

Linguistics and languages (UDC 81)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18454/RULB.13.06>Битокова С.Х.¹, Хавояшкова А.З.²¹ORCID 0000-0001-7298-0245 Доцент, доктор филологических наук,²ORCID 0000-0002-4882-4784 Аспирант,

Кабардино-Балкарский Государственный университет им. Х.М. Бербекова

СЕМАНТИЧЕСКАЯ ДЕРИВАЦИЯ ПРИЛАГАТЕЛЬНЫХ ВКУСА В КАБАРДИНО-ЧЕРКЕССКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ

Аннотация

В статье представлен семантический анализ прилагательных вкуса в кабардино-черкесском языке с позиций когнитивной лингвистики. Показана ведущая роль восприятия в познании и в формировании новых концептуальных структур. Отмечается меньшая структурированность и языковая репрезентация прилагательных вкуса по сравнению с другими модусами перцепции. Показано особое членение данного сегмента перцептивного поля в кабардино-черкесском языке. Оно отмечено как универсальными, так и уникальными свойствами. Последнее мотивировано особым видением мира, в основе которого лежит культурный фактор, объединяющий разнопорядковые сущности и во многом определяющий процессы концептуализации и категоризации мира.

Ключевые слова: восприятие, вкус, семантическая структура слова, семантическая деривация, метафорический перенос, культура.

Bitokova S.Kh.¹, Khavoyashkova A.Z.²¹ ORCID 0000-0001-7298-0245 Associate Professor PhD in Philology,²ORCID 0000-0002-4882-4784 Postgraduate,

Kabardino-Balkarian State University

SEMANTIC DERIVATION OF ADJECTIVES OF TASTE IN THE KABARDINO-CIRCASSIAN LANGUAGE

Abstract

The article presents a semantic analysis of taste adjectives in the Kabardino-Circassian language from the standpoint of cognitive linguistics. The leading role of perception in cognition and in the formation of new conceptual structures is shown. The category of taste is less structured as compared with other modes of perception. Its language representation is less as well. A special division of this segment of perceptual field in Kabardino-Circassian language is shown. It is marked by both universal and unique properties. The latter is motivated by a special vision of the world, which is based on a cultural factor, uniting different constituents, which largely determines the processes of conceptualization and categorization of the world.

Keywords: perception, taste, semantic structure of the word, semantic derivation, metaphorical transference, culture.

Почта авторов / Author Email: khavoyashkova@mail.ru

Introduction

Perception is the most important component of human life. It covers a wide range of phenomena and processes, ranging from the simple awareness of contacting with the surrounding reality, to the generalization of sensory experience in the form of certain knowledge structures reflecting the world, its separate objects and fragments. Perception forms the first stage of cognition [15, P. 17]. In fact, perception is the beginning of the history of the word, thinking and language. It has a huge impact on the language. It is the root cause of the language existence, and the direction, trajectory of language development [11], [12].

The main channels for obtaining sensory information, distinguished by Aristotle, are reduced to the main four: *vision, hearing, taste, smell*. They differ by the role they play in human life and the degree of representation in the language.

This article deals with adjectives of taste in the Kabardino-Circassian language. We proceed from the assumption that cognition corresponds to both conscious and thus specially flowing processes of scientific cognition and simple (sometimes unconscious) comprehension of the surrounding reality [5, P. 84-90]. The term cognition refers to all processes in which sensory data being perceived by our mind are converted into mental representations of different types and held, if necessary, in the memory of a man. Hence, it follows that the word meaning is a cognitive phenomenon behind which there is a certain structure of knowledge [5, P. 76]. It is inseparably linked with culture, consequently, the nature of semantic derivation, the trajectory of rethinking of

primary meanings reflect the specific way of life of the ethnic group, its mentality, cultural stereotypes and standards [13].

Methods

General scientific methods and procedures for obtaining empirical knowledge are used in this work: observation, method of dictionary definitions analyses and comparison. We also resorted to the modern method of introspection which implies the researcher's reference to the inner intuition and knowledge of the language in the interpretation of the data. The material for analyses was obtained from the available lexicographic sources of Kabardino-Circassian language [16], [17], [18] taste adjectives have been analyzed from the viewpoint of their semantic structure and peculiarities of semantic derivation.

