

Features of motivational - nominative signs “type / method of growing” and “taste” in English and Adyghe phytonymic vocabulary

Yagumova N. Sh., candidate, of Philology, assistant professor
Bogus Z. A., candidate, of Philology, assistant professor
Adyghe State University

One of the most complex and interesting problems in the theory of nomination of phytonymic vocabulary of diverse systemic languages is the motivational signs that underlie the names of the surrounding reality.

The system of nominative units of diverse systemic languages is a reflection of the general cognitive processes characteristic of cognition and categorization of the phenomena of the human world in the process of its practical activity, in socialization and adaptation to a particular society.

Speaking about an object or phenomenon of the surrounding world, we mean a system of properties and various bonds that form rather complex denotative bonds in the human mind.

The role in choosing a linguistic attribute for naming an object belongs to the level of individual and public consciousness of a given linguistic community, the original way of life, national and cultural traditions, and, not least, the characteristics of the social and natural living conditions of people.

The process of motivation of plant names always arouses special interest in the language of researchers, since the phytonymic vocabulary of the language, like any other vocabulary, is a form of objectification of the linguistic consciousness of different generations of people.

The result of increasing linguistic interest in autonomous and comparative studies of the botanical terminology in diverse systems is the identification of the cognitive universals that underlies the theory of nomination.

Comparable languages belong to different groups of languages: English – to Indo-European languages, Adyghe language – to Iberian-Caucasian languages. It follows that these languages have their own typological features and differ in the productivity of the formation of lexical units. The subject of our research is the folk-botanical nomenclature of the English and Adyghe languages, presented in this article by two motivational signs: “type / method of growing” and “taste”.

The first motivational attribute “type / method of growing” are two concepts that complement each other well to convey a complicated form of name.

The motivational attribute is based on the following characteristics: *creep*, *shaking*, *curly*, etc. The modifier is often represented by Participle I [P1] – the participle of the present tense and Participle II [P2] – the participle of the past tense, and the supporting component acts as the generic and species names of plants. Here are some examples of definitions, as well as a list of phytonyms with a motivational attribute “type / method of growing”:

- *biting stoncrop* “stoncrop” is quite common on sand-dunes, open grasslands, walls and pavements

throughout Britain, even on roofs, where its presence may explain the longest and most cryptic vernacular name of any British plant welcome-home-husband - though-never-so-drunk [4, 178];

- *creeping buttercup* “creeping buttercup” – is a creeping plant, more southerly species, distinguished from yellow pimpernel by its nearly circular leaves and cup like flowers [4, 173];

- *sessile oak* “sessile-flowering oak” – the plant is so called because its acorns are not carried on stalks, but directly on the outer twigs [4, 77];

- *branching foxtail* “chloris whorled” (lit. : “branched foxtail”);

- *climbing fig* “dwarf ficus” (lit. : “curly ficus”);

- *hairy spurge* “woolly euphorbia”;

- *nodding alder* “dangling alder” (lit. : “nodding alder”);

- *flattened pipewort* “flattened wool stalk”;

- *hairy-spreading* “Euphorbia strengthens” (lit. : “woolly spurge”);

- *ragged pink* “meadow clove” (lit. : “jagged clove”);

- *weeping bore acacia* “acacia weeping” (lit. : “weeping boring acacia”);

- *spreading elm* “elm racemes.”

In the Adyghe language, this motivational attribute of naming is unproductive, because of this the number of examples is few.

This trait is expressed by the direct nominative modifier of complex structural formation. Supporting components are referred to in various names:

chlyryklo “Jerusalem artichoke, earthen pear” (*chly* “earth” + *ry* – connecting element + *klo* from *klon* “go” lit.: “moving on the ground”); *natrylkjets* “popcorn corn” (*natryl* “corn” + *kjets* “thorn”); *lee-guchlepene* “ordinary thorn” (*leeguchle* “bottom of the hollow” + *pene* “thorn”).

The semantic model of the motivational attribute “taste” is a fairly common attribute among different peoples. This motivational attribute belongs to the sphere of affective evaluations or parametric attributes, which is designed to determine the spectral and taste characteristics of phytonyms.

Structural features of phytonymic names with this motivational attribute refer to both endo- and exocentric complex-structural names. In endocentric formations, both the modifier and the supporting component are not metaphorized, or only a modifier is metaphorized, which can have a figurative metaphorized value expressed by names with different denotative orientations.

