

УДК 34:316.347](=161.2)

**Сковронська Ірина Юріївна,**

кандидат філологічних наук, доцент  
завідувач кафедри іноземних мов та  
культури фахового мовлення

Львівського державного університету внутрішніх справ  
e-mail: skovronskairyna@gmail.com  
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-6261-3393

**Юськів Богдана Миколаївна,**

старший викладач іноземних мов та  
культури фахового мовлення

Львівського державного університету внутрішніх справ  
e-mail: dexter@mail.lviv.ua  
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-0602-0630

## ЛІНГВІСТИЧНИЙ МЕНТАЛІТЕТ У КОНТЕКСТІ ПРАВОВОЇ СВІДОМОСТІ УКРАЇНЦЯ

**Анотація.** Поняття ментальності широко застосовується в сучасній науці. Воно стало набутком громадської думки, предметом філософських і соціокультурних роздумів. Ментальність пронизує все людське життя, вона присутня на всіх рівнях свідомості та поведінки людей, і тому так важко підібрати її визначення, ввести в якісь межі.

Оскільки національна ментальність міститься у думці, а думка відображається в мові, то вона є змістом кожної національної мови, а національна мова є формою національної ментальності.

Об'єктивний аналіз позитивних і негативних рис українця намагався здійснити М. Грушевський. До позитивних сторін його характеру він відносить цілісність, стихійну гармонію, високу красу побуту і глибоку вроджену логічність думки, високі культурні та соціальні інстинкти, гуманний характер і тонке етичне почуття, бажання справедливості. До негативних рис – недостачу свідомості, культурного, правового і політичного виховання, освіченості, слабкість національного інстинкту (особливо у східних українців), національної енергії, національного почуття.

Інший дослідник ментальності українців С. Шелухін вважав найбільш притаманною українському народові рисою вільнолюбність, якою вони дорожать найбільше, здатність до наук та ремесла. Він зазначав, що перебування українців тривалий час у складі інших держав призвели до руйнації духовності України, затемнення національної свідомості та притуплення чуття національної і людської гідності, втрати історичної пам'яті та ігнорування історичних традицій.

Правдивому українцеві властива непереможна любов до волі і ненависть до рабства і неволі, про що свідчать козацькі думи, пісні та інші жанри фольклору, відчуття власної гідності, яке може утвердити тільки свобода, гарантована повною економічною незалежністю (насамперед приватною власністю), підставою до яких є соціальна рівність, а також такий державний лад, який би забезпечував права й волю кожного громадянина й сприяв розвитку його здібностей. Інакше кажучи, який відповідав би природному індивідуалізму українця – його характеристичному прямуванню до самовияву.

Із зазначеними етнополітичними і етнопсихологічними рисами, особливо волелюбності та рівноправності, пов'язане почуття власної гідності та поваги до гідності чужої, схильність до певних зовнішніх форм, що традиційно встановилися, так званих «законних речей» (етикет, любов до чистоти, і порядку, краси життя). Ці риси наближають українця до західноєвропейської культури – у дечому до германців, з їх солідністю, діловитістю, любов'ю до комфорту, порядку, чистоти, і в дечому до романської культури – потягом до форми, елегантності, бажання внести у все красу, висвітлити нею кожну сферу життя. Узагалі – світлим і радісним поглядом на життя.

**Ключові слова:** ментальність, мова, культура, правосвідомість, український народ, національна специфіка.

**Skovronska Iryna,**

Candidate of Philological Sciences, Docent  
 Chief of the Department of Foreign Languages  
 and Culture of Professional Speech  
 Lviv State University of Internal Affairs  
 e-mail: skovronskairyna@gmail.com  
 ORCID ID: 0000-0002-6261-3393

**Yuskiv Bohdana,**

senior teacher of the Department of Foreign Languages  
 and Culture of Professional Speech  
 Lviv State University of Internal Affairs  
 e-mail: dexter@mail.lviv.ua  
 ORCID ID: 0000-0002-0602-0630

## LINGUISTIC MENTALITY IN FOCUS OF LEGAL CONSCIOUSNESS OF A UKRAINIAN

**Abstract.** The concept of mentality is widely used in modern science. It became a gain of public opinion, the subject of philosophical and socio-cultural reflection. Mentality permeates all human life, it is present at all levels of consciousness and behavior of people, and therefore, it is so difficult to find out its definition and to enter into any framework.