Discussion

It should be noted that *taste* belongs to the category of complex, poorly structured, diffuse sensations. *Taste* as a physiological term is defined as a special, specific feeling that occurs under the influence of certain flavoring substances on the taste organs of the mucous membrane of the tongue and some other parts of the oral cavity [2, P. 132]. The development of perception-related problems is of great interest in the context of modern cognitive paradigm [5, P. 84-90], [8, P. 51], [10], [7, P. 85], [4, P. 4].

Perception is interpreted as a cognitive process, not as a simple registration of external stimuli. Perception involves the active interaction of a man with the world making use of such important components as reasoning, memory, associative thinking etc. The perceived data is subjected to a complex processing in which, alongside with cognitive abilities, culture plays a significant role. Culture involves civilizational, socio-

psychological and activity components, each having a complicated structure [1, P.13].

Perceptual systems, as psychologists point out, are under the constant influence of signals from the environment. Nevertheless, the sounds and scenes often unforeseen and unpredictable predominate in this flow of information [14, P. 4]. Hence, it follows that the form, size and color of the objects, their location, movement, as well as the sounds that fill this world, are easily perceived and structured by our mind and widely represented in the language. As for taste it is less significant and as a result is less structured and poorly represented in the language [9, P. 84]. But as any other segment of perception it deserves proper attention within the frame of cognitive linguistics.

Each language reflects a certain way of perception and organization of the world. All its meanings form a single system of views and reflect a special way of conceptualization of reality peculiar to this language only. The processes of categorization and conceptualization are nationally specific, as speakers of different languages see the world differently, through the prism of their languages.

Results

In the Kabardino-Circassian language the category of taste is represented by the following main adjectives – *ІәфI* (*sweet*), *гъауцIэ* (*sour*), *фIэIу* (*sour*), *дыдж* (*bitter*), *шыгъэ* (*salty*), *сыр* (*hot*), *мышыу* (*insipid, unsalted*).

It should be noted that there is no lexeme for the general term *taste* uniting types of various tastes. The concept *taste* is always combined with its concrete manifestation, for example, *дыджэгъ* – ‘bitterness, bitter taste’, *ІәфIэгъ* – ‘sweet taste’.

According to the lexicographic data the lexeme *ІәфI* (*sweet*) comprises five meanings. The primary meaning of the adjective *ІәфI* is ‘sweet’: *шеи ІәфI* (*sweet tea*). The importance of having enough sugar in a product, dish or drink is conveyed by the first meaning. Hence, its denotative reference is *sugar*, like in many other languages. The second meaning is ‘delicious’: *ихыныгъуэ ІәфI* (*delicious food*). It implies such features as *tasty*, *palatable* or *savory* and is not connected with the *sweet* taste. It can be referred to any deliciously cooked food which can be salty, hot, spicy and sour, for example, *джэдлыбжэ ІәфI* (*delicious gedlibzha* – a national dish made of chicken and sour cream). Also, *ІәфI* – ‘sweet’ may define any well-cooked dish, like fried meat, stewed vegetables, cottage cheese etc. The third meaning is ‘sweets’: *Іәнэр ІәфIым къыкътэрт* (*the table was full of sweets*). This meaning contains a latent component – prepared by adding some sugar, but does not designate a certain sweet product, since it generates a collective meaning of *sweets*, *desert*. In this example we can observe a special way of word formation – conversion – transition from the category of adjectives to a class of substantives. The fourth meaning – *sweet sparkling water*: *нсы ІәфI* (*sweet water*) also remains in the domain of food as well as the previous ones. It is remarkable that this meaning contains a collective component as the previous one. *Псы ІәфI* may designate all types of the sparkling sweet water, irrespective of its sort (Cola, Pepsi, Fanta, Lemonade etc.). The fifth meaning, which is the only one showing the result of metaphorical transference means ‘pleasant, giving pleasure’: *жеи ІәфI* (*a sweet dream*). It should be noted that *ІәфI* in this meaning is rather limited in its combinability. It can hardly be used with nouns like music, sounds, words (cf. English: sweet songs, music etc).

