METAPHORIZATION OF FLORIST NOMINATIONS

METAFORIZAÇÃO DE NOMEAÇÕES DE FLORISTAS

METAFORIZACIÓN DE LAS NOMINACIONES DE FLORISTAS

Natalia B. KUDRYAVTSEVA[1]
Alexey A. KOLESNIKOV[2]
Ilya A. DANILENKO[3]
Olesya V. SERKINA[4]
Margarita O. SUSHENOK[5]

ABSTRACT: The article discusses the problem of metaphorization of nominative units, which are widespread in both scientific and popular nomenclatures. The object of research is the nominations of the floronyms of the modern German language. The article analyzes the main approaches to the classification of metaphors, based on stylistic, semantic and functional typologies. The article also discusses the main classifications of types of metaphorization of names from one phenomenon of reality to another, systematized in the works of Russisn and foreign linguists.

KEYWORDS: Metaphor, Metonymy, Metaphorical-Metonymic Transfer, Nomination, Floronym.

RESUMO: *O artigo discute o problema da metaforização de unidades nominativas, amplamente difundidas nas nomenclaturas científicas e populares. O objeto de pesquisa são as nomeações dos florônimos da língua alemã moderna. O artigo analisa as principais abordagens à classificação das metáforas, com base nas tipologias estilísticas, semânticas e funcionais. O artigo também discute as principais classificações dos tipos de metaforização de nomes de um fenômeno da realidade para outro, sistematizadas nas obras de lingüistas russos e estrangeiros.*

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: *Metáfora, Metonímia, Transferência Metafórico-Metonímica, Nomeação, Florônimo.*

RESUMEN: *El artículo discute el problema de la metaforización de unidades nominativas, que están muy extendidas tanto en nomenclaturas científicas como populares. El objeto de la*

---

[1] Associate Professor, PhD, Department of German and French, Belgorod State University, 85 Pobedy St., Belgorod 308015, Russia. E-mail: kud@mail.ru. ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6905-1875.

[2] Dean of the Faculty of Foreign Languages, PhD, Associate Professor, Belgorod State University, 85 Pobedy St., Belgorod 308015, Russia. E-mail: kolesnikov@bsu.edu.ru.ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2318-5701.

[3] Associate Professor, PhD, Department of Foreign Languages, Belgorod State University, BSU, Podedy St. 85, Belgorod, 308015, Russia. E-mail: danilenko_ia@bsu.edu.ru ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3096-2425.

[4] Associate Professor, PhD, Department of English and Methods of Teaching English at Belgorod State University, 85 Pobedy St., Belgorod 308015, Russia. E-mail: serkina@bsu.edu.ru. Orcid id: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7474-6169.

[5] Senior Lecturer, Department of Foreign Languages, Belgorod State University, 85 Pobedy St., mail: nikulina_d@dsu.edu.ru. ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/ 0000-0002-7604-7847.

investigación son las nominaciones de los florónimos de la lengua alemana moderna. El artículo analiza las principales aproximaciones a la clasificación de metáforas, a partir de tipologías estilísticas, semánticas y funcionales. El artículo también analiza las principales clasificaciones de tipos de metaforización de nombres de un fenómeno de la realidad a otro, sistematizadas en los trabajos de lingüistas rusos y extranjeros.

PALABRAS CLAVE: *Metáfora, Metonimia, Transferencia metafórico-metonímica, Nominación, Florónimo.*

Introduction

In each language, floronyms act as representatives of the sui generis features of the national culture and worldview of the people. Words denoting one and the same concept may have different semantic content, there may be no equivalent for expressing a particular concept when translating. This implies the need to study the national picture of the world, which is closely related to the geographic location, relief, climate, flora and fauna, that is, with everything that surrounds a person throughout his life in a certain cultural society. In the formation of floristic vocabulary, associative thinking is important, which is focused on the connection between environmental phenomena and flora objects of the nomination. As for floronyms, most of the names have a fairly logical internal form, reflecting the cognitive and evaluative experience of a person. As a result, metaphor and metonymy are ways of creating linguistic images of the surrounding world, and when nominating floronyms, a person indicates the direct basis on which this or that plant received its nomination. Ultimately, metaphorical and metonymic transfers in floristic nominations led to the creation of new concepts based on associations that a person receives when learning about the surrounding reality and embodies in linguistic forms. New concepts create a linguistic picture of the world, which reflects an individual view of the world inherent in a specific national-cultural society.

