



Gunay Mammadagha Aghayeva¹

On the Question of the Peculiarity of the Differentiation of Phytonyms in Modern Azerbaijani and English Languages

Research in modern cognitive linguistics often draws on the principle of anthropocentrism, which emphasises the central role of humans in language. This “human factor” has become key in solving various linguistic issues. A systematic approach to these challenges brings together linguists and scholars from related fields.

Cognitive linguistics incorporates various disciplines, such as cultural studies, regional studies, ethnology, and ethnography. It reflects people’s cultural and moral values while incorporating knowledge from linguistic and cultural research. This brief introduction to our article is essential for us to provide a more accurate and precise terminological definition of the name and identification of the inherent natural properties of phytonyms. Lexemes denoting these terms are available in almost all languages in the world. Essentially, this is a generalised fragment of a language picture. We are primarily concerned with phytonyms used by linguists in contemporary English and Azerbaijani languages. For this purpose, a comparative analysis is clearly necessary.

So, first of all, let us establish: what do scientists understand by phytonyms in general? That is, regardless of the names in a particular language. It is a biological concept by which plants, flowers, and trees are meant. In short, everything related to flora is global because the named species (or types, subspecies) can be meadow, mountain, forest, wood, or grass.

¹ Azerbaijan University of Languages, Azerbaijan.

Meanwhile, it is not for nothing that we began the article by pointing out the symbiosis of several related disciplines. The essence of the matter here lies in the fact that the biological nature of individual English and Azerbaijani lexemes and expressions is genetically closely related to these sciences, although they are far from being separated from cognitive linguistics.

Upon closer examination, it turns out that phytonyms in the two languages we compare have an extensive range of lexical and semantic fields. Accordingly, research is conducted in different directions. Within the framework of the article, there is no real opportunity to consider them in all their nuances. Our main goal is to reveal the most significant, from our point of view, lexical and semantic features of phytonyms in Azerbaijani and English languages, simultaneously differentiating and systematising them.

To achieve this goal, it is necessary to solve some tasks. Among them, the most important to us is searching for and establishing many lexical and semantic characteristics of phytonyms, determining their volume, and finally, bringing general data into the system. The latter will look like a kind of closing link in the chain of phytonyms we discovered and demonstrated, which clearly indicates the range of the study as a whole.

It is necessary to immediately establish the etymology of the desired term. Both English and Azerbaijani phytonyms have not emerged spontaneously. They have organically incorporated the centuries-long experience of cultural, moral, and spiritual development of humanity. However, a small caveat should be noted: the former acquired their names in line with the evolution of the languages of the Romano-Germanic family, while the latter in the context of Turkic tradition. Therefore, the dynamics of this process differ slightly from one another. Nevertheless, in both instances (European and Eastern personality types, respectively), humans, over time, have given certain species of flora their respective names. Thus, it can be reasonably argued that the relevant lexemes in both languages initially associated them in the subconscious and later reflected their acquisition process.

These tasks are essential for completing the overall study of phytonyms, as they will provide a comprehensive understanding of the range and scope of this linguistic phenomenon².

² Ş.Ə. Məlikova, *Tərkibində bitki adları olan frazeoloji birləşmələr: ingilis və Azərbaycan dillərinin materialları əsasında*, filologiya üzrə fəlsəfə dok. ... dis. Avtoreferatı, Bakı, AMEA Nəsimi adına

Among A.V. Superanskaya, T.A. Bobrova, E.V. Ivanova, and other modern linguists, there is an agreement that the term “phytonym” refers to the proper names of nearly any entity in the plant world. However, this general definition does not imply that there is no need for further research into their definitions and categorisation. It is where phytonyms can fully demonstrate their potential.