The next lexeme *гъауцIэ* comprises four meanings. The first one is – *sour, having sour taste*. For example, *мыIэрысэ гъауцIэ* – *a sour apple*. In comparison with the adjective *ІәфI* (*sweet*) this lexeme has a richer semantic structure. In terms of

metaphoric transference it is more varied as well. In its second meaning *гъауцIэ* (*sour*) conveys the feature ‘strong’ which is applicable only to alcoholic beverages: e.g. *аркэъ гъауцIэ* (*strong vodka*). The third meaning is based on metaphorical transference and is connected with some inner qualities of a person, men in particular, and implies ‘severe’, ‘brave’: *лы гъауцIэ* (*sour man*) – *a brave, severe personality*. The third meaning of *гъауцIэ* (*sour*) suggests strength of character, strong personality: ‘хьэл гъауцIэ’ – *a strong character*. Also, it is used to indicate a sharp, but fair remark, a word – *нсальэ гъауцIэ* (*sour word*). The last meaning of this adjective corresponds to a notion ‘cruel’, ‘fierce’ – e.g. ‘завэ гъауцIэ’ – *a cruel war*. The taste adjective *гъауцIэ* is also used as a noun indicating ‘energy’, ‘strength’, ‘labour’: *угъауцIэкIэ нсэужын* (*to live by one’s own labor*). The analysis of lexicographic data allows to conclude that in the Kabardino-Circassian language consciousness, the *sour* taste is associated with the power, strength and courage.

The adjective *фIэIу* is very close to the general meaning of an adjective *гъауцIэ*. The feature *sour* is the basis for both lexemes. But the sphere of application of this feature is different. Thus, *фIэIу* in the Kabardino-Circassian language is referred to the products which became *sour* as result of incorrect handling of the product or dish (sour soup, juice), or as a result of time and temperature effect (sour milk, cream). It underlines the defective character of the product. Another meaning of taste adjective *фIэIу* is prepared pickles – *нацэфIэIу* (pickled cucumber), *къэбыстэфIэIу* (*sauerkraut*). So, we can conclude that this adjective conveys the idea of making something taste *sour* as a result of some external influence.

The next adjective relating to the semantic group of taste is *дыдж* (*bitter*). It does not have a wide range of meanings – only two. The primary meaning conveys the idea of bitterness: *хуцхуэ дьдж* (*a bitter medicine*). The second meaning – ‘angry’, ‘bilious’, ‘caustic’ usually describes a man, mostly his moral features and activities: *нсальэ дьдж* (*offensive words*). The denotative standard of the Kabardino-Circassian *дыдж* (*bitter*) is ‘bile’. It becomes quite clear from the examples: *дыджэзэ* (*bitter bile*) – conveying a high degree of bitterness. Another example: *дыджэзэци нхузэIульхэжкым* (*so bitter that it is impossible to eat*).

Taste adjectives *шыгъэ* – ‘salty’ and *сыр* – ‘hot’, ‘spicy’ are found to have no semantic development according to the dictionary data, though contextual modification of primary meaning seems quite possible.

The adjective *мышыу* (*unsalted*) which in the primary meaning is an antonym to *шыгъэ* (*salty*), refers to tasteless, insipid food in the second: *ерыккы мышыу*. Also, it develops a metaphorical meaning: ‘empty’, ‘senseless’, ‘vapid’ when it defines words, behavior, actions, e.g. *нсальэ мышыу* (*idle talk, mere words*).

Conclusion

The analysis of semantic derivation of taste adjectives in the Kabardino-Circassian language allows to conclude that *taste* being a peripheral perceptual channel does not develop a wide range of derived meanings. The derived meanings of those ones which develop, are found to remain either within the domain of taste, or move, predominantly to the sphere of a man, his moral qualities, behavior and activity. The taste adjectives of the studied language revealed specific denotative standards, and trajectories of metaphorical transferences. The obtained results confirm the cultural impact on cognition, on the processes of conceptualization and categorization of the world.

