

Запрошуємо до дискусії

Invitation for Discussion

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15407/ugz2025.04.102>Boichenko, M. I.¹

0000-0003-1404-180X,

| Kubalskyi, O. N.²

0000-0002-7956-3150

¹ Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Kyiv² Dobrov Institute for Scientific and Technological Potential and Science History Studies of the NAS of Ukraine, Kyiv

Human Life-World in Toponyms: A Philosophical Understanding of Life Space

UDC 1:911:316(045)

From a philosophical perspective, it is considered how a person ascribes meaning to their living space, transforming it into a life-world. The study aims to identify the philosophical foundations of toponymy by clarifying the significance of the concepts of “life-world” and “life space” for the formation of a geographical approach to describing the world. The research methods are social phenomenology (understanding of the life-world in the philosophy of Edmund Husserl, Alfred Schütz, and Bernhard Waldenfels) in combination with neo-institutionalism (Douglas North’s concept) and the philosophy of performativity (John Austin, John Searle, and Hans Ulrich Humbrecht): people establish toponyms according to the principles of intersubjectivity in establishing meanings, striving to achieve higher performing skills to create an everyday value-normative basis. The concepts of “life-world,” “life forms,” and “life space” constitute a conceptual framework for a geographical approach to toponymy. Topology systematically explains and organizes various systems of toponymy, which are special linguistic means by which topological scientists record how humanity inhabits its environment and explores and changes it. In cases of interpretive conflict when establishing toponyms, the selection criterion is the greater performativity of specific toponymic means. As a result, specialists employ institutionalized terminology that ensures the perception of geographical objects as problem-free in explanations. In the modern, globalized world, toponymy reflects how several life-worlds coexist within a single living space, thereby realizing the anthropological need of people to freely and relentlessly expand their mastery of the world without entering into conflict with it or among themselves.

Keywords: *toponyms, human life-world, life space, philosophical topology, geographical topology, intersubjectivity, performativity.*

Relevance of the research

A person is a being who positions himself in the world: by determining his location, a person turns the world into geography—literally “a description of the Earth” (from Greek). Actually, even in the

Bible, in the book of “Genesis,” the Lord creates the world, separates the earth from the sky from the waters, creates all living creatures of the earth, water, and heaven, and on the penultimate day also creates man, Adam, and gives him the task and

For citation:

Boichenko, M. I., & Kubalskyi, O. N. (2025). Human Life-World in Toponyms: A Philosophical Understanding of Life Space. *Ukrainian Geographical Journal*, 4(132): 102–111. [In Ukrainian] DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15407/ugz2025.04.102>

Copyright © 2025 Publishing House *Akademperryodyka* of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine.



The article is published under the open access license CC BY-NC-ND license
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

right to go into this world and give names to all these creatures [1, *Genesis 2: 19-20*]. Therefore, Adam can also be considered the first geographer in a metaphorical sense. But the one who gives names, according to the Bible, is not an outside observer: Adam thereby receives power over all creatures, because they must respond to the names given to them, not only recognizing themselves in them, but also receiving their purpose thanks to them. Adam thus had to confirm God's plan for each creature and had every reason to do so, because the Lord says, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness" [1, *Genesis 1:26*]. At the heart of this theology lies teleology, that is, the doctrine of the goal—the purpose that supposedly has everything that exists. Whether this teleology has scientific grounds—we can hypothesize about this, considering the biblical story as a metaphor for natural evolution—incomplete, selective, and sometimes inverted, but in something else still such that it reproduces the important logic of evolution, its "plan." We can and should also be aware that a person is able to know only a meager fraction of the Universe, and therefore should not be self-confident, believe that he knows the main thing about this world, and put himself above everything in it. Immanuel Kant also formulated the idea that what a person knows as his object is most correctly called a "thing in itself," which is unknowable in its entirety [2]. At the same time, even Kant recognizes that the part of the world that we can both know and influence (although this is not always the same thing), a person is still obliged to order, describe, and catalog. The ancient Greeks called this part of the world "oikumena"—the inhabited world. And giving the world and its parts names, including toponyms, is undoubtedly one of the important ways of mastering this world, giving this living space meaning, and transforming it into your own life-world. Such meaningfulness in its ultimate foundations is provided by philosophy, which is a general ontology and at the same time helps to better form for specific sciences about the world their own subject, which is, from the point of view of philosophy, their regional ontology, in accordance with those regions of reality that they specifically investigate.

Problem statement and major works

Topology is a subject of high priority for mathematicians, although there are specialized publi-

cations on geographical toponymy [3]. However, issues of geographical toponymy are more closely related to philosophical topology, which concerns their cultural and semantic basis [4]. The study of toponyms is well developed from a geographical perspective. However, within the broader field of geography in Ukraine, there are both specialized studies [5] and journals, such as "Journal of Cartography," as well as tangential ones, such as "Regional Studies," as well as relevant textbooks [6-7]. Similarly, in philosophy, the issues of the lifeworld, life forms, and life space are pretty well developed [8-14], and in geopolitics, their own versions of the interpretation of the concepts of "life form" and "life space" [15-16] have been developed, which are based on the ideas of the representative of German idealism, Johann G. Fichte, regarding the self-affirmation of the nation [17]. In Ukraine, general methodological principles for the philosophical understanding of the subject and the terminology of special sciences have also been developed [18-20], and, in particular, a philosophical understanding of institutionalism in special-scientific cognition has been developed [21-22]. However, the connection between the concept of toponyms in geography and the philosophical categories of lifeworld and lifespace, as well as a more specific assessment of the geopolitical concept of lifespace from the standpoint of philosophy and the science of geography, is practically absent, with rare exceptions—research in the field of global studies [23] prevails, which is supplemented by philosophical explorations of the noosphere [24, 25], regional studies [26, 27], or ecology [28].