Let us explain. Using objective research methods, scientists conclude that in modern English and Azerbaijani languages, phytonyms are differentiated according to the following characteristics: form, native natural properties, region, and pragmatic connections. Moreover, it is based on colour, smell, and taste. So, Azerbaijani phytonyms (and we will show this in the article) are inseparable from the Eastern mentality and the world-view of man in general and in general. The peculiarity of differentiation is also manifested in two planes: conditional or associative-speculative and concrete signs. The first includes different forms of flowering, purely tactile sensations (they are individual), and types and methods of planting and growing (their number and possibilities are still not precisely established in linguistics).

It is important to note that the timing of flowering and the shapes of plants and trees in the United Kingdom (as well as in the East) do not match. It is a fundamental difference: the latitudes differ, meaning that biological laws apply differently in each area, which is reflected in language. For example, in Azerbaijan, where summers are very hot, some exotic plants lose their leaves closer to the middle of autumn due to the intense heat. The climate in “Foggy Albion”, on the other hand, is more severe, with trees losing their leaves at the end of summer. This process occurs so quickly that deciduous trees are virtually unrecorded in modern English. The logic behind this is simple: if there is no corresponding object (phenomenon or concept) in one language, there will not be a word or lexeme to describe it in that language. In contrast, the Azerbaijani lan-

Dilçilik İnstitutu 2012; Д.Б. Мирзаханова, *Фитонимическая лексика азербайджанского языка (в сравнении с другими тюркскими языками)*, Автореферат канд. филол. наук, Махачкала 2007; A. Stan, *Phytonyms in idiomatic expressions – A contrastive approach*, Conference on British and American Studies, Investigating language as social (inter-) action, UK 2019; A. Langlotz, *Idiomatic Creativity. A Cognitive-Linguistic Model of Idiom Representation and Idiom Variation in English*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia 2016; C.D. Caraiman, *Concise Oxford Lingua English-Romanian Dictionary*, New York 2009; N.Y. Abasova, *Heyvan mənşəli fitonimlərdə somatik ifadələrin izləri*, Humanitar elmlərin öyrənilməsinin aktual problemləri, Bakı 2018.

guage has phytonyms to describe these plants: *frame tree* – *dağdağan*; *houseplant gledia* – *lələk*. These are deciduous trees and plants. In the East, more precisely, in the sands of Karakum, there is a saxaul. This leafless tree was named *saksaul* in the form of tracing paper. At the same time, there are many leafless trees in England. Therefore, an analogy can be drawn: *qayınağacı* – *maple*.

The second group includes a more extended group of phytonyms, such as inflorescences, differences in taste (modifications of qualitative composition), quantity, names in honour of someone and something, gender, constitution, flowering time, the geography of distribution on the planet, etc. The same law applies to some Azerbaijani phytonyms. Thus, evergreen shrubs have individual taste qualities – “olive” or “oliva”, designated by a single lexeme “zeytun”. From this word comes “olive oil / zeytun yağı”. Laurel has a unique smell. Its taste qualities after cooking are called “dəfnə”. In a comprehensive phytonymic thesaurus, there is a famous saying, “laurel tree / dəfnə ağacı”, although biologists and linguists know this phytonym as a shrub.

As we can see, only to an unenlightened person or at a glance, it may seem that all these signs are largely identical and, if desired, can be easily and naturally reunited into a single whole. In fact, according to the observations of linguists, the colour scheme is extensive and diverse. Moreover, with a slight deviation (deviation from the norm), this applies to phytonyms in languages of different groups. In English and Azerbaijani languages, first of all, it is necessary to consider such nominations that characterise the morphological and structural characteristics of plants and their species (subspecies). It means considering such parameters of the plant world as the “drawing” of a single leaf, foliage on branches, stems, shoots, roots, etc. For example, a shrub with a very thin stem grows in the northern latitudes of Azerbaijan. It is the *qvayula*. It bends easily from the slightest breeze. Its softness resembles rubber. Therefore, the named phytonym is called rubber shrub in the Azerbaijani language. Only a reservation should be made: linguists are interested in these signs not from the standpoint of biology (according to what laws the flower will grow) but as the most accurate selection of the lexeme. In other words, this is how modern linguists study the exterior of plants, flowers, inflorescences or trees, particularly relying on some of the main types of fruits, seeds, etc. Their morphological and structural features underlie phytonyms.