Both in scientific and in «popular» nomenclature (especially widespreadin the latter) phytonymic metaphors are widely used, metaphorical names of plants. In the work of Panasenko L.A. distinguishes between conceptual and synesthetic metaphors, the latter involving the establishment of inter-conceptual connections between the qualities of different areas of sensitivity (PANASENKO, 2016, p.84). Metaphor is a unique way of reflecting reality, the essence of which, despite the abundance of scientific studies remains debatable. Since the ancient times (the works of Aristotle) to the present, this multifaceted phenomenon has been studied from a variety of scientific perspectives, from different angles (in linguistic, logical, psychological, philosophical, linguacultural and other aspects). Linguistically, some

attempts have been made to classify various types of metaphor, but no unified typological system in linguistics has been builtyet.Besides some researchers believe that such a typology is impossible due to the multidimensionality and diversity of metaphorical transferences.

In (MERZLYAKOVA, 2003), there are identified notes three main arguments that form the basis of the linguistic classifications of metaphor, which result are in reducing the existing typologies is reduced to three groups:

1) stylistic typologies;

2) semantic typologies;

3) functional typologies.

In stylistic typologies, metaphor is interpreted as a figurative means that performs a rhetorical function or the function of decorating speech. The main criterion for classifying metaphors in this group is their vivid imagery, expressiveness, originality, and occasionalism. Semantic typologies of metaphors are based on the identification of certain types of correspondences between the primary and secondary objects of metaphorization: the typological classification of metaphors is based on the relationship between the main and derived meanings.

There is no universal classification of types of figurative transfer of names from one phenomenon of reality to another; the most common cases of figurative metaphorical transference are systematized in the works by GakV.G. (GAK, 1971)The most common types of transfer between conceptual spheres are follows:

1) anthroponymic / anthropomorphic metaphor (personification of representatives of the animal and material world, transfer of a feature from anthropomorphic to non-anthropomorphic environment): man → animal, man → artifact an (inanimate object that is the result of human activity); human → natural fact (natural inanimate organism, for example, a tree, plant, river, etc.); person → abstract concept, etc .;

2) zoomorphic / faunimic metaphor (transfer of animal characteristics to other objects): animal → human, animal → plant, animal → inanimate object (artifact, natural fact);

3)synesthetic / sensory / (poly)receptor metaphor, or synesthesia (transfer of sensory perceptions);

4) depersonification (naming a person by means of names denoting artifacts, animals, etc.);

5) transfer from the concrete to the abstract, from the particular to the general (generalizing metaphor);

6) transfer from the abstract to the concrete (See: GAK, 1971, P.26; MERZLYAKOVA, 2003, P.55; ARUTYUNOVA, 1980, P.42; PANASENKO, 2000, P.232).

The functional approach was originally developed by Arutyunova N.D. and further expanded by Telia V.N. and Oparina E.D.. They identified the following types of metaphors (for more details, see: MERZLYAKOVA, 2003, P.56-57; PANASENKO, 2000, P.232):

1) nominative / identifying / indicative metaphor (naming new objects by transferring the name);

2) figurative / associative metaphor (tertium comparation is as an associative-sensual image underlying the transfer);

3) cognitive metaphor (metaphor as a cognitive tool, a means of human cognition of the surrounding world);

4) emotive / expressive-evaluative metaphor (expression of subjective attitude, rational or emotional assessment of the denotation by a person);

5) conceptual metaphor (the formation of new concepts).

Kharchenko V.K. identified 15 functions of metaphors: nominative, informative, mnemonic, style-forming, text-forming, genre-forming, heuristic, explanatory, emotional-evaluative, ethical, auto-suggestive, coding, conspiratorial, playful and ritual (Kharchenko, 1992). In addition, such types of metaphors as an impressive metaphor, a metaphor of intensity, a teleological / normative / utilitarian metaphor, etc. are also mentioned (for more details see: MERZLYAKOVA, 2003, p.76, 80, 81).

For a long time, the opinion about the inadmissibility of metaphors in the language of science dominated in linguistics, the so-called taboo on metaphors in terminology: for example, German linguists, supporters of this point of view, thought that metaphors were the units of language whose meaningswere not formed within the framework of the language system, but were defined within a certain context, as a result of which they could cause misunderstanding and misinterpretation of terminological units (KRETZENBACHER, 1994, p.112).