Since national mentality is contained in a thought, and the thought is reflected in a language, so it is the content of each national language, and the national language is a form of national mentality.

M. Hrushevsky tried to carry out an objective analysis of positive and negative features of a Ukrainian. Positive aspects of his character are believed to be integrity, spontaneous harmony, high level of well-being and deep inborn logic of thought, high cultural and social instincts, humane character and subtle ethical feeling, the desire for justice. Negative features are supposed to be the lack of consciousness, cultural, legal and political education, intelligence, the weakness of national instinct (especially with Eastern Ukrainians), national energy, national feeling.

Another researcher of the mentality of Ukrainians S. Shelukhin considered the most characteristic feature of the Ukrainian people to be free-love, which they cherish most of all, the ability to science and crafts. He noted that the stay of Ukrainians for a long period in the structure of other states led to the destruction of the spirituality of Ukraine, the obscurity of national consciousness and the dulling of the sense of national and human dignity, the loss of historical memory and the neglect of historical traditions.

A true Ukrainian possesses an invincible love to will and hatred for slavery and bondage, as evidenced by Cossack dumas, songs and other genres of folklore, a sense of dignity that can only be confirmed by freedom guaranteed by a complete economic independence (primarily private property), the basis of which is social equality, as well as such a state system that would ensure the rights and will of each citizen and contribute to the development of his abilities, in other words, which would correspond to the natural individualism of a Ukrainian – its characteristic tendency to self-expression.

With the indicated ethnopolitical and ethnopsychological traits, especially freedom of love and equality, a close connection is made between self-respect and respect for the dignity of others, a tendency to certain traditionally established external forms, the so-called «legitimate things» (etiquette, love for purity, and order, the beauty of life). These traits bring Ukrainians closer to Western European culture – in some ways to the Germans, with their solidity, efficiency, love for comfort, order, purity, and in some ways to Romanesque culture – a desire for a shape, elegance, a wish to make everything beautiful, to highlight it in every sphere of life, in general – a bright and joyful look at life.

**Key words:** mentality, language, culture, legal consciousness, Ukrainian people, national specifics.

DOI 10.32518/2617-4162-2018-2-91-97

**Introduction**

The concept of mentality is widely used in modern science, it has become an achievement of public opinion, the subject of philosophical and socio-cultural reflections. Mentality permeates all human life, it is present at all levels of consciousness and behavior of people, and therefore it is so

difficult to find out its definition, to enter into any framework.

Since national mentality is contained in a thought, and the thought is reflected in a language, so it is the content of each national language, and the national language is a form of national mentality [3, p. 5].

The study of ethnic mentality is in the center of attention of such modern linguistic sciences as culturology, linguoculturology, ethnolinguoculturology, ethnopsychology, polylinguoculturology, anthropolinguistics, sociolinguistics, etc.

European linguoculturology is associated with the names of F. de Saussure, R. Jakobson, R. Bart, T. Van Dake, L. Wittenstein, G. Gadamer, G. Guijaume, K. Jaspers and others.

The problems of determining the outlook of the peoples through language units were dealt with by V. Humboldt, A. Potebnia, F. Boas, E. Sepir, B. Uorf, A. Meije, Zh. Vanderies and others.

Among contemporary Russian language and culture researchers one should mention ethnolinguoculturologist N. Tolstoy, ethnographers A. Baburin, Ya. Chesnokova, P. Kozhina, V. Vorobiova; the study of the linguistic picture of the world is described in the works of N. Arutiunova, V. Hak, Yu. Apresyan, V. Ivanov, E. Zemska, V. Teliya, A. Shmelev, V. Vereshchagin, V. Kostomarov, V. Maslova, V. Shaklin, Yu. Stepanov and others.