Therefore, *the purpose of this research* is to identify the philosophical foundations of toponymy by clarifying the significance of the concepts of "lifeworld" and "lifespace" for the formation of a geographical approach to describing the world.

Research methods

The research methodology is social phenomenology, presented in the works of E. Husserl [8-10], A. Schütz [11], and B. Waldenfels [12]. Geographical toponymy appears from the standpoint of this methodology as an essential element of regional ontology, namely, that which is at the intersection of the world of natural guidance (a description of nature and natural parameters of the social world) and social structures of the life-world (intersubjective meanings, based on which the social world as a

whole is structured and its semantic positioning in physical space in particular is established). The key concept in this perspective is the life-world.

On this basis, and from these positions, categories of philosophical anthropology, such as life forms and their life space, have been reinterpreted. In particular, the correlation between the concept of “life space” in the philosophy of H. Plessner [29, 30] and M. Scheler [31], as representatives of German philosophical anthropology, and the concept of geopolitics in its classical exposition by K. Haushofer [15] has been clarified. This entails significant worldview and methodological adjustments to the scientific interpretation of geographical space.

Additionally, drawing on social phenomenology, the meaning of neo-institutionalism and its key concept of performativity [32] have been reinterpreted to clarify the possibilities of geographical topology. By involving the concept of performativity in its phenomenological interpretation by the German-American philosopher H. U. Gumbrecht [33, 34] in the analysis of this issue, a new methodological use is proposed, which is also an applied application of the ideas of performativity in the theory of speech acts [35, 36].

Statement of basic materials

The significance of the phenomenological concept of the lifeworld for geography

The concept of the life-world (*Lebenswelt*, German) was proposed by the German philosopher Edmund Husserl, who founded the direction of phenomenology in modern philosophy. From the very beginning, Husserl made significant changes in the understanding of the essence and tasks of both the theory of knowledge and ontology as the science of being: Husserl defines phenomena as a key concept of ontology, which is a special way of being, which causes a focus (intention) on these phenomena in human consciousness. Passive synthesis and pre-predicative experience begin to play an important role in cognition: that is, most human ideas are formed even before they are realized by a person—in the intersubjective interaction between people, which forms their life-worlds [9]. That is, it is the life-world of people that largely determines their collective intentions regarding phenomena. The intersubjective world, according to Husserl, is primarily a world of natural orientation: “I con-

stantly find around me a spatio-temporal reality to which I myself belong, like all other people who are in it and are connected with it in the same way” [8, p. 65]. However, the life-world also includes inanimate objects, as the Ukrainian phenomenologist V. Kebuladze rightly notes: “the world of our life—the life-world (*Lebenswelt*)— contains many elements devoid of life—tools and machines, favorite books, gifts from loved ones, our homes, the baby teeth of our children saved for our grandchildren, photographs of deceased friends, the burials of our ancestors, etc.” [13, p. 102]. Actually, this is what the Hellenes have called *oikumena* since ancient times. However, Husserl emphasizes not so much physical space as spiritual space. Thus, in his 1935 report on Europe, he notes that he is talking about a spiritual Europe, which includes, in particular, many inhabitants of other continents outside Europe who are of European origin and are carriers of European culture, while he does not recognize Hindus, Gypsies, and representatives of non-European civilizations living on the territory of Europe as part of it: “How can one characterize the spiritual gestalt of Europe? That is, a Europe that is not understood geographically, from the point of view of maps, as if a space that encompasses people who live here together territorially, and who should be defined by this as European humanity” [10].

How to get out of this collision? In modern philosophy, as well as in many practices, the term “location” is introduced. And the same physical space can manifest itself as different locations—depending on who uses it and in what way. It can be a location for filming a movie, and then an ordinary entrance of an apartment building can turn into a location from another time and space. This entrance can also become the scene of a real crime or a real celebration, for example, a wedding. Thus, location is exactly how, in what way people settle in, how they understand a certain physical space. And then the same physical space can become the locations of different life-worlds, which can intersect with each other, or can exist alternately. You can create a temporary location that will even belong to a completely different time and another country—when, for example, films about the Musketeers and 17th-century France were shot in the castles of Western Ukraine. In the same physical space (in the same entrance, for example), representatives of different religions, different gender groups can coexist, and each of them will form their own life-worlds there, which

will partially overlap and more or less conflictively coexist in the same physical space. If we take a larger scale, then parallel geographies may even arise in the same physical space. Even today, this happens when different national traditions give different names, and sometimes different borders, to states, cities, regions, and geographical areas. Today, however, there are certain rules that allow us to adequately correlate these national traditions and bring them together to a single denominator/standard. In more ancient times, maps of the same area compiled by different researchers differed significantly. However, the possibility of some variations in geography cannot be ruled out even today, and perhaps it will never be possible to rule out this – after all, geography is still only a description of physical space, and not this space itself. Thus, the concept of life-world and locations provides a key to understanding the subtle but important differences between physical and geographical space, but still offers a somewhat specific intersubjective interpretation of geography, which, however, although it reflects mainly its subjective component, this component is also its integral condition for functioning.