Список литературы / References

1. Битокова С. Х. Парадигмальность метафоры как когнитивного механизма. Автореф. дис. ... д-ра филол. наук: 10.02.19: защищена 17.12.09: утв. 10.02.10 / Битокова Светлана Хаутиевна. – Нальчик, 2009. – 45 с.
2. Гамезо М. В. Общая психология: Учебно-методическое пособие / М. В. Гамезо. – М.: Ось-89, 2007. – 352 с.
3. Ивашкевич И. Н. К вопросу о роли перцепции в процессах вторичной номинации / И. Н. Ивашкевич // Вестник РУДН, серия Вопросы образования: языки и специальность. – 2011. – №2. – С. 41-45.
4. Колесов И. Ю. Актуализация зрительного восприятия в языке: когнитивный аспект (на материале английского и русского языков): автореф. дис. ... д-ра филол. наук: 10.02.19: защищена 16.02.09: утв. 15.08.09 / Колесов Игорь Юрьевич. – Барнаул, 2009. – 31 с.
5. Кубрякова Е. С. Язык и знание: На пути получения знаний о языке: Части речи с когнитивной точки зрения. Роль языка в познании мира / Е. С. Кубрякова / РАН. Ин-т языкознания. – М.: Языки славянской культуры, 2004. – 560 с.
6. Кубрякова Е.С. Эволюция лингвистических идей во второй половине XX века (опыт парадигмального анализа) / Е. С. Кубрякова // Язык и наука конца XX века. – М.: Издательство Российского государственного гуманитарного университета, 1995. – С. 144-238.
7. Урысон Е. В. Проблемы исследования языковой картины мира: Аналогия в семантике / Е. В. Урысон. – М.: Языки славянской культуры, 2003. – 224 с.
8. Попова З. Д. Когнитивная лингвистика / З. Д. Попова, И. А. Стернин. – М.: АСТ: Восток-Запад, 2010. – 314 с.
9. Рузин И. Г. Когнитивные стратегии именованности: модусы перцепции (зрение, слух, осязание, обоняние, вкус) и их выражение в языке / И. Г. Рузин // Вопросы языкознания. – 1994. – №6. – С. 79-100.
10. Харченко В. К. Лингвосенсорика. Фундаментальные и прикладные аспекты / В. К. Харченко. – М.: Книжный дом «Либроком», 2012. – 216 с.
11. Lakoff G. Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Thought / G. Lakoff, M. Johnson. – New-York: Basic Books, 1999. – 312 p.
12. Lakoff G. Why cognitive linguistics requires embodied realism / G. Lakoff, M. Johnson // Cognitive Linguistics. – 2002. – № 13-3. – P. 245-263.
13. Kovecses Z. Metaphor in Culture. Universality and variation / Z. Kovecses. – Cambridge University Press, 2005. – 314 p.
14. Pylyshyn Z. W. Computational processes in human vision: an interdisciplinary perspective / Z. W. Pylyshyn. – Norwood, 1988. – 45 p.
15. Кубрякова Е. С. Краткий словарь когнитивных терминов / Е. С. Кубрякова, В. З. Демьянков, Ю. Г. Панкрац и др. – М.: Филологический факультет МГУ им. М.В. Ломоносова, 1997. – 245 с.
16. Табухов Х. К. Толковый русско-кабардино-черкесский словарь / Х. К. Табухов. – Нальчик: Эль-фа, 2005. – 768 с.
17. Кабардино-русский словарь / Под ред. Б.М. Карданова. – М.: Гос. изд-во иностранных и национальных словарей, 1957. – 576 с.
18. Словарь кабардино-черкесского языка / Институт гуманитарных исследований Кабардино-Балкарского научного центра РАН. – М.: Дигора, 1999. – 860 с.