Usually in dictionaries the notion of «mentality» is interpreted as «a characteristic structure of mind, a specific way of thinking and an attitude to the reality of a certain people» [1, p. 27].

### **1. Mentality of the Ukrainian people and the language picture of the world**

Mentality belongs to the principles of modern linguistics, along with anthropocentrism, cognitivism, pragmatism, ethnocentrism. The principle of mentality forms the basis of cognitive psychology and cognitive linguistics. «It is the cognitive linguistic where knowledge of the world is described through the linguistic units, the meanings of which are increasingly converging with the content, the concept as a mental essence» [2, p. 123].

Modern science of language observes rapid development of cognitive linguistics as the science of human consciousness in its various manifestations. According to S. Zhabotynska, one of the main tasks of cognitive semantics, as one of the aspects of cognitive linguistics, is the creation by means of analysis and generalization of the significance of multilevel units of language of those conceptual models that will help to explain the formation of a picture of the world of this or that ethnic group. A prerequisite for cognitive semantics is the search for a conceptual model of a piece of information that stands behind a language sign – that mental structure that is not represented in superficial forms of language [4, p. 3–11]. According to Vapirov, on the basis of the tasks of cognitive semantics and related sciences, aimed at studying of the national language and thinking, one can make a transition from purely theoretical issues related to the mentality to the national-language

specifics of the concepts of a particular people [3, p. 7]. Therefore, the linguists face the problem of defining the ratio of the concepts «mentality – language picture of the world».

The language picture of the world, according to O. Pocheptsov, can be considered as linguistic thinking, that is, it is carried out in the form of language and exists in the form of language. The correlation between certain parts of the language and the linguistic picture can be defined as a linguistic mentality. Linguistic mentality includes linguistic mentality and speech mentality. Linguistic mentality is a way of linguistic representation or division (separation) of the world. It includes the correlation between the world and its speech representation, or an image. Speech mentality is a way of speech thinking, that is, the way of speech representation of the world, the correlation between the world and its speech image. Consequently, the above-mentioned ideas confirm the fact that the linguistic mentality is an aspect of linguistic thinking [5, p. 111]. Next, the author comes to the conclusion that since mentality is determined first of all by socio-cultural factors, and not by language, then the types of mentality should be allocated not by language but according to the socio-cultural grounds [5, p. 119].

Recently, the studies of the connection of mental categories and language are made by a group of linguists who consider the problem of national specifics of language based on the theory of linguistic variability, that is, they differentiate and analyze in detail the lexical, phonetic, morphological and syntactical differences of language variants (A. Smyrnytsky, V. Shishmareva, V. Zhirumsky, O. Cherednychenko, O. Semenets and others). But, if one understands the language first of all as a way of a person's attitude to the world, the consequence of world perception, an instrument and the result of world outlook, then according to the well-known linguist A. Naumenko, for all varieties of phonetics, vocabulary, morphology, syntax, one must first of all see the type of national thinking. In other words, the structure of speech, taken in itself, is already a product of the spirit of the people and sheds light on the psychological pattern of national thinking [6, p. 98]. These problems contributed to the emergence of a new philological discipline – linguoculture.

The only common definition of the concept of «mentality» does not exist. A generalized definition can be formulated as follows: «Mentality is a set of mental purposes, habits of thinking, fundamental beliefs of an individual.» In the Soviet historical science, the first attempt to formulate the concept of mentality was made by A. Gurevych, a passionate propagandist of the traditions of «Anals». «Mentality is the presence in a person of a certain society of a certain common mental

instrument, psychological equipment, which gives them the opportunity to recognize in their own way the world and themselves» [7, p. 130].

As M. Yuriy notes, the generalized definition of mentality emphasizes individuality, but A. Gurevich considers it to be adequate to the peculiarities of social consciousness, which is the basis of the formation of a certain type of civilization. In his opinion, the mentality is not a special national logos and not an a priori system of values (part of ideology), but a certain socio-psychological state of a subject – an ethnos, a nation, a nationality, a citizen who embodied in himself (not «in people's memory», but in his subconscious mind) the results of a long and sustained influence of ethnic, natural-geographical and socio-economic conditions of residence of the subject of mentality [7, p. 131].