However, this point of view is disputed by many German Germanists (JAKOB, 1991; BERR, 1990; BRANDT, 1995; HUMS, 1988; JOHNSON, 1987; LIEBERT, 1994; MEESEN, 1986; SCHOLZ, 1983; STÖREL, 1997; WÜSTER, 1970, P.73-76, SEE ROELCKE, 1999, P.68), who believe that there are a significant number of so-called "terminological metaphors" that have become conventional in various terminological systems and that are not perceived as metaphors any longer and differ in contextual autonomy. So metaphors in terminology are not an exception, but are quite common. The emergence of metaphors is associated with the

associative nature of human thinking. The use of metaphors corresponds to the associative structures of thinking, when new objects, processes, concepts are compared with the existing ones (Lakoff / Johnson, 1980).

Results and Discussion

At the present time, the metaphor is widely used in the language of science. As part of the terminological system, it is gradually losing its imagery. Kharchenko V.C. wrote about the wide opportunities for the development of metaphorical figurative meanings in the word, which creates a powerful counterbalance to the formation of an infinite number of new words (KHARCHENKO, 1992, P. 11). The presence of metaphor in the language of science (in biology, in particular) confirms its epistemological and cognitive nature. The concept of "metaphor" is related, on the one hand, to the cognitive mechanism, on the other hand, to the form of thinking and its result (SOSNIN, 2017, P.157). The importance of metaphor can be hardly overestimated, which is emphasized by its definition in a number of stidied as the main mental operation, a way of cognition, conceptualization and categorization, as well as assessment (CHUDINOV, BUDAEV, 2007, P.9). When considering a metaphor as a cognitive entity, it should be emphasized that when creating a metaphor, a certain source interacts, rethinking the result and goals of the nomination. "A cognitive metaphor is one of the forms of conceptualization, a cognitive process that expresses and formulates new concepts and without which it is impossible to obtain new knowledge" (ARUTYUNOVA, 1990, p.6). According to Arutyunova N.D. also notes that "metaphors function as cognitive processes by which we deepen our understanding of the world and create new hypotheses" (ibid., 83). A similar idea is expressed by Kharchenko V.K., who says that the most prosaic, industrial sphere of activity receives more and more metaphors, for example, the word "palm", which has the following meanings: the inner side of the hand; current, place for threshing bread; saban, ploughshare, ralnik, opener; in mountain supports: stand, strut. According to Kravchenko V.K. such words more, obvious advantages of metaphors to a language, the meaning-generating potential of a particular noun and that meaning of the nominative function of metaphors (KHARCHENKO, 1992, P.12).

The basis of the metaphor is the external or internal similarity of two objects (or their parts), due to which the "name" of one object can become the name of another object. This is known as an indirect or figurative nomination, which is based on a certain common feature (tertiumcomparationis), which allows the transfer of a name from one nominee to another.

In the botanical vocabulary, a zoonymic (faunimic) metaphor is widespread, based on the similarity of a plant (or part of it) with animals or birds (with their general appearance or with their individual anatomical features), eg. in German: Hahnenkopf (cock + head), Sauauge (pig + eye), Pferdekraut (horse + grass), Ochsenbrot (bull/ox + bread), Katzkraut (cat + grass), Schafzunge (sheep + tongue), Löwenfuβ (lion + paw), Wolfskraut (wolf + grass), etc. So-called"Household metaphors" express the similarity of plants or their parts with everyday objects: BlauerPantoffel ("small blue shoe"), Fischermütze ("hat/cap of a fisherman"), Geldbeutel ("wallet"), Schwerten ("swords"), Glockenblume ("small bell"),Hahnenkamm("cockscomb"), Frauenschuh ("women's shoe"), Pantoffelblume ("shoe + flower"), Eisenhut ("iron helmet/cap"), Klappmütze ("visor" - klappen"slam" + hat), Frauenmantel ("women's coat"), Kaisermantel ("royal/emperor cloak"), Tauschüsselchen ("a pipkin of dew"), etc. As the examples above show, metaphor is often combined with metonymic transfer: the whole plant is designated by metaphorical designation of one of the parts of the plant (root, leaf, flower), but the name is transferred from part to whole. As fact, a metaphorical-metonymic nomination process takes place in the cases.

