

УДК 811.111'373.74

DOI: 10.32626/2309-7086.2026-23.85-92

Tetiana Mitrousova

ORCID 0000-0002-8961-9381

candidate of philological sciences,

senior lecturer of English Language Department

Kamianets-Podilskyi Ivan Ohienko National University

mitrousova@kpnu.edu.ua

Svitlana Nykytiuk

ORCID 0000-0002-2304-9291

senior lecturer of English Language Department

Kamianets-Podilskyi Ivan Ohienko National University

nykytyuk@kpnu.edu.ua

THE SPECIFICITY OF ENGLISH ETHNONYMS AS VERBAL MARKERS OF 'IN-GROUP' AND 'OUT-GROUP'

The article deals with the investigation of the semantic structure and identify the ethnocultural specificity of English phraseological units that include ethnonyms, as well as to determine the ways in which biased, stereotypical or neutral perceptions of foreigners are expressed and disseminated in the English-speaking community.

In the article it was researched that ethnonyms are classified into macroethnonyms and microethnonyms. Macroethnonyms refer to large ethnic formations, such as Afro-Americans. Microethnonyms, on the other hand, are used for smaller communities united by belonging to a single tribe, ethnicity, nation, or other ethnic group. They encompass ethnonymic names of varying scope and levels of generalization.

It was claimed that the components of ethnonyms can be represented by various linguistic means: words indicating national affiliation, origin, physical characteristics, or lifestyle; proper names; ethnonymic forms derived from the official names of peoples; figurative – metaphorical or metonymic – designations of foreigners; as well as phraseological units that reflect generalized stereotypical perceptions of members of other nations in the English-speaking community.

The authors of the article established that the perception of «other» and «foreign» peoples is influenced by a number of factors, among which historical and geopolitical ones play a leading role. Indeed, the number of ethnonyms adopted in a linguocultural context, as well as their frequency in social discourse, depend on historical ties and geographic location. Numerous national stereotypes negatively portray the neighboring Scots, Welsh, or Irish, despite the fact that they all belong to the same kingdom.

As a result it was established that the study of ethnonyms and the patterns of their origin, development, and use cannot be considered separately from the study of the ethnos itself, as it allows for a deeper understanding of the complex processes that shape ethnogenesis and the ethnic history of any community. Self-designations, as expressions of a people's self-consciousness, and external names, which reflect the stereotypical perceptions of others, are among the main indicators of ethnic unity. The

© Tetiana Mitrousova, Svitlana Nykytiuk, 2026

Стаття опублікована на умовах відкритого доступу за ліцензією CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

researches concluded that the resilience of an ethnos as a social system ensures the relative stability of its representation in collective consciousness and self-awareness.

Key words: phraseology, ethnonym, lexical-semantic features, ethnocentrism, stereotype, in-group / out-group.

Introduction. Language is the basis of any national culture, a key means of understanding and mastering the surrounding world. The linguistic phenomena primarily function as a component of ethnocultural unity and reflect the national mode of existence. As a component of the overall language system, phraseology is regarded as a particularly valuable part of linguistic heritage in which the worldview and national culture of a people are reflected. According to N. Savchuk, the phraseology of every language significantly influences the formation of the figurative picture of the world. At the same time, the perception of reality through linguistic images embedded in the phraseological system is based on general logical-psychological and linguistic principles [5]. From a cultural perspective, phraseological units can be defined as a product of a people's cultural and social life that has developed as a verbal means of reflecting the national and mental characteristics of representatives of a particular culture. Phraseological units, through their meanings, partially intersect with vocabulary, complementing the picture of the world created by lexical units [4]. Phraseological units are not only an inexhaustible source of enhancing expressiveness. Their characteristic feature is that they actively participate in shaping one's own, often stereotypical, attitude toward events / topics / people.

Recent research and publications. Over the past decades, English phraseology has been significantly enriched by monographs, dissertation studies, and scholarly works. Among them are the research studies of N. Lyska, O. Rohach, B. Bakai, and O. Matsko, as well as works of various orientations. For instance, I. I. Humeniuk examines the structural and lexical-semantic features of phraseological units with coloratives in the English language [3]; I. Bereznieva studies phraseological units with semantisms [2]; English phraseological units with a national and cultural component are the object of research attention of N. Petrova [13]; manifestations of ethnocentrism in different types of discourse and the functioning of ethnonyms [1; 6].