Modern dictionary of foreign words provides the following definition of mentality: «Mentality – is the composition of mind, worldview, attitude, psychology» [8, p. 371]. Or: Mentality [fr. Mentalis – mental] – 1) make-up of mind, mental state; an image, a way of thinking of a person or a social group [9, p. 402].

Philosophical definition of this concept can be found in the philosophical encyclopedic dictionary: mentality (from the Latin Mens (mentis) – way of thinking, composition of the soul) – characteristics of the perception specifics and interpretation of the world in the system of spiritual life of one or another nationality, nation, social subjects, which are embodied in certain socio-cultural phenomena. With all the diversity of interpretations of mentality, it is mostly recognized as stable structures of spiritual life that form a certain «frame format» of the world perception and determine one way or another [10, p. 369].

The problems of the mentality of the Ukrainian people were raised by historians of Ukrainian culture M. Kostomarov, V. Antonovych, M. Hrushevsky, P. Kulish, I. Franko, V. Lypynsky, I. Mirchuk, Yu. Lypa, D. Dontsov, V. Shcherbakivsky, D. Vikonska, Ya. Yarema, G. Vashchenko et al., ethnographers M. Yuriy, V. Yaniv, T. Onyshchenko, ethnolinguists G. Bogdanovych, A. Gurevych, V. Rusanivsky, I. Sheveliova, V. Zhayvoronok, V. Kononenko, S. Vapirov, O. Cherednichenko, O. Tkachenko and others.

## 2. The significance of consciousness in the formation of an ethnic group and nation

Ukrainian scholars of national character pointed out that the main factors determining the peculiarities of the nature of the people are ethnic identity (ethnophora), which is the ability to identify itself with a certain ethnic group, separating from all others, and collective ethnic identity, or ethnic mentality integrated by consciousness [11, p. 215–

238]. They evaluated differently the meaning of consciousness in the formation of an ethnic group and a nation, paying particular attention to either the national character, the psychological characteristics of the people or the definition of the carriers of national consciousness.

The first researcher dealing with the issue of Ukrainian ethnopsychology was M. Kostomarov, a great erudite, historian and ethnographer. The properties of the Ukrainian people are well reflected by Kostomarov in his well-known «*Books of the Life of the Ukrainian People*» – the first ideological and political work of the new era of Ukrainian history (for example, History of Rus can be considered the last ideological and political work of the past. It is an uncontroversial work of ethnopsychology that is extremely interesting and valuable [12, p. 28].

*The Books* distinctly emphasize the ideal of freedom – if the Lord punishes, the punishment of captivity is the worst punishment than the flood, war or plague. And accordingly, such system is praised, in which «there will be neither a king nor a prince, nor princes, nor a prince, nor a count, nor a duke, nor a man, nor an exaltation, nor a master, nor a boyar, nor a serf, nor a serpent» [12, p. 19].

V. Yaniv explains that the foundation of our life should be a system that would enable everyone to express themselves in terms of their abilities and values. Conversely, *expressis verbis* stresses on the lack of withstanding tendency in a Ukrainian – a lack of virtue of subordination [12, p. 20]. Kostomarov underlines the sensibility of the Ukrainian people, the denial of rationalism, the liability to passivity, which are manifested in unrealistic dreaming leading to the creation of utopias. These feelings have their distinct reflection in the social tendency of bearing an aid and an ideal of harmony in an exemplary family and society, but with the underestimated instinct of struggle and condemnation of the imperialist war for material gain. Nevertheless, a war for freedom, in the defense of faith (hence the basic human rights), the liberation of slaves, and the of social rights are justified. An expressive praise of religion is believed as a pledge of law and order and a guarantor of freedom [12, p. 28].

