002775>
6. Hlushko, M. (1999), *Fishing tackles and methods of their application. Polissia Ukrainy: materialy istoriko-etnografichnoho doslidzhennia* [Rybolovetski znariaddia lovu ta sposoby yikh zastosuvannia. Polissia Ukrainy : materialy istoriko-etnografichnoho doslidzhennia], Lviv: IE NAS of Ukraine, Issue 2, pp. 19–32. Available at: <http://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/ulib/item/ukr0000012775>
7. Iliadi, O. I. (2000), *The nest of the root \*vǫrg / \*vǫrg in the Proto-Slavic language. Movoznavstvo* [Hnizdo korenia \*vrg / \*vǫrg u praslovianskii movi. Movoznavstvo], № 4-5, pp. 60–65.
8. Kozak, D. N. (2009), *Housing and economic complex of early Iron Age fishermen in Volyn. Arkheolohiia* [Zhytlovo-hospodarskyi kompleks rybalok rannoho zaliznoho viku na Volyni. Arkheolohiia], № 2, pp. 94–98. Available at: <http://dspace.nbuv.gov.ua/handle/123456789/65276>
9. Levytskyi, V. V. (2008), *Fundamentals of German studies*. [Osnovy hermanistyky]. Vinnytsia: Nova knyha. 528 p.
10. Lysenko, P. S. (1974), *Dictionary of Polissya dialects* [Slovník poliskykh hovoriv]. Kyiv: Naukova dumka. 260 p. Available at: <http://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/ulib/item/UKR0001830>
11. Lysychenko, L. A. (2009), *Lexical and semantic dimension of the linguistic world image* [Leksyko-semantychnyi vymir movnoi kartyny svitu]. Kharkiv: Osnova. 191 p.
12. Melnychuk, O. S. (1982), *Etymological dictionary of the Ukrainian language* [Etymolohichnyi slovník ukraïnskoi movy]. Vol. 1. Kyiv: Naukova dumka. 632 p. Available at: <http://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/ulib/item/UKR0001331>
13. Melnychuk, O. S. (1985), *Etymological dictionary of the Ukrainian language* [Etymolohichnyi slovník ukraïnskoi movy]. Vol. 2. Kyiv: Naukova dumka. 572 p. Available at: <http://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/ulib/item/UKR0001334>
14. Melnychuk, O. S. (1989), *Etymological dictionary of the Ukrainian language*. [Etymolohichnyi slovník ukraïnskoi movy]. Vol. 3. Kyiv: Naukova dumka. 553 p. Available at: <http://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/ulib/item/UKR0001335>
15. Melnychuk, O. S. (2006), *Etymological dictionary of the Ukrainian language*. [Etymolohichnyi slovník ukraïnskoi movy]. Vol. 5. Kyiv: Naukova dumka. 507 p. Available at: <http://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/ulib/item/UKR0001340>
16. Onyshkevych, M. I. (1984), *Dictionary of Boyko dialects* [Slovník boikivskykh hovirok]. Vol. 1. Kyiv: Naukova dumka. 494 p. Available at: <http://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/ulib/item/UKR0002754>
17. Paik, V. (1995), *The root of immortal Ukraine and the Ukrainian people* [Korin bezsmertnoi Ukrainy ta ukraïnskoho narodu]. Lviv: Chervona Kalyna. 56 p.
18. Palii, O. (2015), *History of Ukraine* [Istoriia Ukrainy]. Kyiv: R.I.C. 596 p.
19. Saharovskiy, A. A. (2013), *Materials for the dialect dictionary of Central Slobozhanshchyna (Kharkiv region)* [Materialy do dialektnoho slovníka Tsentralnoi Slobozhanshchyny (Kharkivshchyna)]. Vol. 2. Kharkiv: KhNU.
20. Saienko, I. F. (2014), *Weaving traditions in Ukraine: history and modernity. Humanitarnyi visnyk*. [Tradytzii pletynnytstva v Ukraini: istoriia y suchasnist. Humanitarnyi visnyk]. Cherkasy: ChST., № 21, Issue 5, P. 2, pp. 214–219. Available at: [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Gvi\\_2014\\_21\\_5\(2\)\\_19](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Gvi_2014_21_5(2)_19)
21. Sirenko, S. (2011), *On the question of classification of fishing gear. Narodna tvorchis't' ta etnografiia* [Do pytannia klasyfikatsii rybolovnykh znariad lovu. Narodna tvorchist ta etnografiia], № 1, pp. 106–107. Available at: [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/NTE\\_2011\\_1\\_16](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/NTE_2011_1_16)
22. Tsaruk, O. (1998), *Ukrainian language among other Slavic languages: ethnological and grammatical parameters* [Ukraïnska mova sered inshykh slovianskykh mov : etnolinhvistychni ta hramatychni parametry]. Dnipropetrovsk: Nauka i osvita. 324 p. Available at: <http://elibrary.kdpu.edu.ua/xmlui/handle/0564/897>
23. Chabanenko, V. (2010), *Ethnographic works* [Etnografichni pratsi]. Zaporizhzhia: Zaporizhzhia National University. 96 p.
24. Chernysh, T. O. (2019), *Oleksandr Melnychuk jako etymolog i komparatysta. Studia z Filologii Polskiej i Słowiańskiej* [Oleksandr Melnychuk jako etymolog i komparatysta. Studia z Filologii Polskiej i Słowiańskiej], № 54, pp. 1–9. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.11649/sfps.1797>
25. Khalymonenko, H. I. (1996), *Turkisms in the professional and production vocabulary of the Ukrainian language (vocabulary of animal husbandry)* [Tiurkizmy v profesiino-vyrobnychii leksytsi ukraïnskoi movy (leksyka tvarynnnytstva)]. Doctoral thesis. A. Krymsky Institute of Oriental Studies, NAS of Ukraine. Kyiv. 417 p.
26. Yusikova, O. (2012), *Semantic parallels of the word kish in Ukrainian and Russian dialects. Scientific notes of the Vinnytsia M. Kotsiubynsky State Pedagogical University. Series: Philology (linguistics)*. [Semantychni paraleli