For example, N.S. Yagumova builds her classification based on such signs. (In our opinion, it is the most informative, and we will mainly rely on it in this article with our own conclusions and comments). Following the goal she set in her work, N.S. Yagubova cites only English phytonyms. We, in turn, will try to enrich the article with a brief comparative comparison by analysing, and differentiating it according to specific categories.

An example of this is the flower known as the “globe flower”, which, along with its thin stem, resembles a woman’s figure in shape and remains moist for an extended time, giving it the name “bathing suit” (not to be confused with the religious term “font”). The structure of this word also holds significance, as it is a compound word with two roots.

The shape of a flower or plant is also reflected in the Azerbaijani language. Thus, due to its slimness, the phytonym “çinara” also resembles a female figure. Recalling the famous Yesenin “Thin Rowan”, we point out the phytonym “üvəz”. Slender poplars are similar in shape to birch or aspen. But in Azerbaijan, poplars often have black stripes on a white background. Hence the name of the phytonym: “qaraağac”. There is also a poplar similar to a geometric pyramid shape. It is: “əbrişin” – the so-called “pyramidal poplar”.

If the main morphological features are localised at the place of plant cultivation (more often – the growth of a flower), then N.S. Yagumova classifies such phytonyms as locatives. For example, as far as we have managed to find out, some grape varieties cultivated in mountainous areas of Great Britain have a specific taste and shape. This locality is known as “beach grape”, referring to grapes that grow on rocks. It is worth noting that such a phytonym would unlikely have received a similar designation in the Caucasus, specifically in Azerbaijan, where only small mountains and, more commonly, plains, rather than rocks, could serve as a natural locality.

The differentiation of phytonyms based on the mentioned characteristic of a specific region has a geographical locative nomination. It includes, for example, the flower “Irish daisy”³, which in the world classification of flora is listed as “medicinal dandelion”. The scientist proposes only one variant for the phytonym, “Irish Daisy”, which, as can be seen, does not coincide (and does not even speculatively correlate) with the English expression.

³ Н.Ш. Ягумова, *Фитонимическое пространство в языковой картине мира: словообразовательный и мотивационный аспекты: на материале английского и адыгейского языков*, Автореферат: канд. филол. наук, Москва 2008, p. 17.

We believe that we can engage in a small discussion here with N.S. Yagumova on this point. The Russian term only partly agrees with the geographical naming because the flower grows in some regions of Russia. However, this is not the main feature of the phytonym. It has a medicinal purpose, which is why it is called “medicinal”. Unlike the common and well-known meadow dandelion, it is used for treating certain ailments. Therefore, we would like to add that the geographical reference of “Daisy” (Ireland) should be understood in a conditional sense.

Such verbal confusion is hardly possible in the Azerbaijani language. First of all, phytonyms are more often localised by geographical region. Some of them even have a sacred meaning. For example, only in Shusha city of Azerbaijan and globally, as scientists prove, “Xarı bül-bül” grows. This flower is unique in its characteristics, thus, rightfully considered a city symbol. Or take “zəfəran”. This phytonym contains not only flavouring (seasoning) but also the most valuable medical properties.

A clearer distinction between English phytonyms is provided by N.S. Yagumova concerning some other localities. For instance, in instances where a plant produces certain substances that are later utilised in everyday life, agriculture, manufacturing, and industry, among others. Under ordinary circumstances, this plant proves itself in practice, and, therefore, in science, it acquires a verbal form.

One such phytonym is “oil palm”. It is a type of palm tree from which juice is extracted and subsequently processed into oil. Thus, the plant is referred to as “Maslenitsa”. For good reason, the scholar attributes pragmatic qualities to it. Needless to say, N.S. Yagumova, who was directly engaged in the current issue (she was in the middle of her PhD research), was not the only expert who presented her classification of phytonyms in contemporary English.