The difference in the interpretation of life space in philosophical anthropology and geopolitics

These differences between the geographical and physical interpretations of space are especially acute in geopolitics, which reflects the interests of various geopolitical subjects who tend to reshape geography in accordance with their geopolitical interests not on paper, but in life, referring precisely to the objectivity of their own political claims. At one time, this desire to establish its “natural” dominance was marked by empires that gave their own names to the countries they conquered—primarily in Asia, Africa, America, and Australia. After liberation from the colonial burden, many of these countries returned or created their own names, which symbolized the end of slavery. A classic example is the renaming of French Upper Volta in Africa to Burkina Faso (translated from the local language – Homeland of Honest People). This region is still undergoing turbulent political events, as a result of which new renamings are quite possible [37]. But such cases do not only occur in former colonies of the so-called “Third World” countries—even completely democratic countries are not immune from them. What is the value of the

US President’s renaming of the Gulf of Mexico to the Gulf of America and his related similar initiatives [38]. However, after such renamings, empires begin to make attempts to really change geography—they build giant bridges to islands (as they did to Sri Lanka at one time) or peninsulas (as the modern Russian Federation did to Crimea), divert the flow of rivers (the project to divert the waters of the northern rivers of Siberia to the more arid south of the USSR), drain some seas (like the Aral in the USSR) or create numerous new ones (artificial seas along the Dnieper River in the USSR, as well as modern cyclopean hydraulic structures in the Russian Federation and the People’s Republic of China)—all this is the embodiment of plans to reshape objective physical reality, which are especially typical for empires, old and new. Such geopolitical ambitions are based not so much on the concept of the life-world as on the concept of living space, which has a somewhat different, rather political basis, and in philosophy correlates to a greater extent with philosophical anthropology. After all, the concepts of the life-world include the possibility of coexistence of different historical life-worlds in one physical space, while major geopolitical players claim to master this space, up to its transformations—for the needs of one dominant geopolitical subject, to which all other social formations must obey and submit. Typical is the Chinese concept of the Celestial Empire, which was created in ancient times, but also has its modern supporters [23].

The classical concept of living space was developed by the prominent representative of the theory of geopolitics, K. Haushofer, founder of the Institute of Geopolitics at the University of Munich and the Journal of Geopolitics, and presented primarily in his work “Borders in their Geographical and Political Meaning” (1927). According to his views, living space is something similar to the habitat of a population from the point of view of biological science—he considers peoples as “life forms” that are determined by the “biogeographical essence of borders” [15, pp. 20-31]. Every true people must establish its right to rule over a certain land and uses force to do this, and this is not so much the force of higher culture, stronger morality and perfection in science and technology, as physical force, which has its perfect embodiment in military power, which can only be confirmed by victory on the battlefield. This is a classic of what is called Real Politik, that is, the right of the strong, which is dai-

ly embodied in the practices of undisguised coercion in international relations [16].

This idea was also implicitly based on the concept of a closed trading state by Johann Gottlieb Fichte: “A state is only that formation that unites an indefinite multitude of people as a closed unity and comprehensiveness, and only with it do they acquire their undeniable commonality, only through it do they acquire their legal property” [17, p. 26]. According to the logic of this concept, to achieve the specified goals, each state with full right seeks to provide itself within its borders with all the necessary resources, starting from the natural minerals necessary for the country’s economy and ending with its own industry, which provides its own population with all the basic goods and services. In complete agreement with Fichte, Haushofer notes that “in each zone of combat operations only its own independent life reigns” [15, p. 41], and by this he affirms not only the military view of the principles of statehood and the grounds for the military consolidation of its borders, but also that these borders should expand until the above-mentioned conditions are met, and all this reconquered land can have only one master. No coexistence of different states on one land is envisaged, because geopolitics is a war in which there can be only one owner of the land—the winner of the duel.

Such tasks of geopolitics are justified by the nature of man, which is determined by German philosophical anthropology. Thus, in particular, Helmut Plessner in his work “The Stages of the Organic and Man” defines man as an eccentric being who, unlike all other animals, seeks and finds his essence not in himself, but always outside himself, that is, sees his center from the outside, strives for it, carrying out constant expansion by all possible means [30]. Ukrainian researcher B. Yatsenko also notes the polysemantic nature of the concept of force, which, however, geopoliticians reduce to resource-based coercion: “Political practitioners and ordinary people find the above-mentioned vision of the behavior and motivations of force action too complicated. Therefore, they turn to the “resource” version of this concept: a country (State) is strong when it has a large population and a large territory, rich natural resources, economic and military power, and social stability” [18, p. 60].