The purpose of the article to investigate the semantic structure and identify the ethnocultural specificity of English phraseological units that include ethnonyms, as well as to determine the ways in which biased, stereotypical or neutral perceptions of foreigners are expressed and disseminated in the English-speaking community.

Presentation of the main material. Stereotypes are often described as simplified views about other people, formed by judgements based on the group they belong to. Modern studies in social psychology suggest that stereotypical thinking is rooted in the human mind, which means that ethnic stereotypes can partly be considered a natural part of human thinking. In particular, they serve important cognitive purposes – helping people simplify the complexity of the world into something the human mind can more easily understand [10, p. 60]. In this case, stereotypes are cognitive shortcuts that help people classify and understand the world around them.

As mentioned earlier, social categorization involves identifying and emphasizing particular traits of a group. This, in turn, leads to the consolidation of one's own group [7]. The central aspect of this process, which forms the foundation of stereotypes (including ethnic ones), is the distinction between «us» and «them». In the social scienc-

es, this idea was first identified at the beginning of the 20th century by the American anthropologist, sociologist, and historian William Graham Sumner. In his work published in 1906, he introduced the concept of Ethnocentrism to describe the natural tendency of human groups to divide the world into «us» and «them», while also using their own group as the standard for evaluating the norms and traditions of others.

This tendency is frequently accompanied by the formation of negative and dehumanizing attitudes and stereotypes toward those who are seen as the «others» [14], which is hold in contexts of permanent ethno-political conflict. In situations of ethno-political violence, negative and dehumanizing stereotypes about the «other» are not only the result of hostility between groups, but also help sustain the conflict by providing a mental framework that reinforces mistrust and antagonism between them [12]. Stereotypes are seen in many ways, usually considered as a socially shared set of beliefs about traits of social categories [9].

Because stereotypes often express how one nation views other groups, different connotations connected with ethnonyms frequently appear in linguistics. Ethnonyms are not created as fully formed terms; instead, they evolve gradually over time within complex social relationships, reflecting changes in the economic and political life of societies. Among ethnonyms, two groups can be distinguished, which denote the same object of nomination but differ in their origin. These are the names by which a people refer to themselves – autoethnonyms – and the names given to them by other peoples – exonyms.

Based on the nature of the designated object and the scope of the community they denote, ethnonyms are classified into macroethnonyms and microethnonyms. Macroethnonyms refer to large ethnic formations, such as Afro-Americans. Microethnonyms, on the other hand, are used for smaller communities united by belonging to a single tribe, ethnicity, nation, or other ethnic group. They encompass ethnonymic names of varying scope and levels of generalization.

A noteworthy contrast between «macro» and «micro» is also observed in the formation of ethnic nicknames: in the realm of unofficial and derogatory names, pejorative designations tend to dominate for the inhabitants of entire states, political entities, or races, regardless of their actual and precise ethnic affiliation.

The division of ethnonyms into autoethnonyms and exonyms is necessary due to the different informational content they convey. An autoethnonym indicates a people's level of self-assessment, while an exonym reflects the regional and historical perceptions of the community that created it (including characteristics ranging from the appearance of its members to the ways in which their ethnic self-consciousness is expressed). It is important to distinguish in exonyms not only objective but also subjective components, due to their emotional connotations.

At early stages, members of an ethnic community, using self-designations, sought to differentiate themselves from other («foreign») ethnic groups through the opposition of «we» – «they», as well as through national and cultural identification, which in the system of intercultural communication is referred to as «in-group / out-group». In this context, the term «in-group» denotes those phenomena, events, processes, and objects in the surrounding reality that are perceived as familiar, appropriate, and normal, that is, as having a legitimate right to exist.

The components of ethnonyms can be represented by various linguistic means: words indicating national affiliation, origin, physical characteristics, or lifestyle; proper names; ethnonymic forms derived from the official names of peoples; figura-

tive – metaphorical or metonymic – designations of foreigners; as well as phraseological units that reflect generalized stereotypical perceptions of members of other nations in the English-speaking community.