A.A. Kadimova, in a meaningful article on this topic, gives several interesting and characteristic examples. Thus, “dəmirağac” is a bright phytonym formed by the metonymic feature of the object that this tree consists of “qaraçöhrə” is most often used in the phrase “yew alley”. Let us compare: “birch grove” and “pine forest”. Each phytonym – we add on behalf of A.A. Kadimova – has a strict set of individual phrases. The named scientist in the same article cites the rarely used phytonym “əndam”, which means

“dragon tree”⁴. Unfortunately, A.A. Kadimova focuses on etymology but provides only a word-by-word translation. Meanwhile, it is known that this phytonym got its name from the unusually twisted and flattened shape of the branches, resembling a mythical dragon.

Summarising the works of the scientists already named in our article and others, we come to the following conclusions and generalisations. Most linguists refuse such close attention to locatives, but when differentiating and, even more so, reducing English phytonyms into a system, they point to nominations based on the fundamental characteristics of flora. Namely, researchers everywhere operate with such things as colour, smell, shape, and, in some cases, taste qualities, spatial and temporal characteristics (area, as well as the period of flowering and wilting). Each of these signs correlates with a certain lexeme or phrase, which is more or less fixed in modern English and Azerbaijani languages. At the same time, it is clear that norms and standards must be argued in defending them. We are starting to do this in the final part of the work.

So, among the most important characteristics of phytonyms in two languages, colour stands out first. Indeed, this is one of the strongest signs. If we recall the beginning of our article, which talked about the reliance of most scientists on the principles of anthropocentrism, then the colour of plants should generally be considered central. Let us think about it: the human eye first notices the plant’s colour and connects other senses later. A person admires the beauty of a flower, and it is followed along the chain by the perception of form. In some cases, taste and tactile sensations come into play.

Consider the human experience: we first notice the colour of a plant and only then connect other senses to it. We admire the beauty of a flower and follow it with the perception of its shape and, in some cases, even taste and tactile sensation. A.M. Letova proposes differentiating English phytonyms based on a “qualifying feature” specifically based on the “colour aspect”⁵. This naming scheme is fully justified, as this feature is widely recognised in cognitive linguistics as a leading one in analysing various

⁴ А.А. Кадымова, *Семантическая классификация фитонимов в азербайджанском и русском языках*, Вестник ВГУ, Серия Лингвистика и межкультурная коммуникация, Воронеж 2017, р. 127.

⁵ А.М. Летова, *Из истории исследования фитонимической лексики лингвокультурологический аспект*, Вестник МГОУ, Серия «Русская филология» 2014, р. 32.

problems. She cites examples such as the violet flower (“violet”) and the white birch (“white birch”), as well as the rarely used “golden rod” (which means “Goldenrod”) and “purple foxglove” and others.

However, when analysing phytonyms in the Azerbaijani language, we must proceed from other criteria for assessing their colour range. Namely, simple adjectives denoting the main colours of the spectrum have an abstract character in this language. These are abstract colour designations: “ağ”, “al”, “boz”, “qara”, “ala”, “sarı”. Compare: “white”, “red”, “brown”, “black”, “grey”, “yellow”. Combined with plants or trees, they usually have broad compatibility and can denote varying degrees of manifestation of a given feature in different objects. For example, using the adjective “qızıl” (red) with the nouns “dəvə, otaq”, we do not mean the absolute identity of the colour of these objects. At the same time, adjectives of colour inherent in phytonyms can simply be assigned to a specific object, a characteristic bearer of this quality. For example: “ağ tozağacı”. Unlike the specified nominations in English, there are no significant deviations from the colour range. Birch can only be white. Therefore, other colours are unacceptable in Azerbaijani and many other languages.

Thus, objectively speaking, the colour of English and Azerbaijani phytonyms differs in a rich palette. First of all, it reflects the colour diversity of the world, which, as a fragment of the overall picture, is represented in this language by some discrete forms. It is also significant that in these languages, it is relatively easy to identify a limited number of adjectives of colour that make up the core of the lexicon of a given linguistic community at a specific time.