Anthroponymic metaphors include the names of mythological characters, gods, and characters of fairy tales. For example, it is believed that it was Achilles who discovered the healing properties of milfoil, hence the nomination may come from Achilleskraut or Achillpflanze. According to the legend, a wild boar while hunting unexpectedly attacked Adonis, Aphrodite's beloved, wounding him to death, blood spurted from the wound, and where drops of his blood fell to the ground, "Adonis flowers" (Adonisröschen, Adonisrose) appeared. Another legend was used as the basis for the nomination of Amarylliskraut (belladonna, common belladonna): discreet, but at the same time beautiful petals of this plant remind of the Sicilian shepherdess, sung by Virgil in his poems. Names such as German: Junothrönchen ("throne of Juno"), Venusspiegel ("mirror of Venus"), pansies, Russian: Ivan da Marya ("Ivan and Mary"), Maryin root (Mary's root), Ivan tea ("Ivan's tea"), etc. bear the imprint of the national culture and national symbolism: the metaphor is based on associative connections reflected in motivational features that carry information about the everyday and practical experience of a given community, about its cultural and historical knowledge (Telia, 1988, p.192). Metaphor is "one of the most productive means of forming secondary nominations in creating a linguistic picture of the world" (Telia, 1988, p.175).

Conclusion

Summing up the above, we can conclude that each natural language reflects a certain way of perceiving the surrounding world and reflects, with the help of linguistic means present a particular language, the image of reality. The perception and the way of expressing one's knowledge depends on the cultural and national characteristics of a particular language. The national character appears as a complex of stable values, ideas, attitudes, behavioral norms specific for a given culture,that are related to specific social-cultural situations.

The system of nomination of any language is the result of the cognitive and classifying activity of a person, which allows you to highlight the features of the community and differences in nominations in various ethno-linguistic societies. Due to this, the language accumulates multiple designations of objects and phenomena of the surrounding reality, reflecting various signs and characteristics. The combination of linguocultural meanings is reflected in the linguocultural unit –linguoculture. This phenomenon is clearly seen in the field of plant nomination, since humans throughout their historical development have very closely contacted with flora and fauna. Floronyms reflect the knowledge of people about plants, indicate a specific field of their application in medicine or in everyday life, reveal the peculiarities of their use, thereby emphasizing the national and cultural character.

Reference

ARUTYUNOVA, N.D. On the Problem of Functional Types of Lexical Meaning: Aspects of Semantic Research. Nauka, Moscow, 156-249 p.[in Russian]. 1980.

ARUTYUNOVA, N.D. TheTheory of Metaphor / Ed. N. D. Arutyunova, M.A. Zhurinskaya. Progress, Moscow, 511 p. [in Russian]. 1990.

CHUDINOV, A.P., BUDAEV, E.V. Formation and Evolution of a Cognitive Approach to Metaphor. New Philological Bulletin [Novyy Filologicheskyi Vestnik], 1, 8-27. 2007. [in Russian]

GAK, V.G. Semantic Structure of a Word as a Component of the Semantic Structure of Utterances. In: Semantic Structure of a Word: psychological studiy [Semanticheskaya struktura slova: psihologicheskye issledovania]/ Proceedings of the Academic of Science of the USSR, Moscow, 78-96 p. 1971. [in Russian]

KHARCHENKO, V.K. Functions of a Metaphor, Voronezh State University Publishing House, Voronezh,88 p. 1992. [in Russian]

KRETZENBACHER, H.-L. Zur Linguistik und Stilistik des wissenschaftlichen Fachworts, Deutsch als Fremdsprache., 28:195-201 p. and29: 38-46 p. 1992. [in German]

MERZLYAKOVA, A.K. Types of Semantic Variation of the Adjectives of the "Perception" Field, Editorial, Moscow, 352 p. 2003. [in Russian]

PANASENKO, N.I. Cognitive-onomasiological Study of Vocabulary (Experience of Comparative Analysis of the Names of Medicinal Plants): Dissertation of Doctor of Philology, 565 p. 2000. [in Russian]

PANASENKO, L.A. Interpreting Potential of Lexical Categories / Ed.Boldyrev N.N.Pershin R.V.,Publishing house, Tambov. 186 p. 2016. [in Russian]

ROELCKE, T. Fachwortkonzeption und Fachwortgebrauch. Hintergründe einer Diskrepanz zwischen Sprachwissenschaft und Sprachwirklichkeit, Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie., 394-409 p. 1995. [in German]

SOSNIN, A.V. Cognitive Metaphor as a Means of Forming a Concept / ISOM., 1(1), 156-163 p. 2017. [in Russian]

TELIA, V.N. Metaphor in Language and Text / Academy of Sciences of the USSR, Institute of Linguistics, Nauka, Moscow, 174 p. 1988. [in Russian]