Список литературы на английском / References in English

1. Bitokova S. H. Paradigmality of metaphors as a cognitive mechanism. [Paradigmatics of the metaphor as a cognitive mechanism] abstract of dis. ... of PhD in Philology: 10.02.19: defense of the thesis 17.12.09: approved 10.02.10 / Bitokova Svetlana Hautieva. – Nalchik, 2009. – 45 p. [in Russian]
2. Gamezo M. V. Obshchaya psikhologiya: Uchebno-metodicheskoe posobie. [General psychology: textbook] / M. V. Gamezo – M.: Os'-89, 2007. – 352 p. [in Russian]
3. Ivashkevich I. N. K voprosu o roli perceptii v procesah vtorichnoj nominacii [To a question about the role of perception in processes of the secondary nomination] // Vestnik RUDN, seriya Voprosy obrazovaniya: yazyki i special'nost' [Bulletin of RUDN, series questions on education: languages and speciality]. – 2011. – №2. – P. 41-45. [in Russian]
4. Kolesov I. Yu. Aktualizatsiya zritel'nogo vospriyatiya v yazyke: kognitivnyj aspekt (na material anglijskogo i russkogo yazykov) [Updating the visual perception in language: cognitive aspect (based on the material of English and Russian languages)]: abstract of dis. ... of PhD in Philology: 10.02.19: defense of the thesis 16.02.09: approved 15.08.09 / Kolesov Igor' Yur'evich. – Barnaul, 2009. – 31 p. [in Russian]
5. Kubryakova E.S. Yazyk i znanie: Na puti polucheniya znaniy o yazyke: Chasti rechi s kognitivnoj tochki zreniya. Rol' yazyka v poznanii mira [Language and knowledge: on the way of getting the knowledge of the language: Parts of speech from the cognitive science. Role of the language in understanding the world] / E.S. Kubryakova. – M.: Yazyki slavyanskoj kul'tury, 2004. – 560 p. [in Russian]
6. Kubryakova E.S. Evolutsiya lingvisticheskikh idej vo vtoroj polovine XX veka (opyt paradigmalnogo analiza) [Evolution of the linguistic ideas in the 2nd half of the XXth century (experience of the paradigmatic analysis)] / E. S. Kubryakova / Yazyk i nauka konca XX veka [Language and science of the end of the XXth century]. – M.: Izdatel'stvo Rossijskogo gosudarstvennogo gumanitarnogo universiteta, 1995. – P. 144-238. [in Russian]
7. Uryson E. V. Problemy issledovaniya yazykovoj kartiny mira: analogiya v semantike [Problems in studying the linguistic picture of the world: Analogy in semantics] / E. V. Uryson. – M.: Yazyki slavyanskoj kul'tury, 2003. – 224 p. [in Russian]
8. Popova Z. D. Kognitivnaya lingvistika [Cognitive linguistics] / Z. D. Popova, I. A. Sternin. – M.: AST: Vostok-Zapad, 2010. – 314 p. [in Russian]

9. Ruzin I. G. Kognitivnye strategii imenovaniya: modusy percepcii (zrenie, sluh, osyazanie, obonyanie, vkus) i ih vyrazhenie v yazyke [Cognitive strategies of nomination: mode of perception (sight, hearing, touch, smell, taste) and their expression in a language] / I. G. Ruzin // Voprosy yazykoznanija [Questions on linguistics]. – 1994. – № 6. – P. 79-100. [in Russian]
 10. Harchenko V.K. Lingvosensorica. Fundamental'nye i prikladnye aspekty [Linguistic sensation. Fundamental and applied aspects] / V. K. Harchenko. – M.: Knizhnyj dom "Librikom", 2012. – 216 p. [in Russian]
 11. Lakoff G. Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Thought / G. Lakoff, M. Johnson. – New-York: Basic Books, 1999. – 312 p.
 12. Lakoff G. Why cognitive linguistics requires embodied realism / G. Lakoff, M. Johnson // Cognitive Linguistics. – 2002. – № 13-3. – P. 245-263.
 13. Kovecses Z. Metaphor in Culture. Universality and variation / Z. Kovecses. – Cambridge University Press, 2005. – 314 p.
 14. Pylyshyn Z. W. Computational processes in human vision: an interdisciplinary perspective / Z. W. Pylyshyn. – Norwood, 1988. – 45 p.
 15. Kubryakova E. S. Kratkij slovar' kognitivnyh terminov [Short dictionary of cognitive terms] / E. S. Kubryakova, V. Z. Dem'yankov, V. Z. Pancrac and others. – M.: Filologicheskij fakul'tet MGU im. M.V. Lomonosova, 1997. – 768 p. [in Russian]
 16. Tabuhov H.K. Tolkovyj russko-kabardino-cherkesskij slovar' [Explanatory Russian – Kabardian-Circassian dictionary] / H.K. Tabohov. – Nal'chik: El'-fa, 2005. – 768 p. [in Russian]
 17. Kabardino-russkij slovar' [Kabardian-Circassian – Russian Dictionary] / edited by B.M. Kardanova. – M.: Gos. Izd-vo inostrannyh i nacional'nyh slovarej, 1957. – 576 p. [in Russian]
 18. Slovar' Kabardino-Cherkesskogo yazyka [Kabardian-Circassian language dictionary] / Institut gumanitarnyh issledovanij Kabardino-Balkarskogo nauchnogo centra RAN [Institute of humanitarian studies of the Kabardino-Balkarian scientific center RAN]. – M.: Digora, 1999. – 860 p. [in Russian]
-
-