We will talk about this nomination below. It is also important to emphasise here that the lexical units denoting colour in English and Azerbaijani languages belong to the reference attributes of phytonyms. It means there is a specific class of objects whose indispensable attribute is a particular feature. Reference representations are formed mainly by association. The phytonym itself can establish the standard for these terms, specifically its root morpheme – for example, “cherry” refers to “cherry colours”, “raspberry” refers to “raspberry colours”, “rose” refers to “rose colours”, “lemon” refers to “lemon colours”, and so on.

According to the logic of reasoning, colour is followed by taste. There are also many interesting associations from our point of view. It turns out

that the taste qualities of plants have not always received a specific lexical designation in English and Azerbaijani onomastics. Here is the simplest and, perhaps, the most common example. Any rose smells fragrant; its taste qualities are similar to perfume. It is well-known and most likely close to the expression of the principle of anthropocentrism. However, there is still no locative for this feature. So, there are several names: “Fragrant rose”, “Black rose”, “White rose”, and “Chinese rose”, but there is no phytonym in English and Azerbaijani languages reflecting its smell and taste by analogy with perfumes. It is undeniable, given at least the “Pink jam” with a characteristic flavour. Meanwhile, the phytonym “pea”, which tastes like honey, is reflected in English.

Let us compare: from “honey” – in our case, the phytonym “honey pea” was formed, which means “honey peas”. Other criteria that fall under this nomination should differentiate phytonyms in the Azerbaijani language. According to our observations, it will be clearer and stricter if they are laid out according to the principle of kinship. Cereals: *taxıl*; *vələmir*; *ciryulaf*; *darı*; *çovar*; *arpa*. So, by analogy with “honey pea”, the phytonym “şəşəri” is constructed. It is also a cereal crop, meaning “spring barley”. It is characteristic that, in comparison with phytonyms in modern English, the subject is a more pronounced feature in Azerbaijani. So, in modern Britain, it is not customary to peel, that is, sift rice, whereas Azerbaijani housewives do this repeatedly. Therefore, along with the ordinary “duyü”, there is a phytonym “çaltuk”, but only with the corresponding particle “not” in the preposition. The phrase “peeled rice” is formed. The legume culture “lobya” is also purified. A long-forgotten cereal in the world is spelt, known only to philologists based on Pushkin’s famous fairy tale “Pop and Balda” (“Give me boiled spelt”). It comes to life in the Azerbaijani language as a phytonym – *pərinç*.

Tactile ones closely relate to phytonymy with taste qualities. They would come third in our classification. However, this term has no discrepancies, as it is a human sensation that occurs when directly touching a plant. For example, some linguists cite “velvet-leaf blueberry” as a classic example, which as a biological plant type means “Canadian blueberry”, but as a lexical unit in translation, it appears as “velvety-leaved blueberry”.

Unfortunately, we have not found any further discussion of this name in today’s linguistic literature. There is only the standard statement of fact: “tactile sensations”. However, these are necessary for us to more clearly

explain the difference between the nearly synonymous terms “taste” and “touch”. Indeed, in both cases, it would be most appropriate to use the same verb as the primary word in the description. We believe that comments are necessary to complete the phytonym differentiation picture. So, why is this name specifically attributed to these sensations? Because, unlike purely taste qualities, there is an additional element of tactile sensation. This aspect introduces the adjective “velvety”. As we can see, the range of meaning of phytonyms in English can sometimes depend on a single additional element added to the central lexeme. The fourth aspect of our differentiation is the concept of “time”. An example of this is the English phytonym “flower-of-an-hour”. The biological type is “Ceylon spinach”. However, in this context, we are less interested in the literal translation of the words or even the morphological features of the phytonym. Instead, we focus on its structure. The phytonym is divided into four parts by a hyphen, with the first and last lexemes being significant. These are divided into a preposition and an article. This division is not arbitrary. The significant words emphasise the duration of the flower’s bloom and wilting, respectively, and are similar in shape to the Russian word “one-day” (for a butterfly). The authoritative scientist, V.G. Gak, in one of his publications included in the encyclopedic dictionary, correctly points out that during the process of performing operations such as differentiation and subsequent unification of phenomena or concepts, it is essential to take into consideration the specific lexical meaning of the word being analysed⁶.