Antonovych, describing the physical differences between the three peoples in the famous article «Three national types of people», their psychological differences, various forms of social life and its ideals, cultural differences, language, differences in ethical views and concepts came to the conclusion about the existence of three national types [13, p. 91–92]. In his opinion, depending on the measure of sensitivity, feelings from surrounding impressions, one may judge about nature of the people, his social and political status, and finally the ability to develop. According to Antonovich,

a Ukrainian is a type of melancholic: he can not immediately respond to irritation. But even more clearly the character of the people comes through his political ideals. These are the truth and social equality, embodied in ancient *viche*, in the *cossack rada*, where everyone enjoyed a full will and equality. It should be noted that the researcher considers such qualities as desirable and not desirable, both positive and negative, but no culture can withstand the destruction of innate qualities [13, p. 10].

M. Hrushevsky also tried to make an objective analysis of positive and negative features of a Ukrainian. Among positive aspects of his character he mentions integrity, spontaneous harmony, elevated beauty of well-being and deep inborn logic of his thoughts, high cultural and social instincts, humane character and subtle ethical feeling, the desire for justice. Negative features are regarded to be the lack of consciousness, cultural and political education, intelligence, the weakness of national instinct (especially with the eastern Ukrainians), national energy, national feeling. In his work «History of Ukraine-Rus» he noted that the unfavorable historical conditions that led to national decline eclipsed the manifestations of creative activity, and the people were reduced to «an ethnographic mass without a national face» [14. T. 1. P. 3]. These vices are explained by the fact that the rule of the Russian, Polish and Austrian created protest forces, anarchic instincts for Ukrainians, and at the same time lessened the instinct of the organization. The well-known Ukrainian scientist Ivan Mirchuk, who was at the head of the Ukrainian Research Institute in Berlin for a long time, noted that the Ukrainian people strongly rejected all forms of cohabitation, the prerequisite of which is strict discipline and full subordination to the will of the supreme, forgetting that this, of course, has a detrimental effect on the interests of the whole, and in the end – and in his own favor [15, p. 18].

Another researcher of the psychology of Ukrainians S. Shelukhin considered the most characteristic of the Ukrainian people to be the feature of free-love, which they cherish most of all, the ability to science and crafts [16, p. 8].

A prominent scientist-historian V. Lipinsky tried to give the spiritual portrait of a Ukrainian in his main ideological work «Letters to Brothers-Corn-Growers». He considers individualism as the main feature of the Ukrainian way of life, but, first of all, perceiving the dangers of individualism, he emphasizes primarily not Ukrainian individualism, but the lack of Ukrainian subordination, or the «spontaneous inclination to any individualistic anarchism and a sort of Cossack chieftain movement» [12, p. 35].

Yuriy Lipa, describing the Ukrainian character, thinks «picturesque individualism» to be its main feature. In his opinion Ukraine is a part of the

so-called cultivating cultural circle, in the center of which is a woman-mother who unites the whole family. The image of Ukraine – Woman-Mother symbolizes the well-being of the settled farmer's family, which requires the ability to manage, endurance and traditionalism in labor [16, p. 145]. While thinking of individualism the author comes from the following quote: «The desire for beauty enriches the whole life of a Ukrainian. Besides musical and poetic creativity, it can be seen in clothes, in the household, and in love for nature ... The rich poetic nature of a Ukrainian is expressed in numerous number of dumas, household and ritual songs, tales, legends, etc.» [18, p. 186].