As we can see, the price of achieving unambiguousness in political geography is the legitimation of aggressive militarism and the denial of the suprem-

acy of the spiritual principle. However, such biologization does not bring political geography closer to natural accuracy—on the contrary, the place of scientific objectivity is taken here by extreme voluntarism and national subjectivism elevated to the rank of a higher law.

To avoid misinterpretation and application of his concept of human nature, H. Plessner wrote a special work, already by its title polemically directed against the militaristic concept of living space—“The Boundaries of Community. Critique of Social Radicalism” (1924) [29]. In this work, Plessner shows that the principle of eccentricity is appropriate to use to explain the actions of individuals and small communities, but by no means to justify the policies of societies. Also, the founder of philosophical anthropology, M. Scheler, in his work “The Position of Man in Space” (1928), reacted to Haushofer’s concept in such a way that the highest driving force in man is the spirit, which freely sets values, and these in turn subordinate life’s impulses to itself—but not vice versa: it is precisely thanks to the spiritual principle that man is the opposite of the animal and is partially freed from natural coercion [31]. This means that man does influence geography in an objective way, but not as omnipotently and linearly as Haushofer imagined in his concept of geopolitics. The influence of man on geography, indeed, consists not only in adding certain names to geographical objects and disputes about who has the right to give these names. Man has truly turned into a geochemical force in his activity, as V. Vernadskyi argued in his work “Geochemistry”: like all living organisms, man changes the face of the Earth—very slowly, but steadily. Vernadskyi had in mind, first of all, the processes associated with the transformation of sunlight through photosynthesis and its derivatives: “On the earth’s surface there is no chemical force that is constantly acting, and therefore more powerful in its final consequences, than living organisms taken as a whole” [25, p. 32]. In his next work, “Biosphere,” Vernadskyi turns to the concept of the noosphere, through which he shows that, thanks to reason, man appears as an even more powerful geological force—man uses reason for impressive transformations, including those that objectively change geography.

It is in this direction and from this perspective that geography should be considered—as evidence of human transformations of the Earth’s surface, which join the cosmic, geological and biologi-

cal forces that began to change it even earlier and remain the main force of transformations of the Earth's surface.

*Philosophical topology on toponyms
of the life-world*

Thus, topology is designed to a greater extent to organize the results of human influence on changes in the Earth's surface and only slightly proactively participates in these changes themselves. As Ukrainian professor H. Labinska notes, "The first and main purpose of a geographical name is to specify a location on the Earth's surface" [6, p. 7]. Such concretization should first of all fit this specific place into a broader system of geographical relevances—taking into account, if possible, different or alternative ways of determining location, that is, ordering this name not only according to the principle of correspondent truth (correlation of a name with its object), but also according to the principle of coherent truth (correlation of a separate name with a certain system of geographical naming). These two truths reveal mainly different topologies: geographical topology claims primarily to determine correspondent truth, and philosophical topology—coherent truth. Although geography also assumes alternative ways of designation, and philosophy also takes into account physical reality. However, geography perceives physical reality as a given, and philosophy—only as material that can be changed. Moreover, for geography, alternative systems of designation are only a convention, and for philosophy—the manifestation of value orientations that come from more significant realities than geographical ones. Such defining realities for philosophy are different life-worlds.

If geography mainly deals with the first and main function of topology (ordering of location), then philosophical topology is most interested in the second (proactive meaning-making) and seeks to evaluate through its prism both the first function of topology and topology in general. From the point of view of philosophical phenomenology, for example, topology is not something universal and universally significant, but an attempt by a certain specific community to build its own social world (its own life-world) as one that inevitably intersects with the social world of other people (other life-worlds), while all life-worlds necessarily draw their meanings from the universe of pure phenomena,

which is common to all humanity [11, 12]. From the life-worlds on the basis of which globalist claims grow, not only empires arise, but also such geographical phenomena as Pax Romana, Pax Britanica, Pax Americana, the Celestial Empire, the "Russian World," etc. [23]. Hence the transition from the natural naming of the territory of one's small basic life-world to considering the entire planet as a sphere of one's own vital interests, as one's own large lifeworld, and accordingly, an attempt to transform the entire world into one's own large living space. This results in the emergence of claims among such empires to rename all localities in the world themselves—to create an alternative system of toponyms, which they begin to consider as basic. From the point of view of such an imperial approach, the entire world appears as "theirs," then nothing remains extraneous, foreign in the world—the empire has a say in everything in the world. This is reflected in imperial global toponymy. All other countries in the world that do not have imperial ambitions in politics and economics also do not, as a rule, show a tendency to rename other countries and their toponyms. However, these non-imperial countries are constantly forced to deal with political and geographical "aggressive marketing" of countries that claim imperial status—whatever language they use, Latin, English, Chinese or Russian. The new empire may well be the global virtual space of Artificial Intelligence, which is extremely quickly absorbing local life-worlds. Ukrainian researcher A. Boyko reconstructs the philosophical grounds for such proactive toponymy in the following way: "Experience turns us to the primary arche, to the inevitability of bodily-spatial experiences. At the same time, working with space and relationships in it always involves contact with some Stranger, which may be radically different from us. This Strangeness tests us, we try to come to terms with it in ourselves, with what forces us to go beyond ourselves, with what is impossible to control" [4, p. 32]. In the language of geography, this can be interpreted as the need to look for correspondences between different traditions of geographical naming, and sometimes even signs and metrics. At the same time, it is not always a question of different names for the same objects, but also of different marking of borders—not only countries, but also physical objects. The search for objective grounds for understanding and establishing adequate correspondence between such different traditions and metric systems often requires

topology not only thoroughness and accuracy, but also creativity in interpretation, and sometimes the creation of a new common interpretative basis for different traditions and metrics.