Indeed, the differentiation of a chosen concept based on any criteria will be incomplete or even inaccurate in terms of its intrinsic content if the mentioned aspect is not considered.

In the current context, it is essential to correctly classify phytonyms, considering individual nuances, to prevent errors based on characterological criteria. For instance, experts and experienced gardeners know that the “crow’s eye” flowers in central Russia only for one year. If one does not know this fact, it is easy to interpret the root “year” in the name “one-berry” as the flowering duration. An incorrect interpretation of the lexical meaning of this phytonym would lead to the assumption that the flower’s name refers to the period it blooms. However, this is not the case. In Eng-

⁶ В.Г. Гак, *Лексическое значение слова*, Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь. 2-е издание, дополненное, М., Большая Российская энциклопедия 2002, р. 111.

lish, the correct interpretation is clearer, as the numeral “one” is placed before the word “berry”. Therefore, when interpreted correctly, the phytonym refers to the quantity or quantitative value of the fruit. It is important to note that this lexeme indicates the use of only one fruit, similar to the biological category of “one-fruit”.

Furthermore, the entire flora of the world is graded not only according to shape but also according to size and magnitude. This characteristic is taken into account not only by biologists but also by linguists. It is evident that flowers, shrubs and, to an even greater extent, trees (which act as the most prominent characterological feature) can be large or small. Typically, oaks are enormous and have wide-spreading branches. However, a contrary phytonym has also been recorded in linguistics: “dwarf oak”. The general meaning is unequivocal: the main emphasis here is on the value of size. At the same time, it is worth noting that another phytonym that includes the same adjective (dwarf) in its composition seems to have transferred its name to another plant – ficus. There is an immense difference in size between oak and ficus, let alone the biological characteristics that distinguish a tree from a houseplant. However, the phytonym “ficus” in English acquires a significantly different meaning in the phrase “climbing fig”, which means “climbing...” or “creeping...”. This phytonym is similar in type to liana and ivy, which also encircle part of a structure. However, this is not the only difference. In our classification, this phytonym has a different position; it is not a measure of size but a type or growth method. The term’s meaning changes with a single locative, again demonstrating the English phytonym classification’s uniqueness and originality.

All of the above features in the modern Azerbaijani language have distinctive features. First of all, I would like to point out the connection with other Turkic words. For example, the nomination “magnitude” is reflected in the lexeme “bandal”, which has an ancient Turkic origin. “Ban” is a tree, and “dal” is a large branch. The modern Azerbaijani language adopted this complex lexeme, which, in its etymology, consisted of an archaic phrase. Thus, this phytonym was formed, in which the structure seemed to dictate the necessary content.

On the Question of the Peculiarity of the Differentiation of Phytonyms in Modern Azerbaijani and English Languages

Summary

This article is written on a relevant topic. It is a fairly original alloy for exact science, in which rigorous data, formulations, basic conclusions and generalisations are intertwined with interesting and even, to a certain extent, fascinating material. The article is complicated and enriched by a comparative analysis of phytonyms in two languages of different groups. With the apparent dominance of the former, the work is divided into several parts. The first one provides brief information about the terminology itself. The meaning of phytonyms is given according to world standardisation. The author clearly and distinctly clarifies that the phytonymic vocabulary in English and Azerbaijani has gone a long way in development and formation. Moreover, it is emphasised that when analysing phytonyms in the Azerbaijani language, it is necessary to pay closer attention to the etymology of specific words and expressions. In the second part, the colour scheme is differentiated. The third, which logically follows the second, shows its uniqueness in the two named languages. Finally, in the fourth part, various ways of using them are proposed for consideration and linguistic analysis.