The methods and types of ethnic naming, as well as the features that become decisive in the creation of a name, are diverse and depend on who is using it – the people themselves or others, particularly neighboring communities. Among the numerous factors and cues that influence the choice of a name, speakers in each specific situation actualize the feature that seems most appropriate and significant to them. Although potentially many characteristics exist for nomination, a self-designation usually fixes on a single – the most generalized – trait.

A people's self-designation is never accidental – it is formed under the influence of social and historical factors. In contrast, exonyms may arise situationally, based on a certain noticeable feature or a subjective perception of the community – its appearance, lifestyle, social or political structure, or particularities of historical and spiritual development. Such names often emerge in the context of hostile communities and carry negative or derogatory connotations that the ethnos itself does not accept. These ethnonyms, or more precisely ethnophobisms, are the result of a biased, subjective view of another community [8], for example: green nigger – Irish, wetback – Mexican.

Ethnophobisms are onomastic names with humiliating or derogatory connotations, carrying a negative evaluation, which arise as a result of invective reinterpretation of the names of members of a «foreign» community. Their emergence is conditioned by a range of social factors, among which ethnic stereotypes and prejudices play a leading role. For example, the words Chink and Chinky [8] are considered coarse and offensive designations for Chinese people. Such anthroponymic units accumulate real or imagined traits that society attributes to a particular social or ethnic group.

The perception of «other» and «foreign» peoples is influenced by a number of factors, among which historical and geopolitical ones play a leading role. Indeed, the number of ethnonyms adopted in a linguocultural context, as well as their frequency in social discourse, depend on historical ties and geographic location. Numerous national stereotypes negatively portray the neighboring Scots, Welsh, or Irish, despite the fact that they all belong to the same kingdom, for example, Scotch coffee – boiling water tinted with burnt toast; to Scotch a deal – to delay or obstruct a deal; Welsh comb – a hand used instead of a comb; to Welsh on a bet – to fail to pay a lost bet in a partnership.

For the Anglo-Saxons, due to geographic proximity, the «foreign» peoples were the representatives of Celtic cultures – the Scots, Welsh, and Irish – with whom, after migration, they began to share the British Isles. This was the closest circle of ethnic groups that, for centuries, lived nearby as neighbors. It is therefore logical that the Celtic peoples were among the first to be identified as «other/foreign». This perception is reflected in the semantics of ethnonyms and corresponding toponyms. For example, the words *Welsh* and *Wales* mean «foreign» or «from a foreign land» and derive from the Old English *wealh* – «foreigner». According to the etymological dictionary of the English language, this is a common Germanic root, which corresponds to the Latin name for the Celtic people: OE. *Walh*, *Wealh*, pl. *Wealas* corr. to Germ. **walXaz* 'foreign' (Celtic or Roman), pl. –os- L. *Volcae* name of a Celtic people, of unknown origin [15, p. 999]. The mentioned root also entered into the toponym *Cornwall*, combining with a Celtic toponymic element: OE. *Cornwealas*, from OCeltic **Kornovjos*, -ja [15, p. 216]. Thus, the Anglo-Saxons named the Celtic tribes living to the west of their own lands. Notably, the Welsh have always preferred their authentic self-designation

Cymry – a word related to comrade (*kombrogi ‘fellowcountrymen’) [15, p. 240]. The autoethnonym Cymry and the alloethnonym the Welsh clearly reflect the binary opposition of «in-group versus out-group». By rationalizing human experience through language, an ethnos preserves this original, spontaneous, and naïve knowledge of the world in its consciousness for a long time.

Phraseological units containing the component French are often associated with 1) licentiousness and excessive freedom of behavior [16]: when *French* is used in a sexual sense, as it often is, «French» is often used as a euphemism for oral sex in the escort world. A «French lesson» is a visit to a prostitute. «Greek» culture is anal sex and «English» culture is BDSM. «Roman» is orgies and «Swedish» is a full-release massage. If someone speaks the language without an interpreter, it means they perform the act without a protection. It is mainly used to advertise escort services without fear of being busted by police for prostitution; «Pardon my French», ie, pardon the vulgarity from my mouth; «to French» – to kiss using tongues: He frenched her;