*Institutional performativity
in determining the optimal toponymic choice*

To clarify the philosophical grounds for such an expanded interpretation of this creative function of topology, it is worth taking into account the philosophical concept of performativity. The idea of performativity denotes the way of human attitude to the world, when, uttering certain words, people affirm a certain reality by this utterance [35,36]. Such are oaths and other types of public promises and renunciations. In particular, such are the naming of people, beings, things and places by names, which in itself is also a kind of obligation to act in accordance with a certain and recognized name. For example, by accepting someone as a brother or mentor, people recognize the obligation to listen to and follow the advice of this person; by giving names to animals and other living beings, they thereby accept the obligation to take care of them; by recognizing something as edible or poisonous, they also act in accordance with certain characteristics. Similarly, by accepting a country as their Motherland, they thereby recognize their deep connection with it and the priority of its national interests in everything—including metric priorities.

And the choice of a toponymy system is not a simple politeness, but a protection of their own life-world. That is why Turks and Armenians, Kurds and Turks, Azerbaijanis and Armenians, Kurds and Syrians, Israelis and Palestinians, and many other peoples of the Middle East defend their own toponyms so sharply and harshly, to the point of waging war and even committing acts of genocide, and so practically throughout their entire history. In the modern defensive war with the Russian Federation, Ukraine also consistently and clearly defends its toponymy—no less sharply than the very territories that Russia encroaches on. Russia calls the entire Ukrainian Black Sea region “Novorossia,” calls part of Moldova “Transnistria,” and seeks to return the Soviet names of the ancient Ukrainian cities of Bakhmut, New York, and many others—respectively, “Artiomovsk,” “Novgorodskoie,” etc. The specifics of Ukrainian toponymy are explained by Galina Labinska in her special study [7].

However, the German-American philosopher H. U. Gumbrecht offers a more cosmopolitan and postmodern understanding of performativity, which provides grounds for overcoming national borders in a way that differs from imperial expansion [33]. This is an admiration for the irresistibility of beauty and performing skill, which convinces by captivating and inviting with its charms, rather than by the force of physical coercion. Gumbrecht finds this understanding of performativity, for example, in the beauty of sport [34]. Passion for sport—even just as a fan—makes people like-minded and creates a common space of values. Sport convinces us to accept unfamiliar names and titles as close and familiar—due to the deep and pleasant experiences associated with these names. Such performativity creates the effect of presence in a shared life-world—no longer territorial, but a life-world of shared recognition, which does not need meanings to confirm it. If it was previously believed that only classical local life-worlds did not need explanations, and all institutional and systemic social constructions that were built on them, on the contrary, could exist only thanks to such explicit explanations and articulated rules of their functioning, then Gumbrecht explains on what non-reflexive principles of shared satisfaction it is possible to build a global human life-world. Despite the attractiveness of the universal interpretative platform offered by H. U. Gumbrecht’s concept of performativity, nevertheless, an appeal to sport or aesthetics can hardly serve as a common platform for understanding in matters of geography in general and toponyms in particular. However, the criterion of executive excellence has much broader possibilities for implementation—it itself can be considered as universal in institutional issues. This is, in particular, what the 1993 Nobel Prize winner in economics D. North writes about in his work on institutional skill: “The instrumental postulate of rationality in neoclassical theory assumes that participants have the information necessary to correctly evaluate alternatives, and thanks to this they make choices that will contribute to the achievement of desired goals” [32, p. 138]. Of course, this choice is made within the framework of institutional discipline, and not arbitrarily: this choice certainly takes into account previous institutional experience (both positive and negative), and this choice is also clearly aimed at establishing a new institutional design (more or less radical, but always institutional changes). This is the position of neo-institutional-

ism, which is a component of modern practical philosophy or an element of modern social philosophy [21, 22].

Thus, the choice of toponyms is an institutional choice of geographers, which should take into account the institutional proposals of qualified representatives of political, legal and other social systems, and not simply the declarations or doubts of individual politicians, lawyers or other uncertified subjects within the framework of political, legal or any other communication.