The indicated ethnopolitical and ethnopsychological traits, especially free-love and equality, go close with the sense of self-esteem and respect for the dignity of others, a tendency to certain traditionally established external forms, the so-called «legitimate things» (etiquette, love for purity, order, the beauty of life). These features bring Ukrainians closer to the West European culture – in some ways to the Germans, with their solidity, efficiency, love for comfort, order, purity and in some things to Romanesque culture – an inclination for a shape, elegance, a desire to make everything beautiful, to illuminate it in all spheres of life, with a bright and joyful glance at life. According to M. Yuriy we can not avoid ethnopsychological differences between the Dnieper citizen and the Galician, even in the fact that the first type is completely open, that is, he can speak frankly, especially in the flash of emotions, utter the most unpleasant things, though then quickly escapes. The Galician, on the contrary, manifesting general courtesy rarely discloses his real attitude and hides his feelings slowly or stands his position. Finally, the Dnieper habitant, as a rule, wants to act immediately, yet not having time to think over its decision. The Galician, on the contrary, seeks to think over and weigh the consequences of his actions. This is probably due to the long existence on the territory of the Dnieper Ukraine of the Cossack-Hetman state and Zaporizhzhya Sich with their military traditions [7, p. 172].

Certain differences in psychology, culture, political and economic ways of life of Ukrainians in different regions are caused by their historical development. For centuries, Galicia belonged to another state, to another church compared to Great Ukraine, and lived under various cultural influences (mostly Polish and German). The Dnieper habitants are in the majority people of Eastern European culture and consciousness. Although they differ from the Russians, they are very much united with the latter, since 10th to 12th and since 7th to 8th generations of Ukrainians, respectively, in the Left Bank and Right-Bank Ukraine formed together with the Russians and within the Russian Empire. The worldview of the

Galicians was genetically formed and equated with Western Europe – Austro-Germanic and Polish cultures, customs and traditions, since the life of great-grandfathers and grandfathers of modern Galicians was a part of the Polish and Austro-Hungarian states. The Galicians experienced long-term assimilation and even made typical western European, but with Ukrainian background, cultural, religious and everyday traditions. This reduces the possibility for the Dnieper habitants in the modern state policy to take the side of the Galicians and vice versa (the problem of splitting) [7, p. 161].

Dual influence on the Ukrainian statehood was made due to the existence and the activity of the Greek Catholic Church in Galicia. Vatican-dependent Uniate Church in Galicia has formed a universal Western-Catholic mentality, which radically differs from the Orthodox Byzantine mentality of the Dnieper Ukraine [7, p. 161]. On the other hand, the very belonging to the Greek Catholic Church during the reign of Poland contributed to national identity of the Ukrainians of Galicia.

### 3. Similar and distinctive features of the legal consciousness of the Ukrainians of the Dnieper Ukraine and Galicia

Differences between the Ukrainians of the Dnieper Ukraine and Galicia exist not only in the dialects of language, psychology and various church denominations, but also in legal consciousness. Common-Russian law in the Dnieper Ukraine, although always existing with Ukrainianized receptions, was finally introduced in 1840, however, at the level of customary law, among 90% of the population, the Ukrainian law was left with the inherent equality postulate. In Galicia, since 1435, instead of Ukrainian law, the Catholic Polish «Vyslitsky Statute» was introduced, and in 1797 – Austrian law, with its various encouragement of entrepreneurship and accumulation [7, p. 163]. Regarding the typical features of Galicia's population, one should mention the high sense of religiosity, historically worked out efficiency and obedience, in particular his ability to manage, save and distribute the results of his work, as well as dedication,

moderation and national patriotism, which, subject to qualified guidance, could to become a good foundation for state-building. Instead, the people of the Dnieper Ukraine, and above all the Ukrainian intelligentsia, who were mostly peasant in their descent and therefore preferred social liberation, historically developed anarchism, radicalism and populism, and faith in a good and clever master who would restore order and liberate the people.

Certain psychological peculiarities of the Ukrainian people were established during the reign of Soviet power in Ukraine. The new Ukrainian elite, especially in the Dnieper Ukraine, firmly grasped the idea of a strong government, coupled with the idea of justice. The power of a good master, who cares for everyone, thinks and works for the people, must be not only strong, but above all serves for people and just. «Justice in practice is a wish that nobody should be better than me,» and reconciliation in order to make many of us worse, as well as the rejection of all extraordinary, any initiative and a higher and more dynamic lifestyle. These ideas turned out to be the most destructive aspects of the Soviet psychology [7, p. 175].