The motivational attribute “taste” is represented directly by the modifiers directly in the meaning of sweet “sweet”, bitter “bitter”, pepper “bitter”, sour “sour”, salt “salty” and indirectly nominative in the meaning of sugar “sugar”, honey “honey”, treacle

“molasses.” The following are examples of definitions of endocentric complex structural formations, as well as a list of plant names with this motivational attribute:

- *bitter-vetch* “bitter peas” – after its roots are dried, they are chewed as liquorice and considered superior to and far less deleterious than common chewing gums, the taste is both acid and sweet, and never palls [4, 223];

- *bee-bread* “white cinquefoil” – the white flowers can be pulled out of the heads and sucked for a bread of honey (hence ‘bee-bread’) [4, 212];

- *sweet chestnut* “jagged chestnut” – the nuts of the sweet or Spanish chestnut roasted are satisfying and savory [4, 81];

- *sour-trefoil* “ordinary sour” (lit. : “sour clover”); *sour winter grape* “winter grapes” (lit. : “sour winter grapes”); *peppermint* “peppermint”; *sugar-cane* “sugarcane”; *honey-pea* “sugar peas” (lit. : “honey peas”); *treacle-clover* “resinous psoralea” (lit. : “molasses + clover”); *sugar-beet* “sugar beet”; *saltwort* “solyanka” (lit. : “salted woodruff”); *bitter nut* “bitter nut” and others.

In the Adyghe language, taste properties can also be represented by modifiers directly in the meaning of plants: *lashly* “sweet”, *shou* “honey”, *djuzhi* “bitter”, *hafe* “sour”:

qamylshou “sugar cane” (*qamyl* “reed + *shou* “honey”);

leebjelashlu “licorice naked” (*laabzhye* goes back to *lapse* “root” + *lashlu* “sweet”);

chybzhyleshyu “Bulgarian pepper” (*chybzhy* “pepper” + *lashlu* “sweet”); *mezabelidzhe* *lashlu* “radish is delicious” (*mezabelidzh* “radish” + *lashlu* “sweet”);

anjyrefshou “sugar sorghum” (*anjyref* “sorghum wreath” + honey) *shou*);

shouschiggyugynypl “sugar beet” (*shouschiggyug* “sugar” + *gynypl* “beet”);

shouuchig “Gledichia prickly” (*shou* “honey” + *chig* “tree”);

mykhaf “eastern apple tree” (*my* “wild apple tree” + *hafe* “sour”); *kyondij* “fenugreek” (*kyon* “cilantro” + *djdzh* “bitter”); *utsdydzh* “wormwood” (*utsi* “grass” + *dydzh* “bitter”)

Indirectly nominative motivational attribute “bitter” is transmitted by the token “bitter (acute)”, for example:

shybzhystyr “bitter (hot) pepper” (*shybzhy* “pepper” + “bitter” seams);

bjynstyr “onion” (*bjyny* “onion” + “sharp” stitches).

Indirectly nominative motivational attribute “acidity” is transmitted by the lexeme *solu shygeshlo* “sorrel sour”, literally, “what horse meat is pickled with”.

The generic names of plants act as supporting components: *chig* “tree”, *uts* “grass” and species: *kamyl* “reed”, *shybzhy* “pepper”, *belydzh* “radish”, etc.

The fragments of the phytonymic field revealed in the article as a whole confirm the universality of the motivational signs “appearance / growth method” and “taste”.

From a structural point of view, these signs relate to endocentric formations in which the modifier conveys a literal meaning, and the supporting components are transmitted by species and generic characters. As for the motivational attribute “taste” in the Adyghe language, the presence of both directly and indirectly nominative signs of motivation is noted.

Thus, the considered motivational signs of phytonyms in comparable diverse systems of languages have shown that the cognitive nomination of plants is carried out through the use of associative signs that carry certain information for naming plants as part of the linguistic picture of the world.

The need for such studies is determined by the relevance of the development of directions in anthropological linguistics, the anthropocentric approach to language as a cultural phenomenon in the context of linguocultural problems, as well as the importance of a cognitive approach to their analysis and description.

Literature:

1. The New English-Russian Biological Dictionary. – M.: Russo, 2003. – 920 p.
2. Ryabko, O.P. English-Latin-Russian Botanical Dictionary in 3 hours. – R-on Don, Publishing house of the RSU. – 1995.
3. Hakunov, B.Yu. Dictionary of Adyghe plant names. – Nalchik: Elbrus, 1992.–250 p.
4. Mabey R. Flora Britannica: Chatto & Windus. – London. – 1988. – 480 p.