Conclusion

As a result of the conducted socio-phenomenological research, it was found that the philosophical and anthropological concepts of “lifeworld,” “life forms,” “life space” create a conceptual framework for the formation of a geographical approach to toponymy as a description of the world. Humanity inhabits its environment, exploring and changing it and records this thanks to special linguistic means—first of all, toponymy, which is systematically explained and organized by topology. Geographic topology registers the parameters of physical space and at the same time takes into account the semantic and value grounds for the formation of these parameters, including alternative ones, which are explored

by philosophical topology. Performativity is an integral component of the establishment of toponymy—explicit in cases of conflict of interpretations and hidden when using institutionalized terminology. The philosophy of performativity establishes a mutual correlation between the general principles of topology and the way people toponymically describe specific geographical objects.

Novelty

A distinction is made between social phenomenology, philosophical anthropology and geopolitical science in the use of the term “life space”: from the point of view of social phenomenology, one life space can be inhabited by several life-worlds at the same time, philosophical anthropology emphasizes the desire of man to constantly give new meanings to physical space, thus establishing his own freedom and transforming this space into his life space, while geopolitics puts national interests above human freedom and considers physical coercion as the basis for establishing the boundaries of the life space of a nation as the exclusive space of its habitation. It is revealed that not so much military actions as the perfection of execution in competently giving meaning to life space can serve as a universal basis for understanding in establishing toponymy.

References [Література]


1. KJB0. (2025). King James Bible. URL: <https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/>
2. Kant, I. (1998). Critique of Pure Reason. (Timmermann, J., ed.). Hamburg: Meiner. 995 S. [In German]. [Kant, I. (1998). Kritik der reinen Vernunft. Hrg. V. J. Timmermann. Hamburg: Meiner. 995 p.]
3. Taranova, N. (2006). The main stages of the development of toponymy as a science. *Scientific notes of the Volodymyr Hnatyuk Ternopil National Pedagogical University. Series: Geography*, (2). [In Ukrainian]. [Таранова Н. Основні етапи розвитку топонімії як науки. *Наукові записки Тернопільського Національного педагогічного університету імені В. Гнатюка. Серія: Географія*. 2006. № 2.] URL: <http://www.library.tnpu.edu.ua/bitstream/123456789/25135/1/Taranova.pdf>
4. Boiko, A. (2025). Philosophical-topographic orientations after the spatial turn. *Visnyk of the Lviv University. Series Philos.-Political Studies*, 59, 28–36. [In Ukrainian]. [Бойко А. (2025). Філософсько-топографічні орієнтації після просторового повороту. *Вісник Львівського університету. Серія філос.-політолог. студії*. Вип. 59. С. 28–36.] DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30970/PPS.2025.59.3>
5. Kruglov, I. (2020). Transdisciplinary geoeology: monograph. Lviv: Ivan Franko National University of Lviv. 292 p. [In Ukrainian]. [Круглов І. (2020). Трансдисциплінарна геоєкологія: монографія. Львів: ЛНУ імені І. Франка. 292 с.]
6. Labinska, G. (2016). Toponymy. Textbook. Lviv: Ivan Franko National University of Lviv. 274 p. [In Ukrainian]. [Лабінська Г. Топоніміка. Навчальний посібник. Львів: ЛНУ імені І. Франка, 2016. 274 с.]
7. Labinska, G. (2020). Toponymy of Ukraine. Textbook. Lviv: Ivan Franko National University of Lviv. 60 p. [In Ukrainian]. [Лабінська Г. (2020). Топоніміка України. Навчально-методичний посібник. Львів: ЛНУ імені І. Франка. 60 с.]
8. Husserl, E. (2021). Ideas of pure phenomenology and phenomenological philosophy: Book One. General introduction to pure phenomenology. (Kebuladze, V., trans). Kharkiv: Folio. 348 p. [In Ukrainian]. [Гусерль Е. (2021). Ідеї чистої феноменології і феноменологічної філософії: Кн. 1. Загальний вступ до чистої феноменології. Пер. з нім. В. Кебуладзе. Харків: Фоліо. 348 с.]
9. Husserl, E. (2021). Cartesian meditations. Introduction to phenomenology. Trans. From German. Vachtel, A.). Kyiv: Tempora. 304 p. [In Ukrainian]. [Гусерль Е. (2021). Картезіанські медитації. Вступ до феноменології. Пер. з нім. А. Вахтеля. Київ: Темпора. 304 с.]