2) something impolite, mean [16]: «French leave» – «leaving without saying goodbye», desertion, which arose from the French habit of leaving a host’s house without taking leave of the hosts or homeowners. At the same time, this same behavior was also characteristic of the English themselves; «to French» – someone who helps you for a long period of time, only to have you spit in his face at the first disagreement:

«Man! I got totally Frenched by Tom; that bastard denied my promotion because I disagreed with the way he’s handling the Tanaka project. And after all the evenings and weekends I worked for him!»;

3) loser [16]: «the french are a wimpy country»:

dude 1: how many french people does it take to win a war?

dude 2: umm... 3???

dude 1: I DONT KNOW, NEVER BEEN DONE!!!! (usually followed by a laugh of some sort.).

In addition to incorporating a large number of phrases into their lexicon that negatively characterize various peoples and cultures, the English also, in most cases, formed notions of people as being heavily dependent on alcohol and drugs, which led to the emergence of corresponding slang units in English, such as: Indian list – a list of people to whom alcohol should not be sold; to see Indians – to get drunk; Chinese tobacco – (slang) opium; Indian hay/grass – marijuana. The component Dutch symbolizes something «bad» or «unreliable»: The Dutch cure – suicide; to talk like a Dutch uncle – to give a lecture or reprimand; old Dutch – a quarrelsome person; Dutch wife – a rubber sex doll.

Conclusions. The study of ethnonyms and the patterns of their origin, development, and use cannot be considered separately from the study of the ethnos itself, as it allows for a deeper understanding of the complex processes that shape ethnogenesis and the ethnic history of any community. Self-designations, as expressions of a people’s self-consciousness, and external names, which reflect the stereotypical perceptions of others, are among the main indicators of ethnic unity. The resilience of an ethnos as a social system ensures the relative stability of its representation in collective consciousness and self-awareness. Ethnonyms – including autoethnonyms and exonyms, ethnophobisms, and nickname-based ethnonyms – contain structured knowledge that can be valuable for analyzing and improving intercultural communication. The prospect for further research lies in expanding the topic under consideration and placing greater emphasis on the origin of the words being studied.

Список використаних джерел і літератури:

1. Антонченко Т. М. Лінгвістичні особливості функціонування етнонімів та етнофобізмів (на матеріалі англійської мови). *Вісник Київського лінгвістичного університету. Серія Філологія*. Київ: Видавничий центр КДЛУ, 1999. Т. 2. № 1. С. 95–103.
2. Березнева І. М. Особливості вивчення фразеологічних одиниць з семантизмами як наукова проблема. *Лінгвістичні дослідження: зб наук. праць. ХДПУ*, 2000. № 5. С. 122–127.
3. Гуменюк І. І. Структурні та лексико-семантичні особливості фразеологічних одиниць із колоративами в англійській мові: автореф. дис. ... канд. філол. наук: 10.02.04. Чернівці, 2010. 20 с.
4. Левченко О. П. Фразеологічна репрезентація світу. *Мовні і концептуальні картини світу: зб. наук. пр.* Київ: КНУ імені Тараса Шевченка. 2003. № 7. С. 307–315.
5. Савчук Н. М. Особливості національного світосприйняття туркменів: лінгвокультурний аспект. *Вісник Українсько-туркменського культурноосвітнього центру: міждисциплінарний науковий збірник*. Умань: Візаві, 2018. Вип. 2. Ч. II. С. 145–152.
6. Святюк Ю. В. Семантика та функціонування етнономінацій у сучасній англійській мові: дис. ... канд. філол. наук: 10.02.04. Донецьк, 2005. 224 с.
7. Blaine E., Kimberly J., McClure B. *Understanding the Psychology of Diversity*. USA: Sage Publications. 2017. 344 p.
8. *Forbidden American English. A Serious Compilation of Taboo American English* / ed. Spears, Richard A. Illinois: Passport Books. 1991. 225 p.
9. Greenwald A. G., Banaji M. R. Implicit social cognition: Attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. *Psychological Review*. 1995. Vol. 102. P. 4–27
10. Hogg M., Graham M. Vaughan. *Social Psychology*. London: Prentice Hall. 3^d ed. 2002. 792 p.
11. Kudła M. *A Study of Attributive Ethnonyms in the History of English with Special Reference to Foodsemy*. Frankfurt am Main; Bern; Bruxelles; New York; Oxford; Warszawa; Wien: Peter Lang. 2016. 306 p.
12. Oren N., Bar-Tal D. The detrimental dynamics of delegitimization in intractable conflicts: The Israeli-Palestinian case. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*. 2007. Vol. 31 (1). P. 111–126.
13. Petrova N. D. English Phraseological Units with the National Culturological Component. *Foreign Philology*. Kyiv, 1997. № 110. P. 40–50.
14. Schwartz S. H., Struch N. Values, stereotypes, and intergroup antagonism / Bar Tal D., Grauman C. F., Kruglanski A., Stroebe W., eds. *Stereotyping and Prejudice: Changing Conceptions*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1989. P. 151–167.
15. *The Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology* / ed. by C. T. Onions et al. 1966. 1024 p. URL: <https://archive.org/details/onions-ed.-the-oxford-dictionary-of-english-etymology-1966/page/998/mode/2up>
16. *Urban Dictionary*. URL: <https://www.urbandictionary.com/>