### Conclusions

The long-term presence of Ukrainians in other states led to the destruction of Ukraine's spirituality, the obscurity of national consciousness and the dulling of the sense of national and human dignity, the loss of historical memory, and the neglect of historical traditions. A true Ukrainian possesses an invincible love of will and hatred for slavery and bondage, as evidenced by the Cossack dumas, songs and other genres of folklore, a sense of self-respect, which can only be assured by freedom guaranteed by complete economic independence, the basis of which is social equality, such a state system, which would ensure the rights and will of each citizen and contribute to the development and manifestation of his abilities, in other words, which would correspond to the natural individualism of a Ukrainian – his characteristic tendency to self-expression.

### List of Reference

1. Hornby A. S. Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English. Moscow, Oxford, 1982. 1958 с.
2. Богданович Г. Ю. О понятии ментальность и ментализме как принципе лингвокультурологических описаний. *Культура народов Причерноморья*. 2002. № 36. С. 120–127.
3. Вапіров С. Ю. Аспекти вивчення національної ментальності в мовній системі та художньому дискурсі. *Нова філологія*. 2001. № 2 (II). С. 5–11.
4. Жаботинская С. Когнитивная лингвистика: принципы концептуального моделирования. *Лингвістичні студії*. Вип. 2. Черкаси: Сіяч, 1997. С. 3–11.
5. Почецов О. Г. Языковая ментальность: способ представления мира. *Вопросы языкознания*. 1990. № 6. С. 110–122.
6. Науменко А. М. Национальная специфика при функционально-семантическом описании языков. *Нові підходи до філології у вищій школі*. Запоріжжя: ЗДУ, 1998. С. 98–99.

7. Юрій М. Т. Етногенез та ментальність українського народу. К.: Таксон, 1997. 168 с.
8. Современный словарь иностранных слов. Санкт-Петербург: Дуэт, 1994. 740 с.
9. Большой словарь иностранных слов. М.: ЮНВЕС, 1999. 784 с.
10. Філософський енциклопедичний словник. К.: Абрис, 2002. Т. VI. 742 с.
11. Онищенко І. Етно- та націогенез в Україні (Етнолінгвістичний аналіз). К.: Четверта хвиля, 1997. 239 с.
12. Янів В. Нариси до історії української етнопсихології; упоряд. М. Шафовал. 3-те вид., стер. К.: Знання, 2006. 342 с.
13. Антонович В. Три національні типи народні. Моя сповідь: Вибрані історичні та публіцистичні твори / упор. О. Тодійчук, В. Ульяновський. Вст. ст. та коментарі В. Ульяновського. К.: Либідь, 1995. 816 с.
14. Грушевський М. Історія України-Руси: в 11 томах, 12 книгах / редкол.: П. С. Сохань (голова) та ін. К.: Наукова думка, 1991–1998. Т. 1. Пам'ятки історичної думки. С. 3.
15. Мірчук І. Світогляд українського народу. Спроба української характеристики. *Генега*. К., 1994. № 2. С. 87–96.
16. Шелухін С. Україна – назва нашої землі з найдавніших часів. Прага, 1936. 248 с.
17. Липа Ю. Призначення України. Львів: Просвіта, 1992. 271 с.
18. Побут і культура українців / упор. Леонович і Я. Ставровський, 1903. URL: [ukrcenter.com/Література/Юрій-Липа/19832-3/Частина-4](http://ukrcenter.com/Література/Юрій-Липа/19832-3/Частина-4)