10. Husserl, E. (1935). The Crisis of European Humanity and Philosophy. [In German]. [Husserl, E. Die Krisis des europäischen Menschentums und die Philosophie. 1935.] URL: [https://www.hs-augsburg.de/~harsch/germanica/Chronologie/20\]h/Husserl/hus_kris.html](https://www.hs-augsburg.de/~harsch/germanica/Chronologie/20]h/Husserl/hus_kris.html)
11. Schutz, A. (2004). Structures of the life-world. (Kebuladze, V., trans.). Kyiv: Ukrainian Center for Spiritual Culture. 560 p. [In Ukrainian]. [Шюц А. (2004). Структури життєсвіту. Пер. з нім. В. Кебуладзе. Київ: Український Центр духовної культури. 560 с.]
12. Waldenfels, B. (2004). Topography of the Stranger: Studies in the Phenomenology of the Stranger. (Kebuladze, V., trans.). Kyiv: PPS-2002. 206 p. [In Ukrainian]. [Вальденфельс Б. (2004). Топографія Чужого: студії до феноменології Чужого. Пер. з нім. В. Кебуладзе. Київ: ППС-2002. 206 с.]
13. Kebuladze, V. (2017). "Lebenswelt" by Husserl and "Dasein" by Heidegger: problems of translation. *Filosofska Dumka*, (5), 99–108. [In Ukrainian]. [Кебуладзе В. (2015). "Lebenswelt" Гуссерля і "Dasein" Гайдегера: проблеми перекладу. Філософська думка. № 5. С. 99–108.] URL: <https://dumka.philosophy.ua/index.php/fd/article/view/184>
14. Minakov, M. A. (2007). History of the concept of experience. Monograph. Kyiv: PARAPAN. 380 p. [In Ukrainian]. [Мінаков М. А. (2007). Історія поняття досвіду. Монографія. Київ: ПАРАПАН. 380 с.]
15. Haushofer, K. (1939). Borders in their geographical and political significance. II, revised ed. Heidelberg-Berlin-Magdeburg: Kurt Vowinckel Verlag. 279 p. [In German]. [Haushofer, K. (1939). Grenzen in ihrer geographischen und politischen Bedeutung. II, neubearb. Aufl. Heidelberg-Berlin-Magdeburg: Kurt Vowinckel Verlag. 279 S.]
16. Vegesh, M. (2015). The geopolitical concept of Karl Haushofer. Romanian-Ukrainian relations, history and present. Editura Muzeului Satmarean. Pp. 143-152. [In Ukrainian]. [Вереш М. (2020). Карл Гаусхофер: штрихи до портрета геополітика. *Регіональні студії*. № 20 С. 137–145.] DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32782/2663-6170/2020.20.23>
17. Fichte, J. G. (1800). The Closed Commercial State. A Philosophical Outline as an Appendix to the Doctrine of Law and a Model of a Future Policy. Tübingen: J. G. Cotta's Bookstore. 290 pp. [In German]. [Fichte, J. G. Der Geschlossene Handelsstaat. Ein philosophischer Entwurf als Anhang zur Rechtslehre und Probe einer künftig zu lieferenden Politik. Tübingen: J. G. Cotta'schen Buchhandlung, 1800. 290 S.]
18. Yatsenko, B. P. (2025). Category of "power" on the States Geostrategy. *Ukrainian Geographical Journal*. No. 2 (130): 59–66. [in Ukrainian] [Яценко Б. П. (2025). Категорія «сили» в геостратегії держав. *Український географічний журнал*. № 2 (130). С. 59–66.] DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15407/ugz2025.02.059>
19. Kubalskyi, O. N. (2024). Cultural-Anthropological Basis of Strong Constructivism in Social Cognition. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, (25), 51–60. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i25.307595>
20. Kubalskyi, O. (2024). Science Communication in the Global Age: Social and Philosophical Analysis of International Experience and Ukrainian Context. *Philosophy and Cosmology*, 33, 123–133. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/33/4>
21. Boychenko, M. (2016). Institutional origins of globalization. *Bulletin of the Kharkiv National Pedagogical University named after G. S. Skovoroda. "Philosophy"*, 47(1), 3-13. [In Ukrainian]. [Бойченко М. (2016). Інституційні витоки глобалізації. Вісник Харківського національного педагогічного університету імені Г. С. Сковороди. "Філософія". Вип. 47. Ч.1. С. 3–13.]
22. Boychenko, M. (2008). The place of the theory of social institutions in modern social philosophy. *Political Science Bulletin*, 36, 7–21. [In Ukrainian]. [Бойченко М. (2008). Місце теорії соціальних інститутів у сучасній соціальній філософії. Політологічний вісник. Вип. 36. С. 7–21.]
23. Boichenko, M., Kubalskyi, O., Pancheko, L. (2025). The Philosophical System of the All-Under-Heaven in the World Discourse of Geopolitical Science. *The World of the Orient*, (2 (127)), 164–172. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15407/orientw2025.02.164>
24. Vernadsky, V. I. (1926). Biosphere: I-II. Leningrad: Scientific and technical publishing house, Scientific and technical department of V. S. N. Kh. 146 p. [In Russian]. [Вернадский В. И. Биосфера: I-II. Ленинград: Научное химико-техническое издательство, Научно-технический отдел В. С. Н. Х., 1926. 146 с.]
25. Vernadsky, W. (1924). Geochemistry. Paris: Librairie Félix Alcan. 403 pp. [In French]. [Vernadsky, W. La Géochimie. Paris: Librairie Félix Alcan, 1924. 403 p.]
26. Kotyhorenko, V. O. (2025). Social resilience: a dimension of conceptualization. *Regional studies*, 42, 9-18. [In Ukrainian]. [Котигоренко В.О. (2025). Соціальна резильєнтність: вимір концептуалізації. *Регіональні студії*. № 42. С. 9–18.] DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32782/2663-6170/2025.42.1>
27. Patoka, I. V., & Krusanov, D. A. (2025). Indication of Spatial Justice through the Accessibility of Social Services: Contemporary German Experience. *Ukrainian Geographical Journal*, (3), 87–97. [In Ukrainian]. [Патока І. В., Крусанов Д. А. (2025). Індикація просторової справедливості через доступність соціальних послуг: сучасний досвід Німеччини. *Український географічний журнал*. № 3 (131). С. 87–97.] DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15407/ugz2025.03.087>
28. Yermolenko, A., Gardashuk, T., et al. (2025). War and the environment: ecological, ethical and anthropological dimensions: Round Table. *Filosofska Dumka*, (3), 7–73. [In Ukrainian]. [Єрмоленко, А., Гардашук, Т. та ін. (2025). Війна і довкілля: еколого-етичні та антропологічні виміри: Круглий стіл. *Філософська думка*, (3), 7–73.] DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15407/fd2025.03.007>