References:

1. Antonchenko, T. M. (1999). Lingvustychni osoblyvosti funktsionuvannia etnonimiv ta etnofobizmiv (na materialy angliiskoi movy). [Linguistic peculiarities of ethnonyms and ethnophobia (based on The English language)]. *Visnyk Kyivskoho lingvistichnoho universytetu. Seriya Filologiya* [Bulletin of Kyiv Linguistic University. Philological series]. Kyiv: Vydavnychi tsentr KDLU. Vol. 2. № 1. (in Ukr.).
2. Berezneva, I. M. (2000). Osoblyvosti vyvcheniia frazeologichnyh odynyt z semantyzmamy yak naukova problema. [Peculiarities of semantic as a scientific

- problem]. *Lingvustychni doslidzheniia*. [Linguistic researches]: zbirnyk naukovykh prats. HDPU. № 5. P. 122–127. (in Ukr.).
3. Gumeniuk, I. I. (2010). Strukturni ta leksyko-semantychni osoblyvosti frazeologichnykh odynyts iz koloratyvamy v angliiskiy movi: avtoref. dys. ...kand. filol. nauk [Structural and lexical-semantic peculiarities of phraseological units with colors in the English language: thesis abstract of candidate of philological sciences]. Chernivtsi. 20 s. (in Ukr.).
 4. Levchenko, O. P. (2003). Frazeologichna reprezentatsiia svitu [Phraseological representation of the world]. *Movni I kontseptualni kartyny svitu*: Zbirnyk naukovykh prats [Lexical and conceptual representation of the world]. Bulletin of Kyiv National University named by Taras Shevchenko]. Kyiv. № 7. S. 307–315. (in Ukr.).
 5. Savchuk, N. M. (2018). Osoblyvosti natsionalnogo svitospriyatia turkmeniv: lingvo-kulturnyi aspect [Peculiarities of the national worldview by Turkmen: linguacultural aspect]. *Visnyk Ukrainsko-turkmen'skoho kulturnoosvitnioho tsentru: mizhdystyplinarnyi naukovyi zbirnyk*. [Bulletin of Ukrainian and Turkmen cultural and educational center: Interdisciplinary scientific bulletin]. Uman: Vizavi. Vol. 2. P. II. S. 145–152. (in Ukr.).
 6. Sviatiuk, Yu. V. (2005). Semantyka i funktsionuvannia etnonominatsii u suchasniy angliiskii movi: dys. ...kand. filol. nauk [Semantics and functioning of the ethnonyms in the modern English language: thesis of candidate of philological sciences]. Donetsk. 224 s. (in Ukr.).
 7. Blaine E., Kimberly J., McClure B. Understanding the Psychology of Diversity. USA: Sage Publications. 2017. 344 p. (in Eng.).
 8. Forbidden American English. A Serious Compilation of Taboo American English / ed. Spears, Richard A. Illinois: Passport Books. 1991. 225 p. (in Eng.).
 9. Greenwald A. G., Banaji M. R. Implicit social cognition: Attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. *Psychological Review*. 1995. Vol. 102. P. 4–27. (in Eng.).
 10. Hogg M., Graham M., Vaughan. Social Psychology. London: Prentice Hall. 3rd ed. 2002. 792 p. (in Eng.).
 11. Kudła M. A Study of Attributive Ethnonyms in the History of English with Special Reference to Foodsemy. Frankfurt am Main; Bern; Bruxelles; New York; Oxford; Warszawa; Wien: Peter Lang. 2016. 306 p. (in Eng.).
 12. Oren N., Bar-Tal D. The detrimental dynamics of delegitimization in intractable conflicts: The Israeli-Palestinian case. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*. 2007. Vol. 31 (1). P. 111–126. (in Eng.).
 13. Petrova N. D. English Phraseological Units with the National Culturological Component. *Foreign Philology*. Kyiv, 1997. № 110. P. 40–50. (in Eng.).
 14. Schwartz S. H., Struch N. Values, stereotypes, and intergroup antagonism / Bar Tal D., Grauman C. F., Stroebe W., eds. *Stereotyping and Prejudice: Changing Conceptions*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1989. P. 151–167. (in Eng.).
 15. The Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology / ed. by C. T. Onions et al. 1966. 1024 p. URL: <https://archive.org/details/onions-ed.-the-oxford-dictionary-of-english-etymology-1966/page/998/mode/2up>. (in Eng.).
 16. Urban Dictionary. URL: <https://www.urbandictionary.com/> (in Eng.).