## References

1. Hornby A. S. (1982) Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary of Current English. Moscow, Oxford, 1958.
2. Bohdanovych H. Іu. (2002) О поніатту mentalnost y mentalyzme kak pryntsype lynchvokulturolohycheskykh opysanyi [On the concept of mentality and mentality as the principle of linguoculturalist descriptions]. *Kultura narodov Prychornomoria (Culture of the peoples of the Black Sea region)*. 36, 120–127 [in Rus.]
3. Vapirov S. Іu. (2001) Aspekty vyvchennia natsionalnoi mentalnosti v movnii systemi ta khudozhnomu dyskursi [Aspects of the study of national mentality in the language system and artistic discourse]. *Nova filolohiia (New philology)*. 2 ( II ), 5–11 [in Ukr.]
4. Zhabotynskaia S. Kohnytyvnaia lynchvystyka: pryntsypy kontseptualnoho modelyrovania [Cognitive Linguistics: Principles of Conceptual Modeling]. *Linhvistychni studii (Linguistic studios)*. Cherkasy: Siiach. 2, 3–11 [in Rus.]
5. Pocheptsov O. H. (1990) Yazykovaia mentalnost: sposob predstavleniia myra [Linguistic mentality: a way of representing the world]. *Voprosy yazykonaniia (Linguistic issues)*. 6, 110–122 [in Rus.]
6. Naumenko A. M. (1998) Natsionalnaia spetsyfyka pry funktsionalno-semanticheskom opysanyu yazykov [National specificity in the functional-semantic description of languages]. *Novi pidkhody do filolohii u vyshchii shkoli (New approaches to philology in high school)*. Zaporizhzhia: ZDU, 98–99 [in Ukr.]
7. Iurii M. T. Etnohenez ta mentalnist ukrainskoho narodu [Ethnogenesis and mentality of the Ukrainian people]. Kyiv: Takson, 168 [in Ukr.]
8. Sovremennyi slovar ynostrannykh slov [Modern dictionary of foreign words]. Sankt-Peterburg: Duet, 1994, 740 [in Rus.]
9. Bolshoi slovar ynostrannykh slov [Philosophical Encyclopedic Dictionary]. Moskva: YuNVES, 1999, 784 [in Rus.]
10. Filosofskiy entsyklopedychniy slovnyk. Natsionalna Akademiia Nauk Ukrainy. Instytut filosofii im. H. S. Skovorody [Philosophical Encyclopedic Dictionary. National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. Institute of Philosophy named after G. S. Skovoroda]. Kyiv: Abrys, 2002. VI, 742 [in Ukr.]
11. Onyshchenko I. (1997) Etno – ta natsiohenez v Ukraini (Etnolinhvistychni analiz) [Ethno- and Nationogenesis in Ukraine (Ethnolinguistic Analysis)]. Kyiv: Chetverta khvylia, 239 [in Ukr.]
12. Ianiv V. (2006) Narisy do istorii ukrainskoi etnopsykhologii [Essays on the history of Ukrainian ethnopsychology]. Kyiv: Znannia, 342 [in Ukr.]
13. Antonovych V. (1995) Try natsionalni typy narodni. Moia spovid: Vybrani istorychni ta publitsystychni tvory [Three national types of folk. My confession Selected historical and journalistic works]. Kyiv: Lybid, 816 [in Ukr.]
14. Hrushevskiy M. (1991–1998) Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy: v 11 tomakh, 12 knykhakh [History of Ukraine-Russia: 11 volumes, 12 books] / Edit.: P. S. Sokhan ta in. Kyiv: Naukova dumka. T. 1. Pamtky istorychnoi dumky [Vol. 1. Historical Thoughts]. 3 [in Ukr.]
15. Mirchuk I. (1994) Svithliad ukrainskoho narodu. Sproba ukrainskoi kharakterystyky [Worldview of the Ukrainian people. An attempt of Ukrainian characteristics]. *Heneza [Genesis]*. Kyiv. 2, 87–96 [in Ukr.]
16. Shelukhin S. (1936) Ukraina – nazva nashoi zemli z naidavnishykh chasiv [Ukraine is the name of our land since ancient times]. Praha, 1936, 249 [in Ukr.]
17. Lypa Yu. (1992) Pryznachennia Ukrainy [Appointment of Ukraine]. Lviv: Prosvita, 271.
18. Pobut i kultura ukraintsiv [Life and culture of Ukrainians]. URL: [ukrcenter.com/Literatura/Iurii-Lypa/19832-3/Chastyna-4](http://ukrcenter.com/Literatura/Iurii-Lypa/19832-3/Chastyna-4)