slova kish v ukrainskykh i rosiyskykh dialektakh. Naukovi zapysky Vinnytskoho derzhavnogo pedahohichnogo universytetu im. M. Kotsiubynskoho. Seriia: Filolohiia (movoznavstvo)]. № 16, pp. 330–334. Available at: [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Nzvdpu\\_filol\\_2012\\_16\\_75](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Nzvdpu_filol_2012_16_75).

**МІНЯЙЛО Роман Вікторович,**

доктор філологічних наук, професор, професор кафедри української мовознавства, літератури та методики навчання  
Комунального закладу «Харківська гуманітарно-педагогічна академія» Харківської обласної ради, Україна;

пров. Руставелі, 7, м. Харків, 61001

e-mail: [roman298@gmail.com](mailto:roman298@gmail.com)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9392-594X>

**МІНЯЙЛО Наталія Вікторівна,**

кандидат філологічних наук, викладач кафедри іноземних мов та міжкультурної комунікації

Харківського національного економічного університету імені Семена Кузнеця, Україна;

просп. Науки, 9-А, м. Харків, 61165

e-mail: [nataliya.minyaylo@hneu.net](mailto:nataliya.minyaylo@hneu.net)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4643-3309>

## УКРАЇНЬСЬКА ДІАЛЕКТНА ЛЕКСИКА В РЕКОНСТРУКЦІЇ ДАВНІХ РЕМЕСЕЛ

**Анотація.** У статті проаналізовано назви кількох рибальських знарядь та їхні семантичні зв'язки з термінологією інших давніх ремесел – зокрема плетіння та гончарства. Такі взаємозв'язки зумовлені еволюційними змінами в повсякденному житті ранніх спільнот. Археологічні дані дають змогу зробити висновок, що потреба в рибальстві істотно сприяла переходу давніх етнічних груп від кочового життя до осілості, а також розвитку навичок виготовлення різних виробничих і побутових знарядь з рослинної сировини. **Об'єктом** дослідження є лексична система традиційних народних ремесел на східнослов'янському ареалі, а **предметом** – семантичні й етимологічні особливості назв рибальських знарядь у їхньому зв'язку з терміносферою плетіння та гончарства. **Мета** дослідження полягає в уточненні мовних свідчень, що відображають взаємодію архаїчних ремесел. **Завданням** є реконструкція праслов'янської лексичної основи та виявлення семантичних механізмів, через які технологічні дії інтегрувалися у процес номінації рибальських знарядь. Важливим матеріалом для вивчення первісного синкретизму архаїчних культур плетіння, рибальства й гончарства є лексика цих народних ремесел – передусім праслов'янські лексичні та семантичні реконструкції, а також українські діалектні дані. Аналіз засвідчує, що багато українських назв плетених рибальських знарядь походять із праслов'янського періоду: *верша*, *вертень*, *корзина*, *скринка*, *ліска* тощо. Використання плетених кошиків як рибальського знаряддя в окремих регіонах України вказує на спільну етимологічну основу назв *кіш*, *сапетка*, *корзина*, що позначають як рибальські, так і збиральницькі реалії. Подібним чином про це свідчить і застосування глиняного посуду (*корчага*, *гличик*) у рибальському процесі замість плетених виробів. Проаналізований матеріал показує також, що технологічна (дієслівна) сема актуалізується у внутрішній формі назв після появи більш розвинених способів рибальства. Це підтверджує **висновки** мовознавців, етнографів та археологів щодо синкретизму архаїчних промислових культур і виникнення лексики, заснованої на спільності технологічних дій.

**Ключові слова:** первісний синкретизм архаїчних ремесел, рибальські лексико-семантичні реконструкції, діалектна рибальська лексика, екстралінгвальні чинники.