Having completed the theoretical part, the author proceeds to the practical implementation of the central theme, that is, he subjects the most famous English and Azerbaijani phytonyms in science to differentiation. It is based on individual nominations and so-called locatives. Again, as before, the article's author focuses on comparing the desired vocabulary in two languages. When analysing the content of phytonyms, the author relies on their characterological features. These are form, time, age, quantity, and quality. Summarising these features, unifying them and bringing them into a single system is possible. As a result, phytonyms in two languages are presented as a fragment of the overall picture of the universe. Their purely biological nature does not obscure strict linguistic analysis.

In our opinion, the evident success of the article's author should be considered in the constantly cited comparisons of facts or phenomena of two perceived sides: biologists and linguists. In some cases (shown in the work), they partially coincide, but they may have completely different estimates. The latter is observed in the case of identification by linguists of purely distinctive features and signs. Individual characteristics follow from this. It is correctly noted that each specialist is looking for his own angle of view on the desired problem, but all conclusions and generalisations are reduced to linguistic analysis. In any case, the overall picture turns out to be clarified.

Keywords: Azerbaijani language, English language, research range, phytonyms, cognitive linguistics, comparative analysis, modern research, anthropocentrism, differentiation, classification, nominations, plants, flowers, trees

К вопросу о своеобразии дифференциации фитонимов В современном английском и азербайджанском Языках

Резюме

Настоящая статья написана на актуальную тему. По нашему мнению, она представляет собой достаточно оригинальный для точной науки сплав, в котором строгие данные, формулировки, основные выводы и обобщения переплетаются с интересным и даже в известной мере увлекательным материалом. Статья осложнена и обогащена сравнительно-сопоставительным анализом фитонимов в двух языках разных групп. При явном доминировании первого работа чётко разделена на несколько частей. В первой приведены краткие сведения о самой терминологии. Значение фитонимов приводятся по мировой стандартизации. Автор ясно и отчётливо даёт понять, что фитонимическая лексика в английском и азербайджанском языках прошла долгий путь развития и формирования. Причём, особо подчёркивается, что при разборе фитонимов в азербайджанском языке необходимо уделять более пристальное внимание к этимологии конкретных слов и выражений. Во второй части дана дифференциация цветовой гаммы. В третьей, логически вытекающей из второй, показано её своеобразии в двух названных языках. Наконец, в четвёртой части предлагаются к рассмотрению и лингвистическому анализу различные способы их употребления.

Завершив теоретическую часть, автор переходит к практической реализации центральной темы, то есть подвергает наиболее известные в науке английские и азербайджанские фитонимы дифференциации. Она строится на базе отдельных номинаций и так называемых локативов. Вновь, как и ранее, в центре внимания автора статьи находится сопоставление искомой лексики в двух языках. При разборе содержательной стороны фитонимов, автор опирается на их характерологические признаки. Это: форма, время, возраст, количество, качество. Обобщая приведённые признаки, появляется возможность для их унификации, сведения в единую систему. В результате фитонимы в двух языках представлены как фрагмент общей картины мироздания. Их сугубо биологическая природа не заслоняет собою строгого лингвистического анализа.

Явной удачей автора статьи, на наш взгляд, следует считать постоянно приводимые сравнения фактов или явлений двух воспринимаемых сторон: учёных-биологов и лингвистов. Оказывается, в некоторых случаях (показаны в работе) они частично совпадают, но могут иметь и абсолютно разные оценки. Последнее наблюдается в случае выявления языковедами сугубо отличительных черт и признаков. Отсюда следуют индивидуальные характеристики. Правильно отмечено, что каждый специалист ищет собственный угол зрения на искомую проблему, но все выводы и обобщения сводятся к лингвистическому анализу. В любом случае общая картина оказывается прояснённой.

Ключевые слова: азербайджанский язык, английский язык, диапазон исследования, фитонимы, когнитивная лингвистика, сравнительный анализ, современные исследования, антропоцентризм, дифференциация, классификация, номинации, растения, цветы, деревья