29. Plessner, H. (1924). *Limits of Community: A Critique of Social Radicalism*. Bonn: Friedrich Cohen. 121 p. [In German]. [Plessner, H. *Grenzen der Gemeinschaft. Eine Kritik des sozialen Radikalismus*. Bonn: Friedrich Cohen, 1924. 121 S.]
30. Plessner, H. (1928). *The Stages of the Organic and Man: Introduction to Philosophical Anthropology*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. 346 p. [In German]. [Plessner, H. *Die Stufen des Organischen und der Mensch: Einleitung in die philosophische Anthropologie*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1928. 346 S.]
31. Scheler, M. (2018). *The Place of Man in the Cosmos*. With an introduction and notes edited by Wolfhart Henckmann. Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag. 217 pp. [In German]. [Scheler, M. *Die Stellung des Menschen im Kosmos*. Mit einer Einleitung und Anmerkungen herausgegeben von Wolfhart Henckmann. Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 2018. 217 S.]
32. North, D. (2000). *Institutions, institutional change and economic performance*. (Dziub, I., trans.). Kyiv: Osnovy. 198 p. [In Ukrainian]. [Норт Д. Інституції, інституційна зміна та функціонування економіки. Пер. з англ. І. Дзюб. Київ: Основи, 2000. 198 с.]
33. Gumbrecht, H. U. (2004). *Production of Presence. What Meaning Cannot Convey*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. 180 p.
34. Gumbrecht, H. U. (2012). *In Praise of Athletic Beauty*. (Bystrytska, M., trans.). Kyiv: DUKH I LITERA. 216 p. [In Ukrainian]. [Гумбрехт Г. У. Похвала спортивній красі. Пер. з англ. М. Бистрицької. Київ: ДУХ І ЛІТЕРА, 2012. 216 с.]
35. Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 166 p.
36. Searle, J. (1995). *The Construction of Social Reality*. New York: Free Press. 241 p.
37. Kukhta, V. (2025). Impact of elections on political transformations of tropical Africa countries. *Regional studies*, 41, 125-130. [In Ukrainian]. [Кухта В. В. (2025). Вплив виборів на політичні трансформації країн тропічної Африки. *Регіональні студії*. № 41. С. 125–130.] DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32782/2663-6170/2025.41.21>
38. Ukrinform. (2025). Google Maps will rename the Gulf of Mexico in the USA to the American Gulf. 28.01.2025. [In Ukrainian]. [Укрінформ. (2025). Google Maps перейменує в США Мексиканську затоку на Американську. 28.01.2025.] URL: <https://www.ukrinform.ua/rubric-world/3953715-google-maps-perejmenue-v-ssa-meksikansku-zatoku-na-amerikansku.html>

**The article was received by the editorial office on 09/24/2025,
accepted for publication on 11/12/2025.**

Бойченко М. І.¹

 0000-0003-1404-180X,

Кубальський О. Н.¹

 0000-0002-7956-3150

¹ Київський національний університету імені Тараса Шевченка, Київ

² Інститут досліджень науково-технічного потенціалу та історії науки імені Г. М. Доброва Національної академії наук України, Київ

Життєсвіт людини у топонімах: філософське осмислення життєвого простору

УДК 1:911:316(045)

На засадах філософії розглянуто, як саме людина надає своєму життєвому простору осмисленості, перетворюючи його на життєсвіт. Метою дослідження є виявлення філософських підстав топоніміки через з'ясування значущості понять «життєсвіт», «життєвий простір» для формування географічного підходу до опису світу. Методами дослідження є соціальна феноменологія у сполученні з неонституціоналізмом і філософією перформативності: люди встановлюють топоніми згідно принципів інтерсуб'єктивності у встановленні смислів, прагнучи досягнути вищої виконавської майстерності для створення спільної ціннісно-нормативної основи. Поняття «життєсвіт», «життєві форми», «життєвий простір» створюють світоглядну концептуальну рамку для формування географічного підходу до топоніміки.

Ключові слова: топоніми, життєсвіт людини, життєвий простір, філософська топологія, географічна топологія, інтерсуб'єктивність, перформативність.

Цитування:

Бойченко М. І., Кубальський О. Н. (2025). Життєсвіт людини у топонімах: філософське осмислення життєвого простору. *Український географічний журнал*, 4 (132), 102–111. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15407/ugz2025.04.102>

© Видавець ВД «Академперіодика» НАН України, 2025.



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