Тетяна Мітроусова, Світлана Никитюк

СПЕЦИФІКА АНГЛІЙСЬКИХ ЕТНОНІМІВ ЯК ВЕРБАЛЬНИХ ЗАСОБІВ ПОЗНАЧЕННЯ «СВОГО/ЧУЖОГО»

Стаття присвячена вивченню семантичної структури та ідентифікації англійських фразеологізмів у складі етнонімів, визначенню випадків, виявленню упередженого чи нейтрального ставлення іноземців у англомовному середовищі

щі. У дослідженні проаналізовано поняття «етнонім», «етнофобізм», «етноцентризм» та «стереотип».

У статті було досліджено, що етноніми класифікуються на макроетноніми та мікроетноніми. Макроетноніми відносяться до великих етнічних утворень, таких як, наприклад, афроамериканці. Мікроетноніми використовуються для позначення менших спільнот, об'єднаних приналежністю до одного племені, етнічної групи, нації або іншої етнічної групи. Вони охоплюють етнонімічні назви різного масштабу та рівня узагальнення.

Виявлено, що складові етнонімів можуть бути представлені різними лінгвістичними засобами: словами, що вказують на національну приналежність, походження, фізичні характеристики або спосіб життя; власними назвами; етнонімічними формами, похідними від офіційних назв народів; образними – метафоричними або метонімічними – позначеннями іноземців; а також фразеологічними одиницями, що відображають узагальнені стереотипні уявлення про представників інших народів в англомовній спільноті.

Автори статті виявили, що на сприйняття «інших» і «чужих» народів впливає низка факторів, серед яких провідну роль відіграють історичні та геополітичні. Дійсно, кількість етнонімів, прийнятих у лінгвокультурному контексті, а також їхня частота в соціальному дискурсі залежать від історичних зв'язків і географічного розташування. Численні національні стереотипи негативно зображують сусідніх шотландців, валлійців або ірландців, незважаючи на те, що всі вони належать до одного королівства.

Встановлено, що дослідження етнонімів та закономірностей їх походження, розвитку та вживання не можна розглядати окремо від дослідження самого етносу, оскільки воно дозволяє глибше зрозуміти складні процеси, що формують етнологію та етнічну історію будь-якої спільноти. Самоназви, як вирази самосвідомості народу, та зовнішні назви, що відображають стереотипні уявлення інших, є одними з основних показників етнічної єдності. Підсумовано, що стійкість етносу як соціальної системи забезпечує відносну стабільність його представлення в колективній свідомості та самосвідомості.

Ключові слова: фразеологія, етнонім, лексико-семантичні особливості, етноцентризм, стереотип, «свій/чужий».

Отримано: 08.01.2026 р.

Прийнято до друку після рецензування: 03.03.2026 р.

Опубліковано: 25.